

Literary Law Enforcement: Gender in Crime Ballads in Early Modern England

Annie Tock

“Whatever the act, it was more dangerous when done by women.”¹

The eighteenth-century ballad, “The Berkshire Tragedy, or The Wittam Miller,” relates the story of a miller who promises a woman he will marry her if she will have sex with him. She consents and later becomes pregnant. When she approaches the miller about marriage, he refuses to fulfill his promise. Finally, after much nagging on the part of the woman and her mother, the miller lures his former sweetheart to a private place and beats her to death. He is caught and sentenced to hang. At the end of the ballad the condemned man advises the readers:

Young man take warning by my fall,
all filthy lusts defy;
By giving way to wickedness,
alas! this day i die.²

The heart of the message in this ballad is not “do not murder,” rather it is “do not lust.” In the case of this young man, his lust led him to make a promise and incur an obligation to a woman; a surrender of his power that he was not willing to tolerate. Rather than temporarily relinquish his superior position in the social order, he eliminated his obligation by killing its object. The ballad condemns him most strongly for yielding his authority, not for killing another human being. The portrayal of women in early modern crime ballads is about power and its preservation. Crime ballads depicted women both as victims and as offenders to

¹ Susan Dwyer Amussen, “The Gendering of Popular Culture in Early Modern England,” in Tim Harris, ed., *Popular Culture in England, c. 1500-1850* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 1995), 66.

² “The Berkshire Tragedy, or, The Wittam Miller,” *Bodley Ballad Archive*, Douce Ballads 3 (1b) 18th century.

illustrate the tragedies that transpired when traditional gender roles were undermined. Women play the victim in much early modern English crime literature, but in the rarer case in which a woman is the aggressor her depiction in crime ballads reveals much about the gendered social system. This essay will focus on women as offenders, although as the previous example illustrates, there are similar conclusions to be drawn from the study of female victims. Ballads pertaining to women and crime sought to reinforce gender roles and strengthen the social order by providing an example of deviant women as a deterrent to others.

The sample of ten ballads presented here range in publication date from 1616 to the mid-eighteenth century.³ Nine of the ten ballads are printed in the “black letter” style most accessible to the non-elite public. There are three cases of murder, two include theft, five deal with adultery, and two concern prostitution. Seven of the ballads were published in London, a further two were most likely London works, and one came out of Newcastle-Upon-Tyne. Of the crimes detailed in the ballads, five were committed in London, one in Gloucestershire, one in Essex, one in the “North,” and two are undetermined. While this sample is small and further research is required to confirm any findings, the publication dates of the ballads do coincide with the larger historical narrative.

In her article on women prophets during the English Civil War, Phyllis Mack argues that during the upheaval of war and then the Interregnum, 1642 until 1660, gender roles were slightly relaxed allowing women prophets to gain credibility among certain religious groups. She contends, “Religious radicals viewed the period of the Interregnum (1649-1660) as a ‘world turned upside down,’ and they welcomed prophets of both sexes as a kind

³ “Anne Wallens Lamentation,” *Early Modern Center English Ballad Archive 1500-1700*, 1616; “Truth Brought to Light,” *Bodley Ballad Archive*, Wood 401(191), 1662; “The Careless Curate and the Bloody Butcher,” *Bodley Ballad Archive*, Wood 401(187), 1663; “A Job for a Journeyman Joyner,” *Bodley Ballad Archive*, Douce Ballads 1(106a), 1671-1704; “John the Glover and Jane his Servant,” *Bodley Ballad Archive*, Douce Ballads 1(103b), 1671 & 1704; “The Bak’d Bully,” *Bodley Ballad Archive*, Douce Ballads 1(11a), 1672 & 1696; “Dolly and Molly,” *Bodley Ballad Archive*, Wood E 25(140) 1672 & 1698; “The Bridewell Whores Resolution,” *Bodley Ballad Archive*, 40 Rawl. 566(98) 1674-1679; “The Scolding Wives Vindication,” *Bodley Ballad Archive*, Don. b. 13(82) 1683 & 1696; “The Lady Isabella’s Tragedy,” *Bodley Ballad Archive*, Douce Ballads 3(60a), 1711-1769.

of supernatural intrusion into a society which had repudiated reason and tradition.”⁴ Mack explains that with the end of the Interregnum came the end of the period of gender role relaxation. There followed a campaign to reassert traditional gender roles as society became more stable. She writes, “Masculine symbols of the patriarchal family were increasingly appropriate as models for a society whose priorities were political stability and disciplined economic activity furthered by rational self-interest; feminine symbols of diffuse, inchoate power clearly were not.”⁵ Mack’s identification of a reassertion of patriarchal authority after 1660 is supported by fact that seven of the ten sample ballads concerning deviant women were published between 1660 and 1679.

A second point of connection between the ballads and the larger historical narrative occurs with the Reformation of Manners in the 1690s. In *Sources and Debates in English History*, Newton Key and Robert Bucholz point to the Reformation of Manners’ campaign against alehouses, accused of being centers of prostitution, as well as other vices, as a clash between the reforming culture and a traditional popular culture.⁶ Although he contends that a prominent concern with manners was not confined to this period, Martin Ingram asserts, “Sexual offences were always prominent among the ‘ill manners’ that were targeted [by reformers].”⁷ The sample ballads reflect this concern with sexual morality, and their publication dates reveal a possible influence of the Reformation of Manners. As mentioned above, of the ten ballads, five deal with adultery and two with prostitution. In addition, three adultery ballads and one on prostitution were initially published in the 1670s and 1680s and then were republished during the 1690s at the height of the Reformation of Manners.

Key and Bucholz, along with Ingram and Susan Dwyer Amussen, point to a significant tension during this period. Not

⁴ Phyllis Mack, “Women as Prophets During the English Civil War,” *Feminist Studies* 8, no. 1 (Spring 1982): 38.

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ Newton Key and Robert Bucholz, *Sources and Debates in English History, 1485-1714* (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2004), 117.

⁷ Martin Ingram, “Sexual Manners: The Other Face of Civility in Early Modern England,” in Peter Burke, et al., eds., *Civil histories: essays presented to Sir Keith Thomas* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 90.

only was there a growing concern with manners, but there was a particular elite anxiety over the conduct of the lower classes. There has long been debate among historians over elite culture and popular culture and where or if these two cultures intersect. Amussen makes clear her own position, “Elite and popular cultures are not separate, and the theological, political and social ideas expressed in literate culture undoubtedly shaped the experience of all people.”⁸ The crime ballads of early modern England are one point of connection between elite and popular cultures. The ballads, often composed, paid for, and published by members of elite culture, were designed to educate not only elite readers, but also non-elites about the virtues of proper behavior.

Non-elites could have access to these documents when they were displayed in public venues such as taverns and inns and also through oral transmission. These ballads were meant not only to be read privately, but also to be sung and read aloud. In his book, *Popular Cultures in England 1550-1750*, Barry Reay emphasizes the widespread popularity of cheap print even among the non-literate population. He explains, “Reading aloud was one of the main bridges between literacy and orality. Those who could not read had ballads pasted to their cottage walls so that they could get literate visitors to convert print to the spoken word.”⁹ As one of the least expensive forms of print and one that most easily lent itself to memorization and performance, the ballad was a significant line of communication between elites and the larger culture. Ballads, then, could be an effective tool for the elites to impose their values on the rest of society. The maintenance of order was of great importance to elite culture and this was partially achieved through adherence to the traditional gender roles illustrated in ballads and broadsides.

The broadside “The Husband’s Instructions to his Family: or, Houshold Observations” detailed the proper roles of the wife, child, and servant as dictated by the husband. The illustration and Roman style type are clearly elite, but as Reay points out, printed material such as ballads and broadsides were often accessible to a

⁸ Amussen, “The Gendering of Popular Culture,” 49.

⁹ Barry Reay, *Popular Cultures in England, 1550-1750* (London: Longman, 1999), 61-62.

larger audience than the literate upper class. The instructions begin:

Since You're my Wife by Holy Nuptial State,
Such You shou'd be as these few Lines relate:¹⁰

The husband instructs his wife to be modest, "saving, though not penurious," soft-spoken and uncritical of her husband, trusting, and a caring mother who does not fail to discipline her children.¹¹ These virtues, along with others such as chastity and honesty, were characteristics of women who played their proper gender role and aided in the perpetuation of an ordered society.

It is important to note, however, that issues of gender were not only an elite concern, though they may have originated there. In his work on manners and civility in early modern England, Martin Ingram points out the dispersion of anxiety over proper behavior, especially sexual behavior. Ingram writes of his work:

The survey reveals that, far from civility's being an exclusively elite commodity concerned with polite behavior, versions of the concept had resonance much further down the social scale and had a hard moral edge...In the early modern period the morals of everyone were very much a public concern and subject to official censure. Adultery and fornication were not only sins but also crimes.¹²

Adultery was a uniquely complicated offence that was considered a particularly deviant act for a woman. While both elite and non-elite cultures discouraged adultery, the punishment of the transgression provides a clear example of the idea of "two concepts of order."¹³ In the elite world, adulteresses could expect legal action and occasionally capital punishment, while in popular culture women who committed adultery and/or their cuckolded

¹⁰ "The Husband's Instructions to his Family: or, Houshold Observations," *Bute Broad-sides*, B41, 1685.

¹¹ *Ibid.*

¹² Ingram, "Sexual Manners," 88.

¹³ Keith Wrightson, "Two concepts of Order: Justices, Constables, and Jurymen in Seventeenth-Century England," in John Brewer and John Styles, eds., *An Ungovernable People? The English and their Law in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries*, (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1980), 21-46.

husbands were often subjected to a public shaming ritual such as a skimmington or a charivari rather than official censure.

Not only did contemporaries find adultery morally reprehensible, but they believed that it often led to more serious crimes. Frank McLynn explains, "It was a hardy perennial of conservative and reactionary social thought...that the roots of crime were to be located in immorality, especially of the sexual kind."¹⁴ This fear of an escalation of violence was founded in actual incidents, especially cases in which the husband discovers his wife's indiscretion. The ballad "The Careless Curate and the Bloody Butcher" illustrates such an incident and also explicitly articulates the connection between women, adultery, and murder. The ballad opens:

Black Murther and Adultery
Are two such sworn Brothers,
That who-soere their fathers be
Hot passions are their Mothers¹⁵

The author then relates the tale of a butcher's wife who is seduced by her parson. She eventually gives in to his overtures and while they are "in the midst of all their sport," her husband walks in on them. In a rage, the butcher castrates the curate with his knife and the parson soon bleeds to death. The butcher is immediately apprehended by neighbors and sent to jail to await trial. Though apparently unpunished, the wife feels responsible for the entire affair, and the author, by implication, seems to think this designation of blame is appropriate. He rhymes:

His wife is full of sorrow frought,
To think that she (by courses nought)
Hath such a sad confusion brought
Upon three Souls at once.¹⁶

¹⁴ Frank McLynn, *Crime and Punishment in Eighteenth-Century England* (New York: Routledge, 1989), 96.

¹⁵ "The Careless Curate and the Bloody Butcher," *Bodley Ballad Archive*, Wood 401 (187), 1663.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*

At the same time that he condemns the butcher's wife for her transgression, he implores the readers to forgive the parson for his actions. The ballad continues:

I hope ther's none will be to rude
To judge the Clergy for't:
They are but Men as well as we,
And subject to infirmity:
God keep us from Adultery,
Malice, Revenge and Bloud.¹⁷

The ballad of "The Careless Curate" illustrates the concern that adultery could lead to further crimes, and offers this unfortunate threesome as an example of the consequences of such actions. It is important to note that the woman, though not the instigator of the adulterous liaison nor the murderer, is held responsible for the tragedy. The author points to her weakness to resist the parson's invitation as the cause of everyone's downfall. Her failure to uphold her social role as an obedient wife led to two deaths and her own disgrace.

Another reason for adultery's exalted position in society's concerns was its potential economic effect. If an unmarried woman became pregnant she was initially faced with three choices: claim responsibility for the child, give birth in secret and kill the baby (infanticide was a capital offence), or abandon the child on the steps of a church or at a marketplace. The bastard child was a financial liability to the local community. If she abandoned the child he or she had to be taken in and raised either by a charitable family, or by an institution. In either case, the community paid. If the mother kept the child, in theory both she and the father were financially responsible. Frank McLynn contends that most women were not fortunate enough to have the father take responsibility. He writes, "In reality, because of the difficulty of proving paternity, only the woman paid. If she was not employed (as was most likely after the public admission of an illegitimate birth), and the bastard child was chargeable to the parish, the mother would be put in a house of correction."¹⁸

¹⁷ Ibid.

¹⁸ McLynn, *Crime and Punishment*, 112.

One rare example of both parents taking responsibility of a bastard child is found in the ballad "John the Glover, and Jane his Servant."¹⁹ In this song, an "antient" man has a baby boy by his young maid-servant, barely twelve years old. The man's wife cares for the baby. The man wants his servant to bear him another child and eventually convinces her that his wife will care for both children. Yet even when finances are not of concern and the incident does not lead to further crime, adultery is still discouraged. The maid-servant in the above ballad is held as a negative example for young women. The ballad concludes:

You damsels in Suburbs or City,
Let this be a warning to all,
For indeed it is very great pitty,
That you by temptations should fall.²⁰

The problem with adultery, then, goes beyond practical concerns of money and escalating violence.

Above all else, adultery seriously violated the social order and society normally blamed the woman as illustrated by the ballad "The Careless Curate." Men, however, also were responsible for accepting their dominant position in the gender order. The cuckold, a man whose wife has committed adultery, is the most ridiculed example of a man who is unable to hold his authority. In the ballad "The Scolding Wives Vindication: or, An Answer to the Cuckold's Complaint," a first person female narrator justifies her scolding and adulterous actions on the basis of her husband's refusal to play his role. She explains:

'Tis true I his Ears did cuff,
and gave him a kick or two;
For this I had just Cause enough,
Because he would nothing do.²¹

¹⁹ "John the Glover, and Jane his Servant," *Bodley Ballad Archive*, Douce Ballads 1(103b) 1671 & 1704.

²⁰ Ibid.

²¹ "The Scolding Wives Vindication: or, An Answer to the Cuckold's Complaint," *Bodley Ballad Archive*, Don. b. 13(82), 1683 & 1696.

She further accuses him of not making any attempt to sexually satisfy her, and so she turns to lovers. Though the wife has committed several violations of the social order, the ballad does not condemn her. In its tone, it seems to place more blame on the husband who refuses his rightful place in the social order.

Another type of deviant female was the prostitute. Women who were prostitutes were vilified not only for enticing men to sin, but also because they denied their natural role as defenders of sexual morality. Frank McLynn explains, "It was supposed to be the responsibility of women to maintain a universe of sexual order and propriety."²² One female criminal stereotype identified by McLynn and by Paula Humfrey in her work on criminality among female servants²³ is that of "Moll." According to McLynn, Moll King was a notorious London pickpocket who was apprehended and transported to the colonies. When she returned, she continued her life of crime and even worked with the infamous thief-taker Jonathon Wild.²⁴ It should, therefore, come as no surprise that in the ballad "Dolly and Molly" Molly is the woman who falls into prostitution while Dolly remains pure. Dolly and Molly are two country girls who try to make their way in London. Molly finds success in prostitution and tries to convince her friend to join her. Dolly adamantly refuses, which wins her the approval of the author. Dolly warns her friend:

Oh Molly you'l wish you had never been born;
Those immodest pleasures which you so commend,
Will bring you to sorrow and shame in the end.²⁵

Dolly's adherence to proper behavior is rewarded when she marries a good husband, but an unrepentant Molly is eventually stricken with the clap. The author concludes:

Now Molly's distressed, and the pain must endure,

²² McLynn, *Crime and Punishment*, 102.

²³ Paula Humfrey, "Female Servants and Women's Criminality in Early Eighteenth-Century London," in Greg T. Smith, et al., eds., *Criminal Justice in the Old World and the New: Essays in Honour of J.M. Beattie* (Toronto: University of Toronto, Centre of Criminology, 1998), 58-84.

²⁴ McLynn, *Crime and Punishment*, 127-128.

²⁵ "Dolly and Molly or, The Two Countrey Damosels Fortunes at London," *Bodley Ballad Archive*, Wood E 25(140) 1672 & 1698.

She flies to a Quack her distemper to cure;
But Dolly lives bravely, and her will I commend,
For honesty always will thrive in
The End.

This ballad reinforces gender roles by presenting contrasting examples of behavior and rewarding the "honest" woman while illustrating dangerous consequences for the deviant woman. The use of the "Moll" stereotype prevents any confusion on the part of the reader as to which woman is the negative example.

The ultimate violation of the order imposed by gender roles was for a woman to kill her husband. A woman found guilty of murdering her husband was punished not for murder, but for petty treason. Frank McLynn explains the significance of this designation:

The murder of a husband by a wife, whatever the circumstances, was held to strike at the very principles of natural order. . . . These crimes were thought to have a kinship with high treason because they violated the implicit contract between ruler and ruled. Whereas the murder of wife by husband was simple murder, punishable by hanging, petty treason carried the penalty of hanging and burning.²⁶

This was the fate that befell Anne Wallen after she murdered her husband during an argument. The ballad "Anne Wallen's Lamentation" is a first person account (it was common for authors to adopt the voice of one of the characters) detailing her crime and sentencing. Wallen and her husband had an argument in the course of which she scolded him and, after he tried with no success to calm her down, he cuffed her. She responded by grabbing one of his tools and stabbing him in the abdomen. She was discovered by neighbors, tried at the twice-yearly assize court, found guilty, and burned at the stake one week later. "Anne Wallen's Lamentation" contains several interesting messages to the readers. In the beginning of her story, Anne laments the shame her actions have brought upon all women:

Ah me the shame unto all women kinde,

²⁶ McLynn, *Crime and Punishment*, 119-120, 121.

To harbour such a thought within my minde;
That now hath made me to the world a scorne,
And makes me curse the time that I was borne.²⁷

She further advises:

A woman that is wife should seldome speake,
Unlesse discretely she her words repeat.²⁸

The ballad of Anne Wallen illustrates the serious consequence for a woman who commits the gravest of gender order violations and serves as a warning to other women against similar actions.

The recurrent theme in these crime ballads is the concern with proper gender roles. In “The Taming of the Scold: the Enforcement of Patriarchal Authority in Early Modern England,” David E. Underdown discusses community action against scolding women before 1640. He contends that distinct gender roles were crucial for the patriarchal system of order, and that deviance from these roles was perceived by the community as a threat to order. Underdown writes:

Women who defied the authority of their husbands...and even the more culpable husbands who tolerated this, threatened the entire patriarchal order...Unruly women who beat their husbands usually could not [be taken to court], so they had to be dealt with by unofficial community action, by shaming rituals like charivari.²⁹

Ballads, like shaming rituals, were a way in which society clearly articulated a violation of social norms. In addition, ballads and shaming rituals similarly served as deterrents to deviant behavior and encouraged members of the community to conform to the existing social order.

²⁷ “Anne Wallen’s Lamentation,” *Early Modern Center English Ballad Archive 1500-1700*, 1616.

²⁸ Ibid.

²⁹ David E. Underdown, “The Taming of the Scold: the Enforcement of Patriarchal Authority in Early Modern England,” in Anthony Fletcher and John Stevenson, eds., *Order and Disorder in Early Modern England*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 127.

Amussen also argues for the importance of gender roles in popular culture and the maintenance of order. In her article, “The Gendering of Popular Culture in Early Modern England,” Amussen identifies women’s subordination to men as a significant contributor to the ordering of Early Modern England. She writes, “Subordination...was necessary to ensure good order in the household....Since the household in patriarchal political theory was compared to the state, order in it was of critical importance.”³⁰ By identifying hierarchical gender roles at all levels as important to the maintenance of order, Amussen helps explain the concern of contemporaries with such seemingly private transgressions as adultery. Amussen further asserts the difference between women’s violence and men’s violence: violent women were a threat to order, violent men were not. She expounds:

Men beating their wives was less threatening than the rarer cases of women who beat their husbands; the disorder represented by such violence by women is connected to women’s disorderly sexuality....People were more comfortable with women as victims than as aggressors. Women could and did do the same things men did, but when they did, the actions carried different meanings.³¹

Thus, when a man killed his wife it was murder, but when a woman killed her husband it was treason.

Why was there such anxiety over gender roles during this period? In his article, Underdown not only asserts the importance of gender roles to the maintenance of order, he also suggests a reason for their being so crucial to the early modern period in particular. Underdown argues that the rise in community concern over deviant women was a result of the breakdown of neighborly ties and traditional gender roles brought on by the development of capitalism. After comparing the frequency of shaming rituals in arable versus town/wood-pasture regions he finds that such displays of community action against gender role violations were more common in town/wood-pasture areas. Underdown connects this finding with the diffusion of capitalist practices and writes of the town/wood-pasture regions, “These were the communities

³⁰ Amussen, “The Gendering of Popular Culture,” 51.

³¹ Ibid., 66.

most subject to the destabilising effects of economic change, and to the decline of old habits of neighborliness.”³² Underdown further explains that the responsibilities of the wife of a dairy farmer, a common occupation in wood-pasture regions, allowed her greater independent interaction in the marketplace. In addition, women in these regions were more likely to be involved in clothmaking and were sometimes charged with running the business while their husbands were away. Underdown concludes, “The growth of a market economy may thus have given more women a greater sense of independence, making men liable to retaliate when they encountered instances of flagrant defiance of accustomed patriarchal order.”³³

In “Female Servants and Women’s Criminality in Early Eighteenth-Century London,” Paula Humfrey studies the high incident of theft reported among female domestic servants in London. She finds that the number of thefts and the increasing anxiety over women servants was a result of the emergence of wage labor. Humfrey contends that wage earning female servants were more mobile and assertive than their predecessors who had been more dependent on their employers. By affecting the relationship between master and servant and giving greater independence to the servant, wage labor presented a challenge to the traditional patriarchal social system. Humfrey writes:

The bond between employers and domestics was becoming contractual rather than affective. The erosion of the old traditions of service, the old paternalistic safeguards of an intensely patriarchal institution, must indeed have been worrisome for employers and especially for employers of women.³⁴

Humfrey, therefore, agrees with Underdown’s assessment that the rise of capitalism undermined the established patriarchal system of order and the ensuing anxiety resulted in an increased effort to reassert traditional gender roles.

Crime ballads reaffirming traditional gender roles were one method by which authorities sought to deter deviant behavior.

³² Underdown, “The Taming of the Scold,” 135.

³³ *Ibid.*, 136.

³⁴ Humfrey, “Female Servants and Women’s Criminality,” 84.

Deterrence was the major crime-fighting weapon of a justice system that lacked an effective police force. The English people were customarily opposed to the presence of standing armies and state forces that they saw as infringing on their rights as free Englishmen. According to John Langbein’s interpretation of the thesis articulated by Leon Radzinowicz in his 1948 multi-volume work *History of English Criminal Law*, this tradition, combined with the hesitation of the government to construct the necessary administrative apparatus, led to the late development of effective policing. Langbein writes, “They had to put so much weight on deterrence because they had so little chance of catching and convicting the undeterred.”³⁵ The crime ballad illustrating proper gender roles and castigating those who violated them was a crucial weapon of state’s law enforcement efforts. The order of the English state was based on a complex system of *Herrschaft* in which each individual occupied an assigned position and owed deference to others based on gender and social status. The female offender’s deviation from her ascribed role, therefore, was not only an offence against an individual, but a serious threat to the entire system of order.

³⁵ John Langbein, “Albion’s Fatal Flaws,” *Past and Present*, 98 (February, 1983): 97.

Witchcraft Historiography in the Twentieth Century

Jon Burkhardt

Our evidence for witchcraft in Europe comes almost exclusively from hostile sources—from trials and confessions of witches documented by educated “witnesses.” In addressing the question of witchcraft in the Western tradition, historians have often disagreed as to its origins and essence. At least two major interpretations—along with several minor interpretations—of European witchcraft are present in witchcraft historiography. The first interpretation is known as the Murray-Ginzburg, or *folklorist* interpretation. This view sees European witchcraft as the survival of an ancient fertility religion. The second interpretation, currently the most influential, emphasizes the *social and cultural* history of witchcraft, especially the pattern of accusations. This approach can be further broken into several interpretations, the first of which is known as the Thomas-Macfarlane, or *functionalist* interpretation, which sees European witchcraft as the result of the feeling of guilt after refusing charity to someone. A variation within the social and cultural approach can be called the *social control* model. This model, represented here by Marianne Hester and David E. Underdown, sees witchcraft as a tool to maintain the male-dominated status quo. These studies have contributed much, but have continued to concentrate on persecution almost exclusively, paying little or no attention to attitudes and behaviors. Another interpretation within the social and cultural approach, however, looks at these *psychological* aspects and is represented here by Barry Reay and Robin Briggs. While holding some ideas in common concerning early modern witchcraft, each approach uses different presumptions and methodologies.

In 1921, Margaret Murray published *The Witch-Cult in Western Europe*, in which she argued that many of the practices associated with witch descriptions and witchcraft accusations in Western Europe were the ritual remains of an ancient agrarian cult. Murray claimed that this fertility religion had survived in

rural areas into the early modern period. Her ideas were completely rejected by other historians at the time, who viewed witchcraft rather as an example of early modern society’s superstitious nature and the intolerance of the Church. However, Carlo Ginzburg’s fascinating account of an isolated Italian peasant culture in *Night Battles: Witchcraft and Agrarian Cults in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*, and his recent reconstruction of the witches’ Sabbath, conclusively demonstrate the survival of ancient agrarian cults in some parts of Western Europe.¹

In *Night Battles*, Ginzburg studied the peasants in early modern Friuli, a mountainous region in northeast Italy, and uncovered a bizarre set of ancient beliefs. The peasants believed that those individuals born with a caul possessed strange powers.² These people were called *benandanti*, or “good walkers.” “On certain nights of the year” the *benandanti* “fell into a trance or deep sleep...while their souls (sometimes in the form of small animals) left their bodies so that they could do battle, armed with stalks of fennel, against analogous companies of male witches,” armed with stalks of sorghum, to determine “the fate of the season’s crops. They also performed cures and other kinds of benevolent magic.”³ The *benandanti* claimed to have the ability to break the spells of witches. They could identify witches, and thus could denounce fellow villagers or make money by “blackmailing” them. Therefore, the inquisitors saw the *benandanti* as troublemakers—as bad as, if not actually, witches themselves.

The inquisitors, Ginzburg showed, often associated the “popular” ideas they encountered with their preconceived notions about witchcraft (so-called learned, or “elite,” ideas). Thus, the inquisitors, upon coming into contact with these peasants and their strange beliefs, immediately identified them as practicing

¹ Carlo Ginzburg, *Night Battles: Witchcraft and Agrarian Cults in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*, tr. John and Anne Tedeschi (New York: Penguin Books, 1985); Carlo Ginzburg, *Ecstasies: Deciphering the Witches’ Sabbath*, tr. Raymond Rosenthal (New York: Pantheon, 1991).

² The caul, or the amniotic membrane that sometimes covers a newborn baby’s head, is said in many cultures to mark an individual as having special psychic powers.

³ Ginzburg, *Night Battles*, ix.

witchcraft in the service of the devil. The *benandanti* denied these charges at first, claiming that they were “good” witches—as well as good Christians—who fought against “bad” witches. The inquisitors, however, following the line of questioning established by the *Malleus Maleficarum* in 1486 that tied witchcraft to devil-worship, began interrogating the *benandanti*. After several decades of insistent questioning, the *benandanti* were forced to either admit to participating in the witches’ Sabbath, or that their nocturnal battles were merely fantasies and their accusations ploys to make money and spread dissension. Thus, the *benandanti* confirmed, by their admissions, the inquisitors’ suspicions. This view, then, spread throughout the village. Popular beliefs came to resemble the fantasies of the elite.

Ginzburg shed light on these beliefs through the investigations of the Inquisition. A sample of these records is included as an appendix, which form the basis of his book. By piecing together evidence from various trials, Ginzburg revealed that the *benandanti* really believed that they did these things while in a trance-like state, and—equally notable—so did their fellow villagers. Ginzburg’s book revealed a dramatic gap between popular culture and that of the educated elite. These ritualistic battles—at least the beliefs involved with them—clearly showed that witchcraft had everything to do with *maleficium* for the peasants. Ginzburg connected the witchcraft accusations to the filtering of ideas from the learned elite to the illiterate peasants. Within a short period of time, the peasants’ customs, which had seemed so natural to them, became unnatural acts that directly challenged the church.

In *Ecstasies: Deciphering the Witches’ Sabbath*, Ginzburg reconstructed the origins of these peasant beliefs, linking them to ancient cult practices. These beliefs had survived in Europe through the early modern period, Ginzburg argued, echoing Murray’s thesis. However, Ginzburg did not suggest that the accused witches were actually performing the behavior they described. Instead, he argued that they fantasized about performing the acts. In the first part of the book, Ginzburg revealed the gradual emergence of the stereotypical Sabbath in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. The rest of the book examines a variety of similar myths and rituals, seeking to establish a connection amongst them. However, Ginzburg’s arguments are

often too complex to comfortably concur with his final claim that “the documentation we have accumulated proves beyond all reasonable doubt the existence of an underlying Eurasian mythological unity, the fruit of cultural relations sedimented over millennia.”⁴

Ginzburg’s concern was with showing the interaction between popular and elite ideas. Although he was rather vague about much of the information, this book certainly shed light on an important component of early modern popular beliefs. Ginzburg’s methodology resembled the “structuralism” of anthropologist and ethnographer Claude Levi-Strauss, in that he was not interested so much in the particular instances as in the underlying structures of mythical thought which served to unite meaning within cultures.

Inspired by anthropological research, Alan Macfarlane and Keith Thomas have endeavored to identify the positive social functions that witchcraft played in the communities in which it occurred. Their work on English witchcraft revealed the underlying stresses and anxieties of the accusing villagers. From the evidence of the assizes in seventeenth-century Essex, Macfarlane put together a thorough statistical study of witchcraft beliefs.⁵ Originating under the reign of Henry II, the assizes primarily made up England’s felony criminal courts. By the late sixteenth century, the assizes “had established a virtual monopoly [on trials] of crimes likely to lead to a sentence of death,” including homicide, rape, and witchcraft.⁶ Condemned witches were usually older women beyond their childbearing years. Accusers—many of whom were in-laws of those they accused—were nearly evenly divided between women and men. The accused witches usually belonged to a lower social class than their accusers. The accused typically belonged to the lower classes caught in the middle of dramatic economic shifts. Those inviting the charge of witchcraft were generally unpopular—often engaging in lewd behavior, cursing, or begging. In short, acting as a supposed witch acted made one a target for accusations of witchcraft. Macfarlane suggested that the accusation would come

⁴ Ginzburg, *Ecstasies*, 267.

⁵ Alan Macfarlane, *Witchcraft in Tudor and Stuart England: A Regional and Comparative Study* (Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press, 1991, c. 1970).

⁶ J.A. Sharpe, *Crime in Early Modern England, 1550-1750* (New York: Longman, 1999), 33.

after such individuals had demanded, and been refused, charity. The individual would usually leave cursing and any subsequent misfortune experienced by the refuser would be attributed to the beggar's "witchcraft."⁷ Thomas suggested the same, adding that those who refused to give assistance convinced themselves that the beggar was a witch—and therefore not worthy of charity—in order to relieve their guilt.

Thomas' main interest, however, unlike Macfarlane's, was to establish the functionality of witchcraft as plausible to an individual person rather than to society as a whole. Thomas believed that the overwhelming majority of fully documented cases supported his model of charity refusal. However, one problem with this interpretation was the emphasis on an individual's thought processes, rather than the social processes that brought about a trial. A trial took place after a lengthy period of rumors and accusations, usually from several sources. Also, Thomas' approach did not take into account the notion that feuds and consciously false accusations could be behind many cases of witchcraft. According to Jonathan Barry, Thomas' preoccupation with the personal plausibility of witchcraft accusations kept him from exploring the ways in which witchcraft would—or would not—enter the public sphere. "The removal of witchcraft from the public sphere," Barry argued, "resulted from and further intensified the 'feminization' of witchcraft."⁸

This brings us to the question of gender. Where Thomas' account of witchcraft served to explain gender variations in terms of dependence, Marianne Hester claimed that Thomas had overlooked the occasions where it was precisely women's power—not their weakness—that was at stake. Thus, she saw witchcraft accusations as stemming from the competition for resources in the new market economy. Hester looked at women brewers to show how they posed a threat to the increasingly male dominated trade and, as a result, were vulnerable to witchcraft accusations. According to Hester, "one of the most consistent yet least understood aspects of the early modern witch-hunts is how

⁷ Ibid., 196.

⁸ Jonathan Barry, "Introduction: Keith Thomas and the Problem of Witchcraft," in *Witchcraft in Early Modern Europe: Studies in Culture and Belief*, ed. Jonathan Barry, Marianne Hester, and Gareth Roberts (Cambridge, NY: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 35.

accusation and persecution for witchcraft came to be largely directed against women."⁹ These accusations were not merely a reflection of a stereotype, but rather the mechanisms for "social control of women... as a means of recreating the male status quo in the emerging social order."¹⁰

Hester cited the *Malleus Maleficarum* as an obvious example of a double standard that presented female sexuality as inferior to male sexuality. She noted that, "during the period of the witch-hunts the patriarchal ideal for women was that they should be quiet (not scolds) and subservient to their husbands."¹¹ Thus, for Hester, witchcraft accusations "must be seen in the context of widespread fears that women were by no means complying with the ideal of the quiet compliant wife."¹² Witchcraft, she argued, must be viewed as a gendered ideology that served the material interests of men. "Overall," Hester concluded, "patriarchy was maintained within the developing economy, and women's relative dependence on men ensured."¹³

David E. Underdown similarly argued that in early modern England, as the breakdown of the social order seemed to loom ever closer, fear intensified into a "crisis of order" that ultimately led to a witch-hunt, of sorts.¹⁴ The community bond which brought stability was no longer certain. According to local court records (ca. 1560—1640), women who posed what Underdown called a "visible threat" to patriarchal society—loud, unruly women—were increasingly noticed.¹⁵ This is precisely the time, as Underdown pointed out, that witchcraft accusations reached their peak. These women tended to draw negative attention to themselves; either by cursing, or fighting with neighbors, or being seen as threatening due to their strangeness. More often it was the social outcasts, the poor, the widowed, or even strangers, that were

⁹ Marianne Hester, "Patriarchal Reconstruction and Witch Hunting," in *Witchcraft in Early Modern Europe*, 288.

¹⁰ Ibid., 289.

¹¹ Ibid., 294.

¹² Ibid., 295.

¹³ Ibid., 302.

¹⁴ David E. Underdown, "The Taming of the Scold: the Enforcement of Patriarchal Authority in Early Modern England," in *Order and Disorder in Early Modern England*, ed. Anthony Fletcher and John Stevenson (Cambridge, NY: Cambridge University Press, 1987, c. 1985), 116.

