HISTORIA

A PUBLICATION OF THE EPSILON MU CHAPTER
OF
PHI ALPHA THETA
AND THE
EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY
DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY

VOLUME 16
2007

**EDITORS:**

James Hysell

Michael Kleen

Mike Swinford

**EDITORIAL BOARD:**

Samantha Bjornback

Daniel Cuthbert

Amanda Evans

Stephen Sendejas

**FACULTY ADVISOR:**

Dr. Michael Shirley

## LETTER FROM THE EDITORS

Throughout its sixteen years of publication, *Historia* and its editors have made it their mission to create a journal that reflects the scholarly abilities of the students at Eastern Illinois University. This volume attempts to maintain that legacy, and provides a showcase of several of the finest examples of research and writing in the field of history. *Historia* received dozens of submissions this year; each one was well-written, intriguing, and a testament to the diligence and scholarship of the students at Eastern. But as editors of *Historia* we are entrusted with the unenviable task of choosing only a handful of papers for publication from this deep pool of worthy submissions. We sought to illustrate not only the depth of historical research that students engage in, but also the breadth of topics, and the wide range of methodology that they employ. In this volume the reader will find essays spanning a wide range of time periods, geographical locations, and techniques for analysis. With humble allegiance to *Historia's* enduring devotion to diversity, we have chosen articles from the ancient, early modern, and modern eras, in the history of Europe, Asia, the United States, and Latin America. Each of these essays employs unique analytical methods; ranging from the traditional tools of social or cultural history, or those of memory and material culture. In publishing these selections, we have hopefully revealed the variety and quality of historical research in which Eastern's students are engaged. Despite the vast array of diverse topics discussed in this volume, they are all united in their common purpose of revealing some aspect of the greater human story. It is that interest and devotion to humanity that drives all of the students of history at Eastern to produce the quality work that is sampled here. Therefore, with deepest gratitude to the students who submitted their work and the History faculty that provided the guidance and inspiration necessary to create such works, we proudly present the latest volume of *Historia.*

The Editors

# HISTORIA
# VOLUME 17
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

## TROUBLED STATE: BRITISH DECISIONS IN CREATING MODERN IRAQ

**Amanda Lempera**

Modern Iraq is a man-made product of the twentieth century. Prior to World War I the area was called Mesopotamia and was a collection of provinces in the Ottoman Empire. In World War I, Britain invaded the territory and held it after the war under a League of Nations Mandate. By the 1920's The British government had decided to group the provinces together to form Iraq, anticipating that the state would eventually function independent of the mandate system. What was discussed and understood is that each province contained a different group of people, a different culture altogether from the adjacent province. The provinces were grouped together to save money; in the interests of Britain, not the provinces. The tragedy of this mass grouping is that the Kurds of Northern Iraq, who also reside in several other modern day states, were left divided. This group of people was pushed aside in favor of what others desired and now they function as a nation without a state. The important thing to understand is that creating a state is a difficult task and this creation was strained by budget issues. Every angle of forming Iraq under the mandate was discussed in cost to Britain rather than what was best for the disparate peoples living there. The tragedy of the Kurds is that they were acknowledged, and then ignored. They were left to find their place among people unlike them in an artificially made state created by an imperial power to benefit itself, not the Kurds or their neighbors.

Britain's interest in the area called Mesopotamia began with oil. In 1904, the British Navy was facilitated a plan to change from coal power to oil power. The change would primarily make the ships faster, but it would also quell fears that British coal

reserves were running out. In 1908 oil was discovered in Persia, a British area of influence in the Middle East, adjacent to Mesopotamia. Winston Churchill, as First Lord of the Admiralty, made it his mission to get Parliament to approve joining with Persia to form the Anglo-Persian oil company. The company would allow Britain to have oil in exchange for providing infrastructure to Persia. In early 1914 Churchill had finally received permission from Parliament and the company was in motion. Late in 1914, as the world entered into war, the British felt it necessary to invade neighboring Mesopotamia, in the Ottoman vilayet of Basra. The vilayet was the southernmost region of Mesopotamia and would create a buffer between Ottoman-Turkish forces and British oil interests in Persia.[1]

In the game of alliances the Ottoman Empire often sided with Britain for protection from Russia. In World War I, Britain and Russia allied together creating a dilemma for the Ottoman Turks. In 1914, Winston Churchill was worried about where the Turks would side. His response was to confiscate two Dreadnaught ships being built for the Turks. The Turks did not receive the Dreadnaught ships they had been promised from the British. Soon afterward the Turks decided to ally with Germany, but it is unclear whether Churchill's actions directly contributed or not. In any case, the British were then at war with the Turks who were the nearest threat to new British oil holdings.[2]

The Ottoman Empire, often referred to as the "sick man of Europe," had been artificially propped up by Europeans for over a century. The empire made a convenient buffer between Western Europe and Russia. Because the empire was considered so weak, defeating the Turks seemed like more of an inconvenience than anything. The first plan to disable the Turks was a swift push to their capital, Constantinople. The best route

*Amanda Lempera, from Manhattan, Illinois, is a senior History major and a member of Phi Alpha Theta. She wrote this paper for Dr. Michael Shirley's History 2500, Historical Research and Writing, in the Fall of 2006.*

[1]Sara Reguer, "Persian Oil and the First Lord: A Chapter in the Career of Winston Churchill." *Military Affairs 46*, no. 3 (October 1982): 134-137.

[2]Christopher Catherwood, *Churchill's Folly: How Winston Churchill Created Modern Iraq* (New York: Carroll and Graf, 2004), 34.

involved an invasion of the Dardanelles strait. The European side was named Gallipoli. The plan for this infamous battle was developed by Winston Churchill. This battle badly bruised Churchill's political career when the invasion turned out to be a disaster. It was a disaster because the Turks were underestimated, the British never achieved naval superiority, and the battle was unlike the trench warfare the British were accustomed to on the Western front. The drive to Constantinople was not completed as the British and Australian troops took heavy casualties and retreated. Churchill lost his post as First Lord of the Admiralty after the debacle, hence the bruising of his career. With the failure to take Constantinople the British turned to the Middle East as a path to defeat the Turks.[3]

This is where the invasion of Basra comes into play. Christopher Catherwood posited it had been motivated equally by desire for oil and Ottoman land, but few other historians hold this view. Most see Persian oil or the possibility of Mesopotamian oil as driving factors behind the invasion of Basra, therefore leaving out the land angle. The desire for land that Catherwood references, however, is not a figment of his imagination. After invading, the British had high hopes to cultivate the land, even if only to save money by using it to feed the troops deployed there.[4] Whatever the motivation, the British eventually invaded Basra in 1915. William Polk points out this probably would have been good enough to ensure the security of the Persian oilfields. Polk claims the later decision to push north to Baghdad was a product of a mix of overambitious and unruly generals and intelligence that the Turks intended to attack British forces in Basra. The thinking by the generals, it seemed, thought it best to have a buffer for our buffer.[5]

The decision to go to Baghdad created another British debacle. The British troops did well on their way North from Basra, but stalled just outside Baghdad in late 1915. There, General Townsend and his battalions encountered Turkish troops and were forced to retreat back to al Kut, where they sat besieged for four months. Eventually the British surrendered and were marched out.

The Arab revolt of 1916 could not have come at better time. Mesopotamian Arabs were irritated with Ottoman rule, and they decided to fight back. Not surprisingly, the British, along with Australians, aided the Arabs in whatever ways they could. The revolt was not strong enough to allow the British to take Baghdad, but as luck would have it, just as the revolt was fizzling the United States entered the war on the Allied side. The Americans did not fight in Mesopotamia, but their large contribution in the Western theater freed up resources that could be diverted to the Middle East for Britain. Consequently the British pushed through Baghdad claiming the entire Baghdad vilayet and part of the Mosul vilayet farther north.[6]

The British never fully captured the Mosul vilayet. However, in October 1918 Britain obtained control through the Armistice.[7] They occupied the area, but the Turks did not let go that easily and later the League of Nations decided Britain should have it.[8] Britain was now in control of three formerly Ottoman vilayets. The new British colonial government maintained most of the Ottomans' original political organization. Each conquered area was made into a vilayet. In this way each vilayet was often a state or province-type creation that was in agreement with the groupings people had made for themselves in the past. This system kept people with a group they had already felt close to or comfortable with. The three vialyets Britain took had little in

[3]Ibid., 35.

[4]Ibid.

[5]William R. Polk, *Understanding Iraq: The Whole Sweep of Iraqi History, From Genghis Khan's Mongols to the Ottoman Turks to the British Mandate to the American Occupation* (New York: Harper Collins, 2005), 70.

[6] Catherwood, *Churchill's Folly*, 52-55.

[7]Nader Entessar, *Kurdish Ethnonationalism* (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 1992), 49.

[8]C.J. Edmonds, "Kurdish Nationalism." *Journal of Contemporary History 6*, no. 1 (1971): 88.

common except they happened to be near one another. Each was an autonomous unit. The Basra vilayet in the south was an Arab Shia Muslim area, the Baghdad Vilayet was an Arab mostly Sunni Muslim area, and the Mosul vilayet was a mostly Kurdish Sunni area. As the war drew to a close it became apparent the British would have to find a way to either put them together or figure out a way to keep them separate.[9]

In looking at the three, it appears that Basra and Baghdad could possibly live as one due to their Arab backgrounds. Polk argues the fears of "Pan-Islam" or as it is now known, pan-Arab nationalism, motivated Britain to go to Basra in the first place. The British feared an uprising of all Arab peoples and Muslims. This could cause issues in both Africa and India. To stop the uprising before it began, they decided they needed to control the Middle East, the center of the Pan-Islamic movement.[10] To what extent this is true cannot be determined, but the British were aware of a common bond Arabs felt with one another. It is easy then to see why they would naturally put the Arab vilayets together. This union of Basra and Baghdad from now on will be referred to as Iraq because it is the first piece to the puzzle of modern Iraq. What was not so obvious was what to do with the Kurds in Mosul.

The Kurds are not an Arab people. Racially Aryan, like the Persians, they are Muslim, but are Sunni, unlike the Shi'a Persians. The other vilayets of Iraq were mostly Sunni, but the Kurds felt uncomfortable with them because they were Arab.[11] The Kurds are a people consistently acknowledged as separate from their neighbors who get pushed around, divided up, and ignored by them.[12] There are many myths that explain the emergence of the Kurds as a people, but the history is traced back by their calendar. The calendar began with the Kurds'

defeat of the Assyrians almost 3000 years ago.[13] The Kurds are dispersed among modern day Iran, Turkey, Russia, Iraq, and others. They are a proud and militaristic people, often defeating neighboring Arabs and staying on top of military technology and advances.[14] The most important thing to remember about the Kurds is their fiercely separate identity from others around them. Also it is important to note they are not the only ones who believe this. Many other peoples and nations, the Arabs among them, have acknowledged this difference, even if it is hard to explain and trace the origins.[15]

When dealing with Mosul and the Kurds within it, the British had conflicted interests. Helen Chapin Metz asserts the British wanted Mosul to be included in Iraq because oil was there.[16] Most any historian will give this some validity. Steven C. Pelletrie believes in the oil theory as well. What makes his argument different is he believed the British acknowledged the Kurds deserved their own state. They had proved this by including the Kurds in the Treaty of Sévres, to be discussed later, but ultimately it was more convenient to include them in Iraq and take the oil.[17] But perhaps the most interesting assessment is Catherwood's; he does not merely speculate, but shows some good evidence to support his claim that Britain would rather just give up Mosul. By "Britain" he means Churchill who had become secretary of War and Air by 1919. By the time a true decision would be made in Iraq he would lead the discussion as the Secretary of State for the Middle East. In a letter Churchill wrote, but never sent, he calls for Western powers to all leave the Middle East. What he later said out loud was, "The cost of Military establishment in Mesopotamia appears to me to be out of all proportion to any advantage we can ever expect to reap

---

[9]Catherwood, *Churchill's Folly*, 25.

[10]Polk, *Understanding Iraq*, 68.

[11]Stephen C. Pelletiere, *The Kurds: An Unstable Element in the Gulf* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1984), 19.

[12]Edgar O'Ballance, *The Kurdish Struggle 1920-1994* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1996), 3.

[13]John Bulloch and Harvey Morris, *No Friends But the Mountains: The Tragic History of the Kurds* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992), 50-59.

[14]O'Ballance, *The Kurdish Struggle*, 5.

[15]Bulloch and Morris, *No Friends But the Mountains*, 50-51.

[16]Helen Chapin Metz, ed., *Iraq: A Country Study* (Washington D.C.: Federal Research Division, Library of Congress, 1990), 38.

[17]Pelletiere, *The Kurds*, 58.

from that country."[18] Churchill did allude to oil as well, but was so concerned with limiting the military presence in Iraq, thereby limiting the budget, that he would do most anything to meet that end.[19] What was not discussed here were the people who lived in what would become Iraq.

So far only preliminary discussions of the Iraq question have been noted. The first real step to deciding on what Iraq would become was the Treaty of Sévres in 1918. The details of this treaty were configured in 1918 after the armistice was signed between the allies and the Turks, but it was never implemented. The treaty, although never used, is important to the Kurds because it validated their feelings that they should have their own state, meaning Mosul should not have been included in Iraq. To start, it is best to explain there are conflicting views on how the Kurds were able to get included in the treaty. It is also helpful to understand what the treaty said about the Kurds. Article 62 laid out a three-month time line to grant the Kurds autonomy and defined where that state should be. Article 64 said that the Kurdish state, within one year of gaining autonomy, needed to go to the League of Nations to show that the majority of the population desired independence. If the League feels they are capable, the independence will be granted at that time.[20]

Three historians have weighed in about the Kurds inclusion in the treaty. Edgar O'Ballance argues the Kurds were taken by surprise in 1918. He says they were not inclined toward a modern form of nationalism and therefore were not prepared for division after the fall of the Ottoman Empire. He also includes that they were not organized enough to take advantage of the new idea of "self-determination" and demand their autonomy.[21] This implies the British were concerned about the Kurds enough

to include concessions for their autonomy. In direct contrast to O'Ballance is W.G. Eliphinston's view. Eliphinston supports the idea there was a group of Kurds that organized during the war that contacted the Allies in 1918. This contact raised awareness of the Kurds and of their ability to organize that got them included in the treaty.[22] David McDowall falls somewhere in the middle of the previous arguments. McDowall asserts the tribal leaders of certain tribes did work with the British, but there was no greater Kurdish unity. At the tribal level these particular Aghas, or leaders, felt comfortable with the British rule because they were leaving the nomadic life in exchange for city life. They were westernizing. By the time they organized themselves together and realized they would prefer autonomy it was too late.[23] McDowall's moderate interpretation is the best of the three. Not only does it take into account both of the other arguments' extremes, but it rectifies them together to form a story that makes sense.

The Treaty of Sévres validated the Kurds' desire for autonomy, but it was never put into place. The blame for dropping the treaty is typically put in the hands of the Turks, therefore blaming them for the failure to make Mosul independent of Iraq. Something else to note is the Kurds in Turkey were to be joined with the Kurds in Mosul to create a greater Kurdistan. When the treaty was dropped, a Greater Kurdistan was not created and so the Kurds in Turkey remained in Turkey and the Kurds in Mosul in Mosul.[24] There were also Kurds in Russia and Persia. If Mosul was to become part of Iraq the Kurds would then be a nation without a state. They would be spread all over forming a distinct minority in a handful of separate states. If indeed the treaty was passed and the Kurds in Mosul and Turkey united, then half of the world's Kurds would

---

[18]Catherwood, *Churchill's Folly,* 73-74.

[19]Ibid., 75.

[20]W.G. Eliphinston, "The Kurdish Question," *Royal Institute of International Affairs 22,* no. 1 (January 1946): 95.

[21]O'Ballance, *The Kurdish Struggle,* 12-13.

[22]Eliphinston, "The Kurdish Question," 95.

[23]David McDowall, *A Modern History of the Kurds* (London: I.B. Tauris, 1996), 151.

[24]Nigel, Davidson, "The Termination of the Iraq Mandate," *Royal Institute of International Affairs 12,* no. 1 (January 1933): 75.

reside in a Kurd-dominated state. After the Treaty of Sévres was scrapped the Kurds joined with the Armenians, an ethnic group in much the same situation as the Kurds, and lobbied at the Paris Peace Conference in 1919 for the right to self determination.[25] The Kurds were not a priority at the peace conference and the "Kurdish problem" seemed forgotten. In the Treaty of Lausane, the final treaty with Turkey signed in 1923, the Kurds were never mentioned.[26] The decision on the Kurds was already made by 1923. The Cairo Conference of 1921 had concluded what would happen to the Mosul vilayet.

In October 1920, Sir Percy Cox became the High Commissioner of Baghdad. He became the standout personality of the Cairo Conference which commenced on March 12th, 1921. Many of the decisions made at the conference are linked directly back to him and to Winston Churchill. Churchill ran the conference as the Secretary of State for the Middle East, but Cox is regarded as the architect of modern Iraq.[27] Toby Dodge goes so far as to assert Cox is to blame for creating and accepting plans for Iraq.[28] In reality Churchill and the thirty-nine other delegates at the conference also had a hand in planning Iraq. By Churchill's direction the conference focused on a solution to the Iraq problem under the theme of saving Britain money. The whole conference then was focused on the vilayets of Basra, Baghdad, and Mosul. All decisions were discussed in relation to cost of maintenance, the men hoped to create a state they could control on the cheap. Britain was in control of the area under a League of Nations mandate, so the delegates had to come to some conclusion on what to do with the area. It was a British responsibility.

---

[25]Edmund Ghareeb, *The Kurdish Question in Iraq* (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 1981), 6.

[26]Pelletiere, *The Kurds*, 53.

[27]Bulloch and Morris, *No Friends But the Mountains*, 88.

[28]Toby Dodge, *Inventing Iraq: The Failure of Nation-Building and a History Denied* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2003), 21.

The idea of a separate Kurdistan being made of the Mosul province was an attractive idea. It would serve as a buffer between British Iraq and Turkey. Churchill supported this because he was concerned about how an Arab leader would treat the Kurds if they were included in Iraq. Also, he feared the Kurds would never accept an Arab ruler. He worried they desired a separate Kurdistan so bad they would fight for it. This would cause an issue because a Kurd revolt would cost more money, something Churchill was desperately trying to avoid. Cox opposed this whole-heartedly. He pushed the unitary state idea and it was granted, perhaps because he was able to make it seem more cost efficient. Cox argued there was no obvious leader for the Kurds as there was for the Arabs. In addition, the Kurds of Mosul would be alone, without the Kurds from Turkey, making the state too small to support and defend itself when the British left. The British would have to stay in Mosul for some time to ensure protection, an expensive venture. In the interest of saving money, the conference decided to include all three vilayets into one state and Iraq was born.[29]

The Cairo Conference has some critics due to the nature of the state they created. Iraq has been unstable and turbulent throughout its short history as a cohesive state. Elizabeth Monroe has said the conference was working for, "An Arab façade with complete British control of administration and finance."[30] This interpretation coincides with arguments that the British were there for oil, not just to administer a mandate. An Arab façade was a great way to install a pro-British government to continue getting the oil, and cheaply too. Also, the pro British government would help the British control the population, another way to save money on military support. Catherwood calls the conference a dilemma between officials who backed a truly independent Kurdish state and those who cared only about

---

[29]Catherwood, *Churchill's Folly*, 128-149, and Aaron S. Klieman, *Foundations of British Policy in the Arab World: The Cairo Conference of 1921* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1970), 110.

[30]Elizabeth Monroe, *Britain's Movement in the Middle East 1914-1956* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1963), 53.

British imperial ambitions.[31] Given the differences of opinion of Churchill and Cox, Catherwood has made a good argument. Nader Entessar thinks the idea of a pro-British government in Iraq simply became more important than Kurdish independence or autonomy.[32] This ties in with Monroe's ideas. No matter what the idea it is clear the Kurds were shoved aside in favor of a scheme that was better for Britain. This is not terribly controversial in itself. Given the time frame and Britain's imperial nature, the decision to form Iraq around what is best for Britain would have been obvious to the men at the Cairo Conference.

It is easy to place blame on the men of the Cairo conference for creating a state that could not function properly. Making a state is a challenging task. The delegates did take into account the cultural differences of each vilayet; they just could not seem to come up with a suitable solution to group them. Perhaps the blame is on Turkey for not allowing its Kurds to join the Mosul vilayet. The blame for the failure of a state is a heavy burden to bear. The men in both the Cairo Conference and the men making decisions in Turkey did the best they could with what they knew. No one could have foreseen all the problems of the future. Had these men been able to see the future of Iraq they may have done something differently, but this was not the case. The founding of Iraq was based more in saving money than in looking out for the populations there. Now that Iraq is formed, and failing, it is best to understand why from its origins. Iraq has clearly been troubled from the start. The grouping together of different ethnicities into one state has created different kinds of nationalism. Kurdish nationalism spars with Arab nationalism farther south. There is no cohesive Iraqi nationalism, and perhaps this is one problem that will never be solved. Iraq was constructed as an arbitrary state with three distinct nations to save money rather than to benefit the peoples there.

---

[31]Catherwood, *Churchill's Folly*, 125.
[32]Entessar, *Kurdish Ethnonationalism*, 51.

## CULTURAL AND RACIAL STEREOTYPES ON THE MIDWAY

**Josh Cole**

In 1893 the World's Columbian Exposition opened in Chicago. This fair was not the first of its kind, but it was the first one to take place in the Midwest.[1] Chicago was viewed as the industrial capital of the region, so it made perfect sense for it to host one of the most extravagant spectacles of the nineteenth century. The fair itself was divided into two separate parts—the White City and the Midway Plaisance. The White City represented white, middle-class American society, while the Midway served a completely different purpose. The Midway served as both an "educational" example of inferior civilizations and as an amusement for the paying spectators. By examining the numerous exhibits and racialized "others" on the Midway, one is able to see exactly how strong these feelings of Anglo-Saxon superiority were on a national scale. Racial and cultural stereotypes were widespread on the Midway, and they were upheld by nearly all of the spectators and organizers. Therefore, the Midway serves as an excellent case study of both social and cultural history.