¹⁵ Ibid., 119.

accused the most. Since they were alone, they had to fend for themselves. This often brought negative feelings from neighbors. They became witches because they drew the most negative attention.

Underdown attributed this focus on unruly women as a by-product of the transformation that was happening in England, both socially and economically; that is to say, neighborly charity and the habits that aided social harmony began to decline as capitalism brought a more competitive atmosphere in its wake. Capitalism, according to Underdown, helped to more firmly place women into a redefined social order. As the market economy emerged, women may have seemed a threat to the patriarchal system as they became more and more independent. Thus, as women began to assert themselves, a strain was created in gender relations. This strain, according to Underdown, was at the center of the “crisis of order” of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.¹⁶

In *Popular Cultures in England*, Barry Reay asserted that popular cultures in the past are best understood through “description and example, by the historically crafted fiction of experience, rather than by crude definition.”¹⁷ Reay was interested in what he called the “structures of feeling” as systems of meaning; that is, he looked at the attitudes and values expressed in popular beliefs and behaviors. For Reay, the term “popular culture” is a “shared” culture. He did not use it to separate popular from elite, or learned from unlearned. “The key-words for this history,” Reay stated, “are: ambiguous... dynamic... gendered... multiple... over-lapping... and shared.”¹⁸ Reay’s study reversed the traditional tendency in British social history to attempt to find a relation between a certain social group and its position in society by starting instead “with popular culture itself.”¹⁹

According to Reay, witchcraft beliefs had to do with *maleficium*—the causing of harm. The focus was predominantly on power, he argued, “the power of words, the power to change

form, the power to do bodily harm.”²⁰ For Reay, belief systems were the most important aspect in understanding witchcraft. Formal prosecution was the last measure villagers took when worried about witchcraft, Reay argued. First, one would practice “caution,” which could mean either avoiding a supposed witch or, at least, making sure not to offend her. If this did not work, the victim could try to bribe the witch. Counter-magic was the next step one could take to deal with witchcraft. Although considered temporary, scratching the alleged witch’s face was also a way to protect oneself. Thus, the villagers of early modern England attempted a variety of methods to deal with suspected witchcraft. “Violence and recourse to law (with the implied ultimate sanction of death),” Reay explained, “came at the end of a long process of negotiation.”²¹

Witchcraft was seen as “inherited” power; that is, it was in the blood and could be passed on from generation to generation. Sorcery, however, was seen as an acquired technique that could be learned. Despite the elite idea that all witchcraft was black witchcraft, the white witch, Reay stressed, “maintained an autonomy in popular culture.”²² These so-called white, or “good” witches were mostly male, while the “bad,” maleficent witches were usually female. The reason for this view was that women were seen as more “tongue-ripe”—more likely to use words as weapons. Susan Dwyer Amussen referred to women’s “invisible violence”—meaning that men used physical force, but women used words.²³ Thus, they were seen as more likely to resort to witchcraft. Reay argued that the frictions of community life in the context of household and neighborhood interaction, where women played a crucial role, added to these notions—so much so that “sisters and daughters of ‘notorious’ witches were suspected.”²⁴

English witches had “familiars,” as shown by Barry Reay, which were animals kept by the witch, fed with her blood, and

¹⁶ Ibid., 126-7.

¹⁷ Barry Reay, *Popular Cultures in England, 1550-1750* (New York: Longman, 1998), 1.

¹⁸ Ibid.

¹⁹ Ibid., 2.

²⁰ Ibid., 102.

²¹ Ibid., 107.

²² Ibid., 114.

²³ Susan Dwyer Amussen, “The Gendering of Popular Culture in Early Modern England,” in *Popular Culture in England, c. 1500-1850*, ed. Tim Harris (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1995), 63, 67.

²⁴ Reay, *Popular Cultures in England*, 111.

“sent out to perform maleficia.”²⁵ Reay argued that the devil was present early on in English discourses on witchcraft. What was significant about the English demonologies, however, was “their sheer variety rather than any consistency of representation.”²⁶ Witchcraft pamphlets and ballads served to bridge the gap between educated and partially literate cultures. In so doing, Reay argued, “the discourses of demonology could make mental inroads at a popular level and village beliefs influence learned doctrines.”²⁷ Thus, Reay crafted an image of cultural dynamism and malleability in early modern England.

Reay followed the Thomas-Macfarlane theory, which held that witchcraft accusations arose out of a breach in neighborly charity and the guilt associated with that breach. However, according to Reay, what made a particular request for charity potentially risky for the refuser, “was the character or reputation of the requester.”²⁸ He believed that it is likely that many of the so-called “innocent” old women used their reputation as a survival tool. “The majority of accused witches...were not random victims,” Reay argued.²⁹ Vengeance and material gain were important motives in the witchcraft fantasies and narratives. He argued that many of those individuals who were eventually formally charged with witchcraft had actually been suspected of being witches for years prior to the formal charges, if not decades.

Reay noted that Reginald Scot’s account of the social context of witchcraft allegations also referred to the “imprecations and desires” of the witch. Current historians, such as Robin Briggs, have started to explore this psychological aspect of witchcraft. There were a “multiplicity” of cultural divisions to take in to account when addressing the problem of witchcraft, including religious, gender, age, and occupation. “Cultural reform was always on the agenda,” Reay concluded, “from below as well as from above—and popular cultures were perpetually being reshaped and reshaping themselves.”³⁰

²⁵ Ibid., 112.

²⁶ Ibid., 117.

²⁷ Ibid., 118.

²⁸ Ibid., 120.

²⁹ Ibid., 130.

³⁰ Ibid., 212.

In *Witches and Neighbors*, Robin Briggs analyzed the social, cultural, and psychological contexts of the European witch-hunts. One of the dangers Briggs saw in trying to make sense of witchcraft fears was that we can “over-explain” what happened. His unique contribution to witchcraft historiography was to show that the distinctions usually drawn between English and Continental witchcraft do not, under closer inspection, hold up. Although most Continental courts did place more emphasis on the satanic pact and the witches’ Sabbath than did the English courts, popular beliefs about the witch as being a spiteful neighbor were “just as firmly founded in local opinion...as those on the other side of the Channel.”³¹ As in England, village witchcraft was “the basic type, the everyday reality around which everything else was built.”³²

Briggs drew from some four hundred trials in Lorraine, which were augmented by numerous other examples from elsewhere in Europe. Briggs placed the trials in the broader social context of rural agricultural communities, where changing economic conditions are stressing the traditional neighborly values of mutual help. Briggs’ approach was to “focus on the lives and beliefs of the ordinary people who were at once the victims and the principle instigators of most prosecutions.”³³

Usually, those who accused witches were also poor and had quarreled with the accused witch in the past. When left out of an important social event or refused charity, the accused witch reacted with curses or threats. These actions would often convince neighbors that she was a witch, especially when misfortunes—especially the sickness or death of family members—followed her threats. “Witchcraft was not an objective reality,” according to Briggs, “but a set of interpretations, something which went on in the mind.”³⁴

Witchcraft, Briggs argued, provided “intuitively attractive ways of evading logic.”³⁵ He argued against two common assumptions in feminist scholarship on the early modern witch-

³¹ Robin Briggs, *Witches and Neighbors: The Social and Cultural Context of European Witchcraft* (New York: Viking Press, 1996), 12.

³² Ibid., 398.

³³ Ibid., 7.

³⁴ Ibid., 9-10.

³⁵ Ibid., 409.

hunts. One was that the typical witch was actually a “good” witch, such as an astrologer, or an herbal healer, whose beliefs were interpreted by Church authorities as satanic. The second stance taken by feminist historians was the misogynistic stance. This school of thought suggested that those who accused witches did so to punish women who defied gender norms. Instead, Briggs emphasized that there were a variety of causes for witchcraft accusations:

Witchcraft was about envy, ill-will and the power to harm others, exercised in small face-to-face communities...Those involved relied heavily on the cunning folk and their counter-magic, alongside a range of social and familial pressures, to deal with suspect neighbors...Witches were people you lived with, however unhappily, until they goaded someone past endurance.³⁶

Briggs concluded that while the witch may be seen as the “other,” “witchcraft beliefs are in ourselves.”³⁷

Briggs’ analysis of the “confessions” given by so-called witches assumed that any account of such activities as the witches’ Sabbath is merely fantasy—statements given to please authorities while under stress of interrogation. This ignored the possibility that some of the so-called “witches” may have actually used various occult methods in order to harm their enemies.

Defining witchcraft is, therefore, not an easy task. Our understanding of witchcraft in Western culture must be grounded in the specific local discourse. It appears that there were two elements to European witchcraft in the early modern period. First, there was the belief held by most of society (especially peasant society) that witchcraft had to do with *maleficium*; that is, malevolent action—usually as a means to get even—intended to do harm. The other element was the notion, held by a scholarly minority, that witchcraft involved making a pact with the Devil. It was only when the learned elite’s idea of a satanic pact began to make its way into the peasantry that the persecution of witches began to spread. The idea of *maleficium* was reinterpreted and transformed—as seen in many witchcraft confessions—into part

³⁶ Ibid., 398.

³⁷ Ibid., 411.

of the witches Sabbath. However, as J.A. Sharpe pointed out, this is not always the case. “It is obvious that plebian[s]...had their own concepts of order,” he argued, “and were willing to use the law to reinforce them in their own narrow sphere.”³⁸

Ginzburg connected the witchcraft accusations to the filtering of ideas from the learned elite to the illiterate peasants, in which the peasants’ customs, which had seemed so natural to them, became unnatural acts that directly challenged the church. Macfarlane, Thomas, Hester, Underdown, and Reay, on the other hand, all pointed to social tensions as an ingredient in the rise of witch accusations at this time. However, where Macfarlane and Thomas saw guilty feelings, and where Underdown connected the rise of witchcraft accusations to strained gender relations brought about by a market economy, Hester saw the planned oppression of women by men. But to interpret high instances of women accused of witchcraft as a simple result of misogyny is to over-simplify the data. As Sharpe pointed out, “witchcraft accusations rather uncover issues of competition between women, of women’s disputes over reputation and the control of female social space.”³⁹ This, he argued, suggests the need for a reassessment of the role of gender in witchcraft studies. Indeed, one of Briggs’ most interesting findings is that, in France, men accounted for almost half of those accused of witchcraft.⁴⁰ Unfortunately, we find out little else about them.

One theme that is common throughout all of the interpretations is that the belief in witchcraft—that it was *real*—was common. It was real enough for Ginzburg’s peasants that they believed it enabled them to fly; it was real enough for Reay’s villagers that some were able to profit from it occasionally, while it caused others to be suspicious; and, it was real enough for Underdown’s society that it was used in law courts against unruly women. They were witches because they drew the most negative attention, or perhaps they drew the most negative attention because they were witches. Either way, belief relates to an overall theme of early modern European witchcraft. Despite its changing definition in different places across time, the belief that witchcraft

³⁸ Sharpe, *Crime in Early Modern England*, 214.

³⁹ Ibid., 157.

⁴⁰ Briggs, *Witches and Neighbors*, 260.

was real—at least at some level—persisted. Thus, it seems that Briggs' interpretation is the most accommodating for approaching the question of early modern witchcraft—it can be explained by a variety of ways. It all depends on what one expects to find.

A Victimized Woman: La Malinche

Tether A. Campbell

La Malinche, the Aztec mistress of Hernán Cortés, the sixteenth-century Spanish conquistador of Mexico, occupies what must surely be a unique historical position: she is the embodiment of two national myths, the first creative and the second destructive. As the mother of Cortés' son—one of the first children of Spanish and Indian blood—she has been credited as the creator of the Mexican race. By “creating” that new race, she also bears the blame for the downfall of the Aztec people. To this day, Mexican and Mexican-American people debate her place in their national myth, seeking to reconcile that myth's destructive and constructive elements, and so create a less fractured national and racial identity. Much of the truth of La Malinche's story, however, is shrouded in the shifting ground of legend. This paper will examine the historical and literary representations of La Malinche, in order to come to a clearer understanding of her actual historical role, and so better understand the role played by creative forces in shaping both her story and Mexico's creation myth.

La Malinche and Hernán Cortés: A Controversial History

La Malinche was born around 1505 in the village of Viluta. In this Nahuatl speaking town, located in the Paynalla province of Coatzacoalcos in the Veracruz region of southern Mexico, her father was a *cacique*, or lord, of a noble Aztec family. At birth, La Malinche was given the name Malinal.¹

Malinal had a privileged upbringing. She was sent to schools and retained a higher education because of her social status and wealth.² According to legend, she was loved and cherished as a person and was destined to take her rightful place in the lineage of

¹ Different sources list different spellings of her name, i.e., Malinal, Malinulli, and Malin. For clarity's sake, this paper will refer to her as Malinal.

² S. Suzan Jane, “La Malinche (c. 1500 – c. 1527),” in *Herstory: Women Who Changed the World* (New York: Viking, 1995), 41.

inheritance. But life was not so kind. Her father died and her mother remarried, so she became nothing more than an unwanted stepchild. Her mother gave birth to a much-adored son, and Malinal stood in the way of his inheritance. Her mother rid herself of her burdensome daughter by making a deal with passing traders to take Malinal with them. To save face she took the body of a slave's child and buried her as Malinal. She told the town that her daughter had died.³

At the end of Malinal's journey across Mexico with the travelers she found herself in the town of Xicalongo. Then she was taken to Tetipac where, as a slave, she was given to a cacique, a Mayan lord and military chief of Tabasco. Throughout her life as a slave she was quick to learn many different languages. She picked up the Mayan dialects of the Yucatan.⁴ Eventually her knowledge of languages covered the Aztecs, Mayan, and other non-Mayan groups.⁵ As a slave, though, she was reduced from her once noble bearing to chattel.⁶

The cacique gave Malinal to the Spaniard, Hernán Cortés, who had just arrived in Tabasco. Among a tribute of gold, ornamented masks, food, cloth, and twenty slave women, she was a trinket to please the Gods from the Sea. These women were to serve as cooks for the conquistadors. Cortés doled the women out to his military staff. He gave Malinal to a close friend and favorite captain, Alonso Hernández de Puertocarrero. One month later Cortés reclaimed Malinal.⁷ It was said that Malinal's noble bearing had never left her. Her pride showed through in her straightforward manner with her new captives. She held her head

³ Jerome R. Adams, “Doña Marina (La Malinche) c. 1505 – 1530 (Mexico) Mother of Conquest,” in *Liberators and Patriots of Latin America: Biographies of 23 Leaders from Doña Marina (1505 – 1530) to Bishop Romero (1917 – 1980)* (Jefferson, North Carolina: McFarland & Company, Inc., 1991), 3.

⁴ R. Michael Conner, “La Malinche: Creator or Traitor,” from *The Translator Interpreter Hall of Fame* (2000 – 2003). [Online]: <http://www.tihof.org/honors/malinche.htm>.

⁵ Shep Lencheck, “‘La Malinche’ – Harlot or Heroine?” from *Lakeside* 14, 4 (December, 1997): 11, 16, 17, 22. [Online]: <http://www.mexconnect.com/mex/history/malinche.html>.

⁶ Jerome R. Adams, “Voice of Conquest, Mexico, Doña Marina (La Malinche), c. 1505 – 1530,” in *Notable Latin American Women: Twenty-nine Leaders, Rebels, Poets, Battlers and Spies, 1500 – 1900* (Jefferson, North Carolina: McFarland & Company, Inc., 1995), 14-15.

⁷ Conner, “Creator or Traitor.”

high, as the other women slaves did not. An unnamed “first hand account”, quoted by Jerome Adams, referred to Malinal as “good looking, intelligent and without embarrassment.”⁸

Cortés eventually left these Mayan lands. On his path of devastation through the new lands he found he could not communicate with the native people. It was at this time that he was advised one of his twenty slave women spoke these languages.⁹ With the assistance of Jerónimo de Aguiar he was able to make a chain of interpretation. De Aguiar was a Spanish priest that had been shipwrecked on the coast of Cozumel eight years before Cortés arrived. A former slave of the Yucatan Mayans, he escaped these captors and lived with a friendly cacique of another tribe. He was, by this time, equipped to speak Mayan along with his native Spanish.¹⁰ Joining Cortés, de Aguiar helped to convert tens of thousands of Indians and Mayans to Christianity. When the slave women were given to Cortés he also converted and baptized them. In March 1519, Malinal was baptized Doña Marina.¹¹ During the travels of the conquering mass Bernal Díaz emphatically noted about Marina and Aguiar, they “always went with us on every expedition, even when it took place at night.”¹²

At first, the success of interpreting was accomplished by Aguiar speaking to Marina in Mayan; she translated into Nahuatl, the lingua of central Mexican highlands.¹³ The process was then reversed.¹⁴ Marina soon learned Spanish and the process was refined.” The Mexican author Gómez de Orozco stated that Malinche “was an instrumental part of [the Spanish] strategy, interpreting in three languages and providing essential information about economic organization, knowledge of native customs, the order and succession of kingdoms, forms of tribute, rules governing family relations, and so on.” Gone were the ineffectual signs and grunts, replaced by precision and detail for Cortés’

⁸ Adams, “Voice of Conquest,” 5, 15.

⁹ Lencheck, “Harlot or Heroine?”

¹⁰ Peter Rashkin, “Cortés and La Malinche,” from *The Dagger* (2000), 13, 22. [Online]: <http://thedagger.com/archive/conquest/malinche.html>.

¹¹ Conner, “Creator or Traitor.”

¹² Adams, “Voice of Conquest,” 5.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 18.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*

conquest. Not only did Marina interpret for military purposes; she also helped spread Christianity with her work as a translator. A notary and Christian scribe reportedly referred to Marina as an “Interpreter of Christian Letters.”¹⁵ Through her, Spaniards were able to spread their religion.

Moreover, Marina’s role in the conquest was seen for what it was by the Indians. They understood that the words were Cortés’ and not Marina’s; that Marina was operating as Cortés’s alter ego. During the negotiations with Indians was when Marina became La Malinche. Malinche was the term used by Moctezuma when he addressed Cortés. Because the Indians perceived Cortés and Marina as a single unit they dubbed her “the Captain’s woman,” or “La Malinche.”¹⁶

La Malinche stood by Cortés through some of the most important events and meetings during this time. In a letter to his king, Cortés wrote, “the tongue that I have is a woman of this land.”¹⁷ She was there, interpreting, at the first meeting with representatives of Moctezuma. When she discovered the plans of Moctezuma and his warriors, she did not keep her mouth shut. She staved off the slaughter of the Spaniards by divulging these secrets to Cortés.¹⁸ As interpreter she was a central part in dealings with Fat Cacique, and the caciques of Cemplona. Cortés and crew arrested five tax collectors sent by the Aztecs. This made allies of the Cemploanans. The Cemploanans were the first Indian warriors to join with the Spanish. More warriors joined the Spanish after an initial battle with the Tlaxcalans. This new alliance brought thousands to aid in the fight against the Aztecs.¹⁹ Through La Malinche, Tlaxcalans understood that the Spanish would end the demands for tribute and human sacrifices.²⁰

Believing they were trying to bring civilization to Latin America, Spaniards felt justified in all of their actions. With La Malinche at his side, Cortés created a revolutionary pattern of conquest. He went in with guns blazing. Then he brought in La

¹⁵ Conner, “Creator or Traitor.”

¹⁶ Bernal Diaz Del Castillo, *The Discovery and Conquest of Mexico, 1517-1521*. (New York: Farrar, Straus, and Cudahy, 1956), 230.

¹⁷ Adams, “Voice of Conquest,” 17.

¹⁸ Jane, “La Malinche,” 42.

¹⁹ Lencheck, “Harlot or Heroine?”

²⁰ Conner, “Creator or Traitor.”

Malinche for negotiations.²¹ The touch point for La Malinche was the ability to save thousands of Indians lives and avoid more bloodshed of her people. She wanted to save them and this was her way of doing so. In addition with the Spanish and Christianity human sacrifice and cannibalism would come to an end.²² As was shown when Díaz explained that both Marina and Aguilar had become expert at portraying the story of Christ in a variety of tongues and “were so expert at it that they explained it very clearly.”²³ Now a firm follower of the new religion, La Malinche wanted these new ways for her people as well. A letter from Cortés, housed in the Spanish archives, states: “After God we owe this conquest of New Spain to Doña Marina.”²⁴

Although they were never married, Cortés and La Malinche were loyal to each other and constantly guarded one another’s safety. After a battle with the Tlaxcalans, Bernal Díaz, the sixteenth-century Spanish chronicler, reported that Cortés fought his way out of the city “on horseback [with] Doña Marina near him.” Further, Díaz told of the wonder of Marina’s caring nature when he described her during battles, “yet never allowed us to see any sign of fear in her, only a courage passing that of a woman.”²⁵ La Malinche and Cortés loved each other.²⁶ La Malinche had earned Cortés’s confidence and rose from nothing more than a means to an end as a secretary to his trusted mistress. Díaz reported that many other women were offered to Cortés, but he always refused them.²⁷

She became the “Mother of the Mexican Nation” when she bore Cortés a son, Don Martín Cortés in 1522. His was the first Mestizo career that could be charted. He rose to a high government position as comendador of the order of Saint Jago. In 1548, Martin was executed for his role in a conspiracy against the Viceroy, the highest-ranking Spanish official in New Spain.²⁸

²¹ Adams, “Voice of Conquest,” 18, 21.

²² Lencheck, “Harlot or Heroine?”

²³ Adams, “Doña Marina,” 9.

²⁴ Conner, “Creator or Traitor.”

²⁵ Adams, “Doña Marina,” 8.

²⁶ Lencheck, “Harlot or Heroine?”

²⁷ Conner, “Creator or Traitor.”

²⁸ Lencheck, “Harlot or Heroine?”

After the conquest, Cortés returned to his wife in Spain. He chose a Castillian knight, Lieutenant Don Juan Xamarillo, to marry La Malinche. Cortés attended the wedding in Ostatepec in the province of Nogales and presented La Malinche with three gifts of land, one having once belonged to Moctezuma. Also, Cortés asked La Malinche to serve as his interpreter in a mission to Honduras.²⁹ Marina and Xamarillo had a daughter together, Doña María.³⁰ Malinche fell out of sight. In 1529, Diego de Ordáz, a Spanish adventurer, reportedly sighted her with her husband and son.³¹

Views of La Malinche Through History: Abuse and Realism

During her lifetime La Malinche was only spoken of highly. Bernal Díaz authenticated her pedigree time and again. Although he never gave a physical description, he spoke of her nobility of character, her constant concern for her fellow countrymen, and of her kindness. He was witness to her reunion in Honduras with her mother and half-brother, and was awed by her willing forgiveness of them.³²

Her name has since fallen into trouble. To call a Mexican or Mexican-American a Malinche is to call them, in some way, a traitor to their culture. “Malinchista” was a word associated with people who turned their back on their culture. Today’s Mexico places a villainous emphasis on La Malinche’s life: “lover of foreigners”, whore, harlot, mistress, betrayer, and a sell-out.³³ In addition La Chingada was associated with Malinche. The two words had taken on the same meaning. To say someone was a son or daughter of a Chingada or Malinche was a heinous insult.³⁴ At times even Cortés was vilified as a thief and a torturer.³⁵ Clifford Krauss in a *New York Times* article quoted Mexican intellectual Octavio Paz’s book, *Labyrinth of Solitude*, when he wrote about

²⁹ Jane, “La Malinche,” 43.

³⁰ Conner, “Creator or Traitor.”

³¹ Adams, “Voice of Conquest,” 25.

³² Diaz, *Discovery*, 67-68.

³³ Clifford Krauss, “A Historical Figure is Still Hated by Many in Mexico,” *New York Times*, 25 March 1997.

³⁴ Marta E. Sanchez, “La Malinche at the Intersection: Race and Gender in Down These Mean Streets,” in *Publication of the Modern Language Association* 3, 1 (January 1998): 117-128.

³⁵ Rashkin, “Cortés and La Malinche,” 7.

Cortés and La Malinche, declaring, “they are symbols of a secret conflict that we [Mexicans] have still not resolved.”³⁶

Today Mexican people have forsaken La Malinche’s home. It is shunned. The house sits in the Coyocan neighborhood at 57 Higuera Street in Mexico City. Only travelers are interested in viewing the historical home. Tourist guidebooks even push it into their recesses when touting the wonders of Mexico.³⁷

This infamous place was the sanctuary for Cortés to write his chronicles of the conquest for King Charles V. The house could have further been adored for the rich history it held throughout Mexico’s growth. Here in colonial times Indians worked weaving blankets and clothing for their Spanish masters. Then in the 17th century it was left in ruins. The revival of the home in the 19th century by monks was another fantastic tale. The monks, against President Benito Juárez’s anti-clerical policies, operated a convent in the home. Peasants betrayed the monks by turning them into local officials for running the convent, the house was confiscated, and it was made a jail. During the 1930s the home saw further immortality as a possession of Jose Vasconcelos, a Mexican philosopher, and politician in the 1920s. Vasconcelos rented the home to Lupe Rivera, daughter of the famed muralist Diego Rivera. She used the home as a headquarters for her congressional campaign. Despite all of these historic events that took place in the home Mexico still avoids it. The taint of La Malinche is still too much.³⁸

She was the “perpetrator of the original sin.” She mixed Indian and Spanish blood. According to Historian Peter Bakewell, the “intermarriage of Spaniards and natives...became normal policy at least during the founding phase of the mainland empire.” This was because many of the emigrants to Hispaniola were young, single men who lived with or married native women, this was thus the start of the mestizo population. This new race now forms “most of the Spanish American population.” The intermixing of Spanish and Indian women saw declines at different times. As women and families immigrated to New Spain

³⁶ Octavio Paz, *The Labyrinth of Solitude: Life and Thought in Mexico* (New York: Grove Press, Inc., 1961), 87. Clifford Krauss, “A Historic Figure is Still Hated by Many in Mexico,” *New York Times*, 26 March 1997.

³⁷ Krauss, “Historic Figure.”

³⁸ *Ibid.*, 1, 49.

more unions were made within Spanish lines. Further, Spaniards also intermingled with female black slaves. These times of decline created atmospheres of racial anxiety.³⁹

In addition, the 18th century saw the mixing of races occurring with such quickness that categorizing people by race was nearly impossible. Moreover appearances alone could not produce a sure definition of race as well. Thus, today’s Mexicans must respect not only an Aztec heritage, but also the entire triangle of relatively Black-Indian-White. As much as this could have been hailed, as the way life should have been, the reality is that race and social class did and does matter. Because of intermixing, races could at times blend into different social classes. An Indian with the appropriate dress and profession could pass as a Mestizo, or a person with one Spanish and one Indian parent. On the other hand, a white nobleman would never be mistaken for any other race.⁴⁰

Once again racial anxiety reared its head when economics began to be the resource for determining social status. Whites could no longer hold their thrones; they no longer were the only ones able to acquire fine things. New Spain had become a fertile place for many to make loads of money. This, along with the fact that it was increasingly difficult to define race by appearance, festered with the white population. Striving to retain their hold over the inferior class they reached out for titles.⁴¹

La Malinche has continued to be considered the cause of the original sin at Mexico’s birth, or the “Mexican Eve,” representing all that is wrong with Mexico.⁴² Some feminists claim that this woman of the 16th century is at the heart of gender relations in Mexico in the 21st century. They claim that men’s low perceptions of women were created by this long ago union and can be seen in the nation’s current high rate of infidelity and domestic violence.⁴³ Further, La Malinche is iconic for women who depend on men for importance and security and are later left violated or abandoned.

³⁹ Peter Bakewell, *A History of Latin America: Empires and Sequels, 1450 – 1930* (Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers Inc., 1997), 78, 278-279.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 279.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 78 – 278.

⁴² Paz, *Labyrinth*, 87. Paz cites José Clemente Orozco and his mural at the National Preparatory School, as the perpetuator of this manifestation of Malinal.

⁴³ Krauss, 18.

The gender system where the male is active and the female is passive is pervasive in Mexican culture.

La Malinche was degraded and blamed for man's racial anxiety.⁴⁴ Hispanic men did so because the cause of racial or Mestizo anxiety rested at the feet of La Malinche. Octavio Paz, in *The Labyrinth of Solitude*, discussed the problem in a seemingly solid psychological basis:

If the Chingada is a representation of the violated Mother, it is appropriate to associate her with the Conquest, which was also a violation, not only in the historical sense, but also in the very flesh of Indian women. The symbol of this violation is Doña Malinche, the mistress of Cortés. It is true that she gave herself voluntarily to the conquistador, but he forgot her as soon as her usefulness was over. Doña Marina becomes a figure representing the Indian women who were fascinated, violated, or seduced by Spaniards. And, as a small boy will not forgive his mother if she abandons him to search for his father, the Mexican people have not forgiven La Malinche for her betrayal.⁴⁵

Initially, Paz gave her a break for being violated, but in the end she was still the betrayer.

Truly the effect La Malinche had on the male psyche was that she either challenged his power, control, and dominance or she was an affirmation of his inability to protect her. As Leslie Petty put it, "a society of male dominance produces fathers who fear their daughters' beauty, because it may entice a man to violate her, thus threatening the father's role as protector."⁴⁶ In the end a female was blamed for men's faults and atrocities.

The Mexican culture had two standards for women. They were either La Virgen de Guadalupe, who was good and clean, or La Malinche, who was bad and dirty. These two historical figures have taken on mythological proportions. For women in Mexican society today these two figures embody the perceptions of political and social femininity.⁴⁷

⁴⁴ Sanchez, "La Malinche," 128.

⁴⁵ Paz, *Labyrinth*, 86.

⁴⁶ Leslie Petty "The Dual'-ing Images of la Malinche and la Virgen de Guadalupe in Cisneros's *The House on Mango Street*," in MELUS 25, 2 (2000): 122-127.

⁴⁷ Ibid., 119-121.

Twenty-five years ago Mexico thought they could finally break through their disgust with the image of La Malinche, Cortés, and their son. They built a brilliant monument to them. But neither forgiveness nor acceptance was in their hearts. Fierce demonstrations and riots broke out and the statue was destroyed.⁴⁸

José Vasconcelos, one of Mexico's most important intellectual writers, already saw that the Mexican population could not be separated into or defined by being Indian or Spanish. Instead, he recognized that a fifth race had been created, that transcended the four; white, black, red, and yellow that had existed in the nation. He wanted this to be reflected at the artists' will.⁴⁹ Authors had used her in essays and plays such as Carlos Fuentes, Salvador Novo, and Rodolfo Usigli. These artists attempted to show the simplicity of the life she had to create for herself in a harsh situation. Diego Rivera portrayed her as mother and mate, Orozco painted her as the alter ego of Cortés, and Salvador Novo showed her in his play as an interpreter with a willing ear, a religious soul, and a caring heart.⁵⁰

So far the intellectual minds of Mexico were rethinking her. In addition, many Chicana women today do not see her as the cause of their gender problems, but as a woman whose life paralleled their own. The denigration and defamation of their own characters they can see as a reflection of La Malinche's. Her ultimate loyalty to Cortés was a trait to adopt, not to degrade.⁵¹ For Chicanas she had become important in their need to shake off bad stigmas and replace them with an acceptance of their culture.

If blame must have been cast for the downfall of an ancient empire then the very Aztecs themselves should have been looked at. La Malinche just may have been the unsuspecting scapegoat for an unsuccessful king.⁵² The Aztecs were not making friends with their Indian neighbors. Instead their brutality towards other Indian tribes and nations were creating enemies. These oppressed Indians would rally with anyone opposing the Aztecs as the Tlaxcalans did. Moreover the heart of the Aztec nation was already crumbling from small pox reported Bernal Díaz by the

⁴⁸ Krauss, 32.

⁴⁹ Bakewell, 453.

⁵⁰ Krauss, 22.

⁵¹ Conner, "Creator or Traitor."

⁵² Ibid., "La Malinche."

time Cortés, La Malinche, and their warriors arrived. We could have extrapolated that Moctezuma was doing nothing to contain the disease within the capital. As Díaz said, if they had not come when they did the disease may have infested the entire kingdom and killed off the rest of the empire. Moctezuma's failure to defend his kingdom from all types of invaders is the true source of an empire falling, and not La Malinche's work as an interpreter.⁵³

The heart of the matter though was not so simple. Miscegenation, the mixing of racial blood, was not a new idea in Mexican ideology.⁵⁴ In the United States of America racial purity had always been strictly adhered to. When the Europeans settled in North America they firmly believed in not mixing with the Indians. Laws were continuously placed on the books to separate whites from Indians, from blacks, and the idea was alluded to with Mexicans, Japanese, and others. Mexicans had been immigrating into North America for centuries. Since the early 1900s they had been under constant pressure to become Americanized. Their religion had been attacked. Their communal and cultural values, gender responsibilities, hair, and clothes had all been manipulated by European ideals. It was not too far of a stretch to say they had also been brainwashed into believing that interracial relations was also wrong.

After decades of trying to fit into the American culture, of wanting to belong simply to have more of the American dream, they had reemphasized this false notion as well. During the late-18th and early-19th centuries, Vasconcelos had already recognized this dilemma. He declared that the country had been striving to emulate Europe and the United States, and that this train of thought for the Mexican nation needed to end. The reference point for the Latin American nations should have come from within, and not from outside ideals.⁵⁵ Nevertheless, the ideology had not been fully applied and when it was applied to the "Mother of the Mexican Race," she could have been nothing more than a whore. She was the one to blame for combining Spanish and Aztec blood. Well before the Spanish had come to Latin America, one of the

⁵³ Lencheck, "Harlot or Heroine?"

⁵⁴ Sanchez, "La Malinche," 128.

⁵⁵ Bakewell, 453.

ways in which Aztecs conquered other Indians, was to intermarry and miscegenate with the conquered peoples.

La Malinche should not have been held up to today's morals, just as the brutality of the Aztecs could not have been judged. The context was completely different. Cisneros said, "Chicana women," according to Sandra Cisneros, should "accept" [their] culture."⁵⁶ The mixing of races then could not have been a sound reason for accusing an abandoned daughter of being a "whore, a traitor, a sell-out." La Malinche forgave her mother; the Mexican people may one day forgive La Malinche.

⁵⁶ Pilar E. Rodriguez Aranda, "On the Solitary Fate of Being Mexican, Female, Wicked and Thirty-Three: an Interview with Writer Sandra Cisneros," in *The Americas Review* 18, 1 (1990): 64-80; quoted in Petty, "'The Dual'-ing Images," 123.

Eat, Drink, and be Merry for Tomorrow We Die: British Food Situation and Public Reaction During World War II

Tom Spicer

World War II transformed England's diet drastically, as food consumption was heavily reduced and certain foods rationed. The threat of the Nazis and the need for supplies elsewhere in the world for the Allied war-effort would cause British shipping to be transformed. As food imports decreased, the nation developed a new diet based on certain nutritious foods to be produced in large amounts within England's own borders. The government reacted to these new problems by controlling nearly every facet of food production, distribution, and consumption. England was successful in providing food for the physical needs of its people through new shipping and farming practices, the machinery of the Agricultural Industry, and the Ministry of Food. However, England found much difficulty in providing food that satisfied the Englishman's psychological and emotional need to feel content without diverse and enticing meals.