### The Organizers and Visual Culture

Frederic Ward Putnam of Harvard University headed the fair's anthropology section, with the assistance of Franz Boas. Their primary intent for the Midway was to make it educational for the spectators, and they hired a young man by the name of Sol Bloom to provide the Midway with this focus. Bloom frustrated Boas and Putnam; opting to bring entertainment, based on what he had seen in Paris in 1889, to the Midway instead. While Putnam and the fair board treated race in a

---

*Josh Cole is a graduate student in History from Tuscola, Illinois, and a member of Phi Alpha Theta. He wrote this paper for Dr. Lynne Curry in History 4950, Industrial America, in the Spring of 2006.*

[1]The battle for the privilege of hosting the exposition had been between the East and the West; Chicago had faced strong competition from New York. David F. Burg, *Chicago's White City of 1893* (Lexington: The University Press of Kentucky, 1976), 42-43.

traditional hegemonic manner, placing the advanced technology of the Anglo-Saxon race at the center of the fairgrounds and the displays of the lesser races farther away from the center, Bloom's Midway relished the opportunity to make money from its commercialized exoticism.[2]

Bloom organized and coordinated the exhibits in accordance with racial and cultural stereotypes of the time. He knew that white Americans would simply be shocked and appalled with foreign and mysterious races and cultures while also being intrigued by their own curiosities. Exhibits were a very popular form of amusement during the era of industrialization. People did not just want to read about other lifestyles and exotic places, but they would rather like to experience them with their own senses. This notion was captured by Jacob Riis' *How the Other Half Lives*. In it, Riis visually detailed the slums of New York with photographs as well as words. David Leviatin, the most recent editor of Riis' masterpiece, believes that it offered its readers "a spellbinding glimpse of America's future." By skillfully combining word and picture, Riis managed to capture a view of society that revealed modern America's vision of progress, and one that established Anglo-Saxons at the top of civilization.[3]

The transformation of the urban daily newspaper, the astonishing success of George Eastman's line of Kodak products, the growth of advertising, the popularity of the mail-order catalog, and the rise of the national illustrated magazine all helped to create an exciting new visual culture saturated with graphic images, as Riis' work demonstrated. These new realistic images were designed to entice the eye—to make viewers stop, look, and buy.[4] The world's fair in Chicago was no exception, and Bloom wanted to amaze and shock the visitors with

something that they had never witnessed before—a visual hierarchy of race with Anglo-Saxons at the top of civilization. He planned to hit the jackpot with the notion that public spectacles such as the circus-like Midway were cultural phenomena, and he became rich as a direct result of it.[5]

### Imperialism

The overriding view on American foreign policy before the world's fair was one that stressed isolation. People in power wanted to concentrate on American economics and politics at home rather than getting involved in other countries' affairs. The world's fair was the result of a change in mindset of the American public. The citizens of the United States realized that their economy would never live up to its full potential if their aims were not set outside of their national borders as well as overseas. Only then would America be recognized as a true "world power."

Social historian Robert Rydell believes that the Midway offered legitimacy to an imperialistic view of the world, and one that would recognize America as a world power. It allowed Americans, whether it be elites or lower-class citizens, to establish their cultural hegemony as whites. Its anthropologically-validated racial hierarchy served several purposes during this time. It legitimized racial exploitation at home and the creation of an empire abroad. Spectators identified the exhibited peoples as primitives who could be conquered by the superior Anglo-Saxon race. The inferior races could only be improved by association with white Americans, and the foreign peoples would surely be open to the adoption of an industrially superior and civilized religion, government, and culture. Rudyard Kipling referred to this yearning as the "white man's burden," and Teddy Roosevelt bought into the idea as well. As Roosevelt saw it the United States was engaged in a millennial drama of manly racial advancement, in which American men "enacted their superior manhood" by asserting

---

[2]Robert Rydell, John E. Findling, and Kimberly D. Pelle, *Fair America: World's Fairs in the United States* (Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press, 2000), 38-39.

[3]Jacob A. Riis, *How the Other Half Lives*, ed. David Leviatin (New York: Bedford Books, 1996), 9-10.

[4]Ibid., 24-25.

[5]Ibid., 40-43.

imperialistic control over races of inferior manhood, to prove their virility, as a race and a nation. American men needed to take up the "strenuous life" and strive to advance civilization – through imperialistic warfare and racial violence if necessary.[6]

I agree with Rydell that imperialism played a major role on the Midway, for all of the evidence already mentioned. Carefully designed exhibits of the nonwhites on the Midway illustrated ideas that had been used to justify the political and economic repression of Native Americans, African-Africans, and Asian-Americans. These ideas of conquering, nurturing, and ultimately exploiting less civilized peoples were then used to validate American imperial policy overseas. The emphasis on white supremacy created a combined sense of nationalism and racism for Anglo-Saxons.[7] The world's fair was a direct result of these feelings of nationalism and racism, and they were utilized more dramatically after 1893. The United States went to war with Spain in 1898, and the victory gave America a position in the western Pacific (the Philippines) which made it a sort of Asiatic colonial power. However, America was not satisfied, and used force to eventually make Hawaii a United States territory in February of 1900. Secretary of State John Milton Hay's "Open Door" Policy indicated that America wished to have an influence in China, and this was reinforced in the United States sending 2,500 troops to the international army sent to restore order there in 1900.[8] Teddy Roosevelt also acted upon his imperialistic desires, helping Panama to declare independence from Colombia in exchange for control of the Panama Canal Zone.

### In the Name of Science and Education

Americans did not want the Midway to simply be a symbol of imperialistic desires, so all of its exhibits were classified under

---

[6]Paul Kennedy, "The United States as New Kid on the Block, 1890-1940," *Major Problems in Gilded Age and program Era,* ed. Leon Fink (New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 2001), 287.

[7]Ibid., 235-236.

[8]Ibid., 276-277.

the supervision of the Department of Ethnology and Archaeology, which gave them an air of scientific respectability; instruction and entertainment complemented each other on the Midway. The exhibits were organized to include "the civilized, the half civilized, and the savage worlds" in a racial hierarchy leading to a future utopia. Visitors passed between the walls of medieval villages, between mosques and pagodas, past the dwellings of colonial days, and past the cabins of South Seas Islanders and the Javanese, among them hints of ruder and more barbaric environments.[9] It was hailed as a great object lesson in anthropology by leading anthropologists in America, and it provided visitors with an ethnological, scientific sanction for the stereotypical American view of the nonwhite world as barbaric and childlike.[10]

At the fair in Chicago, visitors could witness and even take part in the scientific observation, of and research on, the racial characteristics of the exhibited peoples on the Midway. Phrenology, craniology, physiognomy, and anthropometry shared the assumption that in the outward shape and physical appearance of the body and the inner character—of different races, but also of criminals, prostitutes, and deviants—was manifest. These "scientific" methods are generally understood to be unacceptable in modern society, yet they held significant credibility during the late nineteenth century. The outward shape of the subject's body had to be measured and mapped meticulously. The results of these findings were collected, measured, classified, and filed at the fair's laboratory. At the same time this was occurring in Chicago, anthropological societies and museums of natural history around the nation accumulated tens of thousands of native skulls of exotic peoples in an effort to prove that these "scientific" practices clearly

---

[9]John R. McRae, "Oriental Verities on the American Frontier: The 1893 World's Parliament of Religions and the Thought of Mason Abe," *Buddhist-Christian Studies* 11 (1991): 11-12.

[10]Robert Rydell, *All the World's A Fair: Visions of Empire at American International Exhibitions, 1876-1916* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984), 40.

illustrated differences between the superior Anglo-Saxon race and inferior foreign races by physical measurements.[11]

*Evolutionary Scale of Civilization*

The World's Columbian Exposition in Chicago was not the first fair to use cultural and racial stereotypes as inspirations for their exhibits, whether it be for scientific experiments or ethnological observations. The world's fair in Paris was a major inspiration for the Midway in Chicago. Robert Rydell recognized the significance of these fairs. "These events," Rydell says of the expositions, "were triumphs of hegemony as well as symbolic edifices." As symbolic universes the fairs legitimate the "world order" they create. For Rydell, this symbolic universe represented in ethnological exhibits, was the product of a union between "Darwinian theories about racial development and utopian dreams about America's material and national progress." In the exhibits fairgoers could walk from white-civilization to dark barbarity, and experience the notion of social Darwinism for themselves. The Midway emphasized the inferiority of exotic and primitive races, while the White City showed the evident superiority of the industrialized white American race.[12]

Amusements on the Midway were based on the practices of the "inferior" ethnic groups or segments of a colony's population. For instance, all Native Americans might be thought to wear feather bonnets or all the inhabitants of French West Africa to be like the Dahomeyans shown at so many other exhibitions. These impressions were reinforced if the people on display were housed in structures associated with only one group—the wigwam, the igloo, the grass hut, the Indochinese temple, or the West African mud stockade. Organizers relied on these stereotypes of exotic peoples to attract more visitors who

---

[11]Raymond Corbey, "Ethnographic Showcases, 1870-1930," *Cultural Anthropology* 8, No. 3 (August 1993): 354-355.

[12]Meg Armstrong, "A Jumble of Foreignness": The Sublime Musayums of Nineteenth-Century Fairs and Expositions," *Cultural Critique* 23 (Winter 1992-1993): 207.

wanted to see differing and primitive lifestyles.[13] The different lifestyles of colonial natives became standard fanfare at many expositions for the "education" and entertainment of westerners. The spectators and natives figured as categories in what Raymond Corbey considers western representations of "Self," or characters in the story of the ascent to civilization, depicted as "the inevitable triumph of higher races over lower ones and as progress through science and imperial conquest."

Ethnologist Charles Rau, who observed the Midway in Chicago, stated that "the extreme lowness of our remote ancestors cannot be a source of humiliation; on the contrary, we should glory in our having advanced so far above them, and recognize the great truth that progress is the law that governs the development of mankind."[14] This statement serves as evidence that these sentiments of white superiority over exotic and foreign civilizations were shared by both the common people and the elites in American and western society. Lower- and middle-class citizens did not feel that their racist views were immoral or bigoted because they were supported by some of the most famous and established intellectuals in nineteenth-century society.

The living exhibits on the Midway were typically organized on a scale from civilized to barbaric so that the lower- and middle- class citizens could easily see the distinction between civilization and barbarism. The lower a people, or race, was deemed to be by white America the further removed it was from the "Indian school" that marked one pole of the scale, or that of civilization, and thus closer to the White City. Philippine Igorots and African Pygmies were situated near the pole of barbarity at the other end of the scale, and referred to as the ultimate bottom dwellers on the evolutionary ladder and furthest away from the White City. These peoples were presented in all of their

---

[13]Burton Benedict, "International Exhibitions and National Identity," *Anthropology Today* 7, No. 3 (June 1991): 8.

[14]Corbey, "Ethnographic Showcases, 1870-1930," 341-342.

uncivilized horror, to be jeered and hissed at by the paying customers.[15]

Social historian Robert Muccigrosso also notes this particular assemblage of foreign villages clustered along the Midway. He and many other critics of the Midway assert that the arrangement of these Midway settlements exhibited racial and ethnic biases and were consciously designed to proclaim the superiority of white culture. They charge that officials intentionally arranged for non-Western exhibits to be closer to the "black" city (Chicago) and farthest from the White City. According to these critics, this represented a ranking of cultural achievements, or a microcosm of the world of imperialism that exalted westerners over non-westerners.[16]

I agree with Muccigrosso's assessment that the placement of non-western exhibits was deliberately placed closer to the "black" city because this is exactly what Sol Bloom had in mind. The exotic and unknown peoples were arranged this way in order to represent their complete backwardness compared to the elegance of the White City. White City officials were not comfortable with its close proximity to the Midway due to its denigrating characteristics, so the two were placed as far away from each other as possible in order to maintain the purity and innocence of the industrialized White City.

Harlow N. Higinbotham, president of the board of directors of the Columbian Exposition, rationalized the Midway in his official report published five years after the fair concluded. His description of the fair's organization reinforced this separation of the Midway from the White City for moral reasons. He argued that "the eye and mind need[ed] relief" from the Court of Honor in the White City. The Midway granted the "opportunity for isolating...special features, thus preventing jarring contrasts between the beautiful buildings and the illimitable exhibits on the one hand, and the amusing, distracting, ludicrous, and noisy

attractions" on the other. The low or popular culture of exotic and foreign peoples, in his mind, must not violate the sanctity of high white, industrialized culture.[17] Higinbotham, as well as other elite board members, is the reason why the Midway was allowed to racially and culturally stereotype other groups of people and heavily profit from it. The Midway institutionalized the concept of Anglo-Saxon racial supremacy and the uninterrupted progress of Western civilization and its organizers transferred this ideology to the organization of the fairgrounds.

Although the exhibited peoples were isolated due to their "low culture" as Higinbotham describes, they served several functions on the Midway. The American firm William Foote & Co. African American Characters exploited a show with African-Americans—as the letterhead of the firm stated—appearing as "Savages, Slaves, Soldiers, and Citizens." Crafts, hunting techniques, rituals, dances, and songs were among the activities staged, as well as stereotypical "authentic" performances like warfare, cannibalistic acts, and head-hunting. Igorots from the Philippines could be seen eating dog meat, a food taboo in the west, while African Pygmies illustrated decapitation. The Dahomey "Amazons," heavily armed, simulated fights for the amusement of the white visitors. Aborigines from Queensland, Australia were described on posters as cannibals and bloodthirsty monsters, further fueling the stereotype of them and other black peoples as animalistic abhorrences of nature.[18]

### *Egyptian and Dahomeyan Women, and the Media's National Influence*

These exhibits were meant to entertain the public, and the Midway certainly was full of amusements. It contained sensational spectacles such as exotic dance shows and racialized "others" performing their daily tasks. One of the most popular stops on the Midway was Little Egypt, which offered the exotic female as an object of sexual desire, clearly reflected in the form

---

[15]Ibid., 345.

[16]Robert Muccigrosso, *Celebrating the New World: Chicago's Columbian Exposition of 1893* (Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, Inc., 1993), 164.

[17]Ibid., 154.

[18]Corbey, "Ethnographic Showcases, 1870-1930," 347.

of the "hootchy-cootchy" dance.[19] The women who performed these dances were linked to the ancient sphinx in printed media at the time, whether it was through writing or photography. The sphinx was not only a creature that was thought to be half-woman and half-beast, but also timeless and lifeless.

Popular white media sources did not stop there with their depictions, however. They also compared the modern Egyptian woman to Cleopatra, reinforcing the perception of these women as unchanging and timeless. This linking of the modern Egyptian woman with ancient monuments and thousand-year-old Cleopatras imprisoned her in a time capsule. Her clothing and expression were seen as part of her bondage at the same time that the stereotypical statements of the press served only to seal her in a civilization of the past. Meg Armstrong believes that this portrayal of the Egyptian woman made her less individualistic and more mythical while also making her more "masculine" as her powerlessness was unveiled to the white, superior public.[20]

While observing these exotic women on the Midway, white spectators also viewed them through their own definition of Anglo-Saxon beauty. Dahomeyan women had "dusky beauty" and "savagery" and were commonly depicted in *Midway Types*, a widely circulated *Chicago Times* portfolio of the exhibited people on the Midway. In addition to being viewed as the "savage tigresses" of the Midway, Dahomeyan women were depicted as lacking in the beauty and grace ascribed to favored races; one Amazon was ridiculed for carelessly dangling her legs over the edge of a hammock that was carrying her along the Midway. Impressionable young, white men were warned that dances and songs performed by these women, who enacted risqué caricatures of feminine allure, as one guidebook held, "deprive you of a peaceful night's rest for months to come."[21] The

---

[19]Armstrong, "A Jumble of Foreignness," 209.

[20]Ibid., 213-214.

[21]Judy Sund, "Columbus and Columbia in Chicago, 1893: Man of Genius Meets Generic Woman," *The Art Bulletin* 75, No. 3 (September 1993): 450-451.

intricacies and precision of these exotic dances and rituals by these foreign seductresses mesmerized many male spectators.[22] Beauty on the Midway was determined by the eye of the white beholder, and this beauty was used as a common measure of civilization at the exposition. Dahomeyan women were gaped at in curiosity and awkward amusement as representatives from a non-industrial, non-Christian society during the era of social Darwinism.[23]

However, they still managed to become real, living persons through personalized use of their names in the newspapers.[24] As propaganda to bolster white claims to racial superiority, the newspapers served to convince fairgoers of what they might have missed at their first observation and, aided by racist narratives, how they were supposed to think when confronting the image of any exotic visitor.[25] The "Chinese Beauty" received little to no commentary in the media, while the "Javanese Beauty" was of a "people who were favorite types of study for all who visited them, their small stature, gentle ways and marked air of contentment winning the liking of all who saw them."[26] The status of nations as savage or civilized was determined by white superiors. The whiter the particular race was, the more beautiful the people were represented as a whole. Beautiful people were stereotyped as more civilized and closer to assimilation of American ideals as compared to darker-skinned Africans, for example.

Reporter and journalist Marian Shaw went through the entire fairgrounds and noted her own personal feelings, particularly on the backwardness of the Chinese and other races

---

[22]*Chicago Daily Herald* (University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign Library; Chicago: Stuart Paddock, July 9, 1893, text-fiche), 25.

[23]*Chicago Tribune* (University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign Library; Chicago: David Hiller, August 16, 1893, text-fiche), 1.

[24]*Chicago Herald* (University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign Library; Chicago: Stuart Paddock, August 19, 1893, text-fiche), 2.

[25]*Chicago Evening Post* (University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign Library; Chicago: Melville E. Stone, September 16, 1893, text-fiche), 5.

[26]Armstrong, ""A Jumble of Foreignness," 220-221.

and cultures exhibited on the Midway. She visited Old Cairo Street, where camels roamed around the campgrounds or donkeys "driven by barefooted, yelling little Arabs, who, clad in long, dirty white garments resembling night gowns, scream and hoot and pummel the long-suffering little beasts with their sticks." She regarded these Arabs as wretches who made shrilling sounds from their "barbarous little throats."[27] Her articles expose the nineteenth-century belief in the progress of the Anglo-Saxon race in America and Europe as contrasted with other primitive races. This distinction of the races was neatly packaged in the separation of the highly symbolic White City with its white, Italian neoclassic buildings, and the Midway, with living exhibits from Java, Samoa, Egypt, and other exotic countries. Shaw, like other fair visitors, looked to the Midway as a kind of living time-line showing the advances of the races.[28]

> These people are they, who, in the mad race of nations for power and self, seem to have been left far behind, and, compared with the nations of today, are like untutored children. From the Bedouins of the desert and the South Sea Islanders, one can here trace, from living models, the progress of the human race from savagery and barbarism through all the intermediate stages to a condition still many degrees removed from the advanced civilization of the nineteenth century.[29]

These remarks clearly show that Shaw viewed herself as the social and cultural superior to these exhibited foreigners, but she did not view all of the peoples on display as uncivilized and heathen.

### African-American Reactions to the Portrayal of Dahomeyans and Samoans

African-Americans wanted to be very involved in the organization of the Midway, and wanted full creative control of

their own exhibits so that the darker-skinned natives that Shaw described would not be misrepresented by white organizers. African-Americans also wanted to show the more prominent and civilized features of black America, but they would be denied this active role. These people, who had vainly fought an unstated but effective color barrier in the exposition's planning phase were angered by the organizers ongoing display of Samoan and Dahomeyan male "savages" who were only capable of breaking bones and hunting animals. These groups of people were viewed as unable to achieve independent status in their own land due to their own inability to industrialize, which in turn meant becoming civilized.

Frederick Douglass was offended by these representations of black peoples on the Midway. He protested that the warriors of the Dahomey Village perpetuated the stereotype of blacks as primitive savages, but the Samoan Islanders on the Midway fared even worse. Billed as people "so recently rescued from cannibalism," the Samoans sang and danced but impressed visitors more with their size and reputed appetite for human flesh. The prevailing stereotype of people of color as barbarous and bloodthirsty brutes was simply too much for the Samoans to overcome with their more civilized and entertaining displays. Americans were not impressed with things familiar to them, and they wanted to see these inferior black brutes in all of their ferocity and vileness. White audiences still appreciated their playing "Yankee Doodle" on drums and gongs at the end of their staged presentation, but they were more impressed by their exoticism.[30]

Aside from these exotic portrayals of Africans, blacks were not favorably represented either in the industrialized White City or on the Midway. In fact, African-Americans were banned from participating in and organizing the fair. Ida B. Wells and Frederick Douglass joined forces and compiled a booklet "The Reason Why the Colored American Is Not Represented in the World's Columbian Exposition." Some 10,000 copies of it were

---

[27]Shaw, *World's Fair Notes*, 58-59.
[28]Ibid., 88-89.
[29]Ibid., 56.

---

[30]Muccigrosso, *Celebrating the New World*, 164-165.

distributed during the fair. Wells and Douglass would disagree on the merits of the Colored Jubilee Day at the fair, a day specifically arranged in order to show national contributions of African Americans. Douglass saw it as a small victory for blacks, while the idealistic Wells scoffed at the notion of simply having one day to acknowledge all the successes of her people. The celebrated day did pass without Wells's participation, but Douglass' superb handling of the event changed Wells's perception of it from a belittling occasion to an enlightening experience.[31]

### Interactions/Reactions of the Observers and Exhibited People

While the exhibits frustrated and angered African-Americans, white visitors were amused with the exotic dances and rituals. It was also quite usual for them to physically interact with the exhibited natives. They even threw money to Dahomeyan performers, who were made to beg for it. Clearly, the intent of the promoters of the Midway attractions was to simultaneously turn a profit while presenting the world in all its diversity, based on observation and actual interaction.[32] Of course, the exhibited peoples' behavior and movements were strictly controlled in order to preserve the safety of the paying customers. The peoples on display were represented as "different" from the spectators and forced to behave in a manner that clearly demonstrated their inferiority to that of the Anglo-Saxon visitors. It was unthinkable that they should mingle spontaneously with the spectators in almost all situations, and there were few opportunities for contact between the two parties. The living exhibits had to stay in a certain circumscribed part of the exhibition space, which represented their world; a boundary lay between this world and that of the citizens visiting and inspecting them, between wilderness and civility, nature

---

[31]Christopher Robert Reed, *"All the World Is Here!": The Black Presence at White City* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2000), 152-205.

[32]"The Fair as Educator," *Harper's Weekly* 37 (University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign Library; New York: J. & J. Harper, June 10, 1893, text-fiche), 543.

and culture, which had to be respected unconditionally. All signs of acculturation were avoided as long as the natives were on show because they were clearly heathen peoples compared to Anglo-Saxons.[33]

One key question that has to be asked is how did these exhibited individuals themselves, often more or less coerced into participation, experience and cope with the confining exhibits and the sometimes obnoxious spectators who viewed them as abhorrences of civilization? Many of the exhibited natives had to battle with homesickness, emotional confusion, difficulties of adjustment to the climate and food, and vicious infections. They often actively resisted the roles that were forced on them, for instance by running away, and they could be put back in harness only by force. The reality of the situation was that these "inferior" exhibited peoples basically had no means to escape their servitude to the organizers. It is obvious that they did not enjoy their time on the Midway, and received no real benefits from doing so. They were forced to display their inferior racial and cultural identities in order to entertain a superior white civilization.[34]

### Native Americans

Native Americans were one of the groups that had significant exposure on the Midway Plaisance so that they could demonstrate their inferior status. Although these "Indians" lived on American soil, they were still viewed as barbarians by a majority of white Americans at the end of the nineteenth century. On the Midway, they were set up in teepees, while going about their daily native customs such as cooking over a fire or making bead necklaces. Of course, the organizers insisted on the tepees as their habitats, although the majority of the native participants did not use tepees as their natural living quarters. Sometimes, the Native Americans performed certain rituals for the public. Marian Shaw, a newspaper reporter, noted

---

[33]Corbey, "Ethnographic Showcases, 1870-1930," 344-345.
[34]Ibid., 348.

one of the spectacles. They were "artistically painted in chrome yellow, vermilion and green, with feathers, knives, tomahawks and all of the horrid accoutrements of savage warfare."[35] She despised their war dances and ceremonial music because it was primitive in her mind, as well as in the minds of most white observers.

One sideshow that also constituted effective racism toward Native Americans was Buffalo Bill Cody's Wild West Show and the cleverly named "Congress of Rough Riders." Indians were portrayed as murderous and warlike savages in these shows, and civilized white cowboys played the part of the courageous heroes and victors over the uncivilized heathens. They were very popular forms of entertainment and enjoyed enormous profits. At the opening ceremonies of the fair, several recently defeated Sioux chiefs (the Wounded Knee massacre had occurred only three years before) were made to appear at the climax of the festivities as the chorus was singing "My Country 'Tis of Thee." These ceremonies and shows symbolized the triumph of white civilization over the inferior Indian nations, through both the portrayal of whites as military victors and the willingness of Native Americans to represent themselves as a conquered and obedient race.[36]

Native Americans were portrayed as uncivilized savages, but there was also an effort on the Midway to show that they could be assimilated into white, mainstream society. This desirability of "civilizing" North American Indians was an important theme in the late nineteenth century. This American emphasis on educating and assimilating Native Americans and other dependent peoples was tempered by ideas of racial and social evolution which placed darker-skinned people much lower on an evolutionary scale than white civilization.[37] Commissioner Morgan of the Indian Bureau of Affairs

[35]Marian Shaw, *World's Fair Notes: A Woman Journalist Views Chicago's 1893 Columbian Exposition* (Chicago: Pogo Press, Incorporated, 1992), 59.
[36]McRae, "Oriental Verities on the American Frontier," 12-13.
[37]Benedict, "International Exhibitions and National Identity," 7.

envisioned an Indian exhibit which, in spite of a large dose of traditional flavor, would convince American citizens that the US government was making "United States citizens out of American savages."[38] Morgan turned to Carlisle's Richard Henry Pratt, the nation's best known Indian educator, to organize and supervise a Native American youth school on the Midway. He refused, citing that Buffalo Bill's Wild West Show would provide ample illustration of Indian ways, and the government should not degrade itself by "illustrating in any way the old Indian camp life."[39] By all accounts the Wild West performances, featuring plenty of mounted warriors, were a great success, enjoyed by a public obviously more interested in the Indians of old. The school did eventually open on the Midway, showing Native American youths performing arithmetic and choral singing in a classroom. However, the former stereotype of the Indian as savage warrior prevailed, and the school itself was rarely attended and a financial failure.

### The Far East, China in particular

Americans' attitudes toward the Japanese in 1893 were demeaning and patronizing. The Japanese were portrayed as "cousins" of the Chinese and visitors to the Japanese Village on the Midway were invited to view "part and parcel of the home life of the little brown men." The possibility that these foreigners might become full citizens of the beautiful American utopia was increasingly problematic for Anglo-Saxons. If, however, the Japanese were given at least a little respect in 1893, the Chinese were seen as replicas of the old stereotypes of the shrewd, cunning, and threatening "John Chinaman." References to "almond-eyed" and "saffron-colored Mongolians" abounded throughout the entire nation. Hubert Howe Bancroft, who in the 1880s had written that "as a progressive people we reveal a race prejudice intolerable to civilization," looked disdainfully upon

the Chinese theatre for the "oddity of the performance and for the nature of its themes." He stated that China "is a country where the seat of honor is the stomach; where the roses have no fragrance and women no petticoats; where the laborer has no Sabbath and the magistrate no sense of integrity."[40]

Charles Stevens' *Uncle Jeremiah* was a fictional story about a black family visiting the world's fair in Chicago.  Uncle Jeremiah, the main character of the book, notes his reactions to the displayed people on the Midway.  Through the dialogue and actions of Uncle Jeremiah, Stevens reveals his own feelings about inferior people from the Far East.  His character expressed pleasure that a few "decent-looking Chinamen" who did not "look like rats and whose fluent English proclaims their long stay in 'Flisco' were serving tea at the entrance to the theatre," but he also stated his suspicion that the nearby temple probably contained the opium banks of the morally backward and drug-addicted Chinese actors.  Stevens' use of Uncle Jeremiah's criticism and distrust of the Chinese is significant because it empowers  African-Americans  in  a  white-dominated  society. Although African Americans were severely oppressed in late nineteenth-century America, Stevens believes that they were able to find some comfort in the fact that other people, the Chinese in this case, were less civilized and acculturated than them.  Stevens' portrayal of the Chinese placed them below that of blacks on the scale of civilization.

*Harper's Weekly*, in an article on the Fourth of July parade staged by the villagers of the Midway Plaisance, had its own mixed view on the Chinese. "[They] are a meek people, but seem anxious to apologize and make atonement for their humility by the extraordinarily aggressive dragons and devils which they contrived. The dragon did much to raise the standing of the Midway Chinese among other more savage and not half so ingenious races."[41] The Chinese were thus viewed as creative and half-intelligent, which was much more than could be said

for numerous groups of people on display. *Harper's Weekly*, *Uncle Jeremiah*, and other printed sources popularized national images of the "Chinaman" as timid but cunning and uncivilized, and were placed on the lower end of the evolutionary scale, but still exhibited superior traits over more barbaric people such as the Javanese and Dahomeyans. Jacob Riis agreed with this portrayal of the Chinese as cunning and manipulative, as well as a "constant and terrible menace to society, wholly regardless of their influence upon the industrial problems which their presence confuses."[42]

### The Javanese

The unknown both amused and frightened spectators, who favored their own cultures but worried that these racialized "others" might taint white civilization's progress with their own inadequacies. The Javanese village on the Midway serves as a good example of this fear. Although the Javanese lived in bamboo houses surrounded by tropical palm trees, spectators found the houses to be very awe-inspiring due to their strength, imperviousness to rain, and extreme lightness as to be unaffected by earthquakes. The houses were built on stilts to protect people from snakes, which infested their native soil in Java. The Javanese themselves entertained the visitors with jugglery, dancing, fencing, wrestling, and snake-charming. The "wajang-wong" or Javanese formed a pantomime which greatly impressed Shaw as well.[43]  Although the Javanese appeared to be a primitive people, Marian Shaw thought that they were very efficient and civilized in how they lived their simple lives.  It was this easygoing and romantic lifestyle that made Americans worry that their own superior lifestyles were being challenged by foreigners.

These Javanese were generally referred to as "Brownies" by the visitors, a term that was reinforced by popular newspapers and journals of the day.  "About the shade of a well-done sweet

---

[40]Rydell, *All the World's A Fair*, 49-51.
[41]Ibid., 51-52.

[42]Riis, *How the Other Half Lives,* 126-127.
[43]Rydell, *All the World's A Fair*, 57-58.

potato," the *Popular Monthly* reported, "the Javanese holds the position closest to the American heart of all the semi-civilized races." The Javanese men were described as industrious workers, while the women were viewed as tireless domestic matriarchs. Described as cute and frisky, mild and inoffensive, but childlike above all else, the Javanese were allowed to entertain white Anglo-Saxons as long as they remained in their evolutionary niche.[44] They were just a step above the Dahomeyans on this racialized hierarchical ladder of civilization.

***The Lasting Legacy***

The World's Columbian Exposition in Chicago was designed to celebrate the four-hundredth anniversary of Christopher Columbus' landing in the New World.[45] The fair was meant to celebrate the progress of Anglo-Saxon civilization. Industrialization was the driving force of this progress of superior society, and this was represented in all of the technology and machinery on display in the White City. However, social and cultural progress was solely evident on the Midway Plaisance where a hierarchy of races was on exhibit for the spectators of all classes in American society. Most of these white observers judged the exhibited racialized "others" based on national stereotypes of exotic and foreign races as primitive, inferior, backward, and in the need of white guidance and nurturing. Through the new visual culture of America, whites viewed themselves as superior to darker-skinned Africans, warrior-like Dahomeyans, feminine Egyptians, and sly and odd-looking Chinese and Japanese. Imperialism required Americans to view themselves as the ultimate, civilized world society that was destined to dominate and influence lesser civilizations, and nowhere was this more evident than on the Midway in Chicago. As one observer noted, "To the layman not interested in the arts and sciences it will remain *the great attraction* of the fair. One leaves it with a delightful feeling of having seen the one spot on

the globe which gives in a very comprehensive way an idea of the world's nationalities with their various customs and manners in surprising detail."[46]

---

[44]Rydell, *All the World's A Fair*, 65-66.
[45]Delays meant that it actually took place a year after the anniversary.

[46]*Frank Leslie's Illustrated Weekly* (University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign Library; New York: Stuart Paddock, June 25, 1893, text-fiche), 25.

*DER SCHLIEFFENPLAN: INTERPRETING THE SHADOWS ON THE CAVE WALL*

**Michael A. Kleen**

*I. Introduction (A Rope of Sand)*

Field Marshal Graf Alfred von Schlieffen was Chief of the Imperial German General Staff from 1891 to 1905, and died eighteen months before the outbreak of the First World War. In the winter of 1905/06 Schlieffen drafted his final plan, *Denkschrift*, or memorandum as it has been varyingly referred to, and handed it to his successor Helmuth von Moltke the younger, son of the late Field Marshal Helmuth von Moltke who led the victorious Prussian armies against France in the Franco-Prussian war.

Inspired by the Battle of Cannae, in which Hannibal defeated a much larger Roman army using envelopment tactics that resulted in the virtual destruction of the Roman army in 216 B.C., Schlieffen's plan called for a right wing envelopment of the French army away from German soil, which would bypass the strong French fortifications in Moselle, catch the French army in the open and destroy it.

When Helmuth von Moltke the younger assumed the position of the Chief of Staff, he made adjustments to Schlieffen's plan according to the changing political and military situation. He reduced the ratio of divisions between the German right and left flank in the west and sent more divisions to eastern Germany to defend Prussia from possible Russian attack. It has been on these adjustments that von Moltke's colleagues criticized him after the German attack into northern France fizzled in the opening months of the Great War.

However, in the past fifty years historians have had a difficult time deciding exactly what the Schlieffen Plan was or how it was altered. One historian, Terence Zuber, went so far as

*Michael Kleen, a member of Phi Alpha Theta, is a graduate student in History from Des Plaines, Illinois. He wrote this paper for Dr. Sace Elder in History 5400, Modern Germany, during the Fall of 2006.*

to question whether it even existed as a real war plan at all. The obstacle that faced western historians since the end of World War II until the mid 1990s was that very few original documents regarding German war plans remained. Many had been destroyed by Allied bombing raids or carried off behind the Iron Curtain. Gerhard Ritter's book, *The Schlieffen Plan*, contained one of the few English translations of Schlieffen's actual war plans. It was not until the dissolution of the Soviet Union and the reunification of Germany that some of those original documents were recovered, reigniting debate on the subject.

Although I disagree with Terence Zuber's main assertion, I will show that the Schlieffen Plan, along with how it was altered by von Moltke the younger, has always been a tenuous idea. However, past historians have felt that the plan was common knowledge even while they played freely with the facts, bestowing on it a mythological quality. Even after the addition of primary sources in the 1990s, we are still unable to come to any kind of consensus on what the Schlieffen Plan was. The neutral countries Schlieffen planned to invade varies from historian to historian. Belgium is almost always mentioned, but Holland and Luxemburg appear and disappear throughout various books and articles. Sometimes the planned use of Italian troops in Lorraine is attributed to von Moltke the younger, but sometimes to Schlieffen. Some historians, like Terence Zuber, are overly sympathetic to Imperial Germany. Some, like Annika Mombauer, rail against German war guilt, forget what war they are writing about, and call the Entente the Allies. The goals of the plan, to march around Paris, encircle Paris, attack the French fortresses from behind, or push the French army into Switzerland, also cannot seem to be agreed upon.

In one sense, the Schlieffen Plan that has been described by historians for the past fifty years was a myth. What von Schlieffen and von Moltke the younger intended has been rewritten and mischaracterized many times. However, Terence Zuber's thesis that there never was a Schlieffen Plan is just one more surreal portrait in a long line of paintings based upon

paintings, each one clouded by age and getting further from the actual subject.

This paper is divided into four parts: an introduction, a section on the plan as described by historians from the beginning of the Cold War to 1998, a section on the revision of the plan based on rediscovered primary sources and the debate surrounding the Zuber thesis, and my conclusion.

### II. The Plan, 1955—1998

In 1955 Ludwig Reiners, a German lawyer and economist, characterized the Schlieffen Plan in his book *The Lamps Went Out in Europe* as a military plan that took into consideration a two front war. According to Reiners, Schlieffen anticipated the situation in which Germany found herself at the eve of the Great War. "Chief of Staff Schlieffen," he wrote, "had horrified his associates by working out war games in which Russia, France, England, Belgium, and Serbia were united against Germany and Austria."[1] In this scenario, Schlieffen decided that the only chance for German victory lay in defeating her enemies quickly, one at a time. France had to be defeated in eight weeks with a single bold stroke. The vast majority of the German army would strike through Belgium and, "with Metz as pivot they would complete a gigantic loop…encircle Paris from the rear and, advancing eastward, drive the enemy up against the Swiss border and the Moselle fortifications."[2]

As for the fate of the Schlieffen Plan under his successor von Moltke the younger, Reiners argued that von Moltke watered down the grand plan and wanted to incorporate Italian soldiers in the defense of Alsace-Lorraine, but, "in strengthening the Lorraine defensive front, von Moltke necessarily weakened the offensive army."[3] After the German grand offensive stalled in northern France, and the subsequent French attack in Lorraine

was defeated, "the railroad cars were standing ready in accordance with the Schlieffen Plan," to transfer men to the critical point in northern France, but von Moltke ordered a counter attack against the French fortress line instead.[4] The rest, as they say, is history.

In 1956 Gerhard Ritter published Schlieffen's deployment and operational plans in their entirety in his book *The Schlieffen Plan* along with his own commentary. This book has been the mainstay of nearly all writings on Germany's war plans leading up to World War I because it contained most of the only primary sources on Schlieffen's military thinking from 1905 to 1912 available to Western scholars until the 1990s.

Ritter characterized the Schlieffen Plan as "an offensive which would annihilate the entire French Army at a single blow and achieve quick and total victory on the Western front," singularly in a war against France, but the author argued the plan also fit into Schlieffen's strategic thinking regarding a two-front war.[5] In the event of a two-front war, Germany should decisively defeat the most dangerous enemy first, France, then turn and defeat the other, Russia. Over the course of Schlieffen's tenure as Chief of Staff, "the ratio of strength between the German armies in the East and the West was reduced from 1:2 to 1:4, and later to 1:8."[6]

Schlieffen's war games, according to Ritter, "seem to have been intended to prove that the left wing of the German army could be much weakened in favor of the right."[7] Schlieffen wanted to emphasize that a French attack against German positions in Lorraine would fail and they would be forced to march north to seek decisive victory, making them vulnerable to a massive German counterattack on their left flank.

However, "before 1904-5 Schlieffen had not decided to stake everything on one card and rely on the great envelopment,

---

[1]Ludwig Reiners, *The Lamps Went Out in Europe*, trans. Richard and Clara Winston (Pantheon Books, Inc., 1955; reprint, Cleveland, Ohio: Meridian Books, 1966): 165.
[2]Ibid., 166.
[3]Ibid., 167.

[4]Ibid., 169.
[5]Gerhard Ritter, *The Schlieffen Plan*, trans. Andrew and Eva Wilson (Munich: Verlag R. Oldenbourg, 1956; reprint, New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1958): 17.
[6]Ibid., 30.
[7]Ibid., 40.

cutting across Belgium to Dunkirk. On the contrary, it (his memorandum of 1899) even contains a caution against such boldness."[8] Schlieffen preferred to seek the decisive battle through Luxembourg and Belgium, close to the German deployment area, but in Schlieffen's memorandum of 1905 the plan suddenly changed. He extended the German right flank, siphoned more troops away from Lorraine, and included a strike through the southern tip of Holland. That change did not occur as a result of evolving French plans, Ritter argued. "Although the French General Staff was continually discussing the possibility of a German offensive through Belgium, there were no such changes until 1906," he wrote.[9] The genesis of the plan's alterations was strictly within Schlieffen's own thoughts.

After 1906, Schlieffen maintained the same strategy for both a one and two-front war. "The great envelopment on the right was to be the programme whatever happened, even if the chances of success were greatly diminished by drafting troops to the East."[10] For Gerhard Ritter, there was no question that this was Schlieffen's great plan, and that he had tested the idea in several war games and staff rides.[11]

Lastly, Ritter argued that an envelopment of Paris was part of the plan, but a part Schlieffen was unconvinced would be achievable with the current size of the German army. There was always a danger the French army could sever the sweeping advance with their own offensive, or that the British could land expeditionary forces behind the German lines, although that particular danger "caused Schlieffen very little worry."[12] Impressed by the audaciousness of the plan, Ritter concluded, "Nobody can read the memorandum without being affected by the breadth and boldness of its offensive concept."[13]

In his 1966 book *The German Army*, Herbert Rosinski provided a more detailed analysis of the Schlieffen Plan than Ludwig Reiners had eleven years earlier. The Schlieffen Plan, he argued, was born out of a desire to achieve absolute victory over the enemy through the destruction of the enemy's entire army—one of the goals of war laid out by the philosopher of war von Clauswitz. "By the Schlieffen plan's encirclement," Rosinski explained, "he not only hoped to achieve that decisive blow in flank and rear but to deprive his opponents in advance of any power to develop their initiative."[14]

According to Rosinski's characterization, Schlieffen's plan of 1905 fused "mobilization, operations, and tactical decisions into one single grandiose scheme."[15] The plan was simply to be unleashed upon the enemy and all the details would take care of themselves as the momentum of the attack never gave the French time to respond.

Like Ludwig Reiners, Herbert Rosinski blamed von Moltke the younger for the plan's failure, based on von Moltke's transfer of divisions from the right flank to the left. However, he contended that Moltke's previous critics had taken a "too narrow view of what Schlieffen meant by his plan. His successors took it in precisely the sense which he would have rejected, as an infallible 'recipe of victory' instead of a concrete, flexible solution."[16] Instead of scrapping the plan according to the needs of the changing situation, von Moltke hedged. Even with that in mind, Rosinski was unable to refrain from praising the original plan: "Yet, so brilliant had been Schlieffen's conception…that even in this emasculated form it came within an ace of success."[17]

In his often-cited 1973 book *The Short-War Illusion*, Lancelot L. Farrar, Jr. was more critical of the Schlieffen Plan and also added some details omitted by Reiners and Rosinski. A map

---

[8]Ibid., 41.

[9]Ibid., 43.

[10]Ibid., 47.

[11]Ibid., 45-46.

[12]Ibid., 71.

[13]Ibid., 48.

[14]Herbert Rosinski, *The German Army*, ed. Gordon A. Craig (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1966): 129.

[15]Ibid., 129.

[16]Ibid., 135.

[17]Ibid., 136.

drawn by the Macmillan Company on page xvii, which illustrated the Schlieffen Plan of 1905, as it was now referred to, shows not just a march around Paris by the German army, but an encirclement of Paris. The map key reads: "this plan to invade France through neutral Belgium and to surround Paris was altered a number of times before 1914 and improperly carried out."[18] Here the conventional wisdom that the plan involved a strike through Belgium but was altered and botched by Schlieffen's successor is faithfully repeated.

"The German strategic blueprint, the Schlieffen Plan, was based on the assumption that Germany and Austria-Hungary would go to war against Russia, France, and probably Great Britain," Farrar explained, leaving out a hostile Belgium and Serbia from Schlieffen's strategic planning.[19]

Farrar laid out the plan in three stages: German troops would be quickly mobilized and move through neutral Belgium, march "generally southward" through northern France, then march east and encircle the French army.[20] Schlieffen created his plan in 1905 in anticipation of a two front war and relied on a slow mobilization of Russian forces. Unlike Herbert Rosinski, Farrar expressed less admiration of this plan. "The Schlieffen Plan might have succeeded only in circumstances which would have made it unnecessary (i.e., a one-front war against France)," he argued.[21]

However, Lancelot Farrar was more generous to von Moltke the younger, who, once hostilities broke out, he presented with two options: continue around Paris to the west, or swing east to concentrate against the French army. Moltke chose the eastern rout, one of two equally problematic options, but a choice that doomed the offensive. Furthermore, Farrar postulates that the outcome would have been the same even if von Moltke had transferred troops from Lorraine to northern France. Farrar concluded that despite von Moltke's adjustments, it was clear to him that, "Moltke implemented Schlieffen's strategy."[22]

Eighteen years later, Robert B. Asprey, in his book *The German High Command at War*, attributed the addition of Italians in Schlieffen's plan to Schlieffen himself and not von Moltke the younger, as well as added a second neutral country the plan called to violate, without citing any sources for the information. "Under the terms of the Schlieffen Plan of 1905," he wrote, "the bulk of the German army would deploy in the west. Two smaller armies reinforced by Italian divisions would defend Alsace-Lorraine…the extreme right of this force…would smash through *Holland* and Belgium, *debouch* into northern France, sweep down west of Paris, and wheel on the enemy left."[23] (Italics added for emphasis.)