The threat of the German navy can be clearly seen when one looks to their rates of success early in the war. From 1940 to 1941, there were around 150,000 thousand tons of food and cargo bound for Great Britain lost on the sea due to the German blockade.¹ England lost 11.4 million tons of shipping to Nazi attacks during the entire war.² The Luftwaffe, Germany's air force, also wreaked havoc on England's food supply when it bombed processing and milling plants.³ In May 1941, the aerial

¹ Christopher Driver, *The British at Table, 1940-1980* (London: Hogarth Press, 1983), 17.

² Mancur L. Olson, Jr., *The Economics of Wartime Shortages: A History of British Food Supplies in the Napoleonic War and in World Wars I and II* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1963), 119.

³ Richard James Hammand, *Food and Agriculture in Britain, 1939-1945: Aspects of Wartime Control* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1954), 117.

attacks caused the United Kingdom to lose thirteen percent of its ability to mill certain foods.⁴ In addition, the English lost 309,000 tons of food to German air attacks.⁵

The shipping of food supplies into the U.K. from other countries was absolutely essential in feeding the country during peacetime.⁶ Before the war, the British relied on twenty-two million tons of imported foods.⁷ An increase in the size of English cities had caused a reduction in the amount of land available for farming within England.⁸ This led to an even greater dependency upon food imports. In fact, imports made up half of Britain's food supplies.⁹ One-half of all meats eaten in England, and nearly all the fats, four-fifths of its sugar, and nine-tenths of all cereals and flour were imported before the war.¹⁰ England, prior to the war, was a country that relied heavily upon the food of other nations to feed its own countrymen. Therefore, it was imperative that the Nazi U-boat threat to British imports not become a force capable of starving England out of the war.

England neutralized Germany's blockade of British shipping by reducing vulnerable shipping and increasing food production at home. In order to reduce shipping, the importation of five to six million tons of animal feed per year was reduced to almost nothing.¹¹ The space that was once taken up by food for farm animals was now replaced with food that could be directly eaten by humans.¹² The economical advantage to this policy was that it took several tons of animal feed to produce just one ton of meat or eggs, which would have been wasteful of valuable shipping space.¹³ The change accurately reflects the government's policy that designated ship-space for food that could feed and "sustain" the most amounts of people.¹⁴ With the lack of imported animal

⁴ *Ibid.*, 171.

⁵ Ministry of Food. *How Britain was Fed in Wartime: Food Control, 1939-1945*, 17.

⁶ Olson, *The Economics of Wartime Shortages*, 128.

⁷ *Ibid.*

⁸ *Ibid.*, 117.

⁹ Ministry of Food. *How Britain was Fed in Wartime*, 4.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 5.

¹² *Ibid.*

¹³ *Ibid.*

¹⁴ Olson, *The Economics of Wartime Shortages*, 120.

feed, pig and poultry populations in Britain were greatly reduced. The English farmer had no feed to give to the pigs and poultry, and, in 1943, the number of pigs was reduced from 4.4 million to 1.8 million, and poultry numbers were curbed as well.¹⁵ In addition, the British Government had to convince eager exporters, such as the U.S. and Canada that “minor foodstuffs” (such as tapioca and coffee) were inefficient and non-essential and should no longer be exported.¹⁶ British import shipping dropped from 22.5 million tons of food to twelve million tons during the war years.¹⁷

In addition to the reduced shipping and importing of animal feed, the British exporters, in order to maximize the amount of shippable food, adopted new techniques and inventions to save shipping space. Powdered milk replaced liquid milk, which was advantageous because it did not require refrigerated ships, which were scarce at the time.¹⁸ “Telescoping”, the folding and compressing of meat, and de-boning were practiced.¹⁹ “Telescoping” of meat caused British housewives some confusion as the meat came to England distorted out of its usual form. Upon arrival to England, the meat looked so deformed that women did not know what cut they were actually getting and had to relearn the cuts of meat after the war.²⁰ Britain’s Department of Scientific and Industrial Research invented spray-dried eggs, thus saving ninety-five percent of the space that eggs-in-carton would have taken.²¹ British shipping had been successfully modified to avoid crippling losses to the German navy. It was the job of the agricultural industry and England’s farmers to produce more food to make up for the importation losses.

The farmers and the agricultural industry answered the call to duty. Caloric output by British agriculture increased by more than 10 billion from pre-war levels.²² Early in the war, a Scientific Food Committee for the government’s food policy created the

¹⁵ Ministry of Food, *How Britain was Fed in Wartime*, 9.

¹⁶ Hammand, *Food and Agriculture in Britain*, 29.

¹⁷ Olson, *The Economics of Wartime Shortages*, 128.

¹⁸ Ministry of Food, *How Britain was Fed in Wartime*, 12.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*

²⁰ Driver, *The British at Table*, 22.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 29.

²² Olson, *The Economics of Wartime Shortages*, 125.

“basal diet,” which stressed the consumption of whole-meal breads, fats, milk, potatoes, and other vegetables for the English people.²³ The most important step in providing food for this diet was the plowing of permanent grasses into acreages designated for cereals and potatoes.²⁴ These foods were for direct human consumption, not the feeding of livestock. Cereals, potatoes, and other vegetables provided what the English Government considered “vital nutrients” and were grown in large numbers.²⁵ Every year of the war, save 1945, the Government’s goal for wheat acreage was met.²⁶ Two million additional acres were plowed in 1939, designated for the planting of wheat, potatoes, oats, barley, beans, peas, rye, and mixed corn.²⁷ During the war years, production was increased ninety percent in wheat, eighty-seven percent in potatoes, and forty-five percent in vegetables compared with the pre-war year.²⁸

The agricultural industry was successful in vastly increasing their food production. This success was partly due to the creation of Agricultural Executive Committees. These committees had the power to determine how any agricultural land was to be used and could dispossess farmers who were not keeping up with output expectations. The committees controlled farming through the rationing of feed, fertilizers, and farm machinery.²⁹ In addition, the government set high prices for agricultural products and wages for the agricultural industry in order to keep labor on the farms and the farmers making profits.³⁰ The agricultural sector of Britain had succeeded in the all-important job of producing the food for the country. It was the Ministry of Food that controlled and distributed that food.

The Minister of Food, Lord Woolton, whose head was appropriately potato-shaped, created a slogan for his department:

²³ Hammand, *Food and Agriculture in Britain*, 34.

²⁴ Olson, *The Economics of Wartime Shortages*, 121.

²⁵ *Ibid.*

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 123.

²⁷ Hammand, *Food and Agriculture in Britain*, 32.

²⁸ Ministry of Food, *How Britain was Fed in Wartime*, 5.

²⁹ Hammand, *Food and Agriculture in Britain*, 31.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 38.

“Feed the People!”³¹ The Ministry of Food effectively dealt with the food problems in England through price control and regulations, rationing, and the creation of communal food centers. The Ministry’s job was to control the prices of essential foods all along the different stages of distribution.³² The object of this price control was to, “assure all classes a fair share of food supplies and prevent inflation.”³³ The goal was met, and after three years of war, almost all the important foods had fixed prices, which allowed the average-earning Englishman a chance to buy them.³⁴ Price controls were maintained by subsidies given by the government. The subsidies took form in either the Ministry of Food absorbing trading losses or direct payments to retailers, wholesalers, producers, or shippers.³⁵ Ninety-seven percent of the foods in the Food Index received some amount of subsidy from the government.³⁶ An example was the government’s direct subsidy to local authorities, which enabled them to provide cheap milk for expectant mothers and children at school.³⁷

In order to prevent the wealthy from buying all available goods, the Ministry of Food decided to ration the important and limited supplies of foods. In September 1939, a national registration was given through the mail to all of Great Britain and was used as the basis for rationing.³⁸ The first rationing program did not actually start until January 8, 1940.³⁹ The main foods initially rationed were butter, sugar, bacon, and ham.⁴⁰ The rationing of these foods can be traced to the cutting off of shipping from Denmark after Germany overran it in 1940. Prior to 1939, Denmark had been a major exporter of butter and bacon.⁴¹

³¹ Mosley, *Backs to the Wall: The Heroic story of the People of London During World War II*, 71; Christina Hardymont, *Slice of Life: The British way of Eating since 1945* (London: BBC Books, 1995), 19.

³² Ministry of Food, *How Britain was Fed in Wartime*, 25.

³³ *Ibid.*, 35.

³⁴ Jules Backman, *Rationing and Price Control in Great Britain* (Washington, DC: The Bookings Institution, 1943), 14-15.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, 19.

³⁶ *Ibid.*

³⁷ Hammand, *Food and Agriculture in Britain*, 143.

³⁸ Backman, *Rationing and Price Control in Great Britain*, 24.

³⁹ *Ibid.*

⁴⁰ Driver, *The British at Table*, 22.

⁴¹ Hammand, *Food and Agriculture in Britain*, 20.

Eventually, the major foods rationed expanded to include meat, cheese, fats, and preserves.⁴² Important foods, in terms of calories and nutrition, that escaped rationing’s grasp were bread, oatmeal, potatoes, fresh vegetables, fruit (except oranges), and fish.⁴³ Of the rationed foods, an Englishman could purchase 1 pound of fresh meat (including the bone), four ounces of bacon, eight ounces of sugar, three ounces of cheese, eight ounces of fat, and three ounces of sweets or chocolates per week. This was a small percentage of the pre-war levels consumed by the English. Prior to the war’s beginning, the average person ate one and three-fourths pounds of meat a week, and five and one-half ounces of bacon and ham, one pound of sugar, twelve ounces of cheese, ten and one-half ounces of fats, and six and one-half ounces of sweets and chocolates.⁴⁴ Clearly the consumption of rationed foods had been reduced.

Rationing was strictly regulated. A consumer registered with a single retailer, who then applied for a permit to obtain rationed foods.⁴⁵ Retailers received a guaranteed supply of food based on the number of his customers registered at the date of the last registration.⁴⁶ Customers were tied to one retailer and bought the rations each week from the shop with which they were registered. The retailer canceled a customer’s coupons from his or her ration book after a rationed food was purchased.⁴⁷ Rationed foods were counted in their original forms and as ingredients in other foods. In addition, special permits for rationing were given to institutions with large amounts of people such as hospitals, schools, prisons, hotels, and restaurants.⁴⁸ Extra rations were given to those citizens employed in hard labor. Merchant seamen, underground miners, agricultural laborers, foresters, and other physically drained workers, whom were essential to the country’s survival, received extra food because of their high level of exertion.⁴⁹

⁴² Ministry of Food, *How Britain was Fed in Wartime*, 33.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, 42.

⁴⁴ Driver, *The British at Table*, 27.

⁴⁵ Hammand, *Food and Agriculture in Great Britain*, 21.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 205.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 25.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*

⁴⁹ Backman, *Rationing and Price Control in Great Britain*, 31.

Lastly, there was a less-important aspect of rationing called “points rationing” that was implemented on December 1, 1941.⁵⁰ Points rationing was not essential to British survival. It was adopted from the Germans (of course, this was not told to the British public) and gave consumers a choice in where to spend their “points” for such foods that were considered luxuries at the time or too scarce for the government to guarantee a ration.⁵¹ These foods included canned meats, peas and beans, certain kinds of fruit, tapioca, and biscuits.⁵² Rationing worked well in providing limited amounts of foods not in abundance.

Another aspect of the wartime food program was its creation of large food centers. When an Englishman could not eat at home or at a local restaurant, he could go to a communal feeding center for nourishment. Communal feeding centers were set up both for the poor, who could not afford private restaurant prices⁵³ and for workers who, because of their jobs, could not eat at home.⁵⁴ These large food centers were called “communal feeding centers” until Winston Churchill ordered Lord Woolton to change them to “British Restaurants” because the former sounded too communist.⁵⁵ In 1943, British Restaurants reached their peak, with 2,160 in operation serving around 600,000 meals a day.⁵⁶ The government for any factory employing more than 250 people also set up industrial canteens.⁵⁷ By 1941, seventy-nine million meals were served in industrial canteens.⁵⁸ Agricultural workers who worked too deep within a rural area and did not have a canteen or British Restaurant available to them, received meat pies, snacks, and sandwiches delivered by volunteer organizations.⁵⁹

The government limited the number of these communal feeding establishments to ensure that they did not deplete

⁵⁰ Hammand, *Food and Agriculture in Great Britain*, 112.

⁵¹ Driver, *The British at Table*, 21.

⁵² Ministry of Food, *How Britain was Fed in Wartime*, 42.

⁵³ Hammand, *Food and Agriculture in Britain*, 172.

⁵⁴ Ministry of Food, *How Britain was Fed in Wartime*, 44.

⁵⁵ Driver, *The British at Table*, 3.

⁵⁶ Hammand, *Food and Agriculture in Britain*, 175.

⁵⁷ Hardymont, *Slice of Life: The British way of Eating since 1945*, 12.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 10.

⁵⁹ Ministry of Food, *How Britain was Fed in Wartime*, 45.

“domestic rations.”⁶⁰ The benefit of these communal feeding centers was clearly stated in *How Britain was Fed in Wartime*: “Communal feeding in all its forms was a way of avoiding complicated systems of different rationing for thousands of different workers.”⁶¹ Additionally, it saved time and money by allowing the workers to eat at more convenient locations.

Britain, as a whole, was more healthily fed in the 1940s than it had been in previous years. However, as Christopher Driver points out, “nutritional well-being and psychological perception of eating better or worse are often two entirely different things.”⁶² The government had been able to fulfill the people’s physical needs. This accomplishment is not to be taken lightly. Had the English government not been prepared to handle the assortment of food-related problems, their war effort might have been stalled due to hunger and starvation for English people at home and abroad. People dying or suffering from lack of food may have rioted or been less productive. Had a soldier’s child been ill due to lack of food, who knows how that might have affected the soldier’s ability to fight? It certainly would have added to the stresses of an already tension-filled war. The changes in food importation and food production policies along with the organization of the rationing machine were essential in stabilizing the English nation at war.

Despite this tremendous achievement, most English people agreed that during the war, they were eating worse. The civilian population thought food problems were one of the most important consequences of the war along with evacuations, air raids, and the disruption of family life.⁶³ The Ministry of Information created a report stating the factors of war life that produced low morale. Food was fourth on the list.⁶⁴ Home Intelligence reported low public morale in 1940 and it is clear that all of the war’s consequences, including the food situation, were causes for the

⁶⁰ Hammand, *Food and Agriculture in Britain*, 173.

⁶¹ Ministry of Food, *How Britain was Fed in Wartime*, 47.

⁶² Driver, *The British at Table*, 17.

⁶³ Ina Zweiniger-Bargieowska, *Austerity in Britain: Rationing, Controls, and Consumption, 1939-1945* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 60.

⁶⁴ Ian McLaine, *Ministry of Morale: Home Front Morale and the Ministry of Information in World War II* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1979), 113.

low morale.⁶⁵ The food available to the public failed miserably in satisfying the Englishman's appetite. The government's pathetic attempts at trying to push the available diet reveal its failure to provide food that the people actually liked. Cheese and other highly valued food items were scarce during the war. In addition, homefront propaganda stressed suffering and sacrifice to the British public.⁶⁶ And, in terms of the taste and flavor of their food, suffer and sacrifice they did. The Ministry of Food, itself, admitted the existence of a shortage of a large number of all the more appetizing and popular foods.⁶⁷ Palate stimulants such as blue cheese, anchovies, and other spices were no longer found.⁶⁸ Lord Woolton would try, and fail, to convince the public that whale meat and snoek (an obscure South African Fish) were nutritious and tasty.⁶⁹

The government tried to promote certain recipes with ingredients that were in abundance. Their recipe for a Spanish omelet used dried eggs instead of fresh ones. The "Savory Scones" replaced flour with oatmeal.⁷⁰ These were two of the more respectable recipes the government pushed. "Victory Dishes" look now like a desperate attempt to make meals out of potatoes, dried eggs, and salt cod sound appetizing.⁷¹ "Victory Pudding" was a bland egg-less sponge made with carrot, potatoes, and breadcrumbs.⁷² "Woolton Pie" looked like a steak and kidney pie but had neither the steak nor the kidney.⁷³ These dishes simply could not replace the tastier meals of the past.

The British people's reaction to their diet was one of grudging acceptance and their morale suffered because of the new diet and other food-related problems. Gallup polls of the time show that food and general shortages were a major problem on a national and personal level in the 1940s for the English people.⁷⁴ Fifty

⁶⁵ Ibid., 62.

⁶⁶ Zweiniger-Bargielowska, *Austerity in Britain*, 60.

⁶⁷ Ibid., 37.

⁶⁸ Driver, *The British at Table*, 17.

⁶⁹ Alan F. Wilt, *Food for War: Agriculture and Rearmament in Britain before the Second World War* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 252.

⁷⁰ Ibid., 227.

⁷¹ Hammond, *Food and Agriculture in Britain*, 183.

⁷² Hardyment, *Slice of Life*, 11.

⁷³ Wilt, *Food for War*, 228.

⁷⁴ Zweiniger-Bargielowska, *Austerity in Britain*, 63.

percent of men and thirty-one percent of women polled in 1943 believed that there was not even enough food to keep fit.⁷⁵ The lack of food was matched, unfortunately for the Englishman, by a lack of flavor in the "basal diet."⁷⁶ Not only did quantities of food decrease, but also the quality of rare and precious foods such as chocolates, biscuits, and sweets suffered.⁷⁷ There are accounts of soup having the consistency of paste and containing beige beans and beige potatoes.⁷⁸ Much anticipated Christmas dinners no longer had the succulent courses of turkey, chicken, goose, or even rabbit. Mutton took their place.⁷⁹

The British Restaurants were criticized as well. A Sir William Darling stated that the communal feeding centers "are brutal in their cooking, brutal in their presentation of food."⁸⁰ A meal from one of the British Restaurants was described as follows: "One potato, one piece of carrot, and a 2''x 3'' rectangle of boiled beef, followed by a small piece of boiled pudding, spoilt with evil-tasting sauce."⁸¹ Queues for food were another source of aggravation for the people. "Queuing" was so volatile that Home Intelligence sensed "growing anger" from them and considered the queues "hot-beds of anti-semitism."⁸² People began to believe that Jews, "always manage to get hold of more food than other people."⁸³

Along with queues, certain kinds of foods sparked controversy and discontent among the English population. Shellfish and game were never rationed because the government could not guarantee a rationed amount for all of the population. However, many private restaurants would buy them up and serve them at high prices that only the wealthy could afford.⁸⁴ Tea, a common British beverage, was so rare by 1943 that people thought of trading whiskey for it.⁸⁵

⁷⁵ Ibid., 76.

⁷⁶ Wilt, *Food for War*, 221.

⁷⁷ Ministry of Food, *How Britain was Fed in Wartime*, 2.

⁷⁸ Driver, *The British at Table*, 35.

⁷⁹ Mosley, *Backs to the Wall*, 350.

⁸⁰ Philip Ziegler, *London at War, 1939-1945* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1995), 251.

⁸¹ Ibid.

⁸² Zweiniger-Bargielowska, *Austerity in Britain*, 77.

⁸³ Ibid.

⁸⁴ Ibid., 78.

⁸⁵ Mosley, *Backs Against the Wall*, 336.

In addition, meat rations were so low that they could only last a person for three nights out of the week.⁸⁶ This in turn caused meat to become one of the most sensitive food issues. This was especially true for male manual workers who felt that their diet was inadequate due to the lack of meat. Meat was highly prized as a marker of status and male privilege in the English working class diet.⁸⁷ The large decrease of such an important food caused much unhappiness.⁸⁸

The rationing program also fell under fire. Consumers felt “tied down” to just one retailer they were registered with to receive rations.⁸⁹ There were examples of butchers and customers arguing over varieties and sizes of meat.⁹⁰ One working class woman complained that the rations were simply not “large enough” to please her.⁹¹ In January 1941, only forty-four percent of those polled thought that the existing rationing system worked fairly for everybody.⁹² The main problem people had with rationing was accurately summed up by a Ministry of Food memorandum, “Rationing is essentially inequitable; it provides the same quantity of an article for each person without any consideration of their needs or habits or of their capacity to change.”⁹³

Nothing revealed the public’s dissatisfaction with the food situation better than the extensive black market activity that occurred during the war.⁹⁴ The violators were mainly producers, distributors, and retailers of food. However, it was public demand for certain foods, primarily meat, eggs, poultry, and tea, that kept the market alive.⁹⁵ The worst areas of black market activity were docks, ports, and large industrial areas where there was heavy food traffic.⁹⁶ The black market was supplied through unauthorized production, counterfeit ration coupons, growers and producers of

⁸⁶ Driver, *The British at Table*, 16.

⁸⁷ Zweiniger-Bargielowska, *Austerity in Britain*, 74.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, 21.

⁹⁰ Mosley, *Backs to the Wall*, 311.

⁹¹ Zweiniger-Bargielowska, *Austerity in Britain*, 72.

⁹² *Ibid.*, 70.

⁹³ *Ibid.*, 79.

⁹⁴ Zweiniger-Bargielowska, *Austerity in Britain*, 151.

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, 155.

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, 160.

farm products, theft, and by adding water to increase the weight of rationed foods.⁹⁷ In one example of black market activity, one Italian restaurant hid steaks under a mound of spinach to try and fool the food inspectors.⁹⁸ The Ministry of Food issued 10,598 violations in one year between 1939 and 1940. The next year saw 29,329 and 33,811 during 1942.⁹⁹ It is obvious from both individual reactions and the existence of a black market, that there was a palpable frustration with the food problem.

Mumblin and the black market were as far as the people would go with their dissatisfaction. Indeed, that is a tribute to them and the English government. Certainly, rationing had caused its fair share of headaches for the British people, but by 1942, rationing was accepted as a “necessary matter of course.”¹⁰⁰ There was never any danger of starvation,¹⁰¹ and the wartime diet went well beyond the bare essentials.¹⁰² The British public, despite grumbling and engaging in black market activity, saw the food program as a necessary sacrifice for the war effort.¹⁰³ The Agricultural Industry was successful in handling the reduction of imported foods by producing more homegrown food. The Ministry of Food had the complicated job of rationing and distributing the food, which it did well, despite some minor setbacks. The primacy given to meeting the people’s nutritional needs almost necessarily meant that taste would be sacrificed. Fortunately for Britain’s war effort, the British people grudgingly accepted their bland and monotonous wartime diet. By 1942, food rationing was perceived as one of the great achievements of the war.¹⁰⁴

⁹⁷ Backman, *Rationing and Price Control in Great Britain*, 61-62.

⁹⁸ Ziegler, *London at War*, 250.

⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, 59.

¹⁰⁰ Zweiniger-Bargielowska, *Austerity in Britain*, 72.

¹⁰¹ Mosley, *Backs to the Wall*, 314.

¹⁰² Driver, *The British at Table*, 16.

¹⁰³ Zweiniger-Bargielowska, *Austerity in Britain*, 60.

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, 66.

The Declaratory Act as Portrayed in Colonial American Newspapers

Ryan Ervin

The Declaratory Act was issued simultaneously with the repeal of the Stamp Act on March 18, 1766. It was a vague, elusive piece of legislation that declared Parliamentary supremacy over the American colonies “in all cases whatsoever.”¹ Initially, colonists paid little attention to it, mainly due to their jubilation over the rescinding of the Stamp Act. However, over the next several years it became a devastating document that cleared the way for the Townshend Acts, the Tea Act, and other subsequent Parliamentary measures. The Declaratory Act was what Parliament pointed to when questioned over their right to tax and make laws in the colonies, and it would be continually tied to Britain’s right to legislate for America.

Eighteenth-century newspapers were Americans’ main source for news, both at home and abroad. Opinions and editorials saturated the papers, especially in the early Revolutionary years of the 1760s and 70s. People learned what laws Parliament issued concerning them, and also their own American brethren’s opinions. The newspapers became a powerful tool for writers to sway public opinion, and more influential than any of his contemporaries was John Dickinson. Dickinson, in *Letters from a Farmer*, criticized Parliament for clamping down on colonists’ rights while also calling his countrymen to resistance.²

¹ John Ferling, *A Leap in the Dark* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 54. Ferling calls the Declaratory Act “a bold pronouncement declaring that capitulation on the Stamp Tax issue did not mean that London concurred with the constitutional stand of the American radicals, and indeed that Parliament had the authority to make laws for the colonies ‘in all cases whatsoever.’” Ferling surmises that the colonists “dismissed the statement as simply the bravado of a defeated ministry.”

² Dickinson’s *Letters from a Farmer* “first appeared in a dozen installments in a Philadelphia newspaper between December 1767 and February 1768, [and] was ultimately printed in twenty-one of the twenty-five colonial newspapers.”

Dickinson wrote a letter for the *Boston Chronicle* in late January-early February, 1768. The timing of his letter was important: the Townshend Acts had been passed the year before, thus giving clearer meaning to the foggy terms laid out in the Declaratory Act. Now Parliament was reasserting its right to tax the colonies. Dickinson first tried to discredit the Act outright, writing: “instantly on repealing the stamp-act, an act passed, declaring the power of parliament to bind these colonies in all cases whatever. This however was only planting a barren tree, that cast a shade in dread over the colonies, but yielded no fruit.”³

He also saw that the Declaratory Act was purposefully ambiguous, intending to hide Parliament’s true intentions. Dickinson stated that Parliament was “determined to enforce the authority on which the stamp-act was founded...and it being thought proper to disguise the authority in such a manner, as not again to alarm the colonies.”⁴ Two key points come to light here that help to understand the colonial view of the Act. First, it would always be tied psychologically to the Stamp Act. As the first was repealed, the second was ratified. Moreover, the colonists thought Parliament had sided with them in their view of no taxation without representation; the Declaratory Act eventually proved them wrong in that respect. Secondly, the way in which the Act was written demonstrated to Dickinson, among others, that Parliament was indeed trying to “disguise the authority,” which would make colonists question British motives and intentions.

Dickinson used the Declaratory Act to fuel opposition against Parliament’s right to tax the colonists in any manner, whether internal or external. In fact, the Act (and the Townshend Acts that followed) gave the colonial resistance effort new breath, igniting colonists to fight for the right to govern themselves. Dickinson, again writing in the *Chronicle*, questioned Parliament’s supremacy: “If they have any right to tax us, then whether our own money shall continue in our own pockets, or not depends no longer on *us*, but on *them*.”⁵ Here the Declaratory Act was seen

Ferling states that “the separate essays were gathered and issued in a pamphlet that outsold every other political tract published in America before 1776.” Ferling, *A Leap in the Dark*, 70.

³ *Boston Chronicle*, 25 January – 18 February, 1768.

⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ *Ibid.*

through the lens of the new acts and legislation of Parliament in 1768. The Act was rarely ever attacked outright in the colonial newspapers, oftentimes only referred to as the Act that bound the colonies “in any case whatever,” but it was tied to all new measures and statutes because it became the precedent for all future Parliamentary authority.

Dickinson, in another *Boston Chronicle* article as a “Farmer,” again tried to make the case that the Declaratory Act was unconstitutional. The British Constitution was not a written document with specific rules and laws; it was the embodiment of English laws and customs passed down from the Magna Carta through the ages of history.⁶ Rules of governing and legislating were not easily altered, because such an edifice of standards, patterns and guidelines stood the test of time and was seen as effective. Dickinson said the Declaratory Act gave Parliament new found and unprecedented authority to make any and all laws concerning the colonies, despite being unconstitutional.

What but the indisputable, the acknowledged exclusive right of the colonies to tax themselves, could be the reason, that in this long period...no statute was ever passed for the sole purpose of raising a revenue on the colonies? And how clear, how cogent must that reason be, to which every parliament...for so long a time submitted, without a single attempt to innovate?⁷

There is a danger here in separating the Declaratory Act from its imprint on other acts, since viewing the acts alone leaves out the reasons for them. Indeed, the Declaratory Act was closely bound to all of Parliament’s acts concerning the colonies after 1766, because it was embodied in them. When people wrote about the Declaratory Act in newspapers, it was usually in regards to other acts of Parliament. Colonists saw the Quartering Act, Townshend Acts, and the Coercive Acts as measures taken by a British government that obtained its authority and supremacy from

⁶ The Magna Carta, issued by King John in 1215, is the foundation for the British constitution. It established guarantees of trial by jury and habeas corpus, and generally protected the citizenry’s well being from those ruling. The vagueness of the document has caused many over the centuries to interpret it differently, but its importance in being the basis for Western democracy is unquestioned.

⁷ *Boston Chronicle*, 11 January – 18 January, 1768.

the Declaratory Act. So while the Act itself declared Parliamentary authority, the muscle behind it was found in future legislation.

Other colonists, besides the farmer John Dickinson, had things to say about the Declaratory Act. Two years earlier, H.S. Conway wrote a letter to Governor Bernard of Massachusetts in June 1766, describing Parliament’s repeal of the Stamp Act and passage of the Declaratory Act. Perhaps Conway wished to find favor with Bernard, because his attitudes toward the colonial struggle and Parliamentary authority were markedly different from Dickinson’s. He exclaimed: “The Moderation, the Forbearance, the unexampled Lenity and Tenderness of Parliament towards the Colonies...cannot but dispose the Province committed to your Case, to that Return of cheerful Obedience to the Laws and Legislative Authority of Great-Britain.”⁸ In Conway’s mind, Parliament bent over backwards for the colonists by holding no ill will towards them after the riots spurred by the Stamp Act. The least the colonists could do, he argued, was to be obedient to Great Britain’s legislative authority.

There were many Americans living in London during the 1760s. Many relayed information back home about everything from Parliamentary debates to the mood of Englanders towards the colonies. One letter from London, published in the *Massachusetts Gazette* in April 1766, gave an honest account of Parliamentary debate over both the Stamp Act and Declaratory Act, and provides insight into the thinking and intentions of both Houses. The author informed his Massachusetts-anchored friend that, “your opposition to the authority of Great-Britain...have been highly resented by the government here.”⁹ From this account it is clear that colonial opposition was not towards Great Britain, or even Parliament, but opposition towards the authority assumed by Parliament. It is also obvious, yet necessary, to mention that Parliament “highly resented” this opposition. This resentment could have been the reason for the Declaratory Act.

The author explained that Parliament was not wholly in support of the Declaratory Act. It must have been reassuring “to hear that the great PITT, Mr. BARRE, and two or three others”

⁸ *Massachusetts Gazette*, 4 June, 1766.

⁹ *Ibid.*, 25 April, 1766.

opposed the Act in the House of Commons, and some “opposed also the first resolve in the House of Lords; but a resolve of the right of taxation is *made*.”¹⁰ This helps the modern reader understand that the Declaratory Act was not a unified Parliamentary effort, but was discussed by the members and even disputed by prominent Whig leaders, such as William Pitt.

Another insightful look at the thoughts and views of Parliament shows them to be desperately holding on to their authority and power over America. One must remember that while the repeal of the Stamp Act was being debated, the right of Parliament to issue laws and hold power over America was being discussed as well. They saw the loss of the Stamp Act as a sign of their waning control over the colonies. In this context, it makes much more sense when the Londoner wrote that “there are many, in both houses...who are vehemently against giving way in the least, but would force an implicit obedience even with fire and sword if necessary, but thank God a great majority are for softer measures.”¹¹

Again, in late January 1768, John Dickinson put pen to paper and warned his fellow colonists of the dangers of too much governmental power: “All artful rulers, who strive to extend their own power beyond its just limits, endeavor to give to their attempts as much semblance of legality as possible...That which is now supported by examples, growing old, will become an example itself.”¹² Dickinson’s point was that Parliament tried to make the Declaratory Act a legally justified and reasonable statute, one that over time would be so embedded in the loose fabric of the British Constitution that it would become permanent. This was a frightful warning that not only called colonists to attention, but also made them even more suspicious of Parliament’s intentions.

By the mid-1770s, the colonies were close to open rebellion against Great Britain. Parliament had repeatedly tried to tax America, both internally and externally, and had taken away other rights like trial by jury and public meetings. Many colonists saw all of these laws and regulations placed upon them as stemming from the Declaratory Act, and the unfounded power it gave

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ Ibid.

¹² *Boston Chronicle*, 25 January – 1 February, 1768.

Parliament. While most arguments both for and against it were made in conjunction with debate over other Acts, there is one letter from mid-1774 that specifically attacks the Declaratory Act. The *Pennsylvania Gazette* published the letter by “A Loyal American” at a time when the colonies were in an uproar. The Coercive Acts had yoked Boston into a state of military rule, and disputes between America and Great Britain were growing to a fevered pitch. This was a serious time, one in which colonists had to understand what their relationship with Parliament, and Great Britain, had become.

The Loyal American first attacked Parliament’s power to tax and control the right of trial by jury. With tempered fury he wrote that Parliament saw “it was judged fittest...that, as if the British Americans had but ONE NECK, a SINGLE Stroke might dispatch Millions—by subjecting us at once to the Decrees of Parliament, IN ALL CASES WHATSOEVER.”¹³ The author was saying that Parliament had no right to bind the colonies with a stroke of the pen, much less by the actual Act. There were too many English subjects in the colonies to make so sweeping a statement.

Next, the zealous writer explains that Parliament had passed a similar Declaratory Act for Ireland, stating that the legislature was supreme there. “Compare the Act,” he wrote, “and you will find the Act for America copied from that of Ireland; but in the last mentioned, the annihilating Words—‘IN ALL CASES WHATSOEVER’ are not to be found.”¹⁴ The Loyal American wondered why these words were added for America but not for Ireland. Colonists saw this as unfair treatment; and, more importantly, as a systematic plan to subjugate them and them alone. It is also interesting to see the word “annihilate” used to describe the last clause in the Act. That phrase, “in all cases whatsoever,” was a devastating blow to the colonists after their premature joy over the repeal of the Stamp Act. In many ways, the Act destroyed their idealistic view of their Mother Country.

The Loyal American summarized the general colonial view of the Declaratory Act when he wrote:

¹³ *Pennsylvania Gazette*, 8 January, 1774.

¹⁴ Ibid.

THE declaratory Act...was such a Violation of the Constitution, such an Assumption of new Powers, so subversive of Liberty, and so destructive of Property, that it deserves particular Observation, That it has hitherto passed unnoticed, is owing to the Gratitude and Joy with which America received the Repeal of the Stamp act.¹⁵

The opinionated writers of colonial newspapers expressed their fear that the powers Parliament assumed in the Declaratory Act were detrimental to the ancient Constitution. One of the strongest fears about the Act was that it declared Parliament supreme, while the realm of its supremacy had no foreseeable end. Legislating “in all cases whatsoever” is dictatorial when no limits exist. By April 1775, the colonists would fully understand the lengths to which Parliament would go to ensure its power and what the Declaratory Act had really meant. Violence had erupted in Concord and Lexington, and the document that many had overlooked a decade earlier began to make its presence felt in the fields of Massachusetts.

¹⁵ Ibid.

The Death of Dueling

Wade Ellett

Violence in some form or another has probably always existed. Civilization did not end violence, it merely provided a framework to ritualize and institutionalize violent acts. Once civilized, ritual violence became almost entirely a man's realm.¹ Ritual violence took many forms; but, without a doubt, one of the most romanticized was the duel. Dueling differed from wartime violence and barroom brawls because dueling placed two opponents, almost always of similar social class, against one another in a highly stylized form of combat.² Fisticuffs and war were not the same. Neither followed the rigid formalities dueling demanded, and fighters did not always defend personal honor as duelists, at least in theory, always did.³ Dueling was a unique form of violence, its origins found only in the upper echelons of society, distinctly separate from other violent acts.

It is unclear exactly when the practice of dueling began or when the first actual duel took place. Most writers agree that dueling probably began as a primitive judicial system where disputes were arbitrated by hand-to-hand combat.⁴ But when civilization eventually created regularized procedures to dispense justice, dueling continued as a means to dispute matters of honor.⁵ The duel of honor can be traced back to medieval tournaments,

¹ Pieter Spierenburg, *Men and Violence: Gender, Honor, and Rituals in Modern Europe and America* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1998), 13.

² Richard Cohen, *By the Sword: A History of Gladiators, Musketeers, Samurai, Swashbucklers, and Olympic Champions* (New York: Random House, 2002), 40.

³ Ibid.

⁴ Barbara Holland, "Bang! Bang! You're Dead: Dueling at the Drop of a Hat was as European as Truffles and as American as Mom's Apple Pie," *Smithsonian*, October 1997, 123.

⁵ Woody West, "No Real Justice? Revive The Duel," *Insight on the News* 2, August 1999, 48.

feuds, and a chivalric code of honor emphasizing virtue.⁶ Eventually this code of honor evolved into the upper class and nobility's theory of courtesy and the idea of the "gentleman". This resulted in the adoption of one-on-one combat to settle affairs in the sixteenth century.⁷ The duel of honor, as recognized from entertainment media, was based primarily on the Italian Renaissance idea of the gentleman and arrived in England in the 1570s.⁸ The practice was welcomed by the upper classes, who had long been awaiting a method to solve disputes. But the warm reception was not shared by royalty, and Queen Elizabeth I outlawed the judicial duel in 1571.⁹ Her attempts to remove the practice from England failed and dueling quickly gained popularity.¹⁰

Dueling thrived in England for nearly three centuries; however, the practice eventually came to an end in 1852, when the last recorded English duel was fought. There were many contributing factors to the practice's end. Criticism of dueling, a growing distaste for violence, legal resistance, religious moralism, and new ideas of manhood and honor all decreased the popularity of the duel. Because of its decreased popularity, it became more difficult and less rewarding to duel, so that by the nineteenth century, popular alternatives such as newspapers and court settlements finally defeated the duel.

When dueling arrived in England it found its niche among the landed few. Harold James Perkin pointed out that, "differential status was part of the given, unquestioned environment into which men were born."¹¹ The upper classes appeared to have always been separate from the lower classes, and they had a different set of values. Honor was held in the highest esteem by the upper classes, and paramount to this honor was a gentleman's reputation

⁶ Robert B. Shoemaker, "The Taming of the Duel: Masculinity, Honour and Ritual Violence In London, 1660-1800," *The Historical Journal* 43, no. 3 (2002): 525.

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ Markku Peltonen, "Francis Bacon, the Earl of Northampton, and the Jacobean Anti-Dueling Campaign," *The Historical Journal* 44, no. 1 (2001): 2-5.

⁹ Cohen, *By the Sword*, 44.

¹⁰ Holland, "Bang! Bang! You're Dead," 123.

¹¹ Harold James Perkin, *The Origins of Modern English Society 1780-1880* (London: Routledge & K. Paul, 1969), 24-25.

among his peers.¹² The gentry displayed their status and honor in their manner of dress, speech, behavior, and any other possible means.¹³ As a gentleman's actions and appearance were representative of his status and reputation, all outward signs and matters of protocol were rigidly stylized.¹⁴ Acting outside of protocol would lead other gentlemen to question the honor of that individual.

Dueling appeared to be a perfect solution for many reasons. First, only gentlemen could challenge each other to a duel.¹⁵ Furthermore, dueling upheld the idea of honorable behavior that was so important to would-be duelists. In fact, by the 1700s, dueling textbooks, most notably the widely accepted *Code Duello*, dealt less with actual duel than with the etiquette involved, such as the proper conditions for challenging and accepting, and how best to maintain proper respect.¹⁶

Dueling was reserved only for matters of honor, but the theory of honor to which gentlemen were bound was complex. Honor did not always appear to be the obvious cause of dispute. The romantic image of dueling for a lady's favor, for example, is a false one. Duels involving women were not fought to gain a woman's love, but rather because men took responsibility for the honor of certain women in their lives, including the women they were courting.¹⁷ For instance, a duel that took place in 1791 between two soldiers of the same regiment apparently started because the two men were interested in one woman, and when she eloped with one, the other issued the challenge, not because of love, but rather because of gentlemanly duty. The challenger opted to duel because the woman wrote him claiming that she had been forced to elope. Despite the appearance of a romantically based duel, the challenger was acting on what he felt was his gentlemanly duty on behalf of the lady.¹⁸ Most, if not all, of a gentleman's honorable duties could be well enforced by dueling,

¹² Peltonen, "Francis Bacon," 6.

¹³ Perkin, *The Origins of Modern English Society*, 25.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*

¹⁵ Holland, "Bang! Bang! You're Dead," 124.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 123-124.

¹⁷ Barbara Holland, *Gentlemen's Blood: A History of Dueling from Swords at Dawn to Pistols at Dusk* (Harrisonburg: Bloomsbury, 2003), 38.

¹⁸ *Times* (London), 17 January 1791.

and so the practice found wide acceptance among the upper classes looking for ways to solve disputes.

But this acceptance had not gone unchallenged. There were many critics within sections of the gentry and nobility, even as their peers were fighting duels.¹⁹ In the 1770s these criticisms grew stronger.²⁰ England was changing, and so too was the English gentleman. England underwent many changes to accommodate industrialism. London, for example, gained the benefits of urban planning, such as better-paved streets, and more importantly, a more organized police force. Hence Londoners were less willing to conduct disputes in the streets.²¹ Dueling had been outlawed for over a century, and with the unwillingness to fight publicly, it became increasingly popular to conduct duels in private, away from watchful eyes.²² This contradicted the idea that duels took place to maintain one's reputation, and thus duels lost some appeal. In addition, the ideas of how an honorable gentleman behaved were changing. Reputations were becoming public, and were more often defined in smaller social settings such as clubs, societies and the workplace.²³ Honor also became much more personal. No longer did one person's actions affect the honor of his entire family for generations.²⁴ Cultural opportunity grew, men expected more from life and they began to examine mankind's potential.²⁵ Because of these expanded horizons and new knowledge, men and their conduct began being judged by more modern standards of behavior, most of which centered upon the idea of politeness.²⁶ Anger, and the behavior associated with it, became less accepted in society.²⁷

¹⁹ Shoemaker, "The Taming of the Duel," 539.

²⁰ *Honour's preservation without blood: or, sober advice to duelists* (London, 1680), 24.

²¹ Shoemaker, "The Taming of the Duel," 526.

²² Cohen, *By the Sword*, 50.

²³ Shoemaker, "The Taming of the Duel," 542.

²⁴ Spierenburg, *Men and Violence*, 12.

²⁵ Perkin, *The Origins of Modern English Society*, 11.

²⁶ Shoemaker, "The Taming of the Duel," 526.

²⁷ Elizabeth Foyster, "Boys will be boys? Manhood and aggression, 1660-1800," in T. Hitchcock and M. Cohen, eds., *English masculinities, 1660-1800* (London, 1999), 162; quoted in Shoemaker, "The Taming of the Duel," *The Historical Journal* 43, no. 3 (2002): 525-545, n. 81.

Dueling's critics had always said that it was ridiculous to think that one's honor could be called into question just because of malicious words and other small offences.²⁸ As England industrialized, it became clear that the critics were ahead of their time. The notions of honor were ever changing as well. Even in the seventeenth century, Sir Francis Bacon, one of dueling's greatest critics, adamantly believed that for dueling to end, the theory of honor lying just beneath its surface must be abolished as well.²⁹ By the mid-eighteenth century, the theory was not abolished, but it was weakened by new ideas of honor and new concepts of politeness.

Despite these social changes, the practice of dueling evolved, and although it was not only the weaponry that changed, the shift from swords to pistols in the early 1760s was an important transition.³⁰ All of dueling's rules were based upon swordplay. But fencing had become much more rule-bound and almost choreographed, with time allowances for recovery after a lunge, and moments for rest similar to a time-out.³¹ These rules removed many of the inherent risks found in dueling. Without risk, courage could not be displayed. Dueling with pistols was a legitimate answer to this problem and pistols quickly became the weapon of choice.

Pistols, like all technological implements, improved. They became more accurate, and logically, duels should have become more deadly. However despite increasing accuracy and other advancements with the weaponry, dueling injuries became less common, mostly because of the manner in which duels were conducted.³² Dueling's rules changed to accommodate the new weaponry. Pistol duels offered participants opportunities to refuse to fire or to fire in the air, ending the duel.³³ And as guns became the prominent weapon, the seconds gained more administrative capabilities presiding over the duel, including the number of shots fired, and the ability to end the duel if necessary.³⁴ Most

²⁸ Peltonen, "Francis Bacon," 16.

²⁹ Ibid., 25.

³⁰ Shoemaker, "The Taming of the Duel," 528.

³¹ Ibid., 530.

³² Holland, *Gentlemen's Blood*, 79.

³³ Shoemaker, "The Taming of the Duel," 543.

³⁴ Holland, "Bang! Bang! You're Dead," 124.

importantly, wearing swords had been common for gentleman when dueling was introduced in England, allowing duelists to fight immediately. Not so with the pistol. When a challenge was issued, there had to be a delay so that the pistols could be acquired, and this allowed anger to give way to reason and gave seconds and friends an opportunity to try to settle the argument without firing shots.³⁵ Pistols re-introduced risk to the duel of honor, but paradoxically made the duel less fatal.

While the firearm solved one problem, it introduced another. Unlike the sword, which was primarily an aristocratic weapon, almost anyone could own or operate a pistol.³⁶ Mastering the art of swordplay took decades, requiring an instructor and daily training, but mastering a pistol took much less time.³⁷ With the introduction of the pistol into the duel of honor, dueling spread downward from aristocratic society into the new middle classes.³⁸ This weakened the duel's appeal to some, but others felt that dueling was still a viable solution to matters of honor.

As the nineteenth century drew near, attitudes towards violence changed. Life spans were lengthening, medical treatments were improving, and child mortality rates were declining.³⁹ Across Europe, violence became less acceptable. The criminalization of violent acts grew out of modernization and the emergence of a market economy. The new middle class competed with the traditional gentlemen for power and prestige. Money was becoming as valuable as land.⁴⁰ The gentleman's honor, like the gentlemen themselves, had competition.

In England, ideas instilled by the Renaissance and Enlightenment were being re-thought because of the movement towards the Industrial Revolution.⁴¹ Evolving industrial relationships in the eighteenth century often resulted in visible violence.⁴² War with France from 1793-1815 was the most

³⁵ Shoemaker, "The Taming of the Duel," 533.

³⁶ Ibid., 532.

³⁷ Holland, *Gentlemen's Blood*, 79.

³⁸ Ibid.

³⁹ Perkin, *The Origins of Modern English Society*, 143.

⁴⁰ *The Victorian Criminalization of Men*, Pieter Spierenburg, ed., *Men and Violence: Gender, Honor, and Rituals in Modern Europe and America* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1998), 200.

⁴¹ Perkin, *The Origins of Modern English Society*, 11-12.

⁴² Ibid., 32.

publicized yet in England and the population tired of bloodshed.⁴³ The English, even those who had once enjoyed the duel, were affected. John Chamberlain, in a letter written in the seventeenth century, explained how a foreign war's bloodshed would help abate domestic violence.⁴⁴ By the nineteenth century this idea had become widely recognized and could clearly be seen. The war and synchronized factors contributed to the decreasing acceptance of violence.

Aggressive behavior in general was growing unacceptable. Representatives from a plethora of cultural movements, "from Evangelicalism to Utilitarianism," condemned manhood's culture of honor.⁴⁵ This dramatically affected Englishmen. Homicide records indicate that public violence committed by gentlemen in London had decreased in the late eighteenth century.⁴⁶ Killing to defend one's honor lost its traditional excusable nature.⁴⁷ A reported duel in 1791 makes no mention of further legal proceedings or repercussions.⁴⁸ However, in 1840, a similar duel filled multiple columns in the *Times*, discussing the legal measures following the duel on three separate occasions.⁴⁹

Large numbers of people, from a variety of social classes, were willing to do just about anything to prevent duels from occurring.⁵⁰ Such is the case of the duel between the Earl of Cardigan and Captain Harvey Tuckett. A miller surnamed Dann witnessed the preparation, called for his wife to take notice, interfered with the duelists, and later testified regarding what occurred.⁵¹ This was not an isolated incident. Many times bystanders interrupted duels, or notified the by then larger and

⁴³ Ibid., 10.

⁴⁴ N.E. McClure, ed., *The Letters of John Chamberlain*, vol. 1 (Philadelphia: 1939), 297-298; quoted in Peltonen, "Francis Bacon," *The Historical Journal* 44, no. 1 (2001): 16, n. 55.

⁴⁵ *The Victorian Criminalization of Men*, 204.

⁴⁶ Robert B. Shoemaker, "Male Honour and the decline of public violence in eighteenth-century London," *Social History*, 26 (2001): 190-208.

⁴⁷ *The Victorian Criminalization of Men*, 204.

⁴⁸ *Times* (London), 15 October 1840.

⁴⁹ *Times* (London), 16, 17, 22 September 1840.

⁵⁰ Antony Simpson, "Dandelions on the field of honour: dueling, the middle classes, and the law in nineteenth-century England," *Criminal Justice History*, 9 (1988): 106-107.

⁵¹ *Times* (London), 15 October 1840.

more involved police force. Duelists were forced farther and farther out of the public eye. Duelists had long argued that duels were fought to defend their reputation, but as dueling became private and audiences became smaller and smaller, the gains ceased to outweigh the risks.⁵² Dueling had lost much of its popularity by the early nineteenth century, however duels were still common occurrences. But as opposition grew, alternatives began gaining popularity and support.

One course of action that had long been available gained support in the early nineteenth century. Settling matters of honor using the court system to appeal to civil laws grew in popularity and was common by 1804.⁵³ This was partially due to changes within the courts themselves. At the turn of the nineteenth century, new legislation increased the legal penalties for violence, dueling included.⁵⁴ The increased legal pressure compounded the cultural movements to replace the "worship of honor" with more peaceful ideals, so that dueling's risks outgrew the advantages.⁵⁵ Dueling circled the drain during the nineteenth century, and the courts tried more cases regarding honor as the century advanced. One such case was documented in the *Times* in 1840. The insulted gentleman expressed that, "his enemy should pay dearly for it [the insult, in this case, a slap to the face]," however, the gentleman also declared that the matter would not lead to a duel, as dueling was illegal and immoral.⁵⁶ The issue was resolved, reparations made, and honor was maintained with no bloodshed.

The most popular of the arising alternatives was the press. Duels were fought less with pistols and fought more with words in newspapers. Would-be participants quickly learned that since dueling was losing popularity, a new method to defend reputations needed to be found. The industrial changes and the connected social changes allowed more money to be spent on newspapers, which were quite popular, especially among the wealthy.⁵⁷ Duels

⁵² Shoemaker, "The Taming of the Duel," 537.

⁵³ John Trusler, "A System of Etiquette," (Bath, 1804), 64-66; quoted in Shoemaker, "The Taming of the Duel," *The Historical Journal* 43, no. 3 (2002): 525-545, n. 88.

⁵⁴ *The Victorian Criminalization of Men*, 203.

⁵⁵ Ibid., 201.

⁵⁶ *Times* (London), 5 December 1840.

⁵⁷ Perkin, *The Origins of Modern English Society*, 143.

had become more taboo and were conducted more frequently in private settings; however newspapers could reach a broader audience than any single duel ever could. It would not have been difficult to see the advantage print media offered. By the early nineteenth century, reputations were defended and matters of honor were increasingly resolved more effectively in correspondences through newspapers.⁵⁸

In 1852, the last recorded duel was fought in England.⁵⁹ There were most certainly a few people who still clung to the old ideas of honor, but for the most part, the idea of manhood and its honor had changed to fit a new industrial England. A newfound disapproval of violence and aggression echoed long-held criticisms of the duel. The legal system and, even more so, the press, catered to the new ideas of gentlemanliness, allowing gentlemen to settle disputes in a non-violent manner. The era of honor through combat faded into the past, replaced by an entirely new idea of manhood. By the 1850s, the pen had become mightier than the sword. Even mightier than the pen was the printing press, which laid the final deathblow to a practice weakened by so many opponents.

⁵⁸ Shoemaker, "The Taming of the Duel," 542.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 527.

Wilsonian Ideology and Revolution: U.S. Foreign Policy and Intervention in Bolshevik Russia

Martin Ruhaak

Historians have long debated the role of internationalism and liberal ideology in the foreign policy of Woodrow Wilson. Undoubtedly an academic committed to liberalism, Wilson abolished American isolationism with the United States entry into World War I. Wilson hoped to redesign the world based on the fundamental principles of democracy, self-determination, and capitalism. With the guidance of the United States, Wilson argued, world politics and economics would be governed under a new, liberalized international legal system. The first test of Wilson's postwar agenda came after the Bolshevik revolution in 1917. The socialist revolution threatened to destroy Wilson's postwar world and challenged his commitment to liberal ideology. This paper investigates U.S. policy formation toward the Bolshevik government. According to several primary sources, the policy-making process was inconsistent, but driven by an aggressive, anti-communist State Department. Secretary of State Robert Lansing and other anti-Bolsheviks assumed the lead in designing the policy and suppressed opposing lobbies. Despite his abhorrence of non-democratic institutions and his dedication to the new global order, Wilson frequently deferred on the Russian question. Due to Wilson's weaknesses and the State Department's pursuit of an anti-Bolshevik policy, the United States decided against recognition of the Bolshevik government. Furthermore, the conflicted and incoherent policy formation contributed considerably to military intervention in July 1918.

Wilson, Bolshevism, and Ideology

Initially, the State Department (State) and White House agreed on the proper procedure to follow concerning the coup in Russia. On November 7, 1917, Bolshevik revolutionaries entered Petrograd and forced the Kerensky government out of power.

Seven months earlier, the United States officially recognized the Russian Provisional Government as a democracy and wartime ally.¹ Immediately, U.S. Ambassador to Russia David Francis and Secretary of State Robert Lansing agreed that the United States would make no recognition of the Bolshevik government. State was concerned with Lenin's rhetoric promoting Russia's exit from the war. Reports from Russia warned that a Russian-German armistice was imminent. Maddin Summers, the American Consul General in Moscow reported to Lansing on November 17, 1917, "There is strong feeling amongst the working class...if the movement is not put down immediately peace may be made with Germany."²

State and Wilson also concurred that Russian departure from the war represented a violation of the alliance, thus putting the two in agreement over the issue of recognition.³ Reports from State indicated that the Bolsheviks held only a minority of the political power in Russia, and therefore had no authority to pull troops from the Eastern front.⁴ In 1917 and 1918, the main priority of the United States was to keep Russia in the war. It was diplomatically impossible for the United States to recognize a revolutionary government unwilling to maintain the alliance during wartime.

Both Wilson and Lansing had a similar objective of persuading Russia to maintain the war effort. Wilson saw Russian participation on the Eastern front as essential to Allied victory. Without Russia, the Allies would lose the initiative against Germany, and Wilson feared that American war aims could be compromised. Wilson believed in international peace, but also thought that the peace could only be achieved through the design

¹ Robert Lansing to David Francis, March 20, 1917, Department of State, *Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States, Russia, 1918*, vol. 1 (Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1931), 12.

² Maddin Summers to Francis, November 17, 1917, *Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States, Russia, 1918*, vol. 1, 235.

³ N. Gordon Levin, Jr., *Woodrow Wilson and World Politics* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1968), 67.

⁴ *Ibid.* Initially, this sentiment was true, but within weeks, the Bolsheviks controlled metropolitan areas like Petrograd and Moscow, while anti-Bolshevik forces were scattered across western Russia and parts of Siberia. These nuclei of political power, coupled with Lenin's message of "peace, land, and bread," resulted in enough Russian public support to consider the Bolsheviks a prominent political power.

of a liberal democratic world order. Ideally, Wilson planned to design the postwar world around the ideas of capitalism, anti-imperialism, and anti-revolution.⁵ Without a decisive Allied victory, Wilson's worldview could never come to fruition. Over time, he grew wary of revolution, and specifically retained a deep aversion to non-democratic revolution. Wilson viewed radical sentiments as a threat to democracy, order, and the international community.⁶ According to Wilson and most others in his administration, the Bolshevik revolution was inherently non-democratic and held characteristics that conflicted with American ideals of morality and order. Wilson once commented, "That sort of revolution [Bolshevik] means government by terror, government by force, not government by vote. It is the negation of everything that is American."⁷

Despite his harsh words, Wilson remained divided over the Russian question. Although he decided against recognition, Wilson wanted to keep a line of communication open with the Bolsheviks in order to keep Russia in the war. In his own words, Wilson sought to portray American interests in Russia as a "disinterested friendship," meaning that the United States would assist Russia in the war effort without imperial aspirations.⁸ Of all policy makers in his administration, Wilson seemed to have the most accurate perception of the reasons for the Bolshevik exit from the war. Wilson recognized and valued the anti-imperialist nature of communism. Although he did not fully grasp the tenets of Marxism-Leninism, part of him empathized with the Bolshevik plea for peace. Like Lenin, Wilson desired an end to hostilities in Europe and saw the Bolshevik coup as a result of the tragedies of war.⁹ David Foglesong, a revisionist historian, notes that Wilson nearly endorsed socialism in 1906, because of its close connection with the principles of Christianity. Wilson found it difficult to

⁵ Levin, *Woodrow Willson and World Politics*, 52.

⁶ David Foglesong, *America's Secret War Against Bolshevism: U.S. Intervention in the Russian Civil War, 1917-1920* (Chapel Hill, North Carolina: University of North Carolina Press, 1995), 28.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 25

⁸ Woodrow Wilson to Edgar Grant Sisson, October 24, 1917. Arthur S. Link, ed., *The Papers of Woodrow Wilson*, vol.44 (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983), 436.

⁹ Foglesong, *America's Secret War Against Bolshevism*, 70.

disagree with allocating resources so that no one would be in material need. "Wilson's concern about the rising tension...led him to the verge of endorsing socialism before he pulled back from the brink," claims Foglesong.¹⁰

Most importantly, Wilson's ideologies and ideas concerning international politics and economics did not naturally dispose him towards intervention in Russia. Wilson preached the principle of liberal internationalism, characterized by self-determination, national sovereignty, and democratic governments. In accordance with these principles, Wilson disliked any sign of instability or revolution. Despite this, he strongly believed in adhering to a policy of self-determination, meaning that he allowed states to sort out their own internal affairs. In the case of the Mexican revolution, Wilson encouraged American neutrality and Mexican self-government during the initial years of the conflict. "The peace, prosperity, and contentment of Mexico...mean an enlargement on the field of self-government and the realization of the hopes and rights of a nation whose best aspirations, so long suppressed and disappointed, we deeply sympathize."¹¹ Wilson expressed the same sympathy for Russian self-determination in an address to the 4th Congress of Soviets in March 1918:

I beg to assure the people of Russia through the Congress that it will avail itself of every opportunity that may offer to secure for Russia once more complete sovereignty and independence in her own affairs and full restoration to her great role in the life of Europe and the modern world. The whole heart of the people of the United States is with the people of Russia in the attempt to free themselves forever from the autocratic government and become the masters of their own life.¹²

Vigorous idealism infused Wilson and helped to inspire his sympathy for countries mired in turmoil and revolution. His anti-

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 28.

¹¹ An Address to a Joint Session of Congress. Ray Stannard and William E. Dodd, ed., *The Public Papers of Woodrow Wilson*, vol. 1, *The New Democracy* (New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1926), 45.

¹² Woodrow Wilson to 4th Congress of Soviets, March 11, 1918, Arthur S. Link, ed., *The Papers of Woodrow Wilson*, vol. 46 (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1985), 598.

imperialist tendencies also prohibited Wilson from making swift and aggressive decisions to intervene in troubled states.

Competing with his anti-imperialist principles, however, were Wilson's images of American superiority and moral righteousness. Despite his insistence that countries possessed national sovereignty, Wilson ardently contended that American superiority burdened the United States with the responsibility of actively assisting chaotic nations. Wilson dedicated most of his presidency to spreading the influence of American principles abroad, so as to increase international peace and prosperity. In many of his orations, Wilson encouraged the American public to assist the advancement of others abroad. In a speech at the Naval Academy in 1914, Wilson declared, "So that I hope that wherever you go you will have a generous, comprehending love of the people you come in contact with...always having in mind that you are champions of what is right and fair all 'round for the public welfare, no matter where you are."¹³ Strong U.S. influence abroad, Wilson believed, would achieve two important advances. The first was altruistic. Wilson held an undeterrable faith in the righteousness of democracy and believed that democracy was an instant formula for success. To bring democracy to other nations meant providing those nations with prosperity. Realism offered the premise for the second gain. The Wilson administration held the notion that democratic governments were not only less likely to enter into war, but would be more cooperative with the United States.¹⁴ So in this sense, Bolshevism and communism represented a threat to the U.S. and Wilson's interest.

In the long run, it seems that Wilson hoped that his directives for the postwar world would cure Russian instability and disable the power of the Bolshevik party. In his "Fourteen Points Address," Wilson articulated his postwar plans for Russia. Wilson called for:

The evacuation of all Russian territory and such a settlement of all questions affecting Russia as will secure the best and freest cooperation of the other nations of the world in obtaining for her

¹³ Address to the Graduating Class of the United States Naval Academy, Annapolis, June 5, 1914. *The Public Papers of Woodrow Wilson* vol. 1, 128.

¹⁴ Tony Smith, "Making the World Safe for Democracy in the American Century," *Diplomatic History* 23, (1999): 178.

an unhampered and unembarrassed opportunity for the independent determination of her own political development and national policy.¹⁵

Despite its lofty goals, the White House underestimated the strength and popularity of communism in Russia. Most in the Wilson administration, including Wilson himself, considered Bolshevism as a transient ideology that would pass with time.¹⁶ Moreover, Wilson did not perceive communist Russia as an imminent threat to the United States.¹⁷ The main concern for Wilson and U.S. policy makers was to persuade Russia to maintain the Eastern front, in hopes of occupying German forces.

When the Russian-German peace talks began at Brest-Litovsk in December, the U.S. war strategy faced a major setback. After learning of the initiation of peace talks by Trotsky, Wilson referred to the Bolsheviks as "that military and imperialistic minority which has so far dominated their [Russia's] whole policy"¹⁸ Lenin's decision to sue Germany for peace intensified an already sensitive relationship with the United States. Now, Wilson and his administration had to decide if Bolshevism presented an obstacle to Allied wartime plans and postwar plans for international security. At this point, Wilson encountered an ideological paradox: Did his principles of self-determination and liberal internationalism prevent the United States from intervening in Russian internal affairs? Was American intervention acceptable if it was performed under the auspices of restoring European stability and the Eastern front?¹⁹ These questions haunted Wilson and until the end of his presidency and distorted his Russian policy. Wilson struggled to find a delicate balance between his idealism and realist world politics.²⁰ Wilson often deferred on the

¹⁵ An Address to a Joint Session of Congress, January 8, 1918. Arthur S. Link, ed., *The Papers of Woodrow Wilson*, vol. 45 (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984), 537.

¹⁶ Frank A. Ninkovich, *The Wilsonian Century: U.S. Foreign Policy Since 1900* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999), 70.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*

¹⁸ Wilson Address to a Joint Session of Congress, January 8, 1918, *The Papers of Woodrow Wilson*, vol. 45, 534.

¹⁹ Lloyd C. Gardner, *Wilson and Revolutions, 1913-1921*, ed. Harold M. Hyman (Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: J.B. Lippincott Co., 1976), 42.

²⁰ Levin, *Woodrow Wilson and World Politics*, 55.

Russian question because of his deep uncertainties, often leaving the decisions to Lansing and the State Department.

The State Department, Anti-Bolshevism, and the Case for Intervention

From the outset, State delved into the Russian question and provided the impetus for anti-Bolshevism in the Wilson administration. When the Bolshevik coup actually took place, it came to the surprise of few U.S. officials in Russia. In May 1917, Wilson and Lansing dispatched a small American commission to Russia, led by former U.S. Secretary of State Elihu Root. Dubbed the “Root mission,” the primary objective of the commission was to “convey to the Russian Government the friendship and good will of this nation and to express the confident hope that the Russian people...will join the free people of American in resisting...the ambitious designs of the German Government”²¹ The Root Mission issued democratic and American propaganda to boost Russian morale and help the weary Russians sustain the war effort. Along the way, however, Root and his companions became familiar with the socialist underground movement, especially that of the Bolshevik revolutionaries. In one letter, Root stated, “We subsequently ascertained that a considerable number of Russian refugees of the extreme socialist type returning from America a few days before had endeavored to induce the soldiers and citizens in Vladivostok to prevent the [Root] mission from proceeding to Petrograd.”²² Needless to say, the U.S. government was well aware of the Bolshevik threat to the Provisional Government.

From the beginning, nearly all State officials stationed in Russia lobbied against recognition. David Francis, the U.S. ambassador to Russia, cabled Lansing that he had been in contact with Kerensky after the coup. Kerensky urged Francis to deny recognition to Lenin.²³ Lansing consulted with both Wilson and the Allied governments about the issue of recognition. The Allies

²¹ Lansing to Francis, May 1, 1917, *Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States, Russia, 1918*, vol.1, 108.

²² Frank Polk to Francis: Report of the Special Diplomatic Mission to Russia to the Secretary of State, July 18, 1917, *Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States, Russia, 1918*, vol.1, 131.

²³ Francis to Lansing, November 10, 1917, *Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States, Russia, 1918*, vol. 1, 224.

quickly denounced any form of recognition, as did Wilson. Wilson initially denied recognition in hopes that the Provisional Government could reassume control.²⁴ Instead, the United States maintained official relations with Boris Bakhmeteff, the Provisional Government’s ambassador to the U.S.²⁵ On November 22, Trotsky cabled Francis in Petrograd asking him to accept a Russian plea for armistice and an eventual exit from the war. Trotsky wrote, “I have the honor to beg you...for an armistice without delay on all the fronts and for the opening without delay of negotiations for peace.”²⁶ Promptly, Lansing issued the policy of non-recognition: “In reply to an inquiry as to whether we would join with the Allies in agreement not to recognize independently any new Russian Government, the [State] Department has informed the French Ambassador that we would be glad to exchange views with the Allies at any time on the subject.”²⁷ Eventually, the “views” exchanged between Allies centered on intervention in Russia.

Not all Wilson administration officials were so quick to announce their disdain for the Bolshevik government. Some military attachés assigned to Russia espoused more cautious measures to deal with the Bolsheviks. Brigadier General William Judson was sent to Petrograd in December to investigate the situation on behalf of the War Department. During his trip, Judson personally encountered Trotsky in unofficial negotiations and seemed to have made some progress with the Russian Foreign Commissariat. Judson wrote:

I had a long interview with Trotsky this morning on military features of Lenin-Trotsky program, especially relating to armistice negotiations beginning tomorrow...Trotsky was very responsive. He implied that his principles and desire for peace leave him wide latitude in armistice negotiations and stated

²⁴ Foglesong, *America’s Secret War Against Bolshevism*, 5. Until Lenin and Trotsky declared the official armistice with Germany, the U.S. and Allied governments were not as concerned with Russia leaving the war as much as they were troubled over the nature of the revolution.

²⁵ Ibid.

²⁶ Francis to Lansing, November 22, 1917, *Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States, Russia, 1918*, vol. 1, 244.

²⁷ Lansing to Francis, November 24, 1917, *Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States, Russia, 1918*, vol. 1, 248.

that...in negotiations he would observe and endeavor to protect the interests of Russia's allies.²⁸

Judson's supposed progress contradicted the policy set forth by State. First of all, Lansing and Wilson did not want American officials to make any sort of contact—official or unofficial—with the Bolsheviks.²⁹ Such action could be represented as a sort of de facto recognition. Furthermore, Lansing did not appreciate any intrusion on State Department power, especially from a weaker agency like the War Department. Nevertheless, Judson reported his thoughts on the Russian question and provided a counter-argument against the anti-Bolshevik element. In a speculative vein, it seems that the United States missed an opportunity to resolve the Russian dilemma, or at least open discourse with the Bolsheviks through a relative moderate like Trotsky. Throughout the policy formulation, more missed opportunities arose. Judson's conversation with Trotsky exemplified a potential turning point in U.S.-Bolshevik relations that Lansing eschewed. The intentions of the Bolsheviks in discussions such as these remain unclear, but it is difficult to dismiss such conversations as insignificant.

Simultaneously, President Wilson began to develop his own policies concerning Russia. In line with his hope for a worldwide liberal and democratic agenda, Wilson sought to send messages of friendship and sympathy to the Russian people.³⁰ Wilson held firm to his non-recognition policy and even authorized an embargo against Bolshevik Russia.³¹ Even so, Wilson saw a window of opportunity to bring Russia back into the war. He remained mostly silent on Russian domestic politics and averted comment on the revolution. It seems evident that most of Wilson's actions at the time came from the advice of his closest advisor, Edward House. When it came to revolution, House stood as one of the

²⁸ General William Judson to the War Department, December 1, 1917, *Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States, Russia, 1918*, vol.1, 279.

²⁹ Lansing to Francis, December 6, 1917, *Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States, Russia, 1918*, vol.1, 289.

³⁰ Samuel Flag Bemis, ed., *The American Secretaries of State and their Diplomatics*, vol. 10 (New York: Pageant Book Company, 1958), 109.

³¹ Judson to the War Department: Copy of a letter sent to the Chief of the Russian General Staff, Petrograd, November 25, 1917, *Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States, Russia, 1918*, vol. 1, 266.

most moderate voices in the Wilson administration. House knew that Wilson and Lansing might attempt to crush the Russian Revolution for the sake of international democracy, but advised against such action.³² House was not a staunch ideologue like Wilson. Foglesong writes, "His [House's] views of Soviet Russia would be driven by practical political and strategic considerations rather than moral principles and ideology."³³

House outlined the Wilson administration's early strategy to extend a sympathetic message to Russia and the Bolsheviks. While Lansing and State were denouncing the November revolutionaries as non-democratic anarchists, House lobbied to reunite Russia and the Allies for the war effort.³⁴ House clearly focused on the short-term, looking to prevent German infiltration of Russia and, more importantly, the collapse of the Eastern front. By no means was House a socialist or radical; like Wilson, he believed in a postwar liberal-capitalist order. In order to establish the postwar order, House thought it essential that the U.S. and other Allies make it clearly known that they had no postwar imperial aims. To do so may keep Russia in the war. In a letter to Lansing, House wrote, "The Russian Ambassador at Paris believes it of great importance that you send a message to Russia through Francis or otherwise letting them know of the disinterested motives of the United States."³⁵ House went to great lengths to preserve the façade of a friendly U.S. disposition toward Russia. Lansing agreed with this sentiment simply because of its implications for the war's future prosecution. On most other Russian issues, Lansing and House could not be further apart. The two diplomats, in essence, represented the two conflicting sides of Wilson. Although both subscribed to anti-imperialist notions, House represented the moderate and compassionate side of Wilson seeking to create a worldwide liberal agenda. Lansing, on the other hand, represented the side of Wilson obsessed with order, law, and morality. He abhorred revolution and saw it as a threat to democracy.