According to Asprey, the Schlieffen Plan had several flaws; it depended on divisions from Italy, which were not guaranteed, more troops than the German army was likely to receive, the plan "ignored the French army's defensive capability," and there were no alternatives provided if the plan failed.[24] As for von Moltke's adjustments, which now included preserving Holland's neutrality, Asprey argued they "merely diluted the operational potential of the Schlieffen plan without solving any of its defects."

Jonathan M. Kolkey, an American historian, wrote a fairly conventional description of the Schlieffen Plan in his 1995 book *Germany on the March*, and despite his insistence that the "historian must play the role of the meticulous sleuth who painstakingly sifts through all available evidence," he is not so meticulous when it comes to his criticism of the Schlieffen Plan.[25]

---

[18]Lancelot L. Farrar, Jr., *The Short-War Illusion: Germany Policy, Strategy & Domestic Affairs August-December 1914* (Santa Barbara, California: Clio Press, 1973): xvii.

[19]Ibid., 7.

[20]Ibid.

[21]Ibid., 8.

[22]Ibid., 15.

[23]Robert B. Asprey, *The German High Command at War: Hidenberg and Ludendorff conduct World War I* (New York: William Morrow and Company, Inc., 1991), 26.

[24]Ibid..

[25]Jonathan M. Kolkey, *Germany on the March* (Lanham, MD: The United Press of America, 1996), vi.

"Berlin's military strategy," Kolkey argues, "the co-called Schlieffen Plan, while certainly audacious in scope, remained perhaps beyond the technology of that era."[26] Additionally, he blames the plan's failure not on von Moltke's infamous adjustments, but on "a series of tactical mistakes committed by frontline commanders."[27] He furthermore claims the plan contained many risks, although he fails to elaborate on these. Merely repeating convention, he postulates a timetable of eight weeks for the plan to succeed without citing any references for this conclusion.

In his 1998 book *Imperial Germany and the Great War, 1914-1918*, Roger Chickering uses colorful adjectives to describe the Schlieffen Plan. He characterizes the plan for preemptive war against France as "Schlieffen's obsession," which involved a "colossal strategic envelopment," and a "grandiose wheeling movement" that would violate Belgian neutrality, which was later expanded to involve a violation of Holland too.[28] Most importantly, Chickering introduced the concept of a revolving door into the plan. "The advance of the German armies into France…was to complement the retreat of German forces in the south, so that the French would be lured into a breathtaking 'reversal of fronts,' a strategic 'revolving door'," he explained without providing sources for the quoted phrases.[29]

Chickering makes much out of this new addition to Schlieffen's plan. Von Moltke the younger's only failing, according to the author, was to stand guard in Lorraine, robbing "the plan of its revolving-door effect."[30]

### III. The Revision, 1999—2006

In 1999 Terence Zuber published his controversial essay "The Schlieffen Plan Reconsidered." Using primary documents

that appeared only after the fall of the Soviet Union, which had been unavailable to Western scholars until the 1990s, as well as secondary sources written shortly after the Great War, he concluded that what we have been referring to as the Schlieffen Plan not only was not the real German war plan, but that it was not Schlieffen's masterwork either, as has been claimed by historians since the 1920s.

According to Zuber, the Schlieffen Plan of 1906, which he maintains was "dated December 1905 but was apparently written in January 1906, after Schlieffen had retired,"[31] has been correctly characterized by historians as an attack by the German right flank into Belgium and northern France, which would swing "to the west of Paris, continually turning the French left flank, eventually pushing the French army into Switzerland,"[32] but he mentions neither a violation of Dutch neutrality nor supplemental Italian troops in Lorraine. Additionally, he characterizes the plan as a plan only intended to deal with a one-front war with France, not a two-front war as has been previously maintained.

Zuber contends that the histories of the Great War written by German officers during the 1920s held up the Schlieffen Plan of 1906 as the culmination of Schlieffen's military thought, contending that had von Moltke the younger followed it to the letter instead of watering it down, Germany would have won the war. However, they "revealed practically nothing of Schlieffen's other war plans written between 1891 and 1905."[33]

The three German officers in question, Lieutenant-Colonel Wolfgang Foerster, General Hermann von Kuhl, and General Wilhelm Groener, used Schlieffen's final *Denkschrift* (study) to defend their own conduct in the war and vilify von Moltke for what they saw as his failure. However, Zuber argues this was

---

[26]Ibid., 199.

[27]Ibid.

[28]Roger Chickering, *Imperial Germany and the Great War, 1914-1918* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 21.

[29]Ibid., 21.

[30]Ibid., 23.

[31]Terence Zuber, "The Schlieffen Plan Reconsidered," *War in History* 6, no. 3 (1999): 268.

[32]Ibid., 262.

[33]Ibid.

simply a matter of writing Schlieffen's plan of 1906 into the official histories.

The Schlieffen *Denkschrift* bore little resemblance to the actual situation on the eve of the Great War, Zuber argued. Field Marshall Erich Ludendorff towed the same line as Foerster, Kuhl, and Groener that "Moltke followed the concept of the Schlieffen plan, but failed to execute the plan properly in 1914."[34] However, "Ludendorff had shown only that, with 54 divisions, the right wing in the real plan in 1914 was no stronger than the right wing in the real plan in 1905/6. The true problem is that the right wing in the 'Schlieffen plan'…contained 82 divisions…not 54. Ludendorff did not explain how 54 divisions were expected to do the job of 82."[35]

Furthermore, Zuber cites a Swiss historian named Hermann Stegemann, whose 1917 book on the first year of the war does not mention the Schlieffen plan. Putting two and two together, along with evidence from Schlieffen's final staff rides and war games in which he neglected to test his famous *Denkschrift*, Zuber concluded, "there was no intent to destroy the French army in one immense Cannae-battle. There never was a 'Schlieffen plan'."[36]

In 2001, Terence M. Holmes published a reply to Terence Zuber's controversial thesis. He argued that Zuber misread Schlieffen's *Denkschrift* of 1905/06 and failed to correctly interpret the document's context. Furthermore, he contends that the march around Paris, far from being the goal of the Schlieffen Plan, was merely a "conditional aspect," and that von Moltke the younger adopted "the broad contours of the Schlieffen plan" as long as "decisive victory eluded him on the borders."[37]

When Schlieffen handed his *Denkschrift* of 1905/06 to von Moltke the younger, "it was clearly intended to mark this solemn moment of transition, acquiring thereby the undeniable

character of a '*military legacy*'."[38] Holmes reasons that if Schlieffen's plan had not been the culmination of his military career, as Zuber contended, he would not have bothered to bestow it on his successor in such a manner.

Terence Zuber maintained that the goal of the supposed Schlieffen Plan was to march around and encircle Paris, something that made it unrealistic for use with Germany's actual army and therefore the General Staff could not have taken the plan seriously, because Schlieffen's *Denkschrift* only dealt with the worst-case scenario. However, Terence Holmes contends that the march around Paris was not really the goal of the plan, it was a stroke contingent upon the actions of the French army, namely if it fell back on its second line of defense. The encirclement of Paris "is a conclusion that Schlieffen arrived at most unwillingly," Holmes argues.[39] Furthermore, he contends that the reason the march around Paris is not a feature in Schlieffen's war games or staff rides was because he "came to his unenthusiastic conclusion whilst he was working on the plan and not before…it was not because he took this perspective less than seriously, but because he did not conceive of it until the time of his retirement."[40]

According to Holmes, von Moltke the younger preserved the essential aspects of the Schlieffen Plan, but he firmly believed the French would attack in Lorraine. Therefore, he would not have needed to amass forces on the right flank large enough to make a march around Paris. However, "if the main battle was fought in Lorraine…then there would…be no operational role for the right-wing concentration, and so it is stretching a point to claim, as Ludendorff does, that Moltke remained faithful to the Schlieffen plan."[41] During the course of the 1914 campaign, Moltke did in fact issue an order to march on and around Paris.

---

[34]Ibid., 266.

[35]Ibid., 266.

[36]Ibid., 305.

[37]Terence M. Holmes, "The Reluctant March on Paris: A Reply to Terence Zuber's 'The Schlieffen Plan Reconsidered'," *War in History* 8, no. 2 (2001): 268.

[38]Ibid., 210.

[39]Ibid., 213.

[40]Ibid., 214.

[41]Ibid., 223.

"It seems improbably that this was an entirely spontaneous idea," Holmes argues.[42]

Holmes concludes, "for neither Schlieffen nor Moltke was the march on Paris a fixed objective. It was always merely a means to an end." Schlieffen's plan was to envelop and destroy the French army wherever it was found. "Moltke's pursuit of August 1914 was based on exactly that same principle."[43]

In his 2002 book *Inventing the Schlieffen Plan*, Terence Zuber further elaborated his thesis. Schlieffen's infamous plan was not the culmination of fifteen years of Schlieffen's military thought, he explains, "the so-called 'Schlieffen plan' bore no resemblance to Schlieffen's war planning at all…the 'Schlieffen plan' was invented by the General Staff to explain away their failure to win the 1914 Marne campaign."[44] Zuber again praises Stegemann's 1917 history of the beginning of the Great War, which he previously cited in his article as one of his principal sources, as a detailed description of the German campaign in Belgium and France. "The chain of events and Stegemann's interpretation of the causes and effects are logical and plausible," he wrote and applauded the Swiss historian's omission of the Schlieffen Plan because its inclusion "would only add a counterfactual element: that the Schlieffen plan *should have been* the German war plan (but was not)."[45]

Zuber reiterated his argument that all subsequent historians have taken the conception of the Schlieffen Plan from Foerster, Kuhl, Groener, Ludendorff, and most of all Gerhard Ritter, who adopted their views without looking into the circumstances or motivations behind their claims. "Owing to the recent discovery of the Reichsarchiv manuscript 'Der Schlieffenplan' as well as of a number Schlieffen's last exercises," he argues (sentence error apparently overlooking in editing), "a clear picture of Schlieffen's war planning emerges for the first time. This picture

has nothing in common with the genesis of the 'Schlieffen plan' described by the Reicharchiv or Gerhard Ritter."[46]

The author of the aforementioned manuscript was Dr. Wilhelm Dieckmann, who was arrested and executed in 1944 for conspiring against Adolf Hitler. According to Zuber, Dieckmann also believed the Schlieffen *Denkschrift* of 1906 was the culmination of his military planning, but "the information his manuscript provides leads to another conclusion."[47] What Dieckmann's manuscript really showed was that Schlieffen accepted the elder Moltke's plans for war in the west, and that Schlieffen intended to "launch surprise counteroffensives to encircle and destroy the enemy on or near friendly territory, and not toward deep penetration into enemy territory."[48]

In the same year, Holger H. Herwig took a less controversial view of the Schlieffen Plan by challenging Lancelot L. Farrar's *The Short-War Illusion*, in which Farrar argued that Germany went on the offensive to achieve a total victory over France and end the war quickly. Herwig, like Terence Zuber, basis his argument on documents recently released after the collapse of the Soviet Union.

Herwig argues that "Germany's leading military planners fully knew that the war had every chance of being a protracted struggle, and that the vaunted Schlieffen plan was but the opening salvo in what was likely to be an exhaustive campaign of attrition."[49] Herwig also identifies Gerhard Ritter as the origin of the current view of the plan, that it had been enacted because it provided the German leadership with a short war option.

Unable to prevent himself from also responding to Terence Zuber in the same article, he calls the thesis that there never was a Schlieffen Plan, "utterly misleading."[50] "Not only Schlieffen's contemporaries," he argues, "but also the men who

---

[42]Ibid., 224.

[43]Ibid., 231.

[44]Terence Zuber, *Inventing the Schlieffen Plan: German War Planning 1871-1914* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 5.

[45]Ibid., 8.

[46]Ibid., 136.

[47]Ibid., 137.

[48]Ibid., 219.

[49]Holger H. Herwig, "Germany and the "Short-War" Illusion: Toward a New Interpretation?" *The Journal of Military History* 66, no. 3 (2002): 682.

[50]Ibid., 683.

implemented his plan in August 1914, had no doubt about the existence and authenticity of a Schlieffen plan."[51]

Returning to Farrar's *Short-War Illusion*, Holger Herwig argues that many German commanders, including von Moltke the younger, recognized that the future war would be long and protracted, a "peoples' war."[52] But, "once in office, Moltke quickly came to realize that no viable alternative to Schlieffen's desperate gamble existed."[53] Thus, he 'watered down' the plan and tried to protect Germany's heartland from this feared protracted war by reinforcing the left flank in Lorraine. Nevertheless, he was also convinced that Schlieffen's lightning strike was the only hope to prevent that long war, so he went along with the plan knowing it had only a slim chance of success.

However, Terence M. Holmes disagreed with Herwig's contention that the Schlieffen Plan was a reckless gamble. In a subsequent issue of the *Journal of Military History*, he argues that "Schlieffen's great memorandum of December 1905 does not stipulate a time limit for completion of the projected war against France."[54]

Following from that contention, Homes takes issue with the six-week time limit that has been supposedly imposed on the Schlieffen Plan by historians for the past sixty years. "Schlieffen did not give any such instructions for adhering to a precise and imperative timetable," he argues, but he is unable to give any explanation for where the six-week time limit came from, since it is not in Schlieffen's *Denkschrift*, nor do any historians cite where the number originated.

In 2003, Robert T. Foley published his essay "The Origins of the Schlieffen Plan," in which he argues there was a continuity between Schlieffen's strategic thinking in 1899 and 1905 as

Terence Holmes argued in 2001, but there were also factors Holmes failed to take into consideration. These two factors, Foley contends, were "German beliefs about French deployment plans, and…the ongoing construction of German fortifications."[55]

In 1900, a German officer named Berthold Deimling was ordered to supervise the development of the German order of battle, Foley wrote, and in his memoirs he stated that something very close to the Schlieffen Plan had been put before him, only this time the flanking march was to occur through Luxemburg and Belgium, and "France was to be defeated quickly in a decisive battle, thus allowing units to be transferred to the threatened east."[56] According to Foley, Deimling was most likely describing one of the two German war plans of 1899/1900, *Aufmarschplan I*. "Although *Aufmarschplan I* is generally seen as a plan for war against France alone, there is evidence to suggest that it would be used in a war against France and Russia under certain circumstances," Foley added.[57] In its conception, *Aufmarschplan I* strongly resembled the famous Schlieffen Plan.

Furthermore, Robert Foley argues that any differences between the 1900 and 1905 plans can be explained by two factors. The first was that the German high command correctly guessed that the French planned on extending their lines along the Belgian border, but overestimated the strength and reach of that force. Thusly, Schlieffen called for an even stronger and more extended German right flank.

Secondly, the German fortresses in Lorraine had greatly improved by 1905, allowing Schlieffen to feel that his left flank would be secure from French counter attack. "In Schlieffen's view," Foley wrote, "modern forts on the left bank of the Moselle would 'release troops for use elsewhere'."[58] "Hence, only after 1905 could Schlieffen carry out a powerful enveloping

---

[51]Ibid.

[52]Ibid., 688.

[53]Ibid., 689.

[54]Terence M. Holmes, "'One Throw of the Gambler's Dice': A Comment on Holger Herwig's View of the Schlieffen Plan," *The Journal of Military History* 67, no. 2 (2003): 514.

[55]Robert T. Foley, "The Origins of the Schlieffen Plan," *War in History* 10, no. 2 (2003): 223.

[56]Ibid., 223-224.

[57]Ibid., 224.

[58]Ibid., 231.

movement around the French fortifications safe in the knowledge that its left flank would be secure."[59]

Annika Mombauer, in her 2005 historiographic essay "Of War Plans and War Guilt," looked at the argument espoused by Terence Zuber's controversial thesis, and concludes that there was, without a doubt, a Schlieffen Plan, and that von Moltke the younger operated in the spirit of that plan in 1914. Furthermore, she argues against Zuber's contention that Germany planned to fight a defensive war, and seeks to demonstrate that "contemporary evidence still paints a damning picture of Germany's aggressive war planning in the years 1906-14."[60]

"Zuber has…been accused of distorting his sources and of employing disingenuous arguments," Mombauer contends.[61] She further argues that, even though the idea of an easy and absolute victory is certainly a myth, that does not mean that the Schlieffen Plan, which tried to achieve that, is also a myth. Mombauer also calls into question Zuber's use of the Swiss historian Hermann Stegemann as a source, whose account is "mysteriously given far more credence (and prominence) than those of more directly informed contemporaries."[62] "Other sections of his book," she maintains, "make do with no references whatsoever and are seemingly plucked out of the air,"[63] an offense that, I would add, Zuber certainly is not alone in committing when it comes to this debate.

Mombauer argues that all of Schlieffen and Moltke's contemporaries knew there was a Schlieffen Plan. In 1912 von Moltke wrote to the German chancellor and informed him that violating Belgian neutrality was the only way to engage and destroy the French army out in the open. However, Mombauer maintains that Schlieffen's original intention was to attack

through Holland and Belgium, and von Moltke took Holland out of the equation in order to protect Germany from an "allied" blockade. "Eighty years later, Terence Zuber denies that such a march through Belgium towards France was ever Germany's intention, despite Moltke's clear statements to the contrary."[64]

Annika Mombauer's reasonable solution to the confusion regarding von Moltke's adherence or lack of adherence to Schlieffen's plan is to call the deployment plan of 1914 something else. "Of course, the plan of 1914 was no longer Schlieffen's," she writes, "but Moltke's plan."[65] There certainly was a Schlieffen Plan, but by 1914 it had evolved into a similar, yet distinct plan. She concludes that, "far from slaughtering a sacred cow, Zuber's 'controversy' seems increasingly to be about flogging a dead horse."[66]

Finally, in 2006 Robert T. Foley came back with a new article and offered to clear away the controversy by giving us "The Real Schlieffen Plan." He argues that a shift in Germany's strategic situation in 1905 required an adjustment of Germany's war plans. However, those changes were all made based upon Schlieffen's memorandum of 1905/06, so that "Schlieffen deserves to be remembered as the father of Germany's war plan, with all its strengths and weaknesses, in 1914."[67]

Foley, like Annika Mombauer, attacks Terence Zuber's sources. Zuber makes much out of Wilhelm Dieckmann's unfinished manuscript on Schlieffen's strategic thought. Foley reminds us, as Zuber had, that Dieckmann's manuscript is missing the section regarding 1904 and 1905. Regardless, "he shows how Schlieffen first introduced the idea of outflanking the French fortifications in July 1894."[68] Zuber rejects Dieckmann's premise that this idea culminated in what Dieckmann called the 'envelopment plan,' but Foley argues that "Zuber seems to

---

[59]Ibid., 232.

[60]Annika Mombauer, "Of War Plans and War Guilt:: The Debate Surrounding the Schlieffen Plan," *The Journal of Strategic Studies* 28, no. 5 (2005): 858.

[61]Ibid., 859.

[62]Ibid., 865.

[63]Ibid., 865.

[64]Ibid., 871.

[65]Ibid., 877.

[66]Ibid., 880.

[67]Robert T. Foley, "The Real Schlieffen Plan," *War in History* 13, no. 1 (2006): 91.

[68] Ibid., 95.

believe that he has some type of secret knowledge that allows him to reject Dieckmann's conclusions."[69]

Von Moltke's deployment plans for 1906/07 were "clearly based on Schlieffen's 1905 memorandum," Foley argues, and was the result of Russia's perceived weakness after its war with Japan. "The entire German army was to be deployed in the west against France. Further, it was to launch an immediate invasion of the Netherlands and Belgium in order to bypass the French fortresses."[70]

However, Russia recovered more quickly than the Germans predicted, which forced von Moltke to make alterations to Schlieffen's plan. "The inability to strike the Russian army," Foley contends, "as well as the fact that any war against Russia would certainly be long and indecisive, forced Moltke to concentrate on France."[71] Von Moltke the younger feared a long war, but hoped Schlieffen's plan would bring Germany a short one. Furthermore, Moltke knew he would be unable to attack the French fortress line directly, so he was forced to stick to Schlieffen's 1905 premise. "However, while he stuck to the basics of Schlieffen's 1905 memorandum, as French plans changed, so too did German plans."[72]

Von Moltke the younger noticed the growing strength of the Entente, as well as the French army, and feared France might attack Germany. "Troops had to be found to guard southern Germany against a possible French attack," Foley argues.[73] Finally, as has been mentioned countless times in the past, he reiterates that von Moltke also narrowed the German front by planning to move through Belgium and not both Belgium and Holland. Regardless of these changes, the basic premise of the German war plan remained the same as it had since 1905.

---

[69] Ibid., 98.
[70] Ibid., 105.
[71] Ibid., 108.
[72] Ibid., 110.
[73] Ibid., 111.

## IV. Conclusion (*The Shadow on the Wall*)

Paraphrasing Annika Mombauer, the Schlieffen Plan and its application in World War I seemed like something that did not need any reexamination, but looking at what historians have written about it over the past fifty years, I am forced to conclude that it does. Clearly Schlieffen had a plan, or plans, and bequeathed it to his successor, who modified the general concept, but, when war came, acted within the overall spirit of Schlieffen's plan. He did attack through Belgium into northern France with a strong right wing, attempting to envelop the French army just as Schlieffen had prescribed. He did not hold out in defense, he did not attack the French fortress line (although he did eventually when the assault on the right flank had clearly failed), and he did not attack south through Switzerland. Out of all his available options, he chose the one that was most similar to the plan he had inherited.

However, despite looking at the same evidence, historian after historian has changed the details or interpreted them in opposite ways. Gerhard Ritter seemed quite convinced that Chief of Staff Schlieffen tested his plan in staff rides and war games, but Terence Zuber, looking at some of the same evidence, insists he never did. Both of these historians cannot be correct. Historically as well as logically, Schlieffen could not have both tested his plan and not tested his plan at the same time. Similarly, Ludwig Reiners attributed the planned addition of Italian divisions in Lorraine to von Moltke the younger, but thirty six years later Robert Asprey felt free to attribute those Italian divisions to Schlieffen. Asprey also placed an eight-week timetable on Schlieffen's plan, but recently Terence Holmes lamented the universal imposition of a six-week timetable on the plan. Gerhard Ritter, who conducted one of the most in depth analysis of the Schlieffen Plan, insisted that French military planning did not influence Schlieffen's adjustments between 1900 and 1905, but Robert Foley insists that it did.