³² Foglesong, *America's Secret War Against Bolshevism*, 31.

³³ Ibid.

³⁴ Levin, *Woodrow Wilson and World Politics*, 64.

³⁵ Edward House to Lansing, December 2, 1917, *Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States, Russia, 1918*, vol. 1, 255.

Wilson acknowledged House's proposals of the "disinterested friendship" policy even as Trotsky and the Russian Foreign Ministry negotiated a separate peace with Germany. At the same time, Lansing's case for intervention grew stronger. For some time, Lansing pushed Wilson to assist anti-Bolshevik forces in the Russian civil war that began shortly after the revolution.³⁶ According to Lansing, financial and military assistance to counter revolutionary forces could undermine the Bolshevik government and possibly return Russia to the Eastern front. In December, Wilson agreed to send financial aid to the Cossack rebels in the Caucasus region.³⁷ Wilson approved the transactions based on one major condition. The U.S. would launder the money through Britain and France so not to overtly agitate the Bolsheviks and not to make a de facto recognition of the Cossack army.³⁸ In reality, the U.S. transferred no money, but Wilson's concession signaled a significant shift from the policy of disinterested friendship.

By March 1918, the Supreme Allied War Council began to seriously investigate the option of intervening in Russia. After the signing of the Brest-Litovsk treaty on March 3, 1918, Allied officials feared that Russia would fall into the hands of Germany. With German dominance of Russia, both Europe and the Far East could be destabilized.³⁹ Japan, concerned over German dominance, volunteered to lead the intervention into Siberia. Siberia represented a vital area for the Allies. Caches of weapons located in Siberia needed protection from possible German seizure. More importantly, a Czech legion of troops stationed in Siberia won several decisive battles against Bolshevik forces.⁴⁰ The Allies hoped to transport the Czech legion to the Western front and mount a counteroffensive against the Bolsheviks at the same time. The British and Japanese governments estimated a need for 600,000 Japanese troops.⁴¹ Both Lansing and Wilson

³⁶ Gardner, *Wilson and Revolutions*, 31.

³⁷ *Ibid.*

³⁸ *Ibid.*

³⁹ George F. Kennan, *Soviet American Relations, 1917-1920* vol. 1, *Russia Leaves the War* (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1956), 275.

⁴⁰ Victor M. Fic, *The Collapse of American Policy in Russia and Siberia in 1918: Wilson's Decision Not to Intervene* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1995), 10.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 11.

feared a massive Japanese intervention. Japanese intervention could force Russia to ally with Germany.⁴² House agreed and further added that Japanese occupation of Russia paralleled the benefit of German occupation.⁴³ Wilson also grew wary of Japan's true aims in Siberia. He feared that any imperial movements by the Japanese could destroy already tense relations between the Bolsheviks and Allies. To solve the problem, Lansing suggested that the U.S. land in Siberia with the Japanese, so to prevent any infringements on Russian sovereignty.⁴⁴

Wilson deferred on the issue of Japanese intervention for quite some time. Heavy pressure to intervene came from the Allied War Council. Lansing stressed to Wilson that Japanese intervention in Russia seemed "unwise."⁴⁵ Instead, Lansing pressed Wilson to send an American expeditionary force to supervise the Japanese. Lansing knew that Wilson would not qualify or consider a small American force assisting the Japanese in moving Czech forces out of Siberia as an intervention. Wilson defined intervention as an occupation force taking control of a country and redesigning its political, economic, and social structure.⁴⁶

By July, Wilson yielded to the interventionists at home and at the Allied War Council. Instead of allowing Japanese entry into Siberia alone and risk driving the Russians into German hands, Wilson lobbied the Allied War Council for a different plan. According to the plan, both the U.S. and Japan sent small expeditionary forces of 7,000 each to assist the Czech transportation.⁴⁷ On July 6, U.S. forces landed at Vladivostok and soon met with the Japanese force.⁴⁸ To be clear, Wilson's only intent was to transport the Czechs to France. Yet, the Allied War Council held different ideas about the objectives of the intervention. The French Ambassador to Russia stated, "The Allies may be obliged to intervene in order to meet this threat

⁴² Foglesong, *America's Secret War Against Bolshevism*, 147.

⁴³ *Ibid.*

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*

⁴⁵ George F. Kennan, *Soviet American Relations, 1917-1920* vol. 2, *The Decision to Intervene* (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1958), 93.

⁴⁶ Foglesong, *America's Secret War Against Bolshevism*, 21.

⁴⁷ Fic, *The Collapse of American Foreign Policy in Russia and Siberia*, 11.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*

directed both against the Russian people and against them [the Allies].⁴⁹ This and other turns of events, intensified Wilson's resolve to protest the actual Russian intervention. But at this point, his objections became moot. The commitment of U.S. troops made it hard to effectively protest the intervention and remove the U.S. forces. Wilson's deference on the Russian question left State in control of Russian policy and resulted in interventionist actions in direct conflict with Wilsonian idealism.

The American Lobby Effort and the Division over Bolshevism

While the debate over Russia raged inside the Wilson administration, coordinated lobby efforts among the American public took shape. Proponents of Wilsonian self-determination advocated the acceptance and recognition of the Bolshevik government. Others, more concerned with the outcome of the war, denounced the Bolsheviks as traitors to the Allied cause. A number of other anti-Bolsheviks fundamentally opposed Bolshevism from an ideological standpoint. Those who subscribed to this school of thought perceived the Bolshevik party as the manifestation of the socialist ideal that would one day revolt against international capitalism.⁵⁰

One of the primary lobby efforts came from Raymond Robins, a Bolshevik sympathizer and director of the Red Cross mission to Russia in 1917 and 1918. A Chicago native, Robins was a progressive liberal who hoped to engage in unofficial negotiations with the Bolshevik vanguard.⁵¹ The Red Cross mission began before the Bolshevik revolution in the summer of 1917. Wilson appointed Robins as the director of the mission and placed its members under the supervision of the U.S. military.⁵² Funding for

⁴⁹ Summers to Lansing, April 29, 1918, *Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States, Russia, 1918*, vol. 1, 509. This statement was released before the U.S. landing in Siberia, but during the British and French landings at Murmansk and Archangel.

⁵⁰ Samuel Gompers, *Seventy Years of Life and Labor*, Philip Taft and John Sessions, eds. (New York: E.P. Dutton & Co., Inc., 1957), 225.

⁵¹ David R. Francis, *Russia From the American Embassy* (New York: Arno Press & The New York Times, 1970), 211.

⁵² Kennan, *Soviet American Relations, 1917-1920*, vol.1, 54. The members of the Red Cross mission had no actual affiliation with the Red Cross and performed no medical functions. Most likely, the mission performed under the

the mission, approximately one million dollars, derived from U.S. copper magnate and corporate tycoon William Boyce Thompson.⁵³ The objective of the mission was broad. "These activities were primarily of a political and informational nature, and had as their object the support of the Provisional Government and the stimulation of its war effort," noted George Kennan.⁵⁴ Similar to the Root mission, the Red Cross mission gathered vital information concerning the status of Russian military and civilian morale, as well as the strength of radical factions. Moreover, Robins provided the Wilson administration with an unofficial diplomat to the Bolshevik government. Historians can only speculate that negotiations between the Bolsheviks and State officials, notably Ambassador Francis, complicated the U.S. policy of non-recognition. In fact, discourse between the Bolsheviks and Francis could have been interpreted as recognition of Lenin's government. To Wilson, Robins served as a conduit of information for the U.S. and did not compromise U.S. interests.

From the outset, Thompson expanded the role of the mission by aggressively seeking out Russian factions that could limit the growing influence of the Bolsheviks. Thompson used personal connections with major corporations to fund anti-Bolshevik parties, notably the Social Revolutionary Party.⁵⁵ On one occasion, Thompson solicited one million dollars from J.P. Morgan to fund a Social Revolutionary Party effort to issue pro-war and anti-Bolshevik propaganda among Russian soldiers.⁵⁶ These efforts helped to criticize radical Russian groups, but did little to improve the image of Kerensky and the Provisional Government. Thompson often received similar types of funding, which upset Robins and the Wilson administration. Both Robins and Wilson perceived Thompson's actions as detrimental to U.S. interests in Russia, in that his actions preemptively announced the

guise of the Red Cross to project a sense of neutrality and non-aggression to opponents of Kerensky.

⁵³ Foglesong, *America's Secret War Against Bolshevism*, 108.

⁵⁴ Kennan, *Soviet American Relations, 1917-1920*, vol. 1, 54.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, 57.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.* Kennan brings attention to the irony of socialist political factions benefiting from Wall Street capitalist institutions to preserve a non-capitalist government.

U.S. policy towards a potential Bolshevik government.⁵⁷ Soon after, Robins instructed Thompson to leave the mission.⁵⁸

With Thompson gone, Robins held all control over the mission and its personnel. Soon, however, Robins' role changed as the Bolsheviks deposed Kerensky and the Provisional Government. Despite Wilson's insistence that the mission members refrain from contact with the Bolsheviks, Robins seems to have initiated contact with Trotsky as early as December.⁵⁹ For several months, Robins met with both Trotsky and Lenin on a weekly basis, discussing political and economic issues regarding recognition and trade.⁶⁰ Robins established fairly friendly relations with the Soviet government and actually mediated small agreements between the Bolsheviks and the United States. Robins helped to prevent the nationalization of American trans-national corporations located in Russia and brokered agreements to prevent Russian war supplies from falling into German hands.⁶¹

Simultaneously, Robins reported the context of the meetings to Ambassador Francis on a daily basis. In meetings with Francis, Robins vehemently advocated U.S. recognition of the Bolsheviks. Robins explained to Francis that the growing strength and popularity of the Bolsheviks made it nearly impossible to sustain the policy of non-recognition. In a letter to Lansing, Francis wrote, "Robins, Sisson claim Soviet government stronger daily, but not fully prepared to concur."⁶² Francis denied any prospect of recognition to Robins. In fact, Francis felt that U.S. recognition would only hasten Lenin's effort for a separate peace. In February, 1918, Francis wrote, "Still think that Soviet recognition would be mistake for if separate peace concluded it would be much less binding upon Russian people and much less satisfactory

⁵⁷ Ibid., 59.

⁵⁸ Ibid., 60.

⁵⁹ Francis to Lansing, December 12, 1917, *Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States, Russia, 1918*, vol. 1, 301. Wilson ordered that no Americans in Russia engage the Bolsheviks, but Robins attained special permission to speak with them.

⁶⁰ David W. McFadden, "Hiram Johnson, Raymond Robins, and the Struggle for an Alternative American Policy Toward Bolshevik Russia," *Peace and Change* 18, (January 1993): 53.

⁶¹ Ibid.

⁶² Francis to Lansing, January 23, 1918, *Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States, Russia, 1918*, vol.1, 357.

to Germany without our previous recognition."⁶³ Clearly, Francis did not view recognition within the scope of Robins' mission. Rather, Francis thought that the main objective of Robins' discussions with Bolshevik leaders should focus on the Brest-Litovsk negotiations and preventing the separate peace.

In the weeks prior to the Brest-Litovsk treaty, Robins held to his impression that Lenin and his modified form of Marxism might allow for cordial relations with the United States.⁶⁴ Most meetings between Trotsky and Robins focused on the establishment of trade and the availability of American aid. Apparently, Robins thought that an economic alliance could prevent the separate peace with Germany, as well as an American intervention. Those in the Wilson administration also pondered the benefits an economic alliance. Bolshevik sympathizers, like Robins, viewed economics and trade as an opportunity for cooperation with Russia.⁶⁵ On the other hand, anti-Bolsheviks sought to use economics against the Bolsheviks and topple the government.⁶⁶ Robins insisted that he could coerce Trotsky to end the Brest-Litovsk negotiations if he could promise American aid to defend against Germany.⁶⁷ Francis and State dismissed the request. Again, it seems that the U.S. missed out on another opportunity to establish relations with the Bolsheviks and re-open the Eastern front. On the other hand, no one is absolutely sure of Lenin's sincerity to re-enter the war. Lloyd Gardner and other historians argue that Lenin made the offer with the hope that the U.S. would reject it. Therefore, he could exploit the capitalists and portray the U.S. as an enemy of the Russian people.⁶⁸ Regardless of his motives, the U.S. dismissed Lenin's offer and Russia signed the Brest-Litovsk treaty in March.

The importance of Robins' meetings with the Bolsheviks diminished after the Brest-Litovsk treaty. Despite this, he maintained his effort to establish a U.S.-Bolshevik economic

⁶³ Francis to Lansing, February 8, 1918, *Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States, Russia 1918*, vol.1, 370.

⁶⁴ Gardner, *Wilson and Revolutions*, 37.

⁶⁵ McFadden, "Hiram Johnson, Raymond Robins, and the Struggle for an Alternative American Policy Toward Bolshevik Russia," 55.

⁶⁶ Ibid.

⁶⁷ Gardner, *Wilson and Revolutions*, 36.

⁶⁸ Ibid., 37.

connection. In May, Robins and Lenin created a proposal for economic cooperation. For the most part, the proposal focused on the exchange of U.S. capital goods for Russian natural resources and raw materials.⁶⁹ Robins hailed the proposal as a segue to official relations with the Russians, but no response came from Washington.⁷⁰ On June 1, the Red Cross recalled Robins to America, most likely under advisement of State.⁷¹ Despite his efforts, the U.S. made no mention of an economic relationship. On the contrary, anti-Bolshevik and interventionist sentiments in the Wilson administration grew stronger after Brest-Litovsk.

While Robins made pleas to open relations with Russia, relatively conservative organizations supported the U.S. policies of non-recognition and intervention. One of the primary anti-Bolshevik efforts came from Samuel Gompers and the American Federation of Labor (AFL). Similar to Wilson, Gompers believed in American isolationism and pacifism prior to World War I.⁷² At the opening of World War I, however, Gompers underwent an ideological transformation and began to recognize the importance of international democracy and self-determination. Gompers supported Wilson's decision to enter World War I with an AFL resolution:

RESOLVED, That after sober, serious minded consideration of the industrial problems arising as a result of our country's participation in the war for human rights and the perpetuation of democratic institutions we pledge to him our undivided support in carrying the war to a successful conclusion, in supporting him in his efforts to apply the principles of democracy to the solution of the problems which arise in industry.⁷³

Gompers' newfound internationalist perspective also applied to the Russian Revolution and the Bolshevik government. Similar to the Wilson administration, Gompers favored the Provisional

⁶⁹ McFadden, "Hiram Johnson, Raymond Robins, and the Struggle for an Alternative American Policy Toward Bolshevik Russia," 54.

⁷⁰ Ibid.

⁷¹ Francis to Lansing, June 1, 1918, *Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States, 1918, Russia*, vol. 1, 549.

⁷² Gompers, *Seventy Years of Life and Labor*, 41.

⁷³ Samuel Gompers to Woodrow Wilson, December 14, 1917, *The Papers of Woodrow Wilson*, vol. 45, 298.

Government and denounced the exiled czarist government. Gompers wrote, "The whole world had rejoiced in the overthrow of czarism. In our country where there had long been sympathy with Russian revolutionary movements the news brought a feeling of great uplift."⁷⁴ Clearly, Gompers' international ideologies harmonized with those of Wilson. Moreover, the AFL showed strong support for Wilson during the 1912 and 1916 elections, thus giving Gompers and the AFL a great deal of political influence relative to Robins and the Red Cross. Coupled with his high profile and political influence, Gompers' ideologies placed him in a unique position close to Wilson.

Gompers utilized his ideological proximity to Wilson in order to suppress any form of U.S.-Bolshevik cooperation. According to Gompers, the inherent class conflict characteristic of Marxism-Leninism would destabilize the political and economic structures of capitalist countries. To illustrate his belief, Gompers often compared the potential danger of the Bolsheviks to the radical activities of the International Workers of the World and other groups that advocated class warfare.⁷⁵ Gompers astutely noted that the Bolsheviks intended to begin an eventual war against international capitalism based upon class conflict. Moreover, Gompers advised Wilson that Lenin increased the appeal of socialism because he insisted on removing Russia from the war.⁷⁶ Russia, being demoralized by the war, gravitated towards anti-war activists in Russia despite their political affiliations. Gompers noted that Marxism-Leninism inherently opposed capitalist warfare, and Lenin's promise to leave the war grabbed the attention and support of many Russians. Furthermore, Gompers confided in Wilson and Lansing that the "war weary" countries may gravitate towards socialism and leave the war. To prevent such occurrences, Gompers concluded that recognition could not be extended to the Bolsheviks.⁷⁷ In terms of diplomatic recognition, these sentiments concurred with those of Wilson and especially Lansing.

Although Wilson and most of his administration sided with Gompers, it should be noted that Gompers probably had little

⁷⁴ Gompers, *The Papers of Woodrow Wilson*, 283.

⁷⁵ Foglesong, *America's Secret War Against Bolshevism*, 36.

⁷⁶ Ibid., 37.

⁷⁷ Ibid.

effect in constructing the U.S. policies of non-recognition and intervention. Unlike Robins, Gompers had no tangible role in the Wilson government, thus he had no mechanism for policy advisement. Most likely, Wilson and Lansing probably treated Gompers as a measure of American public opinion against Bolshevism. Furthermore, Gompers' was able to gauge the strength and threat of the American socialists inside the AFL, and assured the President that the socialist threat did not extend to the United States. Most importantly, however, Gompers had almost unlimited access to Wilson due to his political influence and status as the President of the most influential non-governmental organization in America. Robins, on the other hand, spoke directly to Wilson or Lansing very few times. Evidence shows almost no letters or correspondence between Robins and the White House. On the other hand, Gompers and Wilson wrote each other frequently on a variety of topics, including Russia. Throughout *The Papers of Woodrow Wilson*, one finds several discussions between the President and Gompers. Nowhere is there a discussion between Robins and Lansing, let alone Wilson.

Some historians suggest that Robins' limited access to Wilson was intentional. Lansing, who vehemently believed in the role of State as the primary foreign policy agency, disliked Robins' bold suggestions to recognize the Bolsheviks. Lansing would not allow anyone to circumvent State and make foreign policy.⁷⁸ David McFadden argues that Lansing and other anti-Bolsheviks conspired to link Robins to, "advocates of the Soviet government in the United States, thus discrediting him."⁷⁹ Evidently, Robins' views and his aggressive attempts to change U.S. policy prevented him from meeting with Wilson. In that same vein, Gompers managed to meet with Wilson because of his similar views and aspirations for Russia. In all, Gompers' information may have reinforced Wilson's tendency to yield to Lansing. Had Wilson known more of Robins' information, however, he might have asserted himself earlier in the policy-making process.

⁷⁸ McFadden, "Hiram Johnson, Raymond Robins, and the Struggle for an Alternative American Policy Toward Bolshevik Russia," 62.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, 65.

Conclusion

The role of Woodrow Wilson in the initial policy-making stages remains weak at best. Arguably, issues surrounding the World War and the upcoming Paris Peace Conference overwhelmed Wilson and may have impaired his judgment concerning Russia. More likely, it seems that Wilson deferred to State on the Russian policy. Wilson possessed no affinity for Bolshevism and opted not to recognize the Russian government. To Wilson, Lenin chose to abandon the Allies and remove the troops from the Eastern front, thus the U.S. could not establish a diplomatic relationship. It is possible to speculate that Wilson may have been willing to open negotiations for recognition under different circumstances. Furthermore, it is difficult to argue that Wilson would have allowed U.S. policy makers to consider intervention in Russia had the United States not been involved in the World War. Instead, Wilson shows signs of realism in advocating the policy for non-recognition and allowing the possibility for intervention. This assessment corresponds with Arthur Link's opinion that Wilson held realist tendencies—using recognition and American economic power to shape diplomacy.⁸⁰ Nevertheless, Lansing and the State Department undoubtedly dominated the discussions concerning intervention. Gradually, Lansing capitulated to Allied requests to persuade Wilson to intervene. Lansing silenced opposing views, notably Robins, which threatened the anti-Bolshevik consensus in the Wilson administration. Furthermore, Lansing used pro-war anti-Bolsheviks, such as Gompers and the AFL, as the measure of American public opinion against Bolshevism. Wilson made small attempts to diminish the American influence in the intervention, but failed to keep the U.S. out of Russia. Wilson soon reassumed authority over the foreign policy-making process, but it appeared to be too late. Wilson's deference resulted in a misconceived policy that intensified the breach with Russia and served as a precursor to Cold War foreign policies, such as containment.

⁸⁰ Arthur S. Link, "The Higher Realism of Woodrow Wilson," *Journal of Presbyterian History* XLI (March 1963): 3.

An Historiography of Racism: Japanese American Internment, 1942-1945

John T. Rasel

The Japanese Empire's attack on Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, triggered America's entrance into the Second World War. Following what President Franklin Roosevelt described as that "unprovoked and dastardly attack," the United States entered the war and pursued its "Europe First" policy. For the next several years, the United States fought to free Europe from the clutches and terror of Nazi Germany. All the while, the United States was also violating the rights of many of its own citizens. From 1942 until 1946, the United States of America interned over 100,000 Japanese Immigrants (Issei) and Japanese Americans (Nisei) with no trial or hearing. When the last relocation center closed in 1946, historians immediately began researching why this grievous violation of human rights had occurred. This paper will analyze works by various scholars of the internment, as well as matters of ethnicity and culture in a time frame that brackets the evacuation, and argue that the internment was a complex and rapid undertaking that affected those both behind and beyond the camps themselves. Although each school of history has its own inherent strengths and weaknesses, the best approach to addressing the internment seems to be that of social *and* cultural history.

Ronald Takaki attempts to present a broad, comparative study of every major Asian group in his book *Strangers From a Different Shore*. Takaki chooses to deal with each group (Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Filipino) individually, while laying the book out in chronological order, thus providing his audience with a sequential narrative of nearly 150 years of Asian American history. The main focus of *Strangers From a Different Shore* is the issue of race. Takaki argues that since their introduction into American society, Asians have been seen as "strangers," primarily

as a result of racism.¹ Support for Takaki's work comes from a wide variety of sources that suggest a combination of social and cultural methodology. The author seeks to explore similarities and differences between individual immigrant groups, but relies heavily on journals, oral history, and work songs while doing so. Takaki does, however, depend on a good deal of recent academic work to round out his research. Takaki begins his book by describing the initial, hopeful aspirations of the various ethnic groups, and their subsequent disappointment upon reaching America. The following chapters of the book compare the experiences of these various ethnic groups from the time of their arrival until a time period shortly after the Second World War.

In dealing specifically with Japanese Americans, Takaki begins by stating that unlike Chinese immigrants, the Issei were often encouraged to have wives in America, thus promoting a sense of family; this was in sharp contrast to Chinese bachelorhood.² Also addressed in his opening chapters are the individual thoughts of many of the Japanese women en route to America. These thoughts, expressed in both diary entries and haiku, show that there was a great amount of variation in these women's experiences, which ranged from sadness of leaving one's homeland, to a recollection of being forced into prostitution.³

Concerning matters of identity, Takaki asserts that self-employment and service trades, such as farming and shopkeeping, were not trades natural to Asians, but a result of American racism and its effect on Japanese employability.⁴ Because racist policies prevented Issei and Nisei from gaining employment in areas such as production and management, they necessarily turned to farming and other similar trades available to them. Nisei in particular were in a peculiar situation. Born and educated in America, many Nisei were almost fully "acculturated" and often times held college diplomas. The main problem, Takaki states, is that the barrier of racial prejudice barred the Nisei from using their degrees.⁵ Indeed, it seems that much of white America simply refused to

¹ Ronald Takaki, *Strangers From a Different Shore* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1989), 11-12.

² *Ibid.*, 46-47.

³ *Ibid.*, 51-52.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 180.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 219.

accept the Nisei as truly American. In response, many attempts were made by Japanese Americans to display their patriotism. One of the most notable ways in which the Nisei attempted to prove their “Americanism” was by joining the Japanese American Citizens’ League (JACL). The JACL, founded in 1930, largely held an accommodationist, pro-American view that preferred to use “Japanese” as an adjective to modify “American.”⁶ Despite their best efforts to appear more American, Takaki claims the Nisei did not prevail in their quest to gain equality.

Takaki’s account of the aftermath of the Pearl Harbor attack is impressive. Unlike some historians who delight in focusing on the military or political response to the attack, Takaki begins his coverage of the bombing with the opinions of the Issei and Nisei who witnessed the attack. Many of these responses displayed the same shock and fear that white Americans exhibited.⁷ The U.S. military backlash after the attack on Pearl Harbor is a sad yet unavoidable matter in Japanese American historiography. Takaki supports the widely accepted truth that racist speculation, false information and media induced hysteria all contributed to the War Department and military’s demands for internment.⁸ It should be noted, however, that in his discussion of the actual process of internment, Takaki goes to great lengths to give a detailed description of the internment camps and the conditions therein. Relying once again on primary sources such as diaries and poetry, Takaki brings to light the size, smell, and even temperature of the facilities. Thanks to this additional information, an audience not only has the ability to become familiar with the internment process, but also with its effects on the internees. In essence, Takaki attempts to place his readers in the camps themselves.

A major drawback of Takaki’s work is that he does not sufficiently explain or discuss the closing of the internment camps. Especially after presenting so much detail in regards to camp conditions, it is both odd and unfortunate that the author does not expound on the Niseis’ and Isseis’ release. By not discussing the reasons for release, Takaki avoids a great deal of political

⁶ Takahashi, “Changing Responses,” in Takaki, *Strangers From a Different Shore*, 222.

⁷ Takaki, 379.

⁸ Takaki cites various examples of unsubstantiated and racist claims by the media, military, and government officials. *Ibid.*, 380, 387-390.

discourse that could be used to illustrate just how unwise the internment was to begin with.

Takaki’s coverage of Japanese American history is impressive overall. Through his use of primary sources, he is able to present a passionate, but well documented account of Asian American and Japanese American history. In doing so, however, he tends to sacrifice a certain amount of political discussion, which, when dealing with a matter such as the internment, one can ill afford to do. This lack of political explanation can be largely attributed to his use of social and cultural methodologies, which are both bottom-up approaches.

Roger Daniels’ *Prisoners Without Trial* takes a narrative political approach when addressing the evacuation and internment; this is clearly a divergence from Takaki’s cultural turn on the issue.⁹ Daniels’ main thesis is that the imprisonment of the Nisei and Issei was based primarily on race, rather than military necessity, as claimed by the government.¹⁰ The sources employed by Daniels are unknown, due to his book’s absence of footnotes and bibliography. He does however present a clear and concise narrative of the political origins of the internment.

Daniels claims that a major participant in the development of the evacuation was Major General Allen W. Gullison. Gullison, he argues, constantly and successfully petitioned the Justice Department for an act of evacuation, despite assertions made by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and Attorney General Francis Biddle that there was no potential for sabotage from either the Nisei or Issei. General Gullison, along with Secretary of War Harry Stimson and Assistant Secretary of War John McCloy, resorted to the use of false information to convince President Roosevelt to institute Executive Order 9066.

Daniels is much better at depicting the causes of the internment rather than its consequences. In fact, the title of his work does not accurately represent its content. In actuality, Daniels’ book has little to do with the prisoners themselves, and

⁹ Daniels has written several books and over one hundred articles, most dealing with the internment. Many historians regard him as an authority on the issue. [On-line]: <http://asweb.artsci.uc.edu/history/people/facultypages/daniels.html> [3 December 2003].

¹⁰ Roger Daniels, *Prisoners Without Trial* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1993), 1.

more to do with the political decisions leading to the internment. For example, in the chapter of *Prisoners Without Trial* entitled "Life Behind Barbed Wire," the lives of the Nisei and Issei are not covered in great detail. In fact, the twenty-three-page chapter does not even discuss the experiences of the Nisei and Issei at the internment camps until the sixteenth page. Instead, Daniels focuses a great deal of attention on the political and military matters of arranging the internment.¹¹

Unlike Takaki, Daniels gives a greater amount of attention to administrative problems that arose in the camps. For example, he makes it a point to describe the now infamous "questions 27 and 28" on loyalty tests administered by the War Relocation Authority (WRA).¹² On February 8, 1943, the WRA administered loyalty tests as a means of determining if the thousands of internees could be released from the camps without posing a danger to the United States. These hastily constructed tests contained two questions, which asked if (a) the internee would be willing to serve in the United States military, and (b) if they would forswear allegiance to Japan and swear unqualified allegiance to America. Daniels points out that over 2,000 Nisei and Issei had difficulty answering these questions. Issei would be forced to denounce the only citizenship they could legally possess, while the Nisei struggled with the fact that many of them were never loyal to Japan in the first place. In addition, many Nisei were opposed to the idea of volunteering to fight for a country that denied their rights as citizens. Those who failed these loyalty tests were segregated in the Tule Lake internment center.

Daniels goes further than Takaki when addressing the release and resettlement of the Nisei and Issei. Initial resettlement consisted of the release of college students and farm workers, followed eventually by those determined to be "loyal." Daniels goes on to describe problems with resettlement encountered by the Nisei and Issei. One serious difficulty was the depletion of financial resources caused by the rushed evacuation of the Japanese Americans from the west coast. Daniels stresses that the Claims Act of 1948 was grossly insufficient in its attempt to

¹¹ An excellent example is Daniel's detailed explanation of the establishment of Military Areas #1 and #2 by Attorney General Francis Biddle, and the Civilian Exclusion Orders issued by General John DeWitt. *Ibid.*, 51-54.

¹² *Ibid.*, 69.

reimburse the Nisei and Issei for lost funds.¹³ *Prisoners Without Trial* goes on to discuss the increasing liberties and rights gained by persons of Japanese ancestry during the end of the twentieth century; Takaki is relatively lacking in this respect.

Daniels' portrayal of the evacuation and internment covers the political and military aspects of the internment much more thoroughly than Takaki's. For any person seeking to gain a firm understanding of the events leading up to and following the internment, *Prisoners Without Trial* is an excellent source. The book's main weakness is its lack of perspectives from the internees themselves.

Of nearly all the current literature concerning the internment, *Only What we Could Carry* is certainly unique. An anthology of photography, poems, personal stories, legal documents, and memoirs, *Only What we Could Carry* takes a decidedly social approach to the internment as it seeks to uncover the lives of ordinary people.¹⁴ The stated goal of the book is to explore the various thoughts, emotions, and personal histories of those who participated in the internment, and to use that exploration to prevent racial prejudice by better understanding its effects.¹⁵

Only What we Could Carry accomplishes its goals through the depth and range of the sources it employs. The resources used in the anthology discuss many issues, and are divided into five chapters, which address initial reactions to Pearl Harbor, arrivals to the internment camps, problems associated with the camps, the loyalty questionnaires, and the Nisei 442nd Infantry Battalion. This framework provides a somewhat chronological order of events, and also groups like events and ideas into individual chapters.

The great significance of *Only What we Could Carry* is that it can be viewed as a missing link in Japanese American historiography. Although several historians have improved our understanding of the causes and consequences of the internment, few have given us a close look at the feelings and thoughts of

¹³ The Claims Act was created specifically to deal with redress, but reimbursed many Nisei and Issei for only pennies on the dollar. *Ibid.*, 89.

¹⁴ Joyce Appleby, Lynn Hunt and Margaret Jacob, *Telling the Truth About History* (London: W.W. Norton & Company Ltd., 1994), 84.

¹⁵ Lawson Fusao Inada, ed., *Only What we Could Carry* (Berkeley: Heydey Books, 2000), xii.

those most intimately involved in the process; *Only What we Could Carry* fulfills that role. This collection offers an insightful, albeit somewhat disturbing look at the internment, which effectively accomplishes its stated purpose.

The greatest weakness of *Only What we Could Carry* is its apparent lack of examination. A more impressive alternative to an anthology would have been an analysis of these works, rather than merely a presentation. The lack of explanation of the internment's causes and effects also greatly weakens the book's range of usefulness. For this reason, *Only What we Could Carry* could be recommended as a source book, but should not be considered a defining piece of internment history.

Lon Kurashige and Charlotte Brooks present a new turn in internment historiography: the study of identity and culture prior to, and following internment. Participating in a roundtable discussion, both authors take a postmodern approach in their study, focusing on the evolution of Japanese American identity.¹⁶ Kurashige uses a great deal of primary sources such as the Japanese American newspaper, *Rafu Shimpo*. He also employs current books, many of which focus on culture and ethnicity. Brooks' argument is built on primary sources as well, although she utilizes letters and transcribed interviews as opposed to newspapers. Her use of secondary sources is nominal.

Lon Kurashige's "The Problem of Biculturalism: Japanese American Identity and Festival Before World War II" describes the creation of Nisei Week in Los Angeles and the agency the Nisei, specifically the Japanese American Citizens League (JACL) hoped to gain from the festival. Kurashige argues that members of the JACL used biculturalism to relay the idea that they were Japanese enough to support Little Tokyo, but American enough to love and support their home country.¹⁷ This action was taken in order to find a comfortable midpoint between being considered outsiders by white Americans or fully assimilated by their peers.

¹⁶ As described in *Telling the Truth About History*, postmodernism makes a concerted effort to incorporate subaltern groups into existing historiography. Appleby, Hunt, and Jacob, *Telling the Truth*, 217.

¹⁷ Lon Kurashige, "The Problem of Biculturalism: Japanese American Identity and Festival Before World War II," *Journal of American History*, 86 (March 2000): 1634.

Nisei Week began as a way for businessmen in Little Tokyo to bring patrons into the declining business district of the city. It was decided that in order to increase its dwindling amount of customers, whites should be encouraged to shop in Little Tokyo.¹⁸ As Kurashige states, "Nisei Week proved the optimal occasion to dress up Little Tokyo for white consumption."¹⁹

In the mid- to late-1930s, Nisei in Little Tokyo profited from white Americans' curiosity of the Orient. Nisei week included fashion shows of various forms of Japanese apparel, dancing, and customs. The effect of this was twofold; not only did it bring customers to Little Tokyo, it also promoted a development of a community consciousness. Along with this developing idea of self-image, the JACL also tried to construct an image of Japanese Americans for the white world to see; this is best illustrated by floats in a Nisei Week parade held in 1936. In 1936, the parade was focused on the agricultural contributions of the Japanese and Japanese Americans, but did not mention the low-level laborers who grew the produce. Rather, the wholesalers and large-landed farmers were recognized and appreciated. Here, we can see that the JACL was trying to cast persons of Japanese descent in a positive, albeit skewed light.²⁰

The problem of establishing a successful bicultural identity reached a new level of intensity as relations between the United States and Japan became increasingly strained. Skepticism and prejudice directed toward the Nisei and Issei were beginning to escalate, as illustrated by Lail Kane's remarks about Japanese Americans.²¹ The Japanese American Citizens League's solution to this problem was to discard its fondness for Japan and focus strictly on proving the loyalty of Japanese Americans to the United States. Nisei Week therefore ceased to serve as a catalyst for biculturalism, and instead sought to display intense love for the United States.²²

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 1639.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 1642.