It is not unusual or amazing to read disagreements between historians, but what is amazing is that between 1945 and the mid 1990s no new information on the plan came to light, yet what

historians wrote about the plan changed in fairly significant ways. The primary information they looked at had not changed, which leads me to conclude that writing history is like a game of 'telephone' spanning years instead of yards. Each historian felt that the concept of the Schlieffen Plan and why it 'went wrong' at the onset of World War I was so simple that they were free to describe it however they wanted, as long as that description more of less conformed to something they had previously read about the plan.

In that way, I am sympathetic to Terence Zuber's argument that historians have picked up basic assumptions about the plan and repeated them until it seemed like they held an unshakable, literal truth in their hands. Regardless of whether Zuber is right about how genuine Schlieffen's intentions were when he wrote his famous plan, the outcry that came from historians after his provocative unraveling of their idea only seemed to prove his point, that he had "slaughtered a sacred cow," although his act of butchering appeared to only create a red herring.

For years Schlieffen's plan stood behind historian's backs as they jotted down descriptions of its shadowy reflection on the cave wall in front of them. We can only hope in vain that the recent reinvestigation of the Schlieffen Plan will finally yield a consensus.

## WAS THE INCA EMPIRE A SOCIALIST STATE? A HISTORICAL DISCUSSION

**Kevin R. Harris**

Before the Spanish conquest of the Americas in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, the Inca Empire spread down much of the modern South American coast in the Andes Mountains. The empire consisted of more than ten million inhabitants and had, at the time, a very unique political and economic system. The government divided land and animals amongst members of the nation, not necessarily equally, and a system was in place to take care of the elderly and sick. Social scientists have been debating how to classify the Inca Empire for centuries. Arguments have been made which classified the Inca Empire as a socialist state. Many elements of socialism existed in the Inca Empire, but can the state really be classified as socialistic?

The Incas moved into the area which is now known as the Cuzco Valley around 1200. Over the next 300 years they became one of the dominant empires in the "New World." Rural Incas lived in small agricultural communities. According to Peter Bakewell, author of *A History of Latin America*, "the basic unit of society, apart from the family, was the ayllu, which seems fundamentally to have been a clan, a group of people descended from some common ancestor."[1] The *ayllu* played an important role in Incan society; it had landholdings for growing and raising domesticated animals like llamas and alpacas. Families in the *ayllu* owned their own homes, clothes, utensils, and often a garden or small plot of land. According to George Peter Murdock,

> The clan owned collectively, however, all land outside the village. Its members enjoyed equal rights to game, wood, and pasturage on the communal forest and

---

*Kevin Harris is a junior History major from DuQuoin, Illinois. He wrote this paper for Dr. Jose Deustua in History 3255, Colonial Latin America in the Fall of 2006.*

[1]Peter Bakewell, *A History of Latin America* (Malden: Blackwell Publishers Inc, 1997), 26.

meadow, and they tilled in common a portion of the agricultural land for the support of the chief, the cult and the aged.[2]

However, not all land was used for communal purposes all the time. Sometimes individual members of the community used the land for a period of time for personal use. Llamas and alpacas also grazed on the land. These large animals were used for work and their wool was used to make clothing in the Inca State.[3] When a common couple was married the community built them a modest house.[4] It was a custom in Incan society for people to help others in the community who were in need. "People were expected to lend their labor to cultivate neighbors' land, and expected that neighbors would help them in due course. All capable people were collaborated to support the incapable—orphans, widows, the sick—with food and housing."[5] Inca commoners expected this courtesy from their neighbors. Many in peasant villages and communities depended on mutual assistance for survival.

The Inca had a uniquely divided social structure. The males were organized into groups based on age and ability to work. Healthy men between the ages of twenty five and fifty were placed in a category called *purics*. According to Murdock, "each *puric* was a married man, a householder, and a laborer for the state as well as for himself."[6] The *purics* were the heart of labor in Incan society. At the top of the chain was the *Sapa* Inca. The *Sapa* was the King of the Inca Empire and seat of all power. Sally Falk Moore, author of *Power and Property in Inca Peru*, describes the political system under the *Sapa* Inca, "below him are the four *apocunas* who ruled the four quarters of the empire, and below

---

them the *t'oqrikoq* who each ruled 40,000 families."[7] Moore goes on to add that the chain keeps breaking down into smaller groups. She says *hunu* were the next step down and were in charge of 10,000 families. These families were then broken down into groups of 100 families which were divided into groups of 10. She adds, "Inca officials probably were drawn principally from the eleven royal *ayllus*."[8] An element of hierarchy existed in Inca society. Society consisted of a top down caste and class system in which the people at the top did have preferential treatment, but social mobility was a possibility in the Empire.

Many social scientists have attempted to lump the unique Inca society into modern political and economic categories. Louis Baudin argued that Incan society was socialistic. He claimed that the ayllu system is what classified the Inca as a system of state socialism. Baudin defines state socialism as being "based on the idea of the 'regulative action of a central power in social relations'…the modern state socialists propose to respect the existing order, that is, private property and individual initiative."[9] Baudin argues that there is a difference in modern Western Europe and Peru during the time of Inca rule. The idea of private property in Europe had been in existence for centuries, but no such idea existed at the times of the Incas. He claims, "in Peru it rested on a foundation of collective ownership which, to a certain extent, facilitated its establishment, because the effacement of the individual within a group prepared him to allow himself to be absorbed."[10] Baudin argued that the higher ranking Incas tried, and succeeded to an extent, to force a degree of uniformity on the common Inca. The Inca were forced to dress similarly, eat the same food, practice the same religion, and speak the same language, Quechua.[11] He also states that crops

---

[2]George Peter Murdock, "The Organization of Inca Society," *The Scientific Monthly* (Mar 1934): 232.

[3]Ibid.

[4]Louis Baudin, *Daily Life in Peru*, (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1962), 199.

[5]Bakewell, *A History of Latin America*, 26.

[6]Murdock, "The Organization of Inca Society," 233.

[7]Sally Falk Moore, *Power and Property in Inca Peru* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1958), 99.

[8]Ibid., 100.

[9]Louis Baudin, *A Socialist Empire: The Incas of Peru* (New York: D. Van Nostrand Company, Inc., 1961), 89.

[10]Ibid.

[11]Ibid., 93.

from the community land were supposed to be stored by the State and distributed according to need. The leftovers were then supposed to be given to the State. However, he adds that this would have been a problem in Incan communities. He explains, "very wisely the directors of the State waived the exigencies of integral rationalism and shared out the land and not its produce…the ownership of their land was taken from them, but the fruits of their soils remained."[12]

The government ensured that Inca families would be able to have the means of growing enough food for themselves. When an Inca couple was married, they were given a plot of land to cultivate called a *tupu*. The size of the plot varied depending on its productivity. When a child was born, the couple was given more land to be able to feed the child. For a daughter, the couple received half a plot, and for a son they received a whole plot. Once everyone in a community had a sufficient amount of land to support themselves, the rest of the land in the area belonged to the State. Each Inca family was also entitled to two llamas which would be used for wool, transportation, and the manure was used for fertilizer.[13] In a review of Baudin's work, Ralph Blodgett describes the system as "[operating] through production quotas, statistical controls, reserve stocks of goods held against emergencies, the rationing of final products, and sever penalties of violations of regulations."[14] This shows that there was a central planning center in the government which was in charge of production and distribution. This is a key characteristic in the communist and socialist nations we have seen in the twentieth century. Blodgett goes on to add that labor service was mandatory and that personal service was used as a tax system. According to *The Communist Manifesto*, a key element in a communist society is, "[payment of] a heavy progressive or graduated income tax."[15] Since there was no real currency or

payment in Incan society they could not pay an income tax, so they were required to work for the government as a form of tax payment. *The Communist Manifesto* adds another key characteristic, "Equal liability of all to labour. Establishment of industrial armies, especially for agriculture."[16] The majority of non-noble males in Incan society were responsible to pay the government in labor. Nearly everyone was required to work the land. The main form of labor they were responsible for was in agriculture, although some people were required to do other tasks such as building roads or state or religious buildings.

Even though there are examples of socialism in Incan society, not all social scientists are sold on the idea. One main critic was Alfred Metraux. In, "The Inca Empire: Despotism or Socialism?," he lays out his argument against the Incas being socialistic. Metraux starts out by doubting the information people used to classify Incan society. He says, "among the chronicles and reports and documents which Spain, that rummager of old papers, has handed down to us, and in the accounts of the Indians themselves, one finds enough mixed-up assertions and facts to bolster or justify the most diverse interpretations."[17] He also questions the accuracy of the information that the natives gave to the Spanish calling it idealized images and exaggerations. He continues by calling the idea of socialism in Incan society a myth.

The information about the Inca Empire has been interpreted based on a terminology that was not useful for the time. Metraux's argument was, "the Incas combined the most absolute kind of despotism with the greatest tolerance toward the social and political order of its subject peoples."[18] However, this idea seems to be contradictory. Metraux is saying that the Incas were tyrants and ruled tyrannically, but at the same time were very

---

[12]Ibid., 222.

[13]Ibid., 223.

[14]Ralph Blodgett, review of *A Socialist Empire: The Incas of Peru*, by Louis Baudin, in *Southern Economic Journal* (January 1962): 311.

[15]Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *The Communist Manifesto* (London: Verso,

1988), 60

[16]Ibid., 61.

[17]Alfred Metraux, "The Inca Empire: Despotism or Socialism?" in Lewis Hanke and Jane Rausch eds., *People and Issues in Latin American History* (New York: Markus Wiener Publishing Inc., 1997), 76.

[18]Ibid., 77.

tolerant of the social and political order of the Incan people, of the commoners. He also called the system imperialistic and a forced labor system. Another key argument Metraux used to argue against the Incas being socialist is a definition of socialism by Bertrand Russell:

> Socialism essentially means common ownership of land and capital under a democratic form of government. It implies production for use and not for profit and distributed, if not equally to all, at any rate according to inequalities justified only in the public interest.[19]

The Inca Empire surely did not meet this standard. Inca officials, clergy, and the *Sapa* Inca all had privileges in the Empire. According to Metraux a third of Inca production went to support the clergy and another third went to the government. This left only one third of Inca production to the masses.[20] These circumstances under this definition would show that the Inca Empire was not socialistic. The peasants' required service benefited the elite group and not the State as a whole. In addition, aid to the elderly and incapable was the responsibility of the village and not the State. These views strengthened Metraux argument that the Inca Empire was not socialistic.

Baudin himself said that it was a stretch to call the Inca Empire socialistic. According to Blodgett, "[Baudin] concedes that pure socialism does not exist in practice and that the Peru of the Incas was far from a purely socialistic state."[21] Baudin believed that the rural Inca communities resembled socialism and communalism, but recognized that it was a stretch to view the empire as a purely socialistic state, particularly due to the nature of the ruling upper class.

Some authors have categorized the Inca system as a monarchy. George Murdock, while at the same time laying out arguments for socialism, describes an Inca system that much more resembled a monarchy rather than a socialist Utopia.

Murdock suggested that the Chief Inca sat well above the peasants. The *Sapa* Inca was exempt from the labor that others were required to do. He also had a higher standard of living and owned many private herds of animals and landholdings. The position of *Sapa* Inca was also a hereditary one that was passed down from generation to generation, rather than a position that was selected by the masses.[22]

By looking at information from various sources it can be seen that many elements of the Inca Empire were socialistic. The most noticeable are the communal ownership of some land by the *ayllu* in rural communities, and the requirement for the communities to take care of the sick and elderly. However, when looking at the Inca system as a whole it can be concluded that the Inca Empire was not a purely socialist state and that it even had elements of other social and political systems such as a monarchy. Socialism is a modern term that was invented in the 18th century, well after the fall of the Inca Empire. The Inca system was very unique and cannot be classified in any one modern political term. The Inca system stands alone and needs to be classified as its own political and economic system, "Incaism" perhaps.

---

[19]Ibid., 79.
[20]Ibid., 77.
[21]Blodgett, review of *A Socialist Empire*, 312.

[22]Murdock, "The Organization of Inca Society," 233.

## ARTICLE 28: AN ILLUSION OF RELIGIOUS TOLERATION AND SECULAR GOVERNMENT IN JAPAN

**Ashley Tomlinson**

*Introduction*

The late nineteenth century brought the decline of the Tokugawa Shogun and the increase in foreign pressures within Japan. The Meiji government, focused on restoring the Emperor, emerged and had to become accustomed to participating in an entangled, modernized, and westernized world. Studying European examples, the government created a Constitution that included new voting qualifications, a House of Representatives and a House of Peers, regulations to create a state budget, and importantly, freedom of religion.[1] Article 28 of the 1889 Constitution stated that "Japanese subjects shall, within limits not prejudicial to peace and order, and not antagonistic to their duties as subjects, enjoy freedom of religious belief."[2]  Like many Western countries at the time, Japan was claiming a new identity as a secular state.[3]

Though granted in the Japanese Constitution, the reality of a secular government, religious freedom, and toleration was quite different. Religion played a large, irreplaceable role in modern Japanese society, both politically and socially. Taking a deeper look into the development and use of State Shinto, the truth behind claims of religious toleration and protection, and people's dependence on religion proves that Article 28 was

granted for political reasons. Despite its promises, Japan was far from a secular society in the modern era, particularly in the Meiji, Taishō, and Shōwa eras, and wartime specifically.

*State Shinto: Stability, Control, and National Unity*

Established in 1868, the Meiji government was in place about twenty years before it enacted the Constitution that granted religious freedom. Originally, Meiji was created with traditional *saisei-itchi*, "unity of religion in government," in mind, insisting Shinto become a "newly concocted religion of ethnocentric nationalism."[4] Shinto, as a native religion, originated from a Japanese national myth concerning the Sun Goddess Amaterasu, considering the Imperial family her descendants. In this religion, purity is important, giving specific focus on birth, life, and other sacred rituals that are important in expelling impure or bad luck. Being polytheistic, multiple gods or *kamis*, are worshiped at many different types of Shrines throughout the country, ranging from those for war veterans to exam success. In addition, it takes on an animistic approach, revering even mountains and rocks as valuable gods and spirits.[5]

Utilizing this national religion, the government immediately created the Department of Shinto and issued the "Separation Edict," separating the Buddhism-Shinto co-existence that had been in place for hundreds of years. By 1870, the Shinto based "way of the kami" was introduced to guide all Japanese citizens.[6] In 1872, *Kyodo-shoku*, an Administrative Office within the Religious Ministry, was set up to supervise religious Shinto teachings and other areas. This government control experienced many problems, protests, and changes, and by the late 1880s, the Administrative Office was dissolved and the Constitution written, separating church and state. However, in reality, state control of citizens' devotion to Shinto was far from over. From

---

[1]Andrew Gordon, *A Modern History of Japan: From Tokugawa Times to the Present* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003), 93.

[2]*The Constitution of the Empire of Japan* (1889) accessed from "Hanover Historical Texts Project," http://history.hanover.edu/texts/1889con.html.

[3]For the purposes of this paper, "secular" is defined as "not specifically relating to religion or to a religious body." Definition from Dictionary.com, *The American Heritage® Dictionary of the English Language, Fourth Edition* (Houghton Mifflin Company, 2004).

[4]Joseph Kitagawa, *Religion in Japanese History* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1966), 213.

[5]Lecture , Dr. Jinhee Lee, Eastern Illinois University, August 28, 2006.

[6]Ibid., 201.

the 1880s on, the "national cult" of State Shinto was enforced in Japan with the government in control of over 200,000 Shrines and requiring all citizens to register, making Shinto a part of every Japanese life.[7]

Yet, the "secular" Japanese government used Shinto for far more than registration and population statistics. One of the first uses of state mandated Shinto was for the stabilization of government. Starting a new era in Japanese government, replacing a Shogun-centered *bakufu* system which was fairly peaceful for over two hundred years, the Meiji rulers knew that they needed a foundation to back up the restoration of the Emperor. They used the Shinto religion to add prestige, power, and sacredness to the position of Emperor, elevating him to the status of "living Kami," god or deity. [8] Only in the worship of the living kami, or Emperor, can Shinto reach its highest manifestation. This religious emphasis did not cease at the creation of the Constitution. Prince Ito, one of the main drafters of the Constitution, wrote in 1889:

> The Emperor is Heaven descended, divine and sacred;
> He is preeminent above all his subjects.  He must be
> reverenced and is inviolable.  He had indeed to pay due
> respect to the law, but the law has no power to hold him
> accountable to it.  Not only shall there be no irreverence
> for the Emperor's person, but also He shall not be made
> a topic of derogatory comment nor one of discussion.[9]

This made the "kami's will…the Emperor's will," and consequently, the will of the nation until the end of WWII.[10]  This emphasis on the Divine Will of the Emperor bears a striking resemblance to the Divine Right of Kings theory in seventeenth century Europe, stating the ruler receives divine guidance, therefore no one is worthy to challenge. This allows the

government to achieve stability and legitimacy over their new form of government by keeping everyone in their societal rank or place, reducing the risk of protest or unrest.[11]

Similarly, the Japanese government used religion to stabilize their colonies. For example, Japanese officials supported the creation of Confucian temples and institutions in Taiwan and Korea to promote themselves as "benevolent and enlightened masters who had the divine commission to emancipate the inhabitants…from its state of chaos, ignorance, and misery."[12] In other words, subjugated peoples should follow the Japanese rule without challenge because it is divinely inspired and will help bring them out of their inherent misery.[13]

In addition to using State Shinto to create a feeling of stability in Japan, the government also utilized State Shinto to create further governmental control over the people. For instance, all people, no matter what their self-claimed religion, had to register with a Shinto Shrine.[14] The government continued to condense all the national shrines into one system, and used legal enactments to regulate the "organization, priesthood, and ceremony…and limited celebration [to] ceremonies and festivals considered appropriate to fostering national characteristics." Any desire to deviate or make changes to this organization had to receive the approval of the prefectural governor.[15] Most deviations were met with harsh conflict.

The governmental use of religion to control the people only increased as the society crawled closer to the Second World War. In fact, many religious institutions and decisions were then handled by the military. Pushing for support of the "holy war," the government told Shinto priests that they are to "take appropriate steps regarding conditions in your respective jurisdictions in order to make people pray for the conquest of the enemy, feel the august virtue of the deities, entertain strong faith

---

[7]William Bunce, *Religions in Japan: Buddhism, Shinto, and Christianity* (Rutland: Charles E. Tuttle Company), 28-31.

[8]Kitagawa, *Religion in Japanese History*, 203.

[9]D.C. Holtom, *Modern Japan and Shinto Nationalism: A Study of Present Day Trends in Japanese Religions* ( New York: Paragon Book Reprint Corp., 1963), 9.

[10]Ibid., 10.

[11]Ibid., 12.

[12]Kitagawa, *Religion in Japanese History* , 259.

[13]Ibid.

[14]Ibid., 201.

[15]Bunce, *Religions in Japan*, 31-34.

in our victory, and affirm still more their resolution to guard the imperial country."[16]  The government continued to stir up the war as a religious experience, "based on a sense of national destiny centering in the divine nature of the emperor and the sacred 'national structure.'"[17] As seen in the film, Yasukuni Shrine,[18] the ultimate honor was to serve Japan as an ultimately suicidal ***kami****kaze*, "divine wind," pilot.  It is apparent, no matter if the masses supported it or not, "subservience to 'the way of the gods' and 'imperial way' was inevitable" because of governmental controls.[19]

Nonetheless, it must not be implied that the only function of State Shinto was perceived as a stabilizing and controlling institution. The use of a state wide cult or religion served to unify Japan in a time when many were asking, "Who are 'we Japanese?'"[20] And, countless were chanting, "Down with frivolous Europeanization!" "Keep to our national heritage!," and "Japan for the Japanese!"[21] Shinto ideas as moral and national codes promoted by the state allowed Japan to emerge, at least in some light, to put "Western Technology, Japanese Spirit" into practice.[22]  This was idealized in the 1890 "Imperial Rescript on Education." This document was recited daily by school children and by all at special occasions. Although its promotion of State Shinto was not direct, it promoted the state through many religious references. It stated that its subjects would be "ever united in loyalty and filial piety" and required, the "guard and maintain the prosperity of Our Imperial Throne coeval with heaven and earth."[23] The document served as a form of national anthem and was treated as a "holy writ."[24]

---

[16]Ibid., 40.

[17]Ibid.

[18]John elson, *Spirits of the State: Japan's Yasukuni Shrine*, DVD. 2004.

[19]Bunce, *Religions in Japan*, 42.

[20]Gordon, *A Modern History of Japan*, 111.

[21]Masuharu Anesaki, *History of Japanese Religion: With Special Reference to the Social and Moral Life of the Nation* (Rutland: Charles E. Tuttle Company, 1963), 360.

[22]Dr. Lee, Lecture, October 6, 2006.

[23]Emperor Meiji, *Imperial Rescript of Education*, October 30, 1890.

[24]Bunce, *Religions in Japan*, 39.

The use of Shinto ideas to promote nationalism only increased as militarism increased on the brink of World War II. Shrines took on "added prestige," and worshiping at them became more than a religious act, rather "a test of being a true Japanese subject."[25] Many times, religious practice was even overshadowed by nationalistic victory celebrations, fundraising for war supplies, and other patriotic activities at the Shrines.[26]

Clearly, the government was using State Shinto and its practices to promote the stability and control of the nation, but at the same time, providing many Japanese with some much needed feelings of national unity, illustrating "Keep to our national heritage!," and "Japan for the Japanese!"[27] Either way, the government was far from secular, using Shinto to achieve their political goals.

### *Reality of Religious Toleration and Protection: Christianity and Buddhism*

Keeping the above in mind, it is true that the Japanese 1889 Constitution did grant a degree of freedom of religion to its citizens. On paper, Buddhism and Christianity were allowed as long as the citizens were concurrently worshiping and registering with Shinto Shrines, but the government offered little in the way of religious toleration and protection.

From the beginning of Meiji Era, government officials viewed religious toleration not as a right that is owed to their citizens, rather a political strategy. Many Western powers had encouraged this openness concerning religion since the mid nineteenth century in order to establish a relationship, then unequal, with Japan. In the 1850s, President Fillmore, knowing that the Japanese disliked missionaries, told Commodore Perry to relay that "the United States was not like other Christian countries, since it did not interfere in religion at home, much less

---

[25]Ibid., 40.

[26]Ibid.

[27]Dr. Lee, Lecture, October 6, 2006.

abroad."[28] Japan quickly realized that the fastest way to reverse unequal treaties was with the same "modernization" and "Westernization" of their own culture, and this included adopting common legal and political practices, i.e. secular society. Though the government removed of the edict against Christianity in 1873, it was obvious the Japanese government still had "no love [or tolerance] for Christianity."[29] This is evident through the examples of discrimination instead of toleration and protection that continued to plague Japan.

Of all the religions present in Japan during the modern era, Christianity was considered the worst of all evils. Ironically, government officials, former Buddhist priests, and citizens alike were coming together to use "their hard won religious freedom…to attack Christianity," and in many respects, they were successful.[30] Anti-Christian feelings, dating back to time of unequal treaties and rough international relations with the West during the mid nineteenth century, only increased when a Western power would do something unfavorable, i.e. the United States passage of the Oriental Exclusion Act.[31] In the 1890s, Inouye Tetsujiro, then professor of philosophy at Tokyo Imperial University, led an anti-Christian campaign stressing that the "Christian doctrine of universal love was incompatible with national virtues…and the Imperial Rescript on Education," and institutions, like the University of Tokyo, were even gaining positive reputations as "anti-Christian."[32] As late as 1938, popular publications were claiming that Christianity brought an unwanted "measure of encroachment, anxiety and coercion."[33]

In addition, Christianity's very foundations teach the worship of only one god, making it hard to worship polytheistic Shinto simultaneously. Those who refused to worship Shinto were imprisoned, and many died in prison or soon after being freed.[34] During the first three years of the Meiji era alone over three thousand Catholics were arrested or sent into exile.[35] Though violence and death was rare, discrimination in community, work places, and more was not, and over 60,000 hidden Christians suffered as the Meiji "secular" government often encouraged discrimination and gave no protection over religious activities.[36]

On the other end of the spectrum, Buddhism was considered the other major religion in Japan. Before the Meiji, Buddhism, in combination with Shinto, had been a praised religion of Japan, including the requirement that every family register with a Buddhist temple. However, in modern Japan, Buddhists faced persecution that escalated rather quickly.[37] For example, in the Toyama district the number of temples was reduced from 1,730 to seven overnight. [38] All over the country demolished temples and monasteries sent priests and nuns back into secular life, and lands were sold or taken by the government. Although some was the result of consolidation for better control and oversight, many government officials and Shinto priests joined to raise anti-Buddhist feelings among the masses. Buddhists did fight back against the anti-Buddhist campaigns by, in some cases, staging riots and insurrections. For instance, Buddhists of three counties of Echizen (Fukui prefecture) marched together to a local government office demanding changes to allow Buddhist teachings. The government, instead of listening or allowing religious toleration, quickly put down this riot with government troops.[39] Those Buddhist priests who further refused to cooperate were often jailed or "intimidated into silence."[40]

Overall, by the late 1930s and 1940s, all "liberal" or "Western" thinking, including freedom of religion, was

---

[28]Kitagawa, *Religion in Japanese History,* 236.
[29]Ibid., 190.
[30]Ibid., 231.
[31]Ibid., 243-245.
[32]Anesaki, *History of Japanese Religion*, 360.
[33]Holtom, *Modern Japan and Shinto Nationalism*, 93.

---

[34]Bunce, *Religions in Japan*, 41.
[35]Kitagawa, *Religion in Japanese History*, 238.
[36]Gordon, *A Modern History of Japan, 110.*
[37]Ibid., 111.
[38]Kitagawa, *Religion in Japanese History*, 202.
[39]Ibid., 226.
[40]Bunce, *Religions in Japan*, 42

"condemned under suspicion of being a threat to the Japanese way of life," and "freedom of press, thought…assembly… conscience and belief, was violated." People developed a sense of "fear" that denied them the right to express their thoughts to even their closest friends.[41] Clearly, the government provided for a secular society by granting Constitutional freedom of religion, but in actuality, religions other than State Shinto were barely tolerated and rarely protected. Interestingly, there are few records of Buddhists or Christians recanting their faith in favor of Shinto.[42]  It seems, as discovered in the next section, people still desired the spiritual assistance religion brought them, no matter the cost.

*Religion and the Populace: Dependence on and Creation*

Though the government preached secular society and a national cult of Shinto, it did not stop the populace from showing their dependence and need for religion in their own personal lives. People experienced change in the lives due to modernization and Westernization, and many felt like they needed somewhere, other than the new, modernized State Shinto, to turn. Peasants, experiencing Rice Riots and labor strikes often turned to new "messianic or healing" religious activities because they felt that "neither modern civilization nor an industrial economy would alleviate their distress."[43] By 1935 there were over 1,000 of these new religions in practice,[44] and many of these were practiced underground for fear of government disapproval.[45] Like the mainstream religions of Christianity and Buddhism, new religions were also seen as a threat to the government. Leaders were arrested and religions were "dissolved," though many still existed in secret. Again, showing that secular society provided by freedom of religion on paper was not in practice.

Peasants and rural populations were not the only ones who felt they needed some where to turn. Young men and women struggled with *hammon*, spiritual trouble and agony, and were searching for something that went beyond what State Shinto could offer. In extreme cases, the inability to find what one was looking for led to suicide.  For example, a young man, seventeen years of age, jumped into a waterfall, leaving words carved in a tree nearby rendering life "a riddle never to be solved by religion or philosophy." Though this was an extreme case, it encompasses the idea that many young people, both urban and rural, felt at time.[46] It seems that the very set up of Japan's modern secular, religiously free, society had a different effect on the people than the government originally predicted. Many were left desiring a place that offered more "concrete" and "practical" help than State Shinto.[47]

*Conclusion*

There is no doubt that Meiji era brought about changes, political, social, international, economic, etc. that set modern Japan on a path necessary to play a significant role in the modern globalizing world. To do so successfully, the nation adopted many Western practices, including a Constitution that granted religious toleration. Article 28 of the 1889 Constitution stated that Japanese citizens are guaranteed religious freedom "within limits not prejudicial to peace and not antagonistic to duties as citizens."[48] However, this hardly meant Japan was a secular nation. Religion was central part of modern Japanese life. The introduction of State Shinto was used to stabilize, control, and unite Japan as a nation, while other religions, mainly Christianity and Buddhism, were hardly tolerated or protected. Additionally, many were left with a longing for a different, more practical, religion than State Shinto.

---

[41]Kitagawa, *Religion in Japanese History*, 198.

[42]Bunce, *Religions in Japan*, 42.

[43]Kitagawa, *Religion in Japanese History*, 222.

[44]Ibid.

[45]Bunce, *Religions in Japan*, 160.

---

[46]Anesaki, History of Japanese Religion, 376.

[47]Gordon, *A Modern History of Japan, 159.*

[48]Ibid., 110.

By exploring these aspects of Meiji society, it is obvious that Article 28 may have established a state separated from church on the surface. However, in reality, religion still played an integral part in citizens' everyday lives, making it impossible to consider Japan a secular and religiously tolerant nation.

## *RETHINKING "THE EPISODE OF MR. WELLS:" A STUDY IN THE SOCIALISM, POLITICS, AND PERSONALITIES OF THE FABIANS AND H.G. WELLS*

**Robyn E. Carswell**

*The right timing and the right degree, governed alike by vigilance and patience,*
*so that nothing regrettable is done though haste, and nothing left undone through sloth.*
*-Erasmus*
*You may say that the world has been changed by a smaller handful than those who meet here to-night,*
*but they met under Pentecostal tongues of fire,*
*-H.G. Wells*

In 1903, the Fabian Society celebrated almost two decades of existence, and looked to the future with something less than unanimity. A socialist organization founded by well-educated men and women possessed of strong and independent personalities, it was united in its desire to bring about socialism, but scattered in its approach to that goal. The Fabian leaders, especially Beatrice and Sidney Webb, George Bernard Shaw, and Hubert Bland, agreed that new blood was necessary to renew the society's vitality, and they soon settled on one man above others to help them meet that goal: H.G. Wells. Wells, who had been a proponent of socialism nearly as long as the Fabians had been meeting, had written *Anticipations* (1902), a book in which he called for the end of capitalism and the emergence of a new World-State. Fabian leaders read the book and agreed that Wells's ideas could help make Fabianism interesting again. At the urging of Sidney and Beatrice Webb, Wells joined the

*Robyn Carswell, of Shelbyville, Illinois, who earned her BA in history with departmental honors at Eastern Illinois University, is currently a graduate student in History. A member of Phi Alpha Theta, she wrote this paper as her senior honors thesis, in Spring 2006, under the direction of Dr. Michael Shirley.*

Fabians in 1903. All seemed primed for a Fabian revival. Yet only five years later, Wells quit the Fabians in disgust.

Those five years have been labeled as everything from a "petty, dusty conflict"[1] to a "Storm in a Fabian Teacup."[2] During first three years, Wells offered minimal participation in the society, usually through minor essays and a few lectures. In 1906, however, after being asked for a "stock-taking" report by Shaw,[3] Wells shifted from a passive player to a radical reformer. Wells began in February of 1906 with a lecture entitled "Faults of the Fabian." In his address, he heavily criticized the Fabians for being small-minded and collectively inactive. Initially, the Fabians took the censure well and began to make changes. The Fabians formed a special committee to address the problems within the society, but the Fabian Executive eventually stonewalled the report. The ensuing debate between Wells, chair of the Special Committee and Bernard Shaw, chair for the Executive, was carried on over three months at members-only meetings during the closing weeks of 1906 and the early months of 1907. Even after winning a seat on the Executive, Wells's reform attempts remained unrealized. After two years of blocked action, Wells finally gave up in a fit of despair, resigned his position on the Executive, and ended his Fabian membership.

The historiography of H.G. Wells and his membership in the Fabian society is limited, and most scholarly work focuses too heavily on the personality differences and petty squabbles that existed between the factions that developed during his tenure with the society. Many historians rely on early accounts from members such as Edward Pease, S. G. Hobson, Beatrice Webb and Bernard Shaw for their assertions; yet all of these accounts are anti-Wells in nature. Margaret Cole, a Fabian herself, wrote

---

[1]H.G. Wells, *Experiment in Autobiography: Discoveries and Conclusions of a Very Ordinary Brain (Since 1866)* (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1934), 564.

[2]Norman and Jeanne Mackenzie, *H.G. Wells: A Biography* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1973), 201.

[3]George Bernard Shaw (GBS) to Edward R. Pease (ERP), 4 July, 1905 in Dan H. Laurence, ed., *Bernard Shaw, Collected Letters, 1898-1910* (New York: Dodd, Mead & Company, 1972), 536.

*The Story of Fabian Socialism* in 1961 after a gap of almost half a century, since the days of Edward Pease. Cole, who relied heavily on Pease for her conclusions, maintained that, "The immediate issue was one of personality not of principle – Wells *versus* the Old Guard, with Shaw as its chief spokesman."[4] While she is correct in her claim of Shaw as mouthpiece for the Executive and the "Old Gang," she still repeated Pease's assertion that the differences were personal. To her credit, Cole put the affair into the larger picture—that of the parliamentary election of 1906, which previous historians had ignored. She claimed, correctly, that the social historians of the 1950s had largely played down the election, suggesting, "that there was nothing really radical about it."[5]

Other historians, such as George Mariz and Norman and Jeanne Mackenzie, have also relied heavily on anti-Wells sources. In his "The Fabians and the 'Episode of Mr. Wells'," Mariz claimed, "that personal animosity played a large role" in the episode. [6] He also argued that Wells found it impossible to work within a framework that was not completely his own creation.[7] Norman and Jeanne Mackenzie offer two chapters devoted to the Fabian affray in their 1973 biography of Wells. They considered Wells an abrasive character with whom most people could not get along. They claim that Wells, in "Faults of the Fabian," required the Society give itself over to him.[8] In fact, Wells asked only for the liberty to develop a massive propaganda campaign and marketing strategy; it was Shaw who claimed Wells demanded the Executive's resignation.[9]

David Smith, perhaps the most prolific writer on Wells's life, regards the Fabian-Wells imbroglio as overplayed when

---

[4]Margaret Cole, *The Story of Fabian Socialism* (Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1961), 123.

[5]Ibid., 113.

[6]George Mariz, "The Fabians and the 'Episode of Mr. Wells'," *Research Studies* 51, no. 2 (June 1983): 83.

[7]Ibid., 95.

[8]Mackenzie, *H.G. Wells: A Biography*, 197.

[9]*Fabian News*, January 1907, 13.

focusing on the personalities involved: "this matter has received a great deal of attention, much of the correspondence surrounding the case has not yet been printed, and no account uses all available correspondence."[10]  In his own work, *Desperately Mortal*, he maintained that Wells was a novice in the political field and that his four books on socialism represent an evolution in his socialist philosophy and the members of the "Old Gang" were unwilling to be patient.[11]  He further argued, that the "Old Gang" did not want to be reformed, especially Shaw, who according to Smith did not take Wells seriously, "except as a threat to his power on the Fabian executive."[12]  Wells annoyed many members of the Executive by his overbearing personality, and Smith contended they were "threatened by the prospect of the future, or in Shaw's case, by the prospect of losing power."[13]  Smith also claimed that other members of the society had different aspirations for Wells, in particular the Webbs who Smith argued, "thought they could use Wells to their own ends," although he offers no evidence to support this assertion.[14]

As Smith pointed out, few historians have used the personal letters of Fabian members to support their arguments and even fewer have looked at the wealth of information contained in the *Fabian News*.  Personal letters between Shaw and Wells particularly deserve further analysis.  Privately, Shaw encouraged Wells's ideas about the society and supported his thoughts on possible changes, but at the public forum, he blasted Wells for his impulsive ideas and mocked his delays.  In letters to Webb, Shaw supported the use of Wells's ideas, but suggested presenting them as those of the Executive.

Misrepresentation of sources has also created problems in understanding the relationships between Wells and the Fabians.

One scholar, William J. Hyde, has used words of Beatrice Webb out of context to support his argument that the members of the society found Wells to be incorrigible and frustrating.  In his article, "The Socialism of H. G. Wells," Hyde quotes Beatrice Webb in the following: "to Mrs. Webb, Wells was merely a 'speculator,' a 'gambler' in ideas, useful for 'loose generalizations.'"[15]  One could argue Hyde's selective use of Beatrice Webb's words, leads the reader to believe that the Fabians thought of Wells as useful for nothing more than an entertaining diversion.  Beatrice's full words from her diary are as follows:

> We like him much—he is absolutely genuine and full of inventiveness—a "speculator" in ideas—somewhat of a gambler, but perfectly aware that his hypotheses are not verified. In one sense, he is a romancer spoilt by romancing—but, in the present stage of sociology, he is useful to gradgrinds like ourselves in supplying us with loose generalizations which we can use as instruments of research. And we are useful to him in supplying an endless array of carefully sifted facts and broad administrative experience.[16]

Because of errors and misrepresentation, the Fabians as well as other socialist societies demand further research.  While Socialism continues to be a popular and fruitful subject of study among historians, research into the relationship of those who considered themselves socialists, especially radicals, and the larger political movements can help to further the understanding of the successes as well as the failures of their endeavors.  In addition, it is necessary to study the relationship between Wells and the Fabians further, as it has later historic import regarding the rise in popularity of socialistic societies, and why the efforts of upper-middle class radicals to effect political change in Britain

---

[10]David C. Smith, *H.G. Wells: Desperately Mortal: a Biography* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986), 518.

[11]Ibid., 105.

[12]Ibid.

[13]Ibid., 95.

[14]Ibid.

---

[15]William J. Hyde, "The Socialism of H.G. Wells," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 17, no. 2 (April 1956): 218.

[16]Beatrice Webb, *Our Partnership*, eds. Barbara Drake and Margaret Cole (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1948), 289.

did not make as marked a change as one would have expected following the electoral gains of the Labour Party in 1906. Further, it is necessary to address the inaccuracies perpetuated by historians concerning the "episode" between Mr. Wells and the Fabians, inaccuracies that have led to a general labeling of Wells as more of a troublemaker and ill-mannered interloper than an assertive socialist. The arguments over personality clashes and matters of poor taste do not address the deeper issues—that of what exactly it was that the Fabians wanted from Wells, what Wells was trying to accomplish for the Fabians, and to what extent either side was successful. H.G. Wells joined the Fabian Society to help advance the cause of socialism. The Fabian Society recruited H.G. Wells to help advance Fabianism. In that respect, Wells did the job; he did not realize, however, at least initially, that those goals were not the same thing.

Finally, absent from scholarship is discussion of the behind-the-scenes reform party that Wells and several other prominent Fabians constructed. Wells and his reform-minded Fabian supporters had careful planning sessions and corresponded extensively during the tumultuous year after delivery of "Faults of the Fabians," especially in the month prior to election of a new Executive Committee. In short, while personality clashes definitely existed and probably exacerbated the conflict, Wells's ultimate withdrawal from the society after only five years was the culmination of arguments over differences of principle and politics rather than personality.

### Early Fabianism

In order to appreciate the dynamics of the episode, one needs an understanding of the social climate during the formation of Fabianism and what the Fabian Society represented. The socialist revival of the 1880s brought forth a myriad of new socialist organizations across the whole of Europe. The Social Democratic Federation and the Socialist League along with the Fabian Society survive to this day.

The Fabian Society debuted in 1883 when a small group of intellectuals met casually in a basement room to hear a lecture by

traveling scholar and philosopher, Thomas Davidson.[17] Those assembled had recently attended another lecture by Davidson, who was visiting London to promote the formation of Utopian societies and spread the gospel of communal living, and asked him to guest lecture at their first meeting. This was the first gathering of what the group called the Fellowship of the New Life and was attended by eleven others including Davidson himself. Originally, the group considered forming a separate community in which they would share their material possessions, but after the second meeting, the focus shifted away from cooperatives to education of society for the future. A rift developed between those in favor of communal living and those who wanted to focus on social education. The latter broke off from the original group and became the Fabians, although all those present continued to be members of both societies until the end of the Fellowship of the New Life in 1898. The fledgling society borrowed its name from the Roman General Quintus Fabius Maximus, who advocated the weakening of the opposition by harassing operations rather than becoming involved in battles. Thus was the birth of the Fabian Society.

Within two years, membership in the society grew and more notable personalities joined the group; Sydney Olivier, Eleanor Marx, Annie Besant, Graham Wallas, Charles Trevelyan, George Bernard Shaw, and Sidney and Beatrice Webb were among the newcomers. Bernard Shaw,[18] Sidney Webb,[19] Graham Wallas[20]

---

[17]Davidson was a scholar and had lived in America amongst the Utopian societies. He founded Ethical Societies and Schools and published volumes on philosophical subjects. According to Edward Pease, he was extremely charismatic and influenced many people to join in his Utopian thinking. – Pease, *History of the Fabian Society*, 26.

[18]George Bernard Shaw was born in Dublin Ireland in 1856 and moved to London at the age of nineteen. Desperately poor, he attended lectures and debates on local religious, social and political matters for entertainment. He also spend countless hours in study at the British Museum. He found socialism to be something he could support and became active, joining the Fabians in September of 1884, and advanced to the Executive Committee in January 1885.

[19] Sidney Webb was born in 1859 to an upper-middle class family, was educated abroad, but did not attend a University. He became a member of

and Sydney Olivier[21] became the foundation for the 'Old Gang' and much of the early success of the Fabian Society is due to their efforts in writing essays and lecturing. By 1886, the society boasted sixty-seven members, their own journal, titled *Today*, and a small annual income of £35 19s.

In the early years, the society forged manifestos and documents to frame and explain what they stood for and what their goals were. The Fabians believed that they could influence societal change through slow evolution rather than immediate revolution. The first document, "The Fabian Manifesto" issued in 1884, opened by stating that members of the society were responsible for spreading the opinions contained within the manifesto as well as "discussing their practical consequences."[22] They believed that a "life interest in the Land and Capital of the nation is the birthright of every individual" and wealth in the hands of private individuals resulted in competition leading to "adulteration [and] dishonest dealing[s]."[23] In 1887, the Fabian Society adopted its creed, which they called it the "Basis."[24] Edward Pease,[25] long-time secretary for the society, described it

as not fully a statement of faith, but rather "a test of admission, a minimum basis of agreement, acceptance of which is required from those who aspire to share in the control of a Society which had set out to reconstruct [their] social system."[26] The Basis later served as a major source of dissension in the Wells-Fabian relationship when Wells failed to gain Executive Committee support for recommended changes. The Basis stressed the importance of wrenching away "Land and Industrial Capital from individual and class ownership, and the vesting of them in the community for the general benefit,"[27] but the Fabian's basic philosophy was one of patient permeation rather than radical reform. According to the history of the society as told by the Fabians in their centennial work, *100 Years of Fabian Socialism, 1884-1984*, the early founders attempted to infiltrate "institutions by social reformist ideas, patiently setting out a rational case for change and improvement which the thinking citizen would, over time, embrace."[28] They proposed in the Basis that the best way to prepare society for its inevitable shift to socialism was through the "general dissemination of knowledge as to the relation between the individual and Society in its economic, ethical and political aspects."[29]

As the Fabian Society relied heavily on literary output to disseminate their doctrine, they published *Fabian Essays*, a collection of works by individual members; *Fabian Tracts*, intended for public distribution; and, for its members, the *Fabian News*. The views expressed by each member were considered solely his own and not representative of the society. Even collective publications such as *Fabian Essays* demonstrated the

---

London's intellectual crowd, argued most often that there was no need for a revolutionary movement within socialism and society was on a course toward that end, and simply needed guidance along the way. He, like the other members of the 'Old Gang' was a prolific writer and lecturer. He was also Baron Passfield, a title his wife despised and refused to use.

[20]Graham Wallas, a political psychologist, was born in Sunderland in 1858. He attended Corpus Christi at Oxford where he earned his degree and lost his religion. In the early twentieth century, when the society drifted from Liberalism, a cause Wallas staunchly supported, he left the Fabians.

[21]Sydney Olivier was born at Colchester in 1859. Like Wallas, Olivier was an alumnus of Corpus Christi, which was where the two met. He served with the Fabians leaving for a time to serve as colonial secretary and later governor of Jamaica. He was present during the later years of the Wells episode.