²¹ Kane was fervently anti-Japanese, and at one point accused the JACL of being an instrument of Japan. He also asserted that the fishing boats of the Issei and Nisei could be converted to lay mines in the Pacific Ocean. *Ibid.*, 1652.

²² *Ibid.*, 1653.

After 1940, Nisei Week ceased its displays of kimonos, ceremonies and “rising sun” flags. Introduced to fill this void were American symbols, such as the American flag and replicas of the statue of liberty. It is clear that the JACL was willing to restructure its notion of the Japanese American self-image in order to appease white society. In the wake of Pearl Harbor, however, Kurashige poignantly states that nothing could save the Nisei and Issei from the paranoia of white America. In closing, Kurashige emphasizes the ambiguity of Japanese American identity during and after the Second World War. The JACL, he claims, became informants for the government while in the camps in order to further prove their loyalty. The end result was the Nisei and Issei’s unwillingness to follow a traitorous organization urging conformity, and an inability to return to being “Japanese.”²³ In the World War Two era, Japanese American identity was in turmoil.

Kurashige’s, “The Problem of Biculturalism,” does an excellent job of looking at race, identity and even gender values. The article’s major drawback is that by utilizing a postmodern approach, the mainstream political discourse that led up to the internment is almost entirely ignored. Although this article would compliment an already existing knowledge of the internment, its especially narrow focus limits its overall usefulness.

Kurashige is joined in the roundtable discussion by Charlotte Brooks. Brooks also deals with issues of ethnicity and identity in her piece, “In the Twilight Zone Between Black and White: Japanese American Resettlement and Community in Chicago, 1942-1945.” This too is a postmodern approach, dealing with race and class. The main argument presented by Brooks is that the resettling Nisei found it relatively easy to put down roots in Chicago for the simple reason that they were not black. In this respect, Roger Daniels and Brooks share a common idea: Chicago’s existing black/white racial divide let the Nisei settle as an “in-between” race, avoiding the overt discrimination suffered by blacks, while not receiving the full privileges of whites.²⁴ As Brooks puts it, “Not being white did not mean being black.”²⁵

²³ Ibid., 1654.

²⁴ Roger Daniels, *Prisoners Without Trial*, 82.

²⁵ Charlotte Brooks, “In the Twilight Zone Between Black and White: Japanese American Resettlement and Community in Chicago, 1942-1945,” *Journal of American History*, 86 (March 2000): 1656.

Internment and resettlement, argues Brooks, effectively destroyed Issei-controlled enclaves such as Little Tokyo. When resettlement began, the WRA had a large hand in finding jobs for the Nisei. Viewing them as an undesirable ethnic group, the WRA sought to place the Nisei in subordinate positions, such as housekeeping and other service jobs. The Nisei, however, were able to use their in-between status and Chicago’s binary racial stratification to secure industrial jobs left open by white servicemen.²⁶

Once employed in industry, the in-betweenness of the Nisei became very obvious. Although managers were more apt to hire Nisei over African Americans, this did not mean they were willing to look at Nisei as equals.²⁷ The Nisei were rarely promoted to management positions, but at the same time, were treated better than African Americans. In order to promote their in-between status, Nisei would at times accept the existing hierarchy of Chicago; this meant accepting that African Americans were inferior or lazy.²⁸ By accepting these views, the Nisei and whites grew closer together through their disdain for African Americans.

In-betweenness could also be seen in Chicago housing. Nisei typically were not welcome in white neighborhoods, but did not wish to live in black areas. Therefore, Japanese Americans resided on the constantly shifting racial borderlands of Chicago, often taking up residence where “white flight” was occurring. Eventually, when African Americans encroached too closely to their homes, the Nisei would also move. Japanese Americans therefore followed the Caucasian, rather than African American way of life. From their viewpoint, being in-between was better than being at the bottom of the social hierarchy.

Brooks argument is well presented, and her use of primary sources effectively supports her concept. Like Kurashige, her narrow focus impedes discussion of the wider, national factors that influenced the release of the Nisei from the internment camps in the first place. Although this essay is well researched, its lack of background information limits its use as a truly effective piece of internment historiography.

²⁶ Ibid., 1666.

²⁷ Ibid., 1699.

²⁸ Ibid., 1673.

A book using a very different historiographical method is Greg Robinson's *By Order of the President*. Robinson claims that Franklin Delano Roosevelt's decision to intern the Nisei and Issei was racially motivated. He is also quick to point out that many historians have all but absolved Roosevelt for his role in the internment; Robinson sets out to correct this error.²⁹ To prove his point, Robinson relies on what could be called a psychobiographical and political approach. The book chronicles the development of Franklin Roosevelt's attitude about the Japanese from his early days until the end of his life. To do so, Robinson relies on newspaper accounts, autobiographies, letters, diary entries, and dated secondary sources. This is very much a top-down approach to history, focusing primarily on Franklin Roosevelt and his immediate contacts, both governmental and military.

Robinson begins by setting up the growing animosity between the United States and Japan prior to the time of Franklin Roosevelt's election to the Presidency. In the very early twentieth century, Japan was becoming a formidable naval power, and was causing a great deal of suspicion on the west coast of America. Although this military matter was temporarily re-solved, Japan's massive military buildup and invasion of China in the 1930s rekindled these fears. Robinson states that Roosevelt was influenced by many of these factors early in life, which led to a distrust of many Japanese. He even adopted a "nativist" outlook that viewed the Japanese as racially different and opposed "race mixing."³⁰

As stated earlier by Roger Daniels and Robert Takaki, the Justice Department and the FBI were both adamant in their belief that despite Japan's military buildup, the United States had nothing to fear from the Nisei and Issei. Following Pearl Harbor however, Roosevelt's existing distrust of the Japanese resulted in a greater willingness to believe false or exaggerated claims made by the War Department and military. Thus the true and accurate knowledge passed down from Francis Biddle and J. Edgar Hoover was ignored in favor of myths of fifth column activity and a

²⁹ Greg Robinson, *By Order of the President* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001), 6.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 41-44.

potential for sabotage. In Robinson's words, "Roosevelt's actions show how overprepared he was to believe the worst about the entire Japanese American community, notwithstanding the lack of any firm evidence of disloyalty and in the face of tangible evidence of community loyalty."³¹

Robinson attributes Roosevelt's decision to sign Executive Order 9066 to three main reasons. Roosevelt held to the belief that the Nisei and Issei were both "inassimilable," and had a general apathy toward the Japanese and Japanese Americans as a whole.³² This view can best be illustrated by Roosevelt's delegation of powers to his subordinates when dealing with matters of internment. Also, Roosevelt was unwilling to make any type of positive statement in regards to the obvious loyalty of the interned Nisei and Issei. Secondly, Roosevelt's actions seem to have been dictated by political forces. He was willing to intern the Nisei and Issei in order to quell fear on the west coast and maintain war production. Also, Roosevelt delayed the release of the internees from the camps until after the Presidential election of 1944.³³ These events illustrate Roosevelt's willingness to ignore the Nisei and Issei's civil rights in order to make political gains. Finally, the misinformation Roosevelt allowed himself to believe was a vital factor in his decision to sign Executive Order 9066. Because he grew up in an age of skepticism against the Japanese, the president was more willing to believe the false claims of Secretary Stimson and John McCloy, rather than the logic of the FBI and the Justice Department.³⁴

Greg Robinson makes a valuable contribution to Japanese American historiography with *By Order of the President*. A top-down approach focused on Roosevelt is an approach that few, if any, historians have taken, and Robinson does his part by objectively examining Roosevelt's role in the internment in a dispassionate manner. One surprising weakness of Robinson's piece is that it barely utilizes any current scholarship on the internment, relying instead on dated books. The main drawback to *By Order of the President* is that it is solely top-down. This approach ignores the camps almost completely, and gives only lip

³¹ *Ibid.*, 72.

³² *Ibid.*, 123.

³³ *Ibid.*, 234.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 115.

service to the animosity toward the Japanese felt by everyday Americans.

The internment of the Nisei and Issei from 1942 until 1946 was clearly a violation of the rights guaranteed to all persons residing in the United States. To fully appreciate the severity of this event, one must have a broad understanding of its many different aspects. The causes of the internment, whether they be out of military necessity or racially triggered, must be understood. Equally as important are the conditions of the camps, and the lives that were lived behind their barbed wire. Finally, the after effects of the internment on not only the Nisei and Issei, but on America as a whole should also be addressed.

The internment was a complex and rapid undertaking, affecting those both behind and beyond the barbed wire perimeters of the hastily constructed camps. Ideally, as with any topic worth examining, one would hope to find a book or monograph that sufficiently addressed every aspect of the internment; unfortunately, such a compilation is not to be found. In one way or another, each school of history has its own inherent weaknesses when dealing with our past. Political history, for example, although adept at addressing the causes and administration of the internment, does not pay adequate attention to its victims.

The best approach to addressing the internment as a whole is through the use of social and cultural history, employed by Ronald Takaki in *Strangers From a Different Shore*. By incorporating both schools, Takaki addresses, though not in perfect detail, the causes and effects of the internment, while paying considerable attention to the camps and the lives of the internees. Though this approach may not completely satisfy all scholars, it is arguably the best way to present readers with a comprehensive view of the internment.

Crisis in Little Rock: Race, Class & Violence During the Desegregation of Central High School, 1957-1958

Richard J. Hanson

“When hate is unleashed and bigotry finds a voice, God help us all.”

The above quotation first appeared in the *Arkansas Gazette* on September 8th, 1957. It accompanied a picture that has since become internationally recognized as one of the most dramatic scenes of the Civil Rights Movement. It is a picture of a young Negro girl by the name of Elizabeth Eckford and the moment captured her as she walked to school on her first day of class. Clutching her books tightly, and holding back tears, she bravely made her way through a screaming mob of whites shouting epithets and racial slurs at her.

Elizabeth and eight other Negro students, more commonly referred to as the “Little Rock Nine,” were denied entrance to the school by the Arkansas National Guard acting under orders from Governor Orval Faubus. Under the guidance of Little Rock’s NAACP chairman, Daisy Bates, the nine students won a legal battle against the Governor and an injunction was issued to remove the troops. However, as the Little Rock Nine entered Central High School in late September 1957, mob violence forced them out after only a few hours in class. Eventually, the might of the national government was called upon as President Eisenhower mobilized the 101st Airborne Division and then placed the Arkansas National Guard under federal control. Little Rock’s Central High School resembled a battlefield as a constitutional showdown took place between the national government and the state of Arkansas.

The eyes of the world focused on Little Rock, and the city has become legendary within the Civil Rights Movement. At the time, however, racial tensions exploded over this test case of school

desegregation. Mob violence existed before, during, and after the nine entered Central High. Threats on the students’ lives were common and, for the next eight months, the Little Rock Nine endured harassment from their peers as well as the Little Rock community. While most accounts of the crisis focus on the constitutional aspects of the case, they tend to avoid the key issues that help us better understand the factors that contributed to the crisis and the resulting violence. Considerations of race and class are paramount to understanding the episode as it unfolded *within* the community of Little Rock.

The crisis had its roots in the landmark 1954 Supreme Court ruling, *Brown v. Board of Education*. Ruling unanimously, the high court struck down segregation in public education. This controversial ruling threatened to dismantle Jim Crow, and southern states were reluctant to comply. An exception, however, was Little Rock, Arkansas. Arkansas was not located in the Deep South and therefore was regarded by many as moderate when it came to race relations. Over time, however, Arkansas would also reveal its disgust for the federal court order and later joined with its southern neighbors in resisting it.

Little Rock in the 1950s was set in its tradition of Jim Crow, yet was perceived as a progressive state capital. Libraries, parks, and public buses had all been integrated by the mid-fifties, and even 33 percent of Arkansas blacks were registered to vote.¹ According to Juan Williams, “This relatively progressive attitude toward race relations made Little Rock an unlikely stage for the crisis that developed there in 1957.”² As the 1950s progressed, however, neighborhoods became more separated, as suburbs created black and white enclaves. Blacks lived in the east and southeast, while whites were concentrated in the west.³ This only reinforced the traditional southern attitude towards segregation, and while Little Rock could boast of taking a progressive stance on desegregation with some public facilities, most others,

¹ Juan Williams, *Eyes on the Prize: America’s Civil Rights Years, 1954-1965* (New York: Viking Press, 1987), 92.

² *Ibid.*

³ Sara Murphy, *Breaking the Silence: Little Rock’s Women’s Emergency Committee to Open Our Schools, 1958-1963*, ed., Patrick C. Murphy (Fayetteville: University of Arkansas Press, 1997), 30.

including hotels, movie theaters, restaurants, drinking fountains, and restrooms remained segregated in the post-World War II era.⁴

Still, at the time of the crisis in 1957, the public was amazed that such turmoil could exist in a city that had such a high reputation when it came to civil rights. *Time* magazine reported, “Little Rock had long enjoyed better race relations than almost any other Intermediate South city of comparable size.”⁵ It is not surprising, then, that just five days after the *Brown* decision, the Little Rock school board met and decided to comply with the Supreme Court’s desegregation order pending further instructions.⁶

Virgil T. Blossom, superintendent of the Little Rock School District and a liberal in his stance towards desegregation, outlined a plan for the school board that would call for desegregation at the high school level first, then at the junior high/intermediate level, and finally at the grade school level. This transition was to start in the fall of 1957 at Central High School.

After the Blossom Plan was introduced, segregationists in Little Rock began voicing their dissatisfaction with the decision. Their opposition was based mainly on the fact that the phase-in plan limited integration to one school – Central. A new, all-white high school named Hall was being constructed to cater to the affluent white students living on the west side. This left Central with about 2,000 students, all of which were from a working-class neighborhood.⁷ According to Elizabeth Jacoway and Fred Williams, “By building a white high school in the west of the city, to which the affluent members of the white community could send their children, while focusing desegregation on Central High School, which would affect predominantly working- and lower-middle class families, the Blossom Plan was open to criticism that it forced integration on one section of the community while sheltering others from its impact.”⁸ This decision sparked hostility among middle-class whites in Little Rock, and created resentment

⁴ Ibid., 31.

⁵ “The Meaning of Little Rock”, *Time*, 7 October 1957, 25.

⁶ Murphy, *Breaking the Silence*, 33.

⁷ Williams, *Eyes on the Prize*, 93.

⁸ Elizabeth Jacoway and Fred C. Williams, *Understanding the Little Rock Crisis: An Exercise in Remembrance and Reconciliation* (Fayetteville: University of Arkansas Press, 1999), 80.

against those affluent whites whose children would not have to attend an integrated school. Wilmer Counts added, “The old working-class neighborhoods would bear the stresses of the social experiment of school integration, while the affluent white preserves would enjoy pristine white schools that would be spared the strains of educating children of both races in the same classrooms.”⁹

As more and more citizens of Little Rock voiced their criticism of the Blossom Plan, state leaders began to take notice. The appearance of the *Southern Manifesto* in 1956 advocated outlawing public education in the South in order to prevent integration. The entire Arkansas legislation endorsed it with their signatures.¹⁰ Soon thereafter, Little Rock was host to a meeting of the White Citizen’s Council, an organization firmly opposed to integration. The guest speaker was Governor Marvin Griffin of Georgia. Griffin encouraged the citizens of Little Rock to oppose the Blossom Plan as well as the Supreme Court order to desegregate schools. He also called upon Governor Faubus to do the same and set an example for his state. Sara Murphy stated that, “Little Rock’s Capital Citizens Council (CCC) had only five hundred members, two hundred of whom lived outside the city, but the noise they were making was having its intended effect on leaders both at the local and state levels.”¹¹

Following this meeting, a group of local women formed the Mothers’ League of Little Rock Central High, a pro-segregationist organization devoted to rejecting the integration of Central High School.¹² The Mothers’ League, while small in number, was very active. Before school started in September, the women circulated a petition to oust Superintendent Blossom, and, just weeks after the nine Negro students were successfully admitted into the school, the Mothers’ League started a phone tree to persuade students to stage a walkout demonstration.¹³

⁹ Wilmer I. Counts, et al., *A Life is More Than a Moment: The Desegregation of Little Rock’s Central High* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1999), 5.

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ Murphy, *Breaking the Silence*, 38.

¹² Williams, *Eyes on the Prize*, 98.

¹³ Murphy, *Breaking the Silence*, 50.

The Mothers' League acted out of the fear of miscegenation. They felt that their precious white heritage would be infected with the admission of the nine students. The long tradition of miscegenation gave way to the misguided notion of race-mixing as a result of blacks and whites inhabiting the same classrooms. Phoebe Godfrey concluded that, "For poor and working-class whites, like those in the Mothers' League, integration was a direct threat to privileges based on whiteness. Anti-miscegenation laws, both on the books and based on folk-ways, gave poor and working-class whites a legally and socially enforced way to ensure 'white grandchildren.'"¹⁴

As the beginning of the school year neared, Little Rock's citizens became more volatile towards the situation. Although Little Rock's White Citizen's Council was few in number, their strength lay in the fact that they could concentrate all of their efforts in one place, since only one school was being desegregated.¹⁵ In addition, these parents knew they had support from the outside. Citizens' Councils from other southern states joined their Arkansas counterparts. Little Rock's Citizens' Council even started a myth that the nine children were from the north and paid by the NAACP to integrate the school.¹⁶ Thus, the group was able to articulate its grievances effectively, whereas the portion of the white community that felt bound to obey the law and who accepted racial change did so passively.¹⁷ This resistance made the enforcement of the *Brown* decision more difficult to achieve and ultimately put Little Rock's community stability to the test.

Part of the violence during the crisis stemmed from those middle-class whites who, although having reluctantly accepted the *Brown* ruling, were annoyed at those parents they viewed as bringing the crisis upon the rest of the white community. Godfrey noted, "Their anger was directed not only at the Little Rock Nine but also at 'white trash' whites who by virtue of being white,

¹⁴ Phoebe C. Godfrey, "Sweet Little Girls? Miscegenation, Desegregation and the Defense of Whiteness at Little Rock's Central High, 1957-1959" (Ph.D. diss., Binghamton University, SUNY, 2001).

¹⁵ Jacoway and Williams, *Understanding the Little Rock Crisis*, 80.

¹⁶ John A. Kirk, *Redefining the Color Line: Black Activism in Little Rock, Arkansas, 1940-1970* (Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 2002), 125.

¹⁷ Jacoway and Williams, *Understanding the Little Rock Crisis*, 81.

embarrassed middle-class whites by making them look bad in the public eye."¹⁸ Still, these parents contributed to the violence through their inaction and unwillingness to get involved. Jerrold Packard added:

In fact, the image of armed troops symbolically holding back the black tide gave tremendous comfort to those parents who quietly, but intensely loathed the prospect of African-American children fouling their white schools. Equally overjoyed was the local Ku Klux Klan and its attendant groupies of Central's own teenage segregationist thugs.¹⁹

Conflicts of interest arose when the National Guardsmen were removed via the injunction, and the Little Rock police were left to secretly escort the nine students into Central. Mob violence broke out, and rioters planned to overrun the police and take the students out by force, if necessary. This created an awkward situation for the Little Rock police, who were white and had opposed desegregation in the first place, yet were ordered to hold back the crowd with barricades. *Life* magazine claimed that, "The reports coming into Washington from Little Rock clearly indicated the inability—and in some instances the unwillingness—of the Little Rock police to cope with the mob."²⁰

Several students themselves felt that the parents were inflaming the situation and perpetrating unnecessary violence. "If parents would just go home and let us alone, we'll be all right," one student remarked, "We just want them to leave us be."²¹ It is important to note that although several of Central's students opposed integration, they knew it was the law and felt compelled to obey it. Williams added, "The president of the [student] council told reporter Mike Wallace that if only the white parents would stay away from the school, there would be no violence."²²

For many, however, the chief architect of the violence was Governor Orval Faubus. A one-time moderate on the issue of

¹⁸ Godfrey, "Sweet Little Girls?", 226.

¹⁹ Jerrold Packard, *American Nightmare: The History of Jim Crow* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2002), 256.

²⁰ "A Historic Week of Civil Strife," *Life*, 7 October 1957, 40.

²¹ Wilson Record and Jane Cassels Record, eds., *Little Rock USA: Materials for Analysis* (San Francisco: Chandler Publishing, 1960), 78.

²² Williams, *Eyes on the Prize*, 112.

integration, Faubus realized early in 1956 that if he did not come out as a strong opponent of the Blossom Plan, he would risk losing his bid for re-election. According to Packard, "He tragically concluded that if he didn't make a point of forcefully resisting racial integration in the schools, he would open the door for overtly segregationist opponents to wipe him off the polling booth floor."²³ Faubus' own father believed that his son's primary motive was to embarrass the affluent whites who had fled to Little Rock's suburbs.²⁴ Whatever his motives, it was certain by his actions that the Arkansas governor had a hand in creating the crisis.

Faubus made statements about public opposition to the plan for desegregation, and quoted polls for support. He even testified that weapons had been taken from both blacks and whites prior to his decision to call out the troops.²⁵ *Time* reported that Faubus' critics insisted he was exaggerating circumstances and that "almost single-handed he had created the reality of violence from its myth."²⁶ In an editorial featured on the front page of the *Arkansas Gazette*, the newspaper placed the blame for the disorder on Governor Faubus, and urged him to faithfully carry out the court order to desegregate, warning, "he should do so before his own actions become the cause of the violence he professes to fear."²⁷

Many of the students involved also placed blame on the governor for starting trouble at the school. When asked how long he thought the tension was going to last, Ralph Brodie (president of Little Rock's student body) replied, "It's up to Governor Faubus."²⁸ Superintendent Blossom, concerned for the safety of his students, tried on numerous occasions to persuade Governor Faubus to publicly state that he wanted no violence or disorder when school began. According to Blossom, Faubus refused

²³ Packard, *American Nightmare*, 255.

²⁴ Taylor Branch, *Parting the Waters: America in the King Years, 1954-1963* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1988), 223.

²⁵ Virgil T. Blossom, *It Has Happened Here* (New York: Harper, 1959), 60.

²⁶ *Time*, 22.

²⁷ "The Crisis Mr. Faubus Made," *Arkansas Gazette*, 4 September 1957.

²⁸ *Little Rock USA*, 43.

because he feared such a statement would be misinterpreted as one in support of integration.²⁹

By contrast, some did not fault Governor Faubus alone, but defended him and attributed his actions to one who was trying to keep a lid on racial tensions that were about ready to explode. The governor may have predicted violence where there may not have been any, but it was obvious that a majority of Little Rock's residents were opposed to desegregation. Brooks Hays concluded that, "it was this sentiment rather than the threat of violence that accounted for most of the Governor's actions."³⁰ Some even blamed Superintendent Blossom for the violence at the school. Murphy argued, "Blossom was at least partially responsible for that because he had repeatedly urged the governor to make a statement supporting the minimal integration that was to take place at Central High School."³¹

The threat of violence *inside* the school was just as dangerous, if not more so, than what was happening between the parents and community outside of Central. This harassment, too, was due to racial and class tensions among the students. At the beginning of the school year, Principal Matthews instructed teachers via a memo to treat the Negro students with "professional impartiality."³² This became hypocritical in retrospect, for a majority of the administration, staff, and student body harbored resentment against the nine from the very beginning. The violence inflicted upon the nine students ranged from a small group of bullies who tormented them daily to the larger student body that stood by, witnessing the attacks, and did nothing.

The nine students were constantly bullied from the moment they entered Central High. Packard stated, "All were subjected to every kind of vile treatment that their white classmates could devise. They were called niggers...and each of the nine was abused in the halls and classrooms and cafeteria of Central High, so much so that one or another of them was often on the verge of

²⁹ Roy Reed, *Faubus: The Life and Times of an American Prodigal* (Fayetteville: University of Arkansas Press, 1997), 200.

³⁰ Brooks Hays, *A Southern Moderate Speaks* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1959), 154.

³¹ Murphy, *Breaking the Silence*, 36-37.

³² Elizabeth Huckaby, *Crisis at Central High: Little Rock, 1957-58* (Baton Rouge: Olympic Marketing Corp., 1980), 32.

breaking down.”³³ The white students devised many attacks on the nine, including pushing them down stairs, striking them with fists, kicking them, dumping food on them, and spitting on them.³⁴ Elizabeth Eckford remembered that in gym class, a typical daily routine involved whites flushing all the toilets at once while the black students were in the showers, thus scalding them terribly.³⁵

Despite the fact that the nine were escorted from class to class everyday by federalized Arkansas National Guardsmen, they were not immune to attacks by whites. Jefferson Thomas and Terrance Roberts (two of the nine) were attacked in early October. The National Guardsmen, just six feet away from the altercation and witnesses to the attack, did nothing to stop it or to otherwise protect the two boys.³⁶ John Kirk noted, “The inaction of the guardsmen emboldened other white students, who began to intimidate black students further.”³⁷ Black and white students viewed the soldiers differently. Since the guardsmen were all southern youths, they were far less sympathetic towards the black students that required their protection.³⁸

The violence only increased after the guardsmen left in November of 1957. It was at this point that Jefferson Thomas was seriously hurt and knocked out after a particular altercation.³⁹ Ernest Green, the only senior of the group, recalled that after the guards left, there were more bomb threats, lynching threats, and incidents where white students would put broken glass on the floor of steaming shower rooms for the black students to step on.⁴⁰ With no armed guards for protection, the white community resumed their task of trying to remove the nine Negro students from the school. One of the nine, Melba Patillo-Beals, stated that, “segregationists urged Central High’s student leaders to

³³ Packard, *American Nightmare*, 258.

³⁴ Reed, *Faubus*, 232.

³⁵ Elizabeth Eckford, interview by author, 2003.

³⁶ Daisy Bates, *The Long Shadow of Little Rock: A Memoir* (New York: David McKay Co., 1962), 125.

³⁷ Kirk, *Redefining the Color Line*, 120.

³⁸ Beth Roy, *Bitters in the Honey: Tales of Hope and Disappointment Across Divides of Race and Time* (Fayetteville: University of Arkansas Press, 1999), 253.

³⁹ Kirk, *Redefining the Color Line*, 121.

⁴⁰ Ernest Green, interview by author, 2003.

antagonize and taunt us until we responded in a way that would get us suspended or expelled.”⁴¹

In fact, one of the nine, Minnijean Brown, was suspended and later expelled half way through the school year. An out-going and spirited individual, Brown was targeted by white students because they believed she walked the halls as if she “belonged” there.⁴² To the administration, Brown was seen as a “troublemaker.” Superintendent Blossom believed that Brown, while intelligent, was quick-tempered and when harassed by white students, she retaliated and they, in turn, targeted her more than some of the other black students.⁴³ In November, Brown was suspended following an incident in the cafeteria. Several boys were kicking their chairs out into the aisle, hitting her legs as she traveled through the cafeteria with her lunch. After several hits, Brown eventually dropped her tray, spilling the contents on her perpetrators.⁴⁴ She was suspended for this action, and later in February, was expelled after a verbal argument with another student. Elizabeth Eckford recalled that the nine did not even bother to report the bullying by the springtime, because the administration would not do anything about it, and did not believe them when they did report it.⁴⁵

Even though only about fifty students bullied the nine on a regular basis, being ignored was sometimes more painful. This type of treatment was especially hard to endure when it came from teachers. For example, one of Thelma Mothershed’s teachers would not even touch her admit slip. Thelma would be told to put the slip on the teacher’s desk, and then the teacher would slide it over to herself with the back of a pencil.⁴⁶ Not only were the nine Negro students ignored by white students at Central, they were also shunned by their own peers back at the all-black Horace Mann High School.⁴⁷ Most white students, even those that knew some of the nine before they entered Central, were afraid to make

⁴¹ Melba Patillo Beals, *White is a State of Mind: A Memoir* (New York: Penguin, 1999), 11.

⁴² Roy, *Bitters in the Honey*, 179.

⁴³ Blossom, *It Has Happened Here*, 158.

⁴⁴ Minnijean Brown-Trickey, interview by author, 2003.

⁴⁵ Eckford, interview by author, 2003.

⁴⁶ Thelma Mothershed-Wair, interview by author, 2001 & 2003.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*

contact with any of them for fear of alienation from their peers.⁴⁸ Thus, they chose to alienate the nine from the rest of the student body. This had a profound impact on the lives of the nine students. According to Minnijean Brown-Trickey, “People made choices. There was no script for this event. Some people chose to treat us the way they did and some people chose to sit by and do nothing to help.”⁴⁹

In May of 1958, Central High School graduated one black senior, Ernest Green. The following year, Governor Faubus closed the public schools of Little Rock to halt integration. After the closing of the Little Rock schools in the fall of 1958, the school board resigned and a new board was elected, with three avowed segregationists, who fired over forty teachers who had stood up for integration or had shown friendship towards the nine black students during the previous year.⁵⁰ In the fall of 1959, Jefferson Thomas was the lone African American at Central High. Little Rock’s Hall High School had three African Americans to its 730 whites, and by 1960, five African Americans were counted among Central’s student body of 1,515 with eight more the year after that.⁵¹

Today, Central High has a predominantly black administration, staff, and student body. Elizabeth Eckford stated that these statistics should not be viewed as an overall success on behalf of the nine. “Central today is desegregated, but not integrated,” Eckford added, “It may be predominantly black, but courses are still segregated. Most of the students enrolled in the honors and A.P. courses are white.”⁵² Central High School has become an inner-city school within a predominantly black neighborhood surrounded by a community that still deals with racial strife.

As the Little Rock Crisis approaches its 50th anniversary, there are still lessons to be learned from this event. Beth Roy noted, “What the world saw of desegregation in Little Rock was a morality tale about power and race....What many white citizens of Little Rock

⁴⁸ Eckford, interview by author, 2003.

⁴⁹ Brown-Trickey, interview by author, 2003.

⁵⁰ Counts, *A Life is More Than a Moment*, 24.

⁵¹ Mary L. Dudziak, *Cold War Civil Rights: Race and the Image of American Democracy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000), 149.

⁵² Eckford, interview by author, 2003.

saw was also a story about power, but of a very different sort. Their story was about class, about an abuse of privilege by affluent people within their own community.”⁵³ In reflecting on her experience, Melba Patillo-Beals stated that, “If my Central High School experience taught me one lesson, it is that we are not separate. The effort to separate ourselves—whether by race, creed, color, religion, or status—is as costly to the separator as to those who would be separated.”⁵⁴ Elizabeth Eckford concluded that her perceptions today are very different from nearly fifty years ago. According to her, “racism goes across *all* classes.”⁵⁵ Minnijean Brown-Trickey warned that by focusing on the individual actions against other individuals, “we fail to learn the larger lesson of the event.”⁵⁶ The movement for civil rights is far from over in this country, but we have certainly come a long way, thanks to nine young warriors who bravely walked up the steps of Central High School and into the pages of history, forever altering the way we view ourselves and those around us.

⁵³ Roy, *Bitters in the Honey*, 3-4.

⁵⁴ Melba Patillo-Beals, *Warriors Don’t Cry: A Searing Memoir of the Battle to Integrate Little Rock’s Central High*, (New York: Pocket Star, 1994), 312.

⁵⁵ Eckford, interview by author, 2003.

⁵⁶ Brown-Trickey, interview by author, 2003.

Leveling the Playing Field: African-Americans and Collegiate Athletics

Matthew S. Berry

There are numerous accounts of the African-American civil rights movement that spanned the 1950s and 1960s, nearly all of which have centered on the fight for political access and equal treatment in public facilities. What little academic attention has been paid to the area of athletics has been geared towards professional sports, specifically Jackie Robinson and his struggles toward integrating baseball in 1948. *Sports Illustrated* journalist Jack Olsen brought the issue of endemic racism in collegiate athletic programs to the fore in his 1968 series, "The Black Athlete." Student athletes' struggle for equality in collegiate athletics has received comparatively less attention, despite its effect on schools in all areas of the country. Part of the reason for this, as Jack Olsen points out, is that members of the sports community think they have done more than their share in contributing to better race relations.¹ While it is an oversimplification to say that the sports community was significantly ahead of the rest of society, the partnership that developed between athletes and activist universities represents a special relationship of cooperation between authorities and African-Americans not often found during the civil rights era.

Throughout the fifties, sixties, and into the seventies, black athletes at the collegiate level labored for representation and equal treatment in their programs. This paper will chronicle their movement for equality in collegiate athletics beginning with the integration of programs in southern universities, and then turn to a discussion of the problems encountered by African-American athletes in collegiate programs throughout the United States. Further, this paper will illustrate that the successes experienced by

¹ Jack Olsen, "The Black Athlete: A Shameful Story. Part 1: The Cruel Deception," *Sports Illustrated*, 1 July 1968, 15.

the athletes resulted in significant changes to university practices with regards to African-Americans on the playing field and in the classroom. Finally, this paper argues that the movement for integration and equality in collegiate athletics occurred outside the structure of the mainstream civil rights movement and without the assistance of the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA), the main governing body in college sports.

Academic institutions, governments at all levels of the federal system, and the courts carried out the business of integrating collegiate sports on behalf of African-Americans starting as early as the 1940s. Institutions traditionally involved in civil rights issues such as the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) rarely worked on behalf of black student athletes. Collegiate athletes themselves were active in the movement for the integration of sports, not standing by and waiting for it to be done for them.

There is little question that collegiate athletes would have followed in the path of the mainstream civil rights movement and eventually begun to agitate for reforms on their own. They "had seen, all too often, the spectacle of black people demonstrating and picketing groups organizations and institutions" and used this as a blueprint for their own movement.² Fortunately for them, the athletes did not have to rely only on the blueprint left for them by the NAACP, Congress of Racial Equality (CORE) and the Student Non-violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC). Within academia there already was a history of institutional activism with regards to the segregation of athletics. As early as 1940 there had been movements on college campuses to oppose segregation in sports. However, broad mainstream support of athletic integration and reform did not take root until the fifties and sixties when many northern universities began to take proactive steps in voicing their dissatisfaction with segregationist practices in athletic departments.

Despite the widespread recognition of athletics as a possible road to upward mobility, only on rare occasions did members of the mainstream civil rights movement get involved in attempts to

² Harry Edwards, "Harry Edwards Reviews the Making of the Black Athletic Revolt, 1967," from *The Revolt of the Black Athlete*, (New York: Free Press, 1969), 40-47. [Online]: <http://www.barnard.columbia.edu/amstud/resources/civil%rights/edwards.htm> [10 December 2003].

level the playing field in collegiate athletics. The national office of the NAACP, standard-bearer for the civil rights movement, never publicly expressed major concerns with the state of affairs in the NCAA and its members' athletic programs. The same is true of the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU). Dr. Harry Edwards, a collegiate athlete and agitator for equal treatment in sports, posits that the "civil rights leaders of the day probably determined that they should not 'rock the boat' or otherwise disrupt sport's alleged progress by projecting the protest movement into that arena."³ This lack of interest from the mainstream civil rights movement left black athletes to their own devices in working towards fair treatment.