[22]"A Manifesto," *Fabian Tracts*, No. 2 (London: Geo. Standring, 8 & 9 Finsbury Street, E.C., 1884) in *Fabian Tracts, Nos. 1-47, 1884-1893*, (Nendeln/Liechtenstein: Kraus-Thomson Organization Limited, 1969): 6-7.

[23]Edward Pease, *The History of the Fabian Society*, 3d ed. (New York: Barnes & Noble, 1963) 41.

[24] For the full text of "The Basis," see the appendix on the last page of this article.

[25] Edward Pease, born in Bristol in 1857, served as secretary for the Fabians

---

from the beginning with only brief lapses. He dabbled in psychic research and spiritual séances until he met the reform-minded socialists, who preferred moral reform within the middle-class to radical revolution among the working-class. While his role was mainly administrative, he did write occasionally, and in 1916 he authored the first official *History of the Fabian Society*.

[26]Pease, *The History of the Fabian Society*, 72.

[27]Ibid., 284.

[28]Deidre Terrins and Phillip Whitehead, eds. *100 Years of Fabian Socialism 1884-1984* (London: The Fabian Society, 1984), 3.

[29]Pease, *The History of the Fabian Society*, 284.

range of beliefs held by individual members. In the collected essays both Annie Besant and Bernard Shaw presented differing theories of class behavior and morality. Shaw argued that while the bourgeoisie exploited the labors of the lower classes to line their pockets, they were also creating an environment in which the oppressed would "breed like rabbits; and their poverty breeds filth, ugliness, dishonesty, disease, obscenity, drunkenness and murder. In the midst of the riches which their labor piles up for you, their misery rises up too and stifles you."[30] Annie Besant, by contrast, maintained that education of the masses led to morality rather than simply recognizing their oppressed condition: "The moral education of the individual is the lesson, not that desire is evil...but that the wider, fuller satisfaction is built upon the simpler, and common morality a condition of its possibility.... [and that] love, the social instinct, and science, which is ordered knowledge, are his only reliable tutors in practical morality." No member was stifled in his or her personal opinions and editing by colleagues was not done.[31] When they were not writing, members of the Fabian Society lectured. By the time of publication of *Fabian Essays* in 1889, members had collectively delivered over 700 lectures.[32] Most of the lectures were simply reading of the papers and tracts that members had already written, but for members like Shaw and Webb, who were gifted orators, the delivery was as impressive as the material.

Politically, the Fabians did not align with any one particular party, although many individual members attempted to create one. In 1886, open invitations were sent out by the Fabian Society for all socialists to convene and discuss socialist ideas. Members of the Socialist League, a group spawned from a debate within the Social Democratic Foundation, accepted the invitation and a large group of socialists met at Anderton's Hotel

---

[30]Bernard Shaw, et al. *Fabian Essays on Socialism* Jubilee ed. (London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1948; reprint, Letchworth Hertfordshire: The Garden City Press Ltd., 1950), 20.

[31]Ibid., xl.

[32]Ibid., xxxix.

in September 1886. At the meeting, concerns arose that many Fabian members silently wished for a political movement amongst the socialists. Fabian members Annie Besant[33] and Hubert Bland[34] made and seconded a motion that addressed the issue, saying, "That it is advisable that Socialists should organize themselves as a political party for the purpose of transferring into the hands of the whole working community full control over the soil and the means of production, as well as over the production and distribution of wealth."[35]

To this, William Morris, leader of the Socialist League, added the following:

> But whereas the first duty of Socialists is to educate the people to understand what their present position is and what their future might be, and to keep the principle of Socialism steadily before them; and whereas no Parliamentary party can exist without compromise and concession, which would hinder that education and obscure those principles, it would be a false step for Socialists to attempt to take part in the Parliamentary contest.[36]

A heated debate followed that ended in a vote, which carried Mrs. Besant's motion.[37] Out of this deliberation the Fabian Parliamentary League was formed. While it survived for only a few years, the subject of the Fabian Society involving itself in politics became an issue that would resurface repeatedly, especially during the Wells years.

---

[33]Annie Besant, born Annie Wood in London in 1847, was a self-proclaimed feminist and anarchist. She married a minister in 1867, but later separated after she turned from orthodoxy. She championed radical movements, including access to birth control and theosophy.

[34]Hubert Bland was a charter member of the Fabians, along with his wife, Edith Nesbit. Bland married Nesbit in 1880, just two months prior to the arrival of their first son. Bland believed in imperialism and was an established freethinker.

[35]Pease, *The History of the Fabian Society*, 67.

[36]Ibid.

[37]The debate also resulted in Anderton's Hotel barring any further meetings of the Fabian Society. Ibid., 68.

A little over a decade after the conference at Anderton's Hotel, the Socialist societies attempted the process again, this time meeting with various trade union groups and Keir Hardie's Independent Labour Party. In 1900, seventy disillusioned organizations came together to form the Labour Representation Committee (LRC). The various groups joined forces for the purpose of backing candidates who would express the viewpoint of the working-class in Parliament. The LRC was not a political party and indeed had no members, but was rather a loose affiliation of special interest groups coming together for a common cause. Despite its origins as a non-political entity, the LRC later gave birth to the Labour Party, with its first successful candidates (twenty-nine in all) elected to Parliament in 1906. Edward Pease served as the representative for the Fabian Society.

As Pease and the "Old Gang" continued their labors within the Fabian framework, a new century began. With it emerged a rift between the younger crowd and the older generation. Membership was climbing, but new members were younger, typically university students, and increasingly more radical. Older members, specifically the Executive Committee, discouraged change and dawdled when it came to sensitive issues. Major issues such as the society's stance on the Boer War, education, and fiscal reform sharply divided many members.

The first test of this issue came during debates over the society's refusal to comment on the Boer War. They issued no formal leaflets or tracts. As Margaret Cole, author of *The Story of Fabian Socialism* and a Fabian herself, put it, the older generation of Fabians saw the war "as a monstrous irrelevance to Fabian work," which many members, especially the Executive Committee, argued was to promote socialism, not decide rights and wrongs.[38] The Executive Committee reached a divided decision on the subject with seven votes to five in favor of maintaining silence on the war. Sydney Olivier, who was leaving Britain to govern Jamaica, urged the Executive

---

[38]Cole, *The Story of Fabian Socialism*, 98.

Committee to reconsider the decision and publish a leaflet on the war, which they refused. Instead, the society asked the publication committee to consider a more general tract on the subject of imperialism. Executive Committee member S.G. Hobson, political activist and journalist, argued that war was a product of the governing classes and thereby evidence that socialism was necessary. "The Society [should] make its attitude on the war plain," Hobson argued, "and to support the expansion of the Empire only in so far as that may be compatible with the expansion of that higher social organisation which this Society was founded to promote."[39] The press discovered the inner turmoil and ridiculed the Fabians for their inaction, which prompted the Executive to annul their earlier decision and put the question to a postal referendum, asking, "Are you in favour of an official pronouncement being made by the Fabian Society on Imperialism in relation to the war?"[40] The votes yielded a decision that reflected the earlier divided position of the Executive. Out of approximately 800 members, only 476 voted, with 217 in favor of a pronouncement and 249 against. The vote also signified the rare occasion of any societal resolutions being put to a referendum; the Executive Committee normally made all decisions.

While the Fabians remained silent on issues of war, they spent much effort and printed numerous tracts on public education. The education system in turn-of-the-century Britain was miserably poor and the Fabians decided to do something about it. The existing education system was divided among church-administered schools (mostly Anglican) or specially elected school boards. In some areas, such as London, the school buildings and staff were models of their day; while other smaller districts barely scraped by, often having board members who were uneducated and preoccupied with quarrels amongst sects.[41] In response to the state of the education system, the

---

[39]Ibid., 99.
[40]Ibid., 100.
[41]Ibid., 103.

Fabians published the tract *The Education Muddle and the Way Out* in January of 1901. In the tract, the Fabians suggested the larger school boards (Birmingham and Manchester, Liverpool and Leeds) continue to function as independent units, but that the smaller units be enlarged beyond the size of the parish. Also suggested was the creation of County Councils for each remaining district, which in turn held the responsibility for the "provision and maintenance of every kind and grade of education within its area. All School Boards existing within the County should be abolished, and their school transferred to the County Council."[42] The cost of maintaining the school system, the Fabian plan suggested, would come from taxes levied within the county. The County Council was autonomous, but was required to submit its survey for educational provision to the Board of Education for criticism, which in turn had the power to audit education and make suggestions. Several months later a Government Bill appeared that bore a striking resemblance to the Fabian tract.[43] The LRC opposed the Bill and the Fabians opposed the LRC, but regardless of the opposition, the Bill passed.

Fiscal Policy had also left the Fabians bickering amongst themselves. In 1903, the Lord Chamberlain proposed tariff reform, including new taxes on food and preferential duty systems. The argument among the Fabians was not about the taxes or Parliament's right to impose them, but rather, the wording contained in a tract concerning it. The argument led to Graham Wallas, who had been a Fabian since 1886, to resign in January of 1904. In his resignation, he complained that when he had disagreed with form or substance of any tract, his arguments were met with resistance, despite a clear majority of other members agreeing with him against the Executive.[44] Wells, a close friend of Wallas, was disgusted by the "attitude adopted

---

[42]"The Education Muddle and the Way Out," *Fabian Tracts*, No. 106 (London: The Fabian Society, January 1901) in *Fabian Tracts, Nos. 96-129, 1900-1906* (Nendeln/Liechtenstein: Kraus-Thomson Organization Limited, 1969): 12.

[43]Cole, *The Story of Fabian Socialism*, 105.

[44]*Fabian News*, February 1904, 6.

by the society toward various contemporary political issues" and one month after Wallas left, Wells tendered his own resignation, but later retracted it after a scolding letter from Shaw.[45] This was neither the first, nor the last, letter Shaw wrote to Wells giving him fatherly advice.

As the Fabian Society grew, they sought out new members, especially among the intellectual elite, seeking to add to their numbers men and women of the same caliber as themselves. Bernard Shaw stated that he had chosen the Fabians over the Social Democratic Federation "by an instinctive feeling that the Fabians and not the Federation would attract the men of [his] own bias and intellectual habits."[46] The society looked for men and women who were not only socialists, but also well-known personalities. They found writers especially attractive and H.G. Wells was no exception.

### Wells - Life Before the Fabians

Herbert George Wells was born September 21, 1866 in Kent. His father, Joseph, was a professional cricketer and shopkeeper, but a poor businessman. His mother, Sarah, was a lady's maid. Although they considered themselves part of England's middle-class, the Wells household barely rose above insolvency, a fact that fed Wells's ideas about welfare and social programs for families. As his parents' financial security waned, their relationship became more distant and troubled. Wells's later obsession with governmental support for mothers raising their children came from these early years of equating economic stability with happiness. He attended a private school until the age of thirteen, when his parents could no longer pay for their son's education. Wells then apprenticed himself as a draper, but forced his mother to buy his freedom after only three years, after

---

[45]HGW to ERP 17 March 1904 in David C. Smith, ed. *The Correspondence of H. G. Wells*, vol. 2, *1904-1918* (London: Pickering & Chatto, 1998). 13. GBS to H.G. Wells (HGW), 5 April 1904, in Dan H. Laurence, ed., *Bernard Shaw, Collected Letters, 1898-1910* (New York: Dodd, Mead & Company, 1972), 414.

[46]Anthony Wright, "A Century of Fabianism," *History Today* 34, no. 5 (May 1984): 50.

which he returned as a pupil teacher at the local grammar school. After a year, he left for the Normal School (later Royal College) of Science in South Kensington, London.

His interest in socialism developed during his early days at Normal School. He spent more time reading political theories and works on utopian thought than he did on science. He was a member of the school's debating society and it was within the confines of this society that he presented, in 1886, his first paper on socialism. He confessed, during those early college years, to being a socialist aspirant; he wore the required red tie and attended various socialist meetings, including some open ones held by the Fabian Society. He researched socialism, studied utopian societies and participated in debates on socialism. However, the casting of his lot with the Fabians waited for several years while he focused on his literary career.

Wells had early successes with scientific literary works such as *The Time Machine*, *The Island of Dr. Moreau* and *War of the Worlds*, but it was *Anticipations*, a series of essays published in serial form for the *Fortnightly Review* and *North American Review* in 1901, and as a book in 1902, that caught the attention of the Fabian Society. The book was Wells's first non-fiction success and earned him popularity as well as a handsome paycheck. It focused on technological progression for the next century, leading up to what Wells called the "New Republic," in which a new majority of competent men, mostly scientists and engineers, would be responsible for administration of the state. Additionally, Wells saw the uneducated, slovenly masses as dead weight; the new order should use all means necessary to rid itself of the draining, useless horde. Wells also proposed solutions to the problems that he thought the industrial age had created in the chapter "The Higher Synthesis" which outlined the formula to create a World-State. The Fabians, particularly the Executive, shared Wells's elitist view. They latched onto his ideas and hoped that they might be the chosen lot to administer Wells's New Republic. A review in the February 1902 edition of the *Fabian News* by Haden Guest concluded, "perhaps it is through some such…media as Mr. Wells provides that Fabians

will find themselves able to get back to their work of promoting the World-State."[47]

Despite Wells's early interest in political theory, he much preferred socialism from a scientific point of view. His writings on socialism were mostly scientific rather political and he enjoyed more success when dealing with the future in scientific terms rather than socio-political ones. His success with the scientific community of the more literary and social types reflect this.[48] Wells said that the "lion of politics" blocked progression toward a world state and when later asked about socialism in the political realm, he stated that there was "no orthodox socialism, one and indivisible."[49]

**Wells's Socialism and Life among the Fabians**

By the time the Fabian Society discovered Wells for themselves, he had already published several works and devoted a fair amount of time to writing letters to leading newspapers and journals including the *London Times*, the *Morning Post* and *The Fortnightly Review*. His works of fiction were bestsellers and his volumes on socialism, particularly *Anticipations*, increased his popularity. Wells shone in the literary field, and it was his unmatched success as a writer that led to his recruitment by the Fabians.

The Fabians thought *Anticipations* was exceptional, as well as other early works on socialism by Wells. In Guest's review for the *Fabian News*, he chided socialists, saying that they "have very stupidly not been awake to our own business as social reformers."[50] Guest would become one of Wells's chief supporters in the coming years. In the same year, Wells read a speech at the Royal Institution entitled *The Discovery of the Future*. The audience regarded the speech so well that his agent, J. B. Pinker, persuaded the publisher to rush a copy of it as a

[47]*Fabian News*, February 1902, 7.
[48]Smith, *Desperately Mortal*, 118.
[49]Ibid., 119.
[50]*Fabian News*, February 1902, 7.

book. Over 6,000 copies sold the first month.[51] Edward Pease, secretary for the Fabian Society, reviewed the book for the *Fabian News* and concluded that, "we hope his advice will be followed."[52]

Other readers also found Wells's predictions of the future in *Anticipations* compelling. E. Ray Lankester, director of the Museum of Natural History, reviewed the book for *Nature* saying, "it is, truly enough, an unsparing indictment of existing government, society, education, religion, and morality, but it contains also a confession of faith and is full of a spirit of hope and belief in future development."[53] Francis W. Hirst, writing for *Nature* in 1904, but commenting on *Anticipations* as well as Wells's more recent political works, remarked that Wells was toying with "great ideas in a time of flux" and supported him to create 'a great synthesis.'"[54] The book sold 2,430 copies in one month and duplicated that number in the five months that followed.

Wells sent a copy of the book to Bernard Shaw, who received it with less than congratulatory praise. He criticized many of the Wells's ideas and found fault with his conclusions. He even apologized for sharing it with the Webbs and considered his effort as payment for Wells's review of his play: "I see by the Academy that Webb has placed *Anticipations* among his books of the year. As it was I who shoved it on him, I consider that I have rolled your log in return for your noble recognitions of the profundity of *Plays for Puritans*."[55] Shaw even showed signs of jealousy over the book's widespread notoriety, but still aware of the need for reform within the society. He

complained that, "the young men are reading Wells's "Anticipations" instead of attending to us and unless we succeed in drawing fresh blood...we shall go on the shelf like the Cobden Club."[56] Interestingly, Shaw was later Wells's sponsor for induction into the Fabians and counseled him often on proper decorum within the group. He apparently believed in keeping one's enemies close.

Wells received much public attention because of his ideas in *Anticipations*; as a result, Fabian leaders, particularly Beatrice and Sidney Webb, sought him out and began wooing him for the Fabians. Beatrice Webb, unlike Shaw, argued that instead of attacking Wells, the Society should consider using him to their benefit. After discovering *Anticipations* for herself, she insisted that Sidney, her husband, read it. She remarked in her diary that the book was "the most remarkable book of the year: a powerful imagination furnished with the data and methods of physical science working on social problems."[57] Sidney Webb said that it was "his favourite book of the year."[58] The Webbs did think that Wells lacked sufficient understanding of social organization, but despite this, adding Wells's name to the membership roll of the Fabians could have significant advantages. Membership was flagging and those that were joining were of the same age as those who were already members. The Fabian Society was looking for some young blood to invigorate growth.[59]

The Webbs began their recruit of Wells by cycling out to his home at Sandgate, Kent, under the pretenses of meeting him and conveying their admiration of the book. Wells appeared to be the young blood that Shaw had wanted and he made a good impression on the Webbs. Beatrice Webb wrote in her diary, "in the present stage of sociology, he is useful to gradgrinds like ourselves in supplying us with loose generalisations which we

---

[51]Smith, *Desperately Mortal*, 95.

[52]*Fabian News*, June 1902, 24.

[53]E.R. Lankester, "The Present Judged by the Future," *Nature*, 13 March 1902, iii-v; quoted in Smith, *Desperately Mortal*, 94.

[54]Ibid., 118.

[55]Most accounts seem to suggest that the Webbs had read the book before Shaw, which would make it impossible for him to have "shoved" the work onto Sidney Webb. GBS to HGW, 12 December 1901 in Laurence, *Bernard Shaw, Collected Letters*, 245.

[56]GBS to T.H.S. Escot, undated, in Laurence, *Bernard Shaw, Collected Letters*, 254.

[57]Sidney Webb, *Academy* 7 December 1901; quoted in Smith, *Desperately Mortal*, 94.

[58]Ibid.

[59]Ibid., 106.

can use as instruments of research."[60]   Over the next several months, the Webbs and the Wells conferred often, meeting for dinners and exchanging casual correspondence, especially between H.G. and Beatrice.  The Webbs convinced Wells to accept their invitation to join the Fabians, and in February of 1903, after an endorsement by Bernard Shaw and Graham Wallas, the Executive Committee confirmed him as a member.

Shaw was interested in Wells and anticipated what his ideas could provide for the society.  In preparation for Wells's upcoming address to the society concerning municipalities, Shaw encouraged his ideas.  He wrote to Wells saying,

> I think it a most desirable thing that you should let the Fabian Society have the benefit of your ideas on the subject, seeing that the F.S. is responsible to such a very large extent for the present great development of municipalities. Seeing also that the society is always open to new ideas, & especially energetic about the propaganda of any 'better dreamer' that comes along.[61]

In March of 1903, Wells gave his first lecture to the society. He was not a powerful speaker, and despite his earlier success in reading at the Royal Institution, his appearance before the Fabians was less than impressive.  The subject, "The Question of Scientific Administrative Areas in Relation to Municipal Undertakings" was technical and when Wells read it in a monotone voice and spoke in the vague direction of a corner, many in attendance lost interest.[62]  Pease would later state that Wells's public speaking was so awful that had it been anywhere close to his proficiency as a writer, things might have turned out differently in the controversy that was yet to come.[63]  Wells too realized his shortcomings in the realm of oration and later commented on the event saying he spoke "haltingly on the verge

of the inaudible, addressing my tie through a cascade moustache that was no sort of help at all, correcting myself as though I were a manuscript under treatment."[64]  In the reading, Wells claimed that a fundamental belief for all socialists was that property was purely provisional and law-made, but he further defined his own views as part of those socialists "who regard the abolition of inheritance and the intelligent taxation of property for services to the community, as remedies for existing evils."[65]

Early on, the Fabians wrestled with their opinions of Wells; however, those opinions were not as critical as other historians have implied. Beatrice had struggled at length whether Wells's brand of socialism was either brilliance or madness.  In 1902 she wrote,

> Wells is an interesting though somewhat unattractive personality except for his agreeable disposition and intellectual vivacity…. But he is totally ignorant of the manual worker, on the one hand, and of the big administrator and aristocrat on the other.  …he ignores the necessity for maintaining the standard of life of the manual working population; he does not appreciate the need for a wide experience of men and affairs in administration…. But he is extraordinary quick in his apprehensions, and took in all the points we gave him in our 48 hours' talk with him….[66]

By 1904, however, Wells had managed to charm Beatrice and she had come to regard his peculiarities as tolerable.

While it was true that Wells lacked administrative experience, he did have firm beliefs about socialism, many of which he published as political manifestos, such as *Anticipations* and *A Modern Utopia*, as well as numerous papers and tracts that he wrote during his tenure with the Fabians.  In one of the many biographies of Wells, author Vincent Brome attempted to describe Wells's style of socialism. He contended that Wells

---

[60]Ibid., 289.

[61]George Bernard Shaw (GBS) to H.G. Wells (HGW), 15 March 1903, Wells Collection, Rare Book and Manuscript Library, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois.

[62]Pease, *The History of the Fabian Society*, 164.

[63]Ibid.

[64]Wells, *Experiment in Autobiography*, 565.

[65]*Fabian News*, April 1903, 13.

[66]Beatrice Webb, *Our Partnership*, 231.

"never quite reconciled his Socialism with a formal policy…. For him Socialism was much more a 'realization of a common and universal loyalty in mankind, the awakening of a collective consciousness of duty in humanity.'"[67]

Wells argued mostly for the social wellness of the family, although he had little use for those at the lowest levels of humanity and used Malthusian philosophies to support his ideas. *Anticipations* supported suicide and euthanasia over prisons and mounting disease. In *Mankind in the Making,* he supported sterilization for the lowest orders until such a time that science could predict which births would result in drunkenness, criminality or insanity and deal with them accordingly. In regards to the family, Wells proposed that under socialism, the government and society must cease to consider women and children as property. In his 1907 book, *Socialism and the Family*, he argued, "not only must land and the means of production be liberated…but women and children, just as much as men and things, must cease to be owned."[68] In his perfect New Republic, "people [would] rear children for the State and the future; if they do that well… [they] deserve payment just as much as if they built a bridge."[69] If they failed, the State assumed the parental role, while the biological parents assumed the cost. Paying a mother to care for her children, Wells thought, liberated her from economic dependence upon a man. *Socialism and the Family* also defined the relationship between socialism, the socialist movement and the middle-classes. Socialism he defined as a large, "slowly elaborating conception of a sane and organized state and moral culture to replace our present chaotic way of living."[70]  Wells argued that socialism was not a political or economic strategy, but rather a plan for a reconstruction of society. However, he said that, for the moment at least, socialist organizations, including the Fabians, were ill prepared for such a

---

[67]Vincent Brome, H.G. Wells, A Biography (London, Longmans, Green and Company, 1951; reprint, Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1970), 82.

[68]H.G. Wells, *Socialism and the Family* (London: A.C. Fifield, 1907), 56.

[69]Ibid., 57.

[70]Ibid., 5.

colossal task and thus preparation of the masses, via dissemination of information was the most important job. He firmly believed that "the time [was] ripe for a fresh and more vigorous insistence upon the materially creative aspect of the vision of socialism."[71] In other words, the Fabians should permeate via propaganda. Make socialists, he thought, and socialism would inevitably follow. Following an impressive showing by the Labour Party in the 1906, he was optimistic about such a program's chance of success.

The general elections of 1906 had a profound impact on British society and socialist groups specifically. Late in 1905, Prime Minister A. J. Balfour resigned, and the general elections held in January swept the Liberal Party into power for the first time in over a decade.  More important was the makeup of the new members. In the words of historian Walter Arnstein, the new members represented "in some ways the first truly middle-class Parliament in English History, made up to a large extent of lawyers, journalists, and teachers, all of whom worked for a living."[72]  The Labour Party as well made a decent showing, with twenty-nine members elected. The general public, however, was unaware of the secret compact in 1903 between Henry Gladstone, chief Liberal whip, and Ramsay MacDonald, secretary of the Labour Representation Committee, who had agreed in a certain number of constituencies not to compete with each another and thereby risk a Conservative victory.[73] As far as most British people knew, the Labour Party had made an effective showing all on their own.

The result was resurgence in membership in socialist societies. From 1906 to 1910, membership in the Independent Labour Party more than doubled and total membership in the Social Democratic Federation, Social Democratic Party and the British Socialist Party increased by almost seventy-five percent

---

[71]Ibid., 21.

[72]Walter L. Arnstein, Britain *Yesterday and Today: 1830 to the Present* 8th ed. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 2001), 223.

[73]Ibid., 224.

during the same years.[74]  The Fabians, too, enjoyed an increase in membership. Edward Pease attributed much of the growth to the controversy created by Wells and the personalities involved. Beatrice Webb saw a larger picture, considering the society itself was the drawing card. Writing to her diary in 1907 she says, "The little boom in the Fabian Society continues, and Sidney and I, G.B.S., and H.G.W. sometimes ask ourselves, and each other, whether there is a bare possibility that it represents a larger wave than we think—are we, by our constructive thought, likely to attract considerable numbers of followers in the near future?"[75] When examining the membership increase across the whole of socialist groups, however, the numbers for the Fabians do not look quite as impressive as Pease and Webb had implied. While membership numbers were indeed up for the Fabians (from 700 in 1906 to 2462 in 1909), other societies were enjoying a membership swell as well. While the political infighting obviously increased exposure of the Fabians, the more obvious reason was the renewed interest in socialist societies in general.

Historian and Fabian Margaret Cole argued three factors concerning the results of the 1906 election and the impact it had on the Fabian Society. First, the renewed interest in socialism did indeed lead to an upsurge in membership for the Fabians, mostly because the Fabians had the fortunate circumstance of being the longest in existence as well as having a number of notable personalities to its claim. However, those who joined the Fabian society were not necessarily joining to become Fabians, but rather saw in the society "a means of bringing into being a Socialist society in Britain."[76] As Cole observed, the newcomers were unlike the older generation. These second-blooming Fabians were much more concerned with the running of the society and, "not content to leave such matters entirely to the wisdom of the Executive."[77] This group later became Wells's

chief support system. Secondly, the younger generation had much wider intellectual interests and experience than the older generation and was more inclined to argue about Socialistic philosophy and Fabian policy.[78] Third, Cole argued that the newest Fabians, like others, "felt the spiritual distress and discomfort which preceded the mass slaughter [World War I]."[79] Strikes, political infighting and occasionally physical disputes accompanied an overall feeling of disappointment with the lack of achievements of the new Liberal Government.[80] Into this environment, H.G. Wells delivered his critique of the Fabian Society.

### Finding Fault

The manifesto that Wells read in February 1906, "Faults of the Fabian," began what Edward Pease and many historians following him referred to as "The Episode of Mr. Wells."[81] The Fabians themselves, or perhaps more accurately Bernard Shaw, prompted Wells's criticism of the Fabians. Shaw had requested Wells submit a report concerning the dealings of the Fabian Society.  Shaw noted that the society was ripe for change and he was looking for something (or someone) to give the Fabians a much-needed shot in the arm. In 1905, he wrote to Pease, urging a serious stocktaking of where the Fabians stood.

> The proper thing would be two reports, pro & con. If you and Webb were to make out the best case you could for the old policy & the old gang, and Wells, Guest and Chesterton were to do all they could to explode us, we should get something that would really give us an overhauling.  Our methods are substantially what they were 15 years ago; and they and we must be getting rather stale…All I want is a stir up and stock-taking to make Fabianism interesting again.[82]

---

[74]Mariz, "The Fabians and the 'Episode of Mr. Wells'," 97.

[75]Beatrice Webb, *Our Partnership*, 380.

[76]Cole, *The Story of Fabian Socialism*, 116.

[77] Ibid.

[78] Ibid.

[79] Ibid., 117.

[80] Ibid.

[81] Pease, *The History of the Fabian Society*, 163.

[82] Laurence, *Bernard Shaw, Collected Letters*, 536.

Shaw received his stocktaking and more, as Wells took the commission as a personal directive to plan for the reconstruct of the society from the inside out. While Wells prepared his lecture, Pease encouraged progress, "the prospect is lively and I hope you will make us all sit up."[83] However, he cautioned Wells about making public accusations saying, "it is not decent for a member to attack his Executive Coram Publico and no action can be taken, no vote or opposed decision, save at a members meeting."[84] Concerned that Wells's accusations might be misunderstood by the general public, the Executive closed the meeting to all but members and while he did not attack personalities—except perhaps Pease—he certainly was thorough when it came to finding fault with the society and its leadership. Faultfinding within the society had never been condemned, but the situation with Wells was different. He believed the fault lied with the administrative body of the Fabians, not the society as a whole. Given that the Executive held nearly absolute power both de facto and de jure, and that the real power in the Executive was held by only a few—especially, Bernard Shaw and Sidney Webb—attacks on individuals were inevitable. The "personal attacks," however, were based on policy disagreements, rather than on personality clashes, although the outsize personalities involved (even self-admitted gradgrinds) tended to overshadow any matters of principle. Additionally, in the past, those who spoke out were typically on the Executive Committee, but Wells was not. Because of the uncharted waters, Wells feared censorship and went to great measures prior to his lecture to make sure his freedom of speech within the Fabian Society was not restricted. Prior to the delivery of his paper on Fabian faults, he offered to pay for printing it in its entirety in the *Fabian News* so all members would have access to it. Pease wrote back stating that he was sure the Executive would agree to the offer and added, "I have no doubt the Exec. will agree to print your paper

---

[83]Edward R. Pease (ERP) to HGW on Fabian Letterhead, Nov 1905. Wells Collection.

[84]Ibid. "Coram Publico" or "in the presence of the Public."

in full in F. News, especially as you offer to pay for it. My principle is never to refuse offers of money."[85] The society printed the report as Wells had requested but not in the newsletter. Instead, they distributed it privately with a preface urging confidentiality. The note read:

> The criticisms made by Mr. Wells while perfectly legitimate in the intimacy of our society and its friends, are not of the sort that it is desirable to publish indiscriminately…his comments are, it is considered, part of a private discussion of our policy and plans, conceived in a vein of frankness that the outsider might easily misunderstand. [86]

On February 9, 1906, Wells delivered his lecture to a crowd of almost 250 Fabian members. He began his assessment by stating that the values and methodologies of socialism that existed at the inception of the society had changed from twenty years ago, but the society had not. He described the present society as "an extraordinarily inadequate and feeble organization."[87] He then launched a satirical but accurate assessment of the functions he thought the Society should embody and to what extent, in his opinion, they had completely failed to fulfill those functions. Wells first confronted the large amount of intellectual work needed to redeem society, primarily in the dissemination of propaganda. While Wells grudgingly conceded that the society had devoted much effort in this area, he also chided that too many of their plums of wisdom had been given away to the London School of Economics (an institution created by Sidney Webb several years prior), which in Wells's opinion should have been saved for propaganda. Secondly, he argued that the society should function as "a sort of official or

---

[85]Ibid. Apparently even socialists must earn a living.

[86]Cole, *The Story of Fabian Socialism*, 119.

[87]H.G. Wells, "Faults of the Fabian" (paper delivered at a Fabian members-only meeting, Essex Hall, Essex St., Strand, 9 February 1906), Wells Collection, 2. The original typed copy as well as the holograph and revisions are located at the archive. A copy was mailed to members only and not printed in the Fabian News.

representative mouthpiece for socialistic theory in England."[88] He charged them, however, with abusing the privilege, especially concerning their reluctance to speak out on the Boer War and educational reform, the very thing he and Graham Wallas had complained about two years prior. Wells argued that in a moment of weakness, or perhaps boredom, the society had moved from Fabian socialism to Fabian politics.

His third point addressed the society's misdirected propaganda. Wells urged dissemination of information to the middle-class and the "more educated and intelligent sections of [the] population."[89] He pointed out that other organizations, such as the Social Democratic Federation and the Independent Labour Party, were already in place to meet the needs of the working-class, and that centering the propaganda effort on the educated middle-class would not only increase the Fabians' membership but also increase the spent coffers. After covering these points, he moved on to the main thrust of the piece, the faults, which he labeled and sharply discussed. "Our society is small; and in relation to its great mission small minded; it is poor; it is collectively, as a society, inactive; it is suspicious of help, and exclusive."[90] He charged them with "playing at politico-sociological research," rather than actually getting things done.[91] Wells also pointed out that the society was too exclusive in its membership. In order to gain admission to the Fabians, a recruit "must be proposed and seconded by two personal acquaintances, who can answer for his or her deportment."[92] Wells likened admittance to the Fabians as equal to the "fuss and trouble one takes to be made a member of a London social club."[93] He boiled everything down to the number one job—"make socialists and you will achieve socialism; there

is no other way."[94] Additionally, Wells begged for an indulgence of control—specifically for the propaganda machine, not the society as a whole, which at the time he was not aiming for. He believed he was the right man for the job, and with good reason—it was the reason the Fabians had recruited Wells in the first place.

While Wells's analysis of the Fabians was severe, the Fabians were initially receptive to the changes he suggested. Wells's lecture ended with a discussion as to how to address his proposals. At the close of the deliberation, the society set to work forming a committee "to increase the scope, influence, income, and activity of the Society."[95] The original plan was to appoint a large committee, which would include the entire Executive as well as an equal amount of unofficial members. Wells disapproved of this composition and the Executive, heeding his wishes, instead proposed creation of a committee that included only members that Wells himself nominated.[96] Bernard Shaw, in a letter to Wells, suggested that the new group should consist of only those outside of the Executive, since part of the committee's goal was to assess the extent to which the Executive had fulfilled its mission and having members indict themselves would prove fruitless.[97] Shaw also suggested that the committee interview himself, Webb, and Bland separately to obtain their views, goals and sentiments individually. Wells ignored Shaw's suggestions and the final composition of the special committee totaled ten with only three from the Executive—Charlotte Shaw (wife of Bernard), Reverend S.D. Headlam and G.R.S. Taylor. The balance of the committee included reform-minded individuals, with Haden Guest, Mrs. Pember Reeves and Sydney Olivier being major supporters of Wells.

Even as the Special Committee met on matters of change, the Fabian Executive did not delay in implementing some of the

---

[88]Wells, "Faults of the Fabian," 3.
[89]Ibid., 5.
[90]Ibid., 16.
[91]Ibid., 10.
[92]Ibid., 12.
[93]Ibid.

[94]Ibid., 18.
[95]*Fabian News*, March 1906, 9.
[96]Ibid.
[97]GBS to HGW 14 February 1906, Wells Collection.

more agreeable suggestions. By March, the Executive decided in favor of the immediate adoption of Wells's proposal of a new class of Associates. The associates were required to pay an annual subscription of at least 10 shillings and enjoyed all the rights and privileges of full membership, with the exception of voting or taking part in matters of societal affairs.[98]

The committee met over six times in the six weeks following its inauguration and once in a joint session with the Executive Committee. Together they began to work out suggestions concerning membership procedure, propaganda and changes to the society's Basis. Unfortunately, the minutes of the meetings and records of the Wells committee have been lost, but as Pease observed, "The composition of the Committee indicates the probable truth of the rumours that the meetings were anything but dull."[99]

The Special Committee did not present the final report to the Executive until October of 1906, but even as early as March they shared proposed changes with the Executive. The committee suggested new books, short readable tracts, and the format of the Fabian publications updated and printed with more frequency. Strategies to raise revenue included a fixed minimum subscription and a list of subscriptions, published annually. Plans to increase the size of the staff and the offices also appeared.

In regards to the administration of the Fabians, the special committee suggested that a council of twenty-five replace the existing Executive Committee with a core governance body or triumvirate to lead them.[100] In turn, the committee would appoint three sub-committees for the purpose of publishing, propaganda and general purposes. The committee also recommended that the society work collectively with other socialist organizations to raise funds for the support and running of candidates for Parliament.

---

[98]*Fabian News*, April 1906, 14.
[99]Pease, *The History of the Fabian Society*, 167.
[100]*Fabian News*, January 1906, 9.

---

The final item introduced by the committee served later as a true point of debate, the changing of the society's Basis. Wells thought the original Basis was overly technical and did not include provisions for women or children. The proposed Basis, to which society members would be required to make an oath, declared that the Society's goal was to aid in the reconstructing of the social organization by promoting transfer of land and capital to the State, enforcing equal citizenship of men and women, and substituting public for private authority in the education and support of the young.[101] Bernard Shaw thought the new version was "obviously much better than the existing [one]."[102] However, he explained to Wells that the rest of the Executive would be harder to convince and must have their egos stroked rather than battered in order to make any progress. In March 1906 he wrote,

> Your one chance is to shew a perfect appreciation of and sympathy with the exigencies which imposed on us the obvious blemishes in the basis, and to appeal for an attempt to get a more attractive one through by a concentration of our prestige & authority sufficient to silence the guerilla leaders in the society…instead of which, you amuse yourself by treating us to several pages of cheek to the effect that the imperfections of the basis are the result of our own folly and literary clumsiness…you must study people's corns when you go clog dancing.[103]

In other words, Wells needed to use personal persuasion to achieve change via the Executive instead of bullying or shaming them into it. In addition, Shaw wrote Webb, urging the Executive to accept the new basis, if for nothing else than to satiate the members' desire for "want of novelty."[104]

---

[101] Pease, *The History of the Fabian Society*, 176.
[102] GBS to HGW, 24 March 1906. Wells Collection.
[103] Ibid.
[104]GBS to Sidney Webb (SW), 29 September 1906. Laurence, *Bernard Shaw, Collected Letters*, 656.

After a sufficient dressing down by Shaw, Wells set off for America in late March of 1906. The tour fell at an inopportune time, considering the hornet's nest he had just stirred. During his absence, much of the excitement and drama surrounding his criticisms subsided and upon his return in mid summer, many of those who had pledged their unfailing support to him had lost their zeal. Despite their loss of enthusiasm, Wells continued to push for reform.

In late fall of 1906, Wells, Shaw, and Webb corresponded with one another concerning the special committee proposals. The letters show that Shaw pledged support for Wells's ideas, going so far as to say that he intended to step down and let Wells assume the role of leader. However, when Shaw wrote to Webb, he suggested that the Executive continue to appear eager for change and reconstruction, waiting until the Special Committee had delivered its report. Afterward, the Executive could deliver its own "better report on the Society, its history, position, prospects & policy,"[105] effectively keeping the Executive in control.

Sidney Webb, on the other hand, was far less concerned with mocking Wells than simply rebuffing his proposals directly. Writing to Wells on September 3, 1906, Sidney Webb implied that many of his proposals were ill conceived and premature, informing him that new offices and staff required new money and brilliant tracts required brilliant authors. Further, he noted that the current political parties were already well established and most, especially the Independent Labour Party, would not be willing to be a part of yet another joint committee. In regards to the triumvirate, Webb argued that most members of the society could ill afford to come forward and give up their time and talent to manage the business of the society. Even more doubtful, according to Webb, was that the society would trust someone who could. He expressed to Wells that in their present form, the society was unlikely to accept the proposals of the Special Committee, but he offered his services to Wells for

---

[105]Ibid.

rewriting the proposals "in a form in which we could get them through, [rather] than one in which we should inevitably find ourselves on opposite sides."[106]

Shaw, however, preferred to placate Wells, and the two corresponded often during the months between his delivery of the "Faults of the Fabian" and the final proposal of the Special Committee. On September 11, he urged Wells that if he first became a member of the Executive, it would provide him with a better understanding of the inner workings of the administration. Eventually he could take command as leader while Shaw and Webb faded into the background. Wells had not yet been elected to the Executive, but apparently, that was a mere technicality. Shaw continued that while some claimed that the society "has done its work. It hasn't; but *I* have done *my* turn…Webb has done his turn. The old gang has done its turn."[107] He was tired of the Fabians as well as the Executive Committee. On the other hand, Shaw said that Pease had put himself in such a position financially that he could not afford to leave the society, but most of the rest of the Executive was ready to abdicate and "let [Wells] walk over."[108]

Shaw explained to Wells that steering that "crazy little craft" of the Fabians was harder than it appeared.[109] He recommended Wells sit on the Executive for a year or two before committing himself to take control. He also cautioned Wells on the perils of command, warning him that, the energy that wastes itself on senseless quarreling would reform the world three times over if it could be concentrated and brought to bear on Socialism…[and]…if you let your mind turn from your political object to criticism of the conduct and personality of the men round you, you are lost. Instantly you find them insufferable; they find you

---

[106]SW to HGW, 3 September 1906, Wells collection.

[107]GBS to HGW, 14 September 1906, Wells collection (italics in the original).

[108]Pease had been secretary for the Fabians in 1886 and again from 1890-1913, he remained the honorary secretary until his death in 1955.

[109]GBS to HGW, 14 September 1906, Wells Collection.

the same; and the problem of how to get rid of one another supersedes Socialism.[110]

He then turned his attention to Wells's fault-finding paper, and suggested he concentrate more on socialism and reform and less on his "irresistible impulse to expose the futility of the lot of us."[111] Shaw did not think Wells would fare any better than he and the others had, but he was more than willing to let him try.

Circumventing Wells, Shaw and Webb discussed the proposed changes and how the Executive could present a new report that was superior to that of the Special Committee. They correctly anticipated the split that resulted between the older generation of Fabians and the newer reform-minded socialists. On September 29th, Shaw wrote to Webb, "I feel very strongly that when Wells's report is given to the Society, it must be followed, not by a vindication or a defence [sic] or an explanation or apology or counter-attack, but simply by a better report on the Society, its history, position, prospects & policy, than Wells'."[112] Shaw felt confident that the members would side with the Executive because the "rank & file do not want to have to desert their old government & accept a Boulanger[113]: what will please them is to feel what a splendid lot of fellows their leaders are & what a score it is to have such a swell as Wells taking the juvenile lead."[114]

Following delivery of "Faults of the Fabian," Wells had requested a delay in the election of the Executive until the report of the Special Committee was complete. Wells had hoped that

---

[110]Ibid.

[111]Ibid.

[112]Laurence, *Bernard Shaw, Collected Letters,* 657.

[113]Shaw was fond of using names from books, plays and other notable personalities to make a point. In this case, he was referring to George Earnest Jean Marie Boulanger, a French General in the 1880s whose attempts at military reform made him popular with the soldiers, but his outspoken personality and insubordination made him a challenge to the government. Interestingly he was also known to be a poor public speaker.

[114]Laurence, *Bernard Shaw, Collected Letters,* 656. The P.S. to the Letter tells Webb not to destroy the letter as it may be useful to circulate to other members of the Executive, Shaw may have held back in his opinion of Wells because of this.

---

when members read the report of the Special Committee, they would see the value of Fabian reform and a new, younger, more committed society could take shape. He fully realized that any changes he proposed could only occur at the Annual Meeting and that only occurred at the time of Executive election. However, after months of delay, the Executive decided to postpone a vote until the next scheduled election in March. Concerned that the present Executive would reject the proposals of the Special Committee, Wells began to look for more reform-minded candidates to replace the existing Executive. If his suggestion of an enlarged Executive of twenty-five passed, the odds were in Wells's favor that he could have a majority and possibly move past the oligarchy of the "old gang."

In October, Wells wrote to fellow Fabian, Ralph Mudie-Smith, asking if he would object to a nomination for the Executive as "there will be an unique opportunity of bringing in fresh blood amidst the disturbances of the forthcoming Special Committees report…I want new men, younger men,—then we'll get things done."[115] In several letters between Wells and Guest, they considered candidates that supported reform as well as had the possibility of succeeding in an election. In a letter to Victor Fisher,[116] Wells asked if he was in such a position to "work in the future for the Fabians if a revolution [could] be brought off."[117] The events of December 7, 1906, explain the revolution Wells had intended. The *Fabian News* reported on the entire debate; however, one must take into account that George Standring, long-time Fabian and member of the Executive Committee, compiled the report. The wording consistently defends Shaw, Webb and others of the Executive, while depicting Wells as a spoiled child bent on having his own way. Despite the obvious prejudice, much can be learned from the article.

---

[115]Smith, *Correspondence,* 115.

[116]Fisher was a politician and newspaper editor. Like Wells, he joined the Fabians as part of the second generation