Integrated collegiate athletic programs had existed for decades prior to the *Brown v. Topeka Board of Education* Supreme Court decision in 1954, nearly all of them in northern states. However, in the years following this decision, southern state governments struggled to maintain segregation in their states. Southern state governments proved particularly resistant in the area of athletics. Jim Crow laws, with regards to the mixing of the races on the playing field, were initially repealed and subsequently re-enacted in several southern states. Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Louisiana, and Mississippi legislatures all passed laws forbidding universities in their states from playing integrated teams on their home fields. Sponsors of a bill barring integrated athletic contests in Birmingham, Alabama said the purpose of their law was "to make clear at least, how the people feel about their social traditions."⁴ The Mississippi House of Representatives took this a step further in 1956, introducing a bill that would have forbade schools in that state from playing against any schools that had integrated athletic squads, no matter the venue.

The actions of the southern states created heated debate within the collegiate athletic community, especially in 1956. Over the course of that year, many northern colleges took institutional stands against segregation in athletic departments. The intensity of this battle can be most clearly seen in the controversy surrounding the 1957 Sugar Bowl in Louisiana, which slated Georgia Tech University against the University of Pittsburgh. In

³ Ibid.

⁴ *New York Times*, 3 June 1954.

June of 1956 the Louisiana legislature introduced a bill prohibiting integrated participation in athletic contests. Despite widespread criticism of the legislation from outside the south, threats of boycott by northern schools, including the University of Pittsburgh, and a plea from the governing body of the Sugar Bowl, the bill was passed in the legislature, and Governor Earl Long signed it into law. In doing so, Long stated, "the comment I've had over the state has run about 4 to 1 in favor of it... In signing it, I'm going along with a majority that I've heard from."⁵

Immediately following passage of the bill into law, Notre Dame, the University of Dayton, and St. Louis University withdrew from the basketball tournament associated with the Sugar Bowl festivities. Additionally, many other northern schools including Wisconsin, Marquette, Cincinnati, and Harvard broke ties with and cancelled scheduled games against all segregated sports programs. Despite the widespread opposition to the Louisiana law within the collegiate athletic community, the NCAA did not take any action to encourage its repeal or relaxation. Instead, they deferred responsibility by referring to NCAA by-laws, which made no reference to segregation, and to the fact that it was the state that enforced the law in question, not the Sugar Bowl itself. In response to this controversy, the Georgia legislature countered by introducing legislation forbidding state schools from playing in contests that did not abide by the segregation laws of the state in which the game occurred.

The collegiate athletic establishment never took legal action against the Louisiana law (or others like it) despite the problems it caused. The law in question remained on the books until 1959, when a professional boxer challenged its legality in court. In *Dorsey v. State Athletic Commission*, the District Court held that Act 579 of 1956 violated the due process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution and opposed the Supreme Court decision in *Brown*. The Louisiana State Athletic Commission appealed the decision to the United States Supreme Court where it was affirmed.

The fight for a playing field open to all races continued after the *Dorsey* decision. While the southern states were required to obey the decision, it in no way enforced any guidelines for

⁵ *New York Times*, 17 July 1956.

universities in their practices with regards to the recruiting of players. The athletic programs of many southern schools remained completely segregated throughout the fifties and well into the sixties. This was especially true for schools in the Deep South, particularly the Southeast Conference (SEC) of the NCAA. It would be nearly a decade after the *Brown* decision and four years after *Dorsey* before many of the major southern colleges would desegregate their athletic programs.

The Texas and Oklahoma University systems took the lead and desegregated their athletic programs first, Oklahoma being the earliest in 1955. Schools in Western and Northern Texas followed suit the following year, though not always voluntarily. North Texas State College integrated their athletic programs in 1956 with the half-hearted concession of that school's president James C. Matthews. Matthews' acquiescence resulted from a Supreme Court decision against North Texas in which the school was found to be acting in opposition to *Brown*.⁶ Fearing further legal trouble, he gave in when two African-Americans expressed interest in the athletic program there. As Ronald Marcello points out in his case study, the integration of North Texas' athletic program went very smoothly; so smoothly in fact, the following year the college president gave the coaching staff permission to begin recruiting black players.⁷ The schools in the eastern most portion of the state would not follow suit until 1963 when The University of Texas, Texas Tech, and Texas A&M desegregated.

The years 1963 through 1966 represent a turning point in the leveling of the playing field; integration efforts in collegiate athletics would start picking up momentum in what one journalist for the *New York Times* called the "hard core south." It is during this time period that there occurred many firsts on the fields and courts of collegiate athletes. Several southern schools enrolled their first black athletes, offering some of them scholarships. These include Wake Forest and Duke universities in North Carolina and the University of Maryland. Furthermore, 1963 saw Mississippi State University break with tradition and allow their basketball team to play against an integrated opponent; and, most

⁶ Ronald E. Marcello, "The Integration of Intercollegiate Athletics in Texas: North Texas State College as a Test Case, 1956," in *Journal of Sport History*, Vol. 14, 1987, 286-291.

⁷ Ibid.

important, the University of Kentucky became the first SEC school to contemplate the integration of its athletic program.

In 1963, the University of Kentucky (UK) began to consider integrating their athletic program, prompted by an editorial in the student newspaper.⁸ Although no rule existed in the SEC by-laws requiring segregation of athletic teams, the university felt it prudent to circulate an informal poll to other conference members asking them to comment on whether there would be an adverse affect on the relationship between their schools if UK decided to desegregate. Reactions were mixed among the member schools that replied. Georgia Tech and Tulane both answered negative-ly, while Mississippi State said that it would affect their ability to schedule home games against UK. Several of the athletic directors responded in the press, shifting responsibility for making the decision to school presidents or boards of regents. Jeff Beard, the athletic director at Auburn University, told the *Atlanta Constitution* that the decision would "be a matter for the Board of Trustees, not the athletic department."⁹

Despite the mixed reaction, the University of Kentucky officially announced the voluntary integration of their athletic teams in May of 1963, one month after circulating the poll. The remainder of the Southeast Conference would maintain segregated programs until 1966 when the United States Office of Education ordered the desegregation of the athletic programs. It did so on the grounds of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, which prohibits segregation in any programs that receive federal funding.

By the mid-1960s, African-Americans had effected a "significant fracturing of the total segregation that had existed... in one realm eschewed by Dr. [Martin Luther] King-sport."¹⁰ Yet there remained significant problems to be addressed in the treatment and opportunities afforded African-American athletes.

⁸ *New York Times*, 13 April 1963.

⁹ *Atlanta Constitution*, 13 April 1963. Just prior to this statement Beard stated that he could not recall, but did not think, Auburn had "ever played against teams using Negroes" and that "if the question were to materialize, Kentucky must make its own decision... Auburn or other SEC Schools shouldn't help make it for them."

¹⁰ Harry Edwards, "The Man Who Would Be King in the Sports Arena" on *ESPN.com*, 28 February 2002. [Online]: <http://sports.espn.go.com/espn/print?id=1340982&type=story> [10 December 2003].

Racist coaches and teammates, institutionalization of failing academic programs and social injustices were rampant in collegiate athletics. Sports, which represented what African-Americans perceived to be the greatest area of opportunity, retained many racist practices, riddling this path to greater economic and social equity with obstacles.

As shown in Jack Olsen's five-part series for *Sports Illustrated*, black athletes had plenty of reasons to complain about unfairness in the world of collegiate athletics. Because most black athletes came from poor backgrounds, they were ill prepared socially and educationally when they arrived on predominantly white college campuses. Furthermore, the racist beliefs of their coaches and teammates hindered the black athlete's ability to integrate into the white social scene. Through interviews with black athletes, Olsen illustrates their collegiate experience as lonely and alienating. Many complained of lacking a peer group and mistreatment at the hands of their coaches. The difficulty black athletes had relating to their white peers and coaches shows that the theory of athletics being an avenue to greater integration is flawed. In his interview with Jack Olsen a University of Kansas basketball coach stated, "of all my Negro players...only one...ever became completely integrated."¹¹

With only sparse African-American representation on college campuses during the sixties, black athletes were forced to attempt to integrate themselves into the white college social scene. But the racist beliefs that still ran deep in the white community hampered most attempts. There are numerous stories of black athletes having their eligibility threatened by coaches for being seen conversing with white girls, on or off campus. Instances of this were widespread, affecting athletes on campuses from Southern Texas to Northern California and Washington. On a rare occasion in 1965, the NAACP issued a press release against the practice of coaches trying to dictate black athletes' social lives. The local chapter in Champaign, Illinois accused the University of Illinois of racial insensitivity because coaches allegedly told black athletes to "limit their social contact to fellow Negroes."¹²

¹¹ Jack Olsen, "The Black Athlete: A Shameful Story. Part 2: Pride and Prejudice," *Sports Illustrated*, 1 July 1968, 25.

¹² *New York Times*, 14 February 1965.

The coaches' treatment of African-American athletes on the field was in many cases equally reprehensible. Too often black athletes were seen as tools for winning games and not as student-athletes. Coaches treated their black athletes as sub-human, frequently referring to them as animals. Abuse of African-American athletes by universities and the coaches that represented them took many forms. At the University of Kansas, Olsen describes what he calls a "peculiar relationship" between an assistant coach and one of the African-American players assigned to him, which revolved around the coach kicking the player in what the coach perceived as a joking manner. Other black members of the team saw this as the coach's true colors showing. Olsen quotes Willie McDaniel as saying "it wouldn't have been the team joke if the coach had been kicking me!"¹³

While there is little question that there are many other cases like that of the player at the University of Kansas, more often coaches engaged in more subtle physical abuse of their African-American athletes. Black players were recruited for the sole purpose of winning games. In their zeal to succeed on the field, white coaches would play black athletes regardless of their physical condition. Black players were aware of the precariousness of their position on athletic teams and at universities forcing them to endure great physical hardships on the field. Olsen quotes a black basketball player as saying "they [the coaches and trainers] figure that the Negro is Superman... we can't get hurt."¹⁴ In order to maintain their eligibility black athletes suffered through injuries in the hopes that their perseverance would be rewarded with a professional contract.

African-Americans' relations with their white teammates were no better. White athletes often carried with them the same racist baggage that the coaches, or just could not relate well with the blacks. A former black athlete interviewed by Olsen says that there were two types of whites that he encountered in his time in college, the first being "the one who thinks that the way to be friendly with us is to tell the latest 'nigger' joke...to show how relaxed they are," and the second "kind of white who'll right away have to begin a deep think session on the problems of race. They

¹³ Olsen, "The Black Athlete: Pride and Prejudice," 28.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*

are absolutely incapable of taking us as human beings. They can't talk normally to us."¹⁵

The lack of involvement of the mainstream civil rights organizations left the African-American athlete without strong leadership, resulting in a loose, decentralized movement. Harry Edwards took the mantle of leadership in the movement, speaking out on the behalf of African-American athletes and against the injustices they faced. Edwards represented the majority of African-American athletes in that he viewed his athletic prowess as a means to rise above his socio-economic condition. Following his undergraduate basketball career at San Jose State College, he enrolled in graduate school at Cornell University in the sociology program. In 1965, he began agitating for the recognition of the unfair practices of collegiate athletic programs and their treatment of African-Americans.

Edwards is best known for his involvement in the movement for a protest of the 1968 Olympic Games by black athletes. However, he was then, and remains a harsh critic of the collegiate athletic establishment and its treatment of African-American athletes. In 1965, he organized a protest at San Jose State College that resulted in the cancellation of the opening home game of the football season. In organizing the protest, Edwards and his organization United Black Students for Action (UBSA) approached the administration with a series of demands, among them reforms in the athletic department.¹⁶

Despite the lack of centralized leadership, African-American athletes were remarkably active on campus in social struggles for themselves and on behalf of the entire civil rights movement. Throughout the sixties and into the early seventies these athletes campaigned for reforms using the non-violent methods espoused by the mainstream civil rights movement. The most successful tool at the disposal African-American athletes was the boycott. Athletes threatened to boycott for a wide variety of reasons from lack of representation on coaching staffs to the racial practices of their opponents.

In 1968, the year of greatest protest for many social and political movements, black athletes in growing numbers protested,

¹⁵ Ibid.

¹⁶ *New York Times*, 21 September 1965.

on and off field, racial injustices. Issues as disparate as lack of representation on coaching staffs to cheerleading squads were the onus behind African-American athletes threatening to boycott practices and games until their complaints were taken seriously. Of the many large American universities—including Colorado State, University of Texas at El Paso (UTEP) and Stanford—where athletes were protesting racial injustice, three of the student groups were fighting for reforms to remedy institutional racism within their respective departments. Black student athletes at Michigan State University, San Jose State College and the University of California banded together and issued demands to their schools. In these instances the grievances of the athletes were not merely regarding the cosmetics of the coaching staffs, but academic as well. They demanded that the practice of placing athletes in curriculums solely to maintain their eligibility be ended to facilitate their ability to graduate.

In 1968, UTEP, a school known for its recruitment and exploitation of African-American athletes, became embroiled in racial turmoil. It became the first school where black athletes gave up their scholarships due to racism on the coaching staff. African-American athletes were upset over the double standard exhibited with regards to black and white athletes in terms of educational opportunity and family assistance. Additionally, they protested the incessant use of the word “nigger” by the coaching staff, after repeated pleas by the African-American members of the team for it to stop.¹⁷

In response to racism on coaching staffs, African-American student athletes utilized threats of boycott in order to persuade university athletic departments to hire black coaches would better understand them and their needs. Such tactics were successfully utilized at Marquette University, the University of California and the University of Washington. At Marquette members of the faculty joined in the protest, threatening to walk out if the athletes demands were not met. In all three cases the Universities acquiesced.

One of the most widespread protests by collegiate athletes occurred from 1968 to 1970 involving athletes in the Western

¹⁷ Jack Olsen, “The Black Athlete: A Shameful Story. Part 3: In An Alien World,” in *Sports Illustrated*, 15 July 1968, 31.

Athletic Conference (WAC). Black athletes protested in unprecedented numbers against taking the field against Brigham Young University (BYU) due to the racist policies of the Mormon Church, which operates Brigham Young. At the heart of their complaint was that the Mormon Church effectively kept African-Americans from full membership in the church by refusing to bestow priesthood upon them.¹⁸

Black athletes from San Jose State College, Colorado State University, University of Arizona and University of Washington mobilized campus protests against athletic department ties with BYU.¹⁹ The student protests took different forms, some organized student rallies against the policies of Brigham Young while other athletes refused to participate in games involving BYU. At the University of Arizona black student athletes agreed to play in a game for fear of losing funding, but asked that a conscience clause be added to athletic scholarships allowing them to refuse to play in games against schools that practiced, or were affiliated with institutions that practiced segregationist principles. Another University of Arizona student asked WAC to expel Brigham Young due to the racist policies of the church.

Student protests against Brigham Young University were successful in that they opened a dialog within the Mormon Church. In December of 1969, the church released a statement to their congregations explaining the reasons for the protest of their university's athletic schedule and the church's position with regards to African-Americans and the priesthood. However, the students did not effect a change in the practices of the Mormon Church, which stated, in no uncertain terms, that they would not be dictated by worldly protests, only by revelation from God.²⁰

¹⁸ *New York Times*, 1 December 1968, 6 December 1968, 5 November 1969, 6 November 1969, 13 November 1969, 24 December 1969, 9 January 1970, 6 February 1970, and 12 February 1970.

¹⁹ Athletes from UTEP were cut from their track team after they went to their coach to ask permission to not compete against BYU. In a little poetic justice, it is believed that UTEP did not win the national title because of the loss of these athletes.

²⁰ *New York Times*, 9 January 1970. The Mormon Church would not change its position until 1978 when new leadership in the church reported that they had received a revelation from God stating that the time had come for full membership to be bestowed upon African-Americans.

Black student-athletes led many of the above-mentioned protests themselves for the purpose of reforming the system for those that would follow in their path. However, many coaches and fans looked upon these forward-looking students as ungrateful, compromising the opportunity for those that might succeed them. Harry Edwards answers these critics saying, "the cliché that sports has been good to the Negro has been accepted by black and white, liberal and conservative, intellectual and red-neck. And the Negro athlete who has the nerve to suggest that all is not perfect is branded as ungrateful, a cur that bites the hand."²¹ Anthony Ripley of the *New York Times* speculated in a 1969 article that "there is an element of self destruction in [black student militancy]. It has led to dismissals and a cutback in recruiting, and for many blacks from poor families a college education means a football scholarship. At stake for a few...are lucrative professional contracts later on."²² To substantiate this claim he cited the commissioner of the Western Athletic Conference as saying many schools are rethinking their practices of recruiting heavily in the African-American community.

This proposed recruitment boycott of African-American athletes never materialized. Collegiate athletic programs continued the practice of using black athletes for their own prestige, only on rare occasions facilitating a quality education. The vast majority of black athletes recruited were not ready for a college level education. In order to keep their "hired guns" eligible, black athletes were pushed into "easy" programs of study. In forcing students into "watered down" course loads the collegiate athletic establishment had effectively prevented their black athletes from reaching their academic potential and gambled with the lives of their players.

Graduation statistics for athletes were not kept during the time period in question, but evidence presented by Olsen coupled with statistics from a *Chronicle of Higher Education* study of athletes entering college during the 1984-85 academic year illustrate the point well. African-Americans represented twenty-five percent (835 of 3288) of athletes that entered college athletics in the mid-

²¹ Olsen, "The Black Athlete: The Cruel Deception," 15.

²² Anthony Ripley, "Irate Black Athletes Stir Campus Tension," in *New York Times*, 16 November 1969.

eighties as compared to their twelve percent representation in the overall American population. Of the 835 black athletes only 26.6 percent graduated as compared to 52.3 percent of their white counterparts.²³ The numbers are even more striking when only males are factored into the equation. These statistics illustrate that the vast majority of black athletes failed to graduate despite their disproportionately high re-presentation.

The practices of grade inflation in haphazard programs of study led to the creation of the academic environment in which the disparities above could occur. Athletes who were not offered a professional contract were left on their own when their eligibility ran out. With financial and academic aid no longer available, black athletes departed college with a transcript of disjointed coursework and no degree. An unnamed white sociologist told Gary Olsen “there is nothing in the world so forlorn and useless as a Negro college athlete who has used up his eligibility....If he’s going into the pros, of course, that’s something different. But how many of them will make it with the pros? One in a hundred?”²⁴

In the waning years of the 1960s and into the 1970s, this final issue, that of academic opportunity, became the central issue for African-American athletes in their fight for equity. Students from California to Michigan agitated for reforms in this area and were largely successful. Their protests resulted in increased African-American representation on university faculties and the addition of African-American Studies courses in curricula.

In 1968, at the University of California, black student leaders called a meeting with the athletic director leaving him with a list of grievances stemming from their perception that they were treated as second-class citizens. Included in the list were many of the issues mentioned above, including reforms in academic advising and counseling, removal of quotas on scholarships, and a need for greater understanding from coaches. Highest on their priority list were demands regarding the last point of contention

²³ D. Lederman, “Academic Outcomes of Division I Athletes Entering College, 1984-85,” in Audwin Anderson and Donald South, “Racial Differences in Collegiate Recruiting, Retention, and Graduation Rates,” in Dana Brooks and Ronald Althouse, eds., *Racism in College Athletics: The African-American Athlete’s Experience* (Morgantown, WV: Fitness Information Technology, Inc., 1993), 93.

²⁴ Olsen, “The Black Athlete: The Cruel Deception,” 16.

mentioned above: The hiring of a black trainer to prevent injured black players from being returned to action too soon, and hiring black assistant coaches to facilitate better communication between African-American athletes and the white coaches.²⁵ At Michigan State a similar situation arose in 1972, when black athletes requested continued financial and academic aid after their athletic eligibility ran out.

Despite these developments, there is very little evidence of black student-athlete protest in the schools of the Deep South, particularly in the Southeast Conference and the Atlantic Coast Conference. This is attributable to two underlying factors, the first being that the schools were very late in the integration of their programs. It would be five years after the Office of Education mandate for an end to segregation in the SEC before the last school would be integrated (Mississippi State in 1971). The second factor is that many schools placed quotas on the number of African-Americans that could be on the team, subtly enforcing it through the practice of “stacking.” Stacking entails only allowing black athletes to play at certain positions at which they are perceived to excel (wide receiver and tailback in football, guard in basketball), thereby limiting the number of roster spots available to them.

It would be easy to characterize the victories of the athlete-activists as insignificant because many of the issues they fought against persist to the present time. College athletic departments continue to recruit African-Americans in numbers exceeding their representation in society and on college campuses. However, the rate of failure is slowly being closed in important areas, including graduation rates. Currently, African-Americans represent 28.9 percent of Division I collegiate athletes that receive financial aid (scholarships/grants-in-aid), as compared to 16.6 percent of black students overall. Fifty-three percent of these students fail to graduate college within six years of entering as compared to thirty-six percent of their white counterparts and forty-three percent of overall students. The numbers become only slightly more skewed when broken down by gender and sport, where in basketball and football combined African-American males represent sixty-eight percent of the athletes in those sports, 58.1 percent of which fail to

²⁵ *New York Times*, 25 January 1968.

graduate.²⁶ When placed in comparison to the 1984-85 data shown above there is a dramatic improvement.

Furthermore, great strides have been made in awareness of issues that affect African-American athletes. Since the mid-eighties, black athletes have not had to struggle alone to prevent discriminatory practices. By raising issues at the national level, the student athletes of the sixties and seventies forced the authorities that govern collegiate athletics to take notice and become active. In 1984, the NCAA began keeping graduation statistics in an attempt to ensure un-drafted athletes who desire it, receive a complete education. In the 1990s, the NCAA also began tracking African-American representation on collegiate coaching staffs.

All of these achievements are directly attributable to the work of the athlete-activists of the sixties and seventies. Despite the failure of the mainstream civil rights movement to assist in addressing the problems of African-American collegiate athletes, many great accomplishments were achieved. Moreover, the students within the movement did not reserve their protests for issues that only affected them or their sport. To the contrary, black athletes followed the lead of Arthur Ashe who in 1968 called on black athletes “to champion the causes of their race” and used their position of power within the collegiate athletic community to push for reforms outside of sports as seen in the controversy over BYU.²⁷

It is now the dawn of the twenty-first century and the movement for equality in collegiate athletics is still alive, and as long as there are still major “firsts” occurring it will continue. Most recently, in December of 2003, a member school of the Southeast Conference hired an African-American as head coach of their football team, the first in conference history. Ironically, Mississippi State University, the longest hold out for integration of its athletic program, broke with tradition in doing so. However, a chorus of “too little, too late” began immediately showing that the movement for equality in collegiate sports is far from over.

²⁶ National Collegiate Athletic Association, “2003 NCAA Graduation Reports,” on *NCAA.org*, 1 August 2003. [Online]: http://www.ncaa.org/grad_rates/2003/d1/d1_aggregate/DI.html [11 December 2003]. This data represents the four-class average up to and including the 1996-97 school year.

²⁷ *New York Times*, 16 September 1968.

Washington Post columnist Michael Wilbon summed up the tardiness of the moment this way: “Well into the first decade of the 21st century, the SEC joined the 20th century yesterday.”²⁸ Black student-athletes are no longer alone in their struggle for fair representation in collegiate sports. Mainstream organizations that carry the torch of the civil rights movement have taken a greater interest in the area of athletics. Jesse Jackson and his Rainbow Push Coalition and the NAACP have been at the center of the drive for greater diversity on coaching staffs, as well as getting colleges to graduate greater numbers of student-athletes.

²⁸ Michael Wilbon, “Another First, This One on SEC Football Sidelines,” *Washington Post*, 3 December 2003. [Online]: <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A29785-2003Dec2.html> [5 December 2003].

Archives: The Last Bastion of Memory

Paul Gerald Baumann

The desire to remember and preserve the past is an inherent individual, familial, and societal need. In societies replete with stories, artifacts, and writings, this desire is easily satisfied. In societies where written records are scant and community knowledge is less than complete due to the destruction of one's cultural heritage and the removal of the few extant records and histories to far away archives, museums, and private collections, however, that desire for remembering and preserving is more difficult to satisfy and thus all the more important. Repositories of knowledge, such as those that are found in local and regional archives, aid in the consolidation and continuation of communities and cultures. Efforts are now being made within some institutions to collect records from other peoples without removing them from their countries of origin. These labors protect against loss and aid researchers in studying former Mesoamerican cultures without the loss of their heritage.

Within the Mesoamerican community, written works that were once commonplace and mundane within the upper echelon of society have long since become exceedingly rare amongst all groups. This has left the majority of the descendants of the pre-conquest indigenous peoples searching for a link between themselves and their past. In order to better comprehend the feeling of loss amongst the Mesoamerican peoples of today, an understanding of the records that still exist, how they were created, and for what purpose, will provide a springboard for further enlightenment about the complex issues surrounding the loss of their cultural antecedents.

Mesoamerican writing systems are of indeterminate age. Records that remain, and the time periods they represent, depend upon the medium that was used in their creation; this does not however lend itself to a clear view of how old the written word might be. Books, or *códices*, that remain were created of paper,

hide, or woven cloth. Paper was made by beating sheets of either bark or maguey fibers until they were flat and then gluing them to other sheets, multiple hides were stretched and then glued together to form stronger hides, and sheets of woven cloth glued together, also known as *lienzos*, were created. Paper and hides were covered in a plaster to provide a smooth writing surface. *Lienzos* on the other hand, did not lend themselves to plaster application and the pigments were thus applied directly to the surface of the cloth.¹ These are not however, the only media upon which indigenous writings still exist.² Sculptors often recorded histories, astrological observations and genealogies on buildings, lintels over doors, *stelae* that adorn courtyards, and other forms of permanent construction. Potters created ceramic pieces that were often incised, contained bas-relief hieroglyphs, or were painted.³ Painters adorned walls in temples, homes, tombs and caves with the language that they spoke.

The records that remain must be understood within the context that they were created to properly focus on the role archivists should play in the preservation of the extant material. The cultural area that encompasses Mesoamerica is home to more than one hundred different modern language groups. At the time of the conquest (1521-1697), the number of languages was close to 150.⁴ Each group of people wrote in the language they spoke. This would have created mass confusion in the understanding of the written word, even at the time of the con-quest, if it were not for certain unifying traits within the written word itself.

Throughout Mesoamerica the use of writing was utilized for a wide variety of social and societal necessities. Records were kept of business transactions, genealogies, and dynastic lists. Prose and poetry were also part of the written record. And soon after the

¹ Elizabeth Hill Boone, *Stories in Red and Black* (Austin: The University of Texas Press, 2000), 23-24.

² Robert Wauchope, ed., *Handbook of Middle American Indians* 14, 3, in Howard F. Cline, Charles Gibson, and H. B. Nicholson, ed., *Guide to Ethnohistorical Sources* (Austin: The University of Texas Press, 1975), 4-5.

³ Francis Robicsek and Donald M. Hales, *The Maya Book of the Dead, The Ceramic Codex: The Corpus of Codex Style Ceramics of the Late Classic Period* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1981), 3-9.

⁴ Gordon Brotherston, *Painted Books from Mexico: Códices in UK Collections and the World They Represent* (London: British Museum Press, 1995), 21-22.

conquest, transcription of oral histories took place when Spanish priests and monks interviewed the indigenous peoples.⁵ Entire libraries were said to exist at the time of the conquest in the capitals of the Aztecs and the Quiché-Maya, and many books existed throughout the region in the hands of local communities and sometimes lords.⁶ Motolinía, an early Spanish priest and historian, wrote in 1541, “historians in the Aztec world depicted conquests, wars, dynastic successions, plagues, storms, and ‘noteworthy signs in the skies’.” Texcoco, one of the sister states of Tenochtitlán, had a huge documentary archive. Historians were needed to arrange events in chronological order and specialists were utilized to work specifically with genealogical records, geographical limits, ceremonies and laws.⁷

Even before the conquest began in earnest in 1521, indigenous books and manuscripts were being sent back to Europe. However, beginning with the Night of the Long Knives, in which the Spaniards burnt the Aztec capital Tenochtitlán to the ground,⁸ and continuing until the last books of the Itzá Maya were removed from Tayasal in 1697,⁹ the removal and destruction of the Mesoamerican written record took on new meaning. The missionary role of the Catholic Church in New Spain required that the indigenous peoples be brought to the gospel and that all of their pagan ways, including their written records, be expunged. Bishop Zumárraga, the inquisitor of idolatrous practices in central Mexico, and who took a leading role in the burning of all native religious books, was accompanied in his efforts by Bishop Diego de Landa in the Yucatán.¹⁰ This burning of pagan texts was known as an “auto-de-fé,” or “act of faith.” In Maní, Yucatán alone, more than twenty-eight of the sacred texts were lost in this manner. Bishop de Landa, described the book burning in Maní: “We found a large number of books in these characters and, as

⁵ Wauchope, *Handbook of Middle American Indians* 15, 4: 313-314.

⁶ Abraham Arrias-Larreta, *Literaturas Aborígenes de América: Azteca, Incaina, Maya-Quiche* (Buenos Aires: Editorial Indoamerica, 1968), 55-58, 179-181.

⁷ Wauchope, *Handbook of Middle American Indians* 15, 4.

⁸ Thomas Hugh, *Conquest: Montezuma, Cortés and the Fall of Old Mexico* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1995), 434-531.

⁹ Grant D. Jones, *The Conquest of the Last Maya Kingdom* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998), 101-102.

¹⁰ Wauchope, *Handbook of Middle American Indians* 14, 3: 15-16.

they contained nothing in which there was not to be seen superstition and lies of the devil, we burned them all, which they regretted to an amazing degree, and which caused them affliction.”¹¹ In the Mayan area of New Spain the loss was such that even today only four códices have been found that can be definitively declared Mayan.¹² This does not mean that their provenance has been ascertained, and thus they are of considerably less benefit to the Mayan community than would be hoped.

It should not be assumed that all of the works that have been lost were lost in the purges of the Inquisition. The climate in many parts of Mesoamerica is such that there is very little chance that documents will remain unless inscribed in stone or on ceramics. Paintings are often lost simply because there is no way to protect them. Theft is also key to understanding the loss of many of the precious written texts.

There are texts that have survived from pre-conquest times and others that were written soon after the conquest by individuals who still knew how to create them. The total number of these códices and manuscripts is difficult to ascertain due to the diffusion of the remnant works, but attempts have been made to locate and document their existence. One of the best and most comprehensive efforts is contained in *The Handbook of Middle American Indians: Volumes 12-15*. These volumes list over one thousand pictorial manuscripts and almost one thousand more texts written as prose, poetry, history, títulos, geographies, etc. Nearly two thousand manuscripts exist to teach the descendants of the Mesoamerican peoples about their beliefs, customs, and practices. This number becomes significantly less impressive when one considers that less than twenty of that number can be dated prior to the beginning of the conquest in 1521.

That does not, however, mean that written works from the period soon after the conquest are not important. Three spectacular examples are the *Popol Vuh*, *The Annals of the Cakchiquels*, and the various *Books of Chilam Balam*. The *Popol Vuh*, written sometime between 1550 and 1555, is the Quiché-Maya account of the creation of the world, and the history of the

¹¹ Robicsek, *Book of the Dead*, xix.

¹² David Freidel, Linda Schele, and Joy Parker, *Maya Cosmos: Three Thousand Years on the Shaman's Path* (New York: Quill William Morrow, 1995), 41-46.

Quiché people. Abraham Arrias-Larreta states that the *Popol Vuh*, the “splendid Maya-Quiché creation sometimes rivals and sometimes surpasses the philosophical depth and the imaginative power of the most famous theogonical legends of the world. And it is, at the same time, an epic of high literary quality and, possibly, the most brilliant expression of the ancient American mind”.¹³ *The Annals of the Cakchiquels*, written from 1571-1604, is another account of the creation, as well as the history of the Cakchiquel people prior to, and after, the conquest.¹⁴

Finally, the *Books of Chilam Balam* contain the Yucatec Maya view of the creation, as well as the prophecies of five Mayan priests who predict the subjugation of their people and the coming of foreigners to their land.¹⁵ While the survival of these books, in their various forms, is of importance in understanding the role of archives in preserving the heritage of the Mesoamerican peoples, any of the extant manuscripts from Mesoamerica can be studied.

We will now turn our attention to the various códices and the historical antecedents that have brought them to their current repositories. Current titles of códices have been derived from a strictly European style of referencing. The Codex Borgia derives its name from a former owner, the Codex Nuttall from the woman who discovered it, the Códice Baranda from its patron, the Códice de Tlatelolco from its presumed provenience, and the Dresden Codex from the location where it was discovered. Also, some are named for some feature of their content.¹⁶ Aside from one written text that is named for its provenience, this way of thinking does not lend itself well to rediscovering the original context in which a codex was discovered or the people who wrote it.

Like all of the pre-conquest manuscripts, the early history of the Codex Nuttall is obscure. It was “discovered” in the Dominican monastery of San Marco in Florence, Italy in 1859. Some have suggested that this codex was one of two sent by

¹³ Abraham Arias-Larreta, *Pre-Columbian Literatures* (State College: Mississippi State University, 1964), 95.

¹⁴ Adrián Recinos and Gisele Díaz, tr., *The Annals of the Cakchiquels* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1953), 43-161.

¹⁵ Maud Worcester Makemson, tr., *The Book of the Jaguar Priest: A Translation of the Book of Chilam Balam of Tizimin* (New York: Henry Chuman, 1951), 3-227.

¹⁶ Wauchope, *Handbook of Middle American Indians* 14, 3: 7-8.

Cortés to Charles V in 1519.¹⁷ Soon after its discovery, the text was given as a gift to Robert Curzon, the fourteenth Baron Zouche. Upon his death in 1873 the manuscript was passed on to his son who gave the Peabody Museum of Harvard University, and more importantly Zelia Nuttall, permission to make a facsimile copy in 1898. This copy was published in full color in 1902. Some errors in this version were fixed in 1975.¹⁸

The Codex Borgia, one of the finest single examples of pre-conquest writing, arrived in Europe sometime early in the sixteenth century, although it is not known exactly when. It was not heard of again until Alexander von Humboldt saw it in the possession of the estate of the late Cardinal Stefano Borgia in 1805. He wrote that Cardinal Borgia had acquired the codex from the Giustiniani family. The Giustiniani family had entrusted the codex to several servants who had in turn given it to their children as a toy. The condition of the codex was thus greatly diminished, including three pages that had been burnt by fire.¹⁹ After a protracted legal battle returned the codex to the Borgia family museum, it was eventually given to the Apostolic Library of the Vatican at the conclusion of the nineteenth century. It is still housed there today. Several editions have been published in the past, including the Kingsborough in 1830, Ehrle in 1898, Seler in 1904, and the Nowotny in 1976, each adding something new to the existing body of work on the subject.²⁰ It is currently believed that it was originally painted in central or southern Puebla, in the vicinity of Tepeaca, Cuauhtinchan, or the Tehuacán Valley.²¹

The Codex Telleriano-Remensis, a particularly interesting Mexican colonial manuscript, is currently within the collection of the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris, France. While its origins are unknown, most scholars believe it was written around 1563. The manuscript, written on watermarked paper, was probably manufactured in Genoa, shipped to Spain and then Mexico, where

¹⁷ Zelia Nuttall, ed., *The Codex Nuttall: A Picture Manuscript from Ancient Mexico* (New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1975), x.

¹⁸ Wauchope, *Handbook of Middle American Indians* 14, 3: 176-177.

¹⁹ Gisele Diaz and Alan Rodgers, *The Codex Borgia: A Full-Color Restoration of the Ancient Mexican Manuscript* (New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1993), viii-ix.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, viii.

²¹ *Ibid.*, ix.

it was written, before returning to Europe. In the seventeenth century it belonged to the French bibliophile Charles-Maurice Le Tellier, the archbishop of Reims.²² The name of this manuscript is thus derived from the name of the collector and the Latin form of the town name Reims. Having recognized that he would never make use of his manuscript collection, Le Tellier gave most of his collection to the Bibliothèque du Roi, the predecessor of the Bibliothèque Nationale.²³ Alexander von Humboldt discovered this document while searching through the Nationale's holdings, and published many of its paintings in 1810.

Perhaps of more significance is the origin of the rest of the 429 inventoried items that comprise the Mesoamerican manuscripts in the Bibliothèque Nationale. The majority of all the works came from the collection of Eugène Goupil, who was "born in Mexico from a French father and a Mexican mother who descended from the Aztecs in a direct line." Goupil had acquired the collection from a friend in 1889, Joseph-Marie Aubin, who had been ruined by the Panama scandal.²⁴ He debated for a time the merit of giving the collection to Mexico, but deciding that Mexico was "rather remote" and "few persons would consult it," he decided to donate the collection to "the center of the intellectual world, [the] mandatory stop for the travelers of science," the Bibliothèque Nationale.²⁵

The attitude exhibited by Eugène Goupil prior to donating his collection to the Bibliothèque Nationale is indicative of the feeling of superiority that existed in various countries of the world when dealing with the native peoples of Mesoamerica. The same people who created the codices and other manuscripts were considered incapable of protecting their own patrimonial interests. This point of view led to the creation of specialized collections of Mesoamerican literature within libraries, museums, and archives outside of Mesoamerica. There are more than sixty-four major repositories of early American literature located around the world,

²² Eloise Quiñones Keber, *Codex Telleriano-Remensis: Ritual, Divination, and History in a Pictorial Aztec Manuscript* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1995), x.

²³ *Ibid.*, ix.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, x.

²⁵ *Ibid.*

of which only twenty-three are located in Mexico and Central America, and only nineteen are located in Mesoamerica proper.²⁶

The Spaniards, who always exhibited a passion for "bureaucratic minutiae," created a general archive at the palace fortress of Simancas in 1545. Official documents relating to the governing of the Indies were housed together, and as lesser administrative collections arrived, they too were added.²⁷ There was, however, no concerted effort to systematize the collection until the time of the Bourbon dynasty in the eighteenth century. In 1780, to refute current criticisms being put forth by the English, French and others, Charles III ordered Juan Bautista Muñoz, the royal chronicler, to gather documentation. While Muñoz was able to complete one hundred and twenty-six volumes prior to his death, the most important thing he was able to do in order to aid future research, was persuade the Spanish Crown to establish the General Archive of the Indies in Seville in 1785.²⁸ Although not all records were gathered, many came in from Simancas and elsewhere relating to the governing of both the Indies and the Philippines. The Crown also ordered that documentation be provided from overseas officials, and within each Audiencia of the New World records were compiled and copies sent to Spain.²⁹

This compilation of records led to the formation of the National Archives of Mexico in 1823. In the nineteenth and twentieth centuries many of the individual Mexican states also created local archives.³⁰ In both cases, publications relating to the documentary evidence contained within their collections have come forth. These are not however, the only records which have been gathered. In Guatemala the most important depository is the Archivo General del Gobierno of Guatemala. Following an important law passed in 1937, systematic additions of records from both the Archivo Colonial and the Archivo Municipal de Guatemala have been made.³¹ Every country in Central America has its own national archives, and while several have suffered

²⁶ Wauchope, *Handbook of Middle American Indians* 14, 3: ix-x.

²⁷ Wauchope, *Handbook of Middle American Indians* 13, 2: 5-6.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, 5.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 5-6.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 6.

³¹ *Ibid.*

losses due to earthquakes and fires, the majority of all known records are now housed in central depositories.

Archives have the daunting task of collecting what is most beneficial historically for the locale and to the society that exists within it. This is often achieved on the whim of the archivist, or in the case of the early Spanish archives, upon the command of someone who wants something specific to be housed. The Massachusetts Historical Society (MHS), upon drafting its constitution in 1791, expressed the goals that they sought for their institution: “The preservation of books, pamphlets, manuscripts, and records, containing historical facts...to mark the genius, delineate the manners, and trace the progress of society in the United States...and rescue the true history of this country from the ravages of time, and the effects of ignorance and neglect.”³²

The American Jewish Historical Society (AJHS), utilizing the MHS constitution as a guide post, as did many of the early collecting societies, decided how to best serve the Jewish population of the United States upon incorporating in 1892. There was some discord between the members about the most effective way that anti-semitic feelings throughout the United States could be combated. One member declared that he felt the collection and preservation of documents would be sufficient. He wanted the society to stress “especially the collection of documents by which it is shown how the Jews of the United States have attained their high intellectual position, and they need not stand back in any community in this country and they are on the highway to greater success...”³³ Reform rabbi Kaufmann instead proposed that “we should not simply as scholars and historians register facts but...should publish such essays, articles or longer works that would stir the interest of the Jews and show our fellow citizens what the Jews have done in the history of culture in America.”³⁴

For the Jewish people collective memory is of great importance. Maurice Halbwachs, “pioneering explorer of the ‘social framework of memory’ in the 1920s, said that only social groups determine what is worth remembering and how it will be

³² Elizabeth Kaplan, “We Are What We Collect, We Collect What We Are: Archives and the Construction of Identity,” in *The American Archivist* 63,1 (Spring/Summer, 2000): 134-135.

³³ *Ibid.*, 135-139.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 138.

remembered.”³⁵ He also stated that, “what social groups choose to remember not only determines them as a group by creating a common memory for its members but also defines them.”³⁶ While these two statements appear to be contradictory they are clearly related to the preservation of archival materials. The past, and the story that is preserved from it, is created by the individuals who preserve the memories and pass them on.³⁷

During World War II the Germans became exceedingly efficient at locating, removing and eliminating records. Entire libraries were wiped out, individual collections were sought and either confiscated or destroyed, and entire archives were ransacked. Much that was not destroyed was relocated to Germany where it was utilized as the foundation for research on the Jews and their faith.³⁸ The truths that were sought were often arbitrary, and the uses to which they were put even more so.

Throughout the war records were sought out, fought for, captured and destroyed by both sides. As not all records were returned immediately, and some have yet to be repatriated, it is important to understand why these archival records are so important. Linda Barnickel says that, “in the mere custody of records there is power. This power can exist in many forms, including the use of documents against their former owners or creators, and the destruction of documents in an effort to rob a people of their cultural identity.”³⁹

George Orwell, in his book *1984*, explains the actions of the Bureau of Records:

Day by day and almost minute by minute the past was brought up to date....All history was a palimpsest, scraped clean and reinscribed exactly as often as was necessary....Every Record has been destroyed or falsified, every Book has been rewritten,

³⁵ Hilda Nissimi, “Memory, Community, and the Mashhadi Jews During the Underground Period,” in *Jewish Social Studies* 9,3 (Spring/Summer, 2003): 76-77.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 77.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, 87.

³⁸ Marek Sroka, “The Destruction of Jewish Libraries and Archives in Cracow during World War II,” in *Libraries & Culture* 38,2 (Spring, 2003): 154-157.

³⁹ Linda Barnickel, “Spoils of War: The Fate of European Records During World War II,” in *Archival Issues* 24, 1 (1999): 7-20.

every statue and street and building has been renamed, every date has been altered....History has stopped. Nothing exists except an endless present.⁴⁰

One would hope that this depiction is not a realistic picture of modern day archives. It is important however to remember that archival work is subjective.⁴¹ The voices of the past that are heard through the records that archives maintain are only as accurate as the voices that are utilized to tell that story. Archivists give meaning and truth to “authentic” voices of the past by accessioning documents; however, it is the archivist who makes the decision about what is authentic and what is not.⁴² Archives are subject to and “products of the vagaries of circumstance, accident and interest.”⁴³

Efforts within the archival realm to create and maintain the cultural identity of the Mesoamerican people is ongoing and constant. As has been discussed previously, the approximately two thousand indigenous documents still in existence are scattered throughout the world. There are also many other documents that are housed in archives in Mesoamerica and the world that relate to the indigenous peoples after the conquest. Archives, libraries, and museums throughout the world contain pieces of the story of these peoples. An excellent example of what can be done, without removing the patrimonial records of a civilization, is the collection of the Tozzer Library at Harvard University. Their collection consists of photographic re-productions, microfilm, manuscript facsimiles and transcripts of virtually all known Mesoamerican anthropological literature.⁴⁴ While it is true that they have several original manuscripts, they have made an effort to collect copies of original documents without removing them from their context.

Many alternative methods are being sought as additional sources of information on the peoples of Mesoamerica and their culture. Ian S. Graham of the Peabody Museum of Archaeology

⁴⁰ George Orwell, *1984* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1964), 128.

⁴¹ Kaplan, “We Are What We Collect,” 147.

⁴² *Ibid.*, 147.

⁴³ Randolph Starn, “Truths in the Archives,” in *Common Knowledge* 8, 2 (2002): 393.

⁴⁴ John M. Weeks, “Maya Ethnohistory: A Guide to Spanish Colonial Documents,” in *Anthropology* 34 (Nashville: Vanderbilt University Publications, 1987), 1.

and Ethnology has been collecting all known hieroglyphs from every excavated site throughout Mesoamerica. His work has already reached over twenty-five volumes and is continuously growing, as more and more research is made available. Other records are being compiled by ethnographers who, utilizing scientific methods of investigation, are studying the descendants of the Mesoamerican peoples and recording oral histories. These sources of information are of immense importance when one considers that they constitute more documentation on many of these peoples than is known to have survived the conquest and the colonial period. Archivists have new means of complimenting their already existing manuscripts and documents without removing the patrimonial heritage that has remained. These new archival methods, coupled with emergent cultural sensitivities among archivists, have increased the potential of better preserving the Mesoamerican peoples’ cultural memory and thus their cultural heritage.

The Evolution of Interpretation in the National Park Service and at the Lincoln Home National Historic Site

James A. Sturgill

It has been said that the past is a foreign country. Like a trip to a foreign country, a visit to the past often requires someone to interpret the different thoughts and ideas that the past holds. Interpretation in the sense of a visit to another country might require a person to translate an unfamiliar language or explain unfamiliar customs to a visitor. Interpretation in an historic sense also requires a person who, familiar with the ways of the past, can bridge the gap of understanding and help a person from the present to explore the events that shaped the way that the world is today.

Efforts to interpret various national parks and other important sites began at roughly the same time and continued to change as ideas about the parks and about history changed. Though vastly different in the initial approaches to interpretation, the National Park Service (NPS) now works with a unified structure for interpretation. Using primary and secondary sources concerning the national parks, and primary sources from the archives of the Lincoln Home National Historic Site in Springfield, Illinois, this paper will examine the shifts in thought concerning interpretation in the National Park Service and at the Lincoln Home to explore the evolution of interpretation. Initially, the attempts at interpretation were little more than the exhibition of curiosities. Today, interpretation is the formal process of incorporating historical methods and research in the presentation of the many sites in the National Park Service, including the Lincoln Home.

The NPS maintains hundreds of national parks within the United States. Each of these parks presents a unique part of the story of the country, from military battlefields and cemeteries, to wildlife refuges, to scenic shorelines; the list goes on and on. Even with so many different areas of interest that each park covers, there exist unifying principles that each park abides by.

One of the areas where this unity is apparent is in the principles that guide the interpretation of each park.

The national parks have served at the forefront of innovation of interpretation at historic and natural sites, from their inception with the 1916 National Parks Act to the present. Along the way, innovators such as Freeman Tilden, author of *Interpreting Our Heritage*, have kept the interpretation fresh and relevant as the times and the people who visit the parks have changed. Within this framework, some parks have held places of prominence in the American consciousness, such as the Gettysburg National Battlefield Park, Valley Forge National Battlefield Park, and the Lincoln Home in Springfield, Illinois.

The Lincoln Home, at the corner of Eighth and Jackson Streets in Springfield, Illinois, continues to attract visitors from around the world. First brought into the public eye during the presidential election of 1860, the home served initially as the center of domestic life for the Lincoln family. After the Lincolns left Springfield for Washington, D.C., Lucian Tilton, a railroad man and friend of Mr. Lincoln, rented the home and maintained it for the Lincolns.¹ Tilton and his family resided in the home on the fateful day in April of 1865 when Abraham Lincoln became the first martyred president in the nation's history. The body of the president came back to Springfield. Funeral bunting draped the home during this time. Immediately after the funeral, the home began its development as a shrine. The Tiltons lived in the home until 1869, paying rent to Lincoln's son Robert.

During this time, the nation saw the beginnings of interpretation in what would become the national parks. In the 1830s, George Catlin advocated interpretation of the national and historical treasures of the nation, specifically the cultures of the various Native American peoples he met in his travels west of the Mississippi. Not much work took place to follow up on this initiative until the 1870s, when John Muir and Nathaniel P. Langford advocated the interpretation of the natural wonders of

¹ Wayne C. Temple, *By Square and Compass: Saga of the Lincoln Home* (Springfield, IL: Ashlar Press, 1984; reprint, Mahomet, IL: Mayhaven Publishing, 2002), 139. Citations refer to the reprint edition.

Yosemite and Yellowstone, respectively.² Both of these men recognized the importance of making the wonders of these areas accessible to the public, Muir going so far as to make the first printed reference to “interpretation.” These efforts paved the way for the interpretation revolution that took place during the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries.

The Lincoln Home continued as a renter’s residence into the 1880s. After the Tiltens vacated the home, several other tenants occupied the home, each one more content to live in the home than to make any major efforts towards interpreting the house. This changed in 1883 with the rental of the home by Osborn H. I. Oldroyd. Born in Ohio, and a veteran who fought with an Ohio regiment during the Civil War, Oldroyd began collecting Lincolniana during the 1860 presidential race. Oldroyd, somewhat of an opportunist, recognized the potential of attracting visitors to the home and charging them a small fee (a fact that he later denied) to see the home and his collection of Lincoln items. Oldroyd moved in and set up his collection in the front and back parlors of the home.

Oldroyd made every effort to capitalize on his collection. Due to his desire to make money from his residence, Oldroyd worked through the Illinois Legislature to have the home purchased by the state. Attempts in 1883, 1884, and 1885 all failed, but an attempt in 1887 met with success with the passage of House Bill 848 on May 25, 1887.³ The management of the home fell to a commission made up of the governor of the state and several other state officers. This commission saw fit to appoint Oldroyd as the first custodian of the home. The legislature voted \$1000 per annum for Osborn’s salary, and allotted \$2800 for repairs to the home.⁴ Oldroyd’s occupation of the home appears more a means of increasing his wealth rather than to preserve the integrity of the property. He tore down the original stable on the property in 1887 and even went so far as to sell pieces of the Lincoln Home as souvenirs to people from all over the country. Some oddities came

² C. Frank Brockman, “Park Naturalists and the Evolution of National Park Service Interpretation through World War II,” in *Journal of Forest History* 22, 1 (1978): 26.

³ Temple, *By Square and Compass*, 205.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 208-209.

to the home, including a Civil War era cannon given the moniker of the “Mary Todd Cannon.”

Oldroyd continued exhibiting his collection in the home until a change in gubernatorial administration led to his dismissal in 1893. He removed the collection and took it with him to the Petersen Home in Washington, D.C., where Lincoln died shortly after the assassination attempt at Ford’s Theater. Oldroyd further capitalized on the collection of Lincoln items in 1926 when he sold the collection to the U.S. for \$50,000.⁵

The 1880s through the early 1900s also saw an increase in the amount and style of interpretation in parks across the country. The War Department managed many of the sites that eventually became national parks, and soldiers who served in these parks often filled in as guides. The post commanders, who also served as park superintendents, recognized the need for some kind of programming, and encouraged their soldiers to act in this capacity for the parks’ guests. The beginnings of museums and exhibits accompanied this use of soldiers as guides. “In 1905 Frank Pinkley, then custodian of Casa Grande ruin in Arizona,” according to Brockman, “displayed archaeological artifacts. This was in effect the first museum exhibit in a National Park Service area.”⁶ Concurrent with this development of museum exhibits, more parks began to guide visitors around the important sites in their areas. The federal government even got into the act, publishing “a number of booklets concerning some of these areas.”⁷ As public recognition of these many areas increased, efforts to interpret these areas increased. This holds true for the Lincoln Home as well.

After Oldroyd left the home, Herman Hofferkamp took over as custodian.⁸ Also a Civil War veteran, Hofferkamp worked with what little was in the home to maintain its appearance. With Oldroyd’s collection gone, the state worked to collect new objects connected to the Lincolns, while Hofferkamp hired contractors to repaint and repaper the home. Some changes made to the home affected the integrity of the site, such as when “R.H. Armbruster

⁵ *Ibid.*, 211, 214.

⁶ Brockman, “Park Naturalists,” 27.

⁷ *Ibid.*

⁸ Temple, *By Square and Compass*, 211.

installed an awning”⁹ over the front door, a feature that the Lincolns never had. Hofferkamp remained custodian until 1896, when the governor’s office changed hands again and he was replaced by Albert S. Edwards, cousin of Robert Lincoln, Albert’s wife, Josephine, and their daughter Mary.

Edwards held the custodian’s position during several special celebrations at the home. On February 12, 1909, the site celebrated the centennial of Lincoln’s birth, and on the 50th anniversary of the Lincoln’s trip from Springfield to Washington, then president William Howard Taft paid his respects to Lincoln at the tomb and the home.¹⁰ Other distinguished guests visited the home, and the Edwardses served as gracious hosts to all of these many figures. Edwards passed away in 1915, and his wife Josephine occupied the custodian’s post in his place until her passing in 1918. At this time, the Edwards’s daughter, Mary, took over as custodian of the home, and held the post until 1924. Some changes took place under the custodianship of the Edwardses, such as the removal of an elm tree that Abraham Lincoln planted during his residence in the home. During the tenure of the Edwards family, changes took place in the nation that would eventually affect the Lincoln home.

In 1916, the United States Congress passed an act establishing the National Park Service. With the passage of this act, attitudes towards the parks and interpretation of the parks changed. In 1918, “Mount Rainier National Park established a Bureau of Information, headed by Park Ranger J. B. Flett, to satisfy the growing demand for authentic information on the area’s natural history,” and Mesa Verde National Park saw the establishment of a museum, “the first museum in a Park Service area.”¹¹

These steps inaugurated the widespread effort towards professional interpretation in the national parks. In 1919, Horace M. Albright, superintendent of Yellowstone, appointed a park ranger at Yellowstone, Milton P. Skinner, a man who advocated the presence of educational programming at the park. “Skinner,” according to Brockman, “began developing a park museum in the former Bachelor Officers’ Quarters at the park headquarters at Mammoth Hot Springs,” a facility still in use into the 1970s.¹²

⁹ Ibid., 223.

¹⁰ Ibid., 228.

¹¹ Brockman, “Park Naturalists,” 29.

¹² Ibid., 30.

Yosemite National Park’s interpretive program began the following year. Scholarship accompanied these efforts, with scientists and historians consulted during the development of these programs, and often recruited as the rangers who presented these various programs to the public. Initiation of professional interpretive programs continued at other parks in the system throughout the 1920s. Unfortunately, the Lincoln Home did not parallel these steps.

After Mary E. Brown retired in 1924, Virginia Stuart Brown, granddaughter of Abraham Lincoln’s first law partner, assumed the duties of custodian. Cosmetically, the home changed somewhat, with the removal of the cannon in 1932, and the addition of latticework over the front door around 1932. Brown stayed on until 1953, and saw some of the first major attempts by the state to represent the house as it would have looked when the Lincolns lived there. The house was painted white during Hofferkamp’s custodianship, and remained white for many years. During structural repairs in the 1950s, a brown layer of paint evidenced itself from under many layers of white paint. The state wanted to paint the house to match this brown, but Virginia Stuart Brown spoke out against the change. Fortunately for history, she was overruled and the house was painted brown. It remains that color to this day. In 1953, Brown retired, and Kathleen S. Bradish became custodian of the home. Restoration of the site continued, with archaeological evidence used to reconstruct the outbuildings of the home during the 1950s through the 1970s, and illustrations from *Leslie’s Illustrated Weekly* to refurbish the interior. Visitors to the home now had access to the second floor, which they could not do until the repairs and restoration took place, and Bradish lived in another house in the Lincoln neighborhood. Bradish acted as custodian until 1958, at which time the state began employing curators to maintain the home.

The period of Virginia Stuart Brown’s and Kathleen Bradish’s custodianships saw many changes to interpretation in the National Park Service. In the first week of October 1925, the Eighth National Park Conference was held in Mesa Verde National Park. Brockman called it a “milestone in National Park Service interpretation.”¹³ Discussion at this conference focused on

¹³ Ibid., 37.

improving interpretive efforts service-wide, as well as on the importance of informing the public of the benefit of patronizing the national parks. In 1928, the Secretary of the Interior named “a committee of prominent scientists and educators to study and report on the educational possibilities inherent in the national parks.”¹⁴ This group of learned professionals recommended creation of a new office to oversee interpretation service-wide. In 1931, the Park Service began exploring the interpretation of the many historic sites that fell under its jurisdiction. Director Horace M. Albright “appointed Verne E. Chatelain...as the Service’s first chief historian.”¹⁵ Chatelain advocated the selection of historic sites based on their interpretive value, and maintained the historical importance of the sites in the National Park Service.

This emphasis on history in the NPS led to the passage of the Historic Sites Act in 1935, which, according to Barry Mackintosh:

directed the Secretary of the Interior, through the (National Park) Service, to “establish and maintain museums” in connection with historic properties, to “erect and maintain tablets to mark or commemorate historic or prehistoric places and events of national historical or archeological significance,” and to “develop an educational program and service for the purpose of making available to the public facts and information pertaining to American historic and archaeological sites, buildings, and properties of national significance.”¹⁶

This legislation opened the door for more concerted efforts to interpret and preserve the history of the parks in the National Park Service. The emphasis on history served as a blessing and a curse to the parks. Though they now had the mandate to interpret the history of the many sites in the service, they had the problem that many sites no longer looked as they did when the historic events took place there. Since the passage of the legislation, the NPS has faced the challenge of interpreting sites as they look today while trying to explain the way that the sites have changed from the way they looked in the past. The NPS ran into stumbling blocks, such

¹⁴ Ibid.

¹⁵ Barry Mackintosh, *Interpretation in the National Park Service: A Historical Perspective* (Washington, DC: National Park Service, 1986). [Online]: http://www.cr.nps.gov/history/online_books/mackintosh2.

¹⁶ Ibid.

as poor scholarship, that have forced the NPS to reevaluate the interpretation of some of their sites. But, even with these problems, the Service protects and preserves these many sites well.

The National Park Service continued to utilize new technologies to interpret the parks. The 1930s saw the introduction of guided automobile tours, while the 1940s saw the use of electric maps with colored lights at several battlefield parks. As Mackintosh states, “the Washington Monument had a recorded interpretive message in 1947.”¹⁷ Recorded messages saw wider use in the 1950s, as many more parks began to use visitor-activated messages. Acoustiguides came into vogue at several presidential homes, with Eleanor Roosevelt recording the message for Franklin D. Roosevelt National Historic Site, and Ethel Roosevelt Derby recording the message for the site dedicated to her father, Theodore Roosevelt. 1958 saw the parks interested in “sound and light” systems that were en vogue in Europe. Some of the innovations turned out to be failures, such as the program at Kings Mountain National Military Park in South Carolina. The program presented men from both sides of the battle arrayed in a theater, yelling back and forth at each other across the auditorium in recorded speeches. The system failed, with the program going out of synchronization and confusing more visitors than it helped.¹⁸

The National Park Service also began living history programs at their sites during the 1930s with a program at Yosemite National Park. More programs sprang up in the 1950s, but did not become popular until the mid-1960s. Living farms started at several parks, and costumed guides portraying period characters staffed several sites. These roots led to the presence of costumed interpreters at many sites, a practice still followed in many of the parks today.

The National Park Service worked hard to professionalize and standardize interpretation. Advocates saw the importance of interpretation as a tool to educate park visitors, with several committees and park employees speaking out for the utilization of interpretation as a means to help visitors understand the parks.

¹⁷ Ibid.

¹⁸ Ibid.

Steps in the 1950s moved the parks towards standardization, as “between 1953 and 1955 the Service published four booklets on interpretive techniques: *Talks* and *Conducted Trips* by Howard R. Stagner, Chief of Interpretation in the Natural History Division; *Campfire Programs* by H. Raymond Gregg, Chief of Interpretation in the Omaha regional office; and *Information Please*.”¹⁹ These books preceded a monumental work in the practice and principles of interpretation, Freeman Tilden’s *Interpreting Our Heritage*. This book outlined six principles of interpretation that all interpreters should follow in their programs. These principles are:

- I. Any interpretation that does not somehow relate what is being displayed or described to something within the personality or experience of the visitor will be sterile.
- II. Information, as such, is not Interpretation. Interpretation is revelation based upon information. But they are entirely different things. However, all interpretation includes information.
- III. Interpretation is an art, which combines many arts, whether the materials presented are scientific, historical, or architectural. Any art is in some degree teachable.
- IV. The chief aim of Interpretation is not instruction, but provocation.
- V. Interpretation should aim to present a whole rather than a part, and must address itself to the whole (person) rather than any phase.
- VI. Interpretation addresses to children (say, up to the age of twelve) should not be a dilution of the presentation to adults, but should follow a fundamentally different approach. To be at its best it will require a separate program.²⁰

A milestone in the standardization of interpretation, Tilden’s book, originally published in 1957, continues to influence and inform interpreters in the tools and techniques of interpretation. Interpretation in the National Park Service continued to develop, with ten interpretive goals adopted in 1962, and the beginning of publication of “NPS Interpreter’s Newsletter” in 1967. These steps

¹⁹ Ibid.

²⁰ Freeman Tilden, *Interpreting Our Heritage*, 3rd ed. (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1977), 9.

helped in the dissemination of interpretive practices service-wide. The major advances in interpretation came at a time when changes took place for the Lincoln Home as well.

After Kathleen Bradish retired in 1958, the State of Illinois employed professional curators to maintain the house. Concurrently, several legislators in the city of Springfield and the State of Illinois worked to get the home turned over to the federal government in an effort to get better custodianship of the home. Representative Paul Findley from Illinois worked within the U.S. Congress to pass legislation to turn over the home to the federal government. Findley’s efforts led to the NPS studying ways of interpreting the home in 1969. These efforts led to endorsement of the effort to transfer the home from the Secretary of the Interior, and eventual passage of legislation in 1971 to transfer the home to the NPS. The ceremonies to transfer the home took place on October 9, 1972, with President Richard Nixon signing the legislation from the desk Lincoln used while a state legislator. This legislation brought the Lincoln Home into the National Park Service, and brought interpretation of the home into the same system as the other national parks.

After falling under the auspices of the National Park Service, the home received an historic furnishings plan, which outlined the history of the home, and set about to place the house as the Lincoln family had it. Accompanied by period illustrations from *Leslie’s Illustrated Weekly*, this plan provided a road map for the interpretation of the home’s decorative and personal artifacts. In 1976, a final interpretive prospectus for the home was released, outlining the goals for the interpretation of the home. This document explained the importance of the home and the time Lincoln spent in Springfield in molding him into the man who led the country through the Civil War. The prospectus offers an interpretive theme, as well as four interpretive goals for the home. The site interpretation consisted of looking at the ways in which Lincoln changed from a small time country lawyer into a nationally recognized political figure. The prospectus states that “the commonness of Lincoln’s life here...is a veil through which we must look to discern the rather profound personal changes that

must have been taking place in (Lincoln) during these years.”²¹ The interpretive prospectus parallels the interpretation principles established service-wide by emphasizing the interpretation of the site and the happenings at the site as they pertain to broader national history.

The National Park Service began to centralize interpretive planning in the 1960s and 1970s, with development dollars going towards interpretive prospecti, such as the one for the Lincoln Home mentioned above. The prospectus “provided excellent direction for the design and production of interpretive facilities and media.”²² The late 1970s saw budget reductions in the Service, as well as a drive in the Service to get back to basics, with interpreters “challenged by management to show how programs supported basic park goals.”²³ This drive led to the implementation of an *Annual Statement for Interpretation (ASFI)* that each park would generate for itself. A look at the table of contents of several of these *ASFI* shows them to be more concerned with administrative functions and general management practices, and not so much with actual interpretive practices.²⁴ The outline of interpretive themes encompasses only two out of forty-eight pages in 1983-1984, and two out of forty-three pages in 1985. The lack of budget left interpretation at the home and in the parks stagnant for over a decade. Perusal of the archives of the Lincoln Home National Historic Site gleaned only the above-mentioned *ASFI* from 1983-1984 and 1985 for the decade of the 1980s. Work was done to maintain the integrity of the home, but the interpretation of the home changed little during this time.

The National Park Service began to rethink interpretation in the Service in 1994, when “a team of interpretation managers, supervisors, and planners began work on a new planning chapter

²¹ Department of the Interior, National Park Service, *Final Interpretive Prospectus: Lincoln Home National Historic Site/Illinois* (Washington, DC: GPO, 1976), 3.

²² Department of the Interior, National Park Service, *Comprehensive Interpretive Planning* (Washington, DC: GPO, 2000).

²³ *Ibid.*

²⁴ Robert F. Holmes, Chief, Interpretation and Visitor Services, Lincoln Home National Historic Site, *Annual Statement for Interpretation* (Springfield, 1983-1984) and Lincoln Home National Historic Site, *Annual Statement for Interpretation* (Springfield, 1985).

for ‘NPS-6: Interpretation and Visitor Service Guidelines.’”²⁵ This chapter, released the following year, served to consolidate the ideas concerning interpretation in the national parks that developed independently in the different parks. This consolidation produced the idea of *Comprehensive Interpretive Planning (CIP)*, published in 2000 and which serves to help “parks decide what their objectives are, who their audiences are, and what mix of media and personal services to use. The product is not the plan, but an effective and efficient interpretive program that achieves management goals, provides appropriate services for our visitors, and promotes visitor experiences.”²⁶ The *CIP* gives park superintendents the initiative to actively work to prepare interpretive goals for their parks that fit their own mission while still falling into the accepted practices of the NPS. In order to accomplish the steps outlined in *CIP*, each park is to create its own *Long Range Interpretive Plan (LRIP)*, which “defines the overall vision and long-term (five to ten years) interpretive goals of the park.”²⁷ The Lincoln Home recently completed writing its *LRIP*, and awaits approval from the NPS in Washington, D.C.²⁸ The *CIP* outlines how parks such as the Lincoln Home should go about creating their *LRIP*, describing the parts that each *LRIP* should include. The *CIP* also assigns responsibility for the *LRIP* to the Chief of Interpretation and his/her staff, and approval of the *LRIP* to the park Superintendent.

Just prior to the publication of the *CIP*, the Division of Interpretive Planning, Harper’s Ferry Center released *Planning for Interpretation and Visitor Experience*, a comprehensive guide for parks within and without the NPS to follow when creating and implementing an interpretive plan.²⁹ This publication outlines all of the parts that an interpretive plan should include, and goes into more detail than the *CIP* does. This guide describes the importance of goal-driven planning, and includes descriptions of

²⁵ Department of the Interior, National Park Service, *Comprehensive Interpretive Planning* (Washington, DC: GPO, 2000).

²⁶ *Ibid.*

²⁷ *Ibid.*

²⁸ Susan Haake, Curator of Collections, Lincoln Home National Historic Site, interview by author, 10 April 2003.

²⁹ Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Harper’s Ferry Center, *Planning for Interpretation and Visitor Experience* (Harper’s Ferry, 1998).

how to create interpretive themes, goals and objectives, as well as how to incorporate visitors into the planning and to utilize site resources when planning. This guide also gives recommendations for different media, facilities, and landscapes that can be used in interpretive planning.

The *2001 National Park Service Management Policies* include a chapter devoted to interpretation and education. The chapter begins by stating that “through interpretive and educational programs, the National Park Service will instill in park visitors an understanding, appreciation, and enjoyment of the significance of parks and their resources. Interpretive and educational programs will encourage the development of a personal stewardship ethic, and broaden public support for preserving park resources.”³⁰ This chapter outlines the components required for effective park interpretive and educational programs, interpretive planning, access for disabled persons, and partnerships with non-park persons and agencies. This document upholds the practices and procedures outlined in the *CIP* and the large *Planning for Interpretation and Visitor Experience*. The Lincoln Home, as a park in the National Park Service, utilizes these documents when planning for interpretation today.

The evolution of interpretation in the national parks and at the Lincoln Home National Historic Site follows a course that starts out divergent but converges with the introduction of the Lincoln Home into the National Park Service. The Lincoln Home has undergone many transitions to reach its status as an important national park, from Osborn Oldroyd’s capitalization on the site as a means of income, to the first steps towards restoration and the eventual acquisition of the home by the federal government. Interpreted very little at first, the Lincoln Home now falls under the interpretive guidance of the NPS. As custodians came and went at the site, great advances took place in interpretation in the National Parks. From the beginnings of interpretation by George Catlin and John Muir to the current initiative of *Comprehensive and Long Range Interpretive Planning*, the national parks served and continue to serve as the center for innovation in interpretation.

³⁰ Department of Interior, National Park Service, *2001 NPS Management Policies: Chapter 7: Interpretation and Education*. [Online]: <http://www.nps.gov/policy/mp/chapter7.htm>.

No longer concerned with capitalizing on the name of the 16th president, the Lincoln Home now serves at the forefront of historic interpretation and preservation. By reinventing itself in the 1990s and continuing to grow as the times change, the National Park Service created an approach to interpretation that serves as a model for parks and historic sites around the country and will continue to do so in the future. Parks such as the Lincoln Home National Historic Site serve as the front line of this reinvention and reinterpretation, and continue to explain the importance of the parks in the nation’s history. If what the author saw in touring the home recently holds for the future, and the parks continue to train their interpreters as well as the ones at the Lincoln Home, the parks will continue to set the standard for interpretation for years to come.³¹

³¹ Personal visit to the Lincoln Home National Historic Site, 24 April 2003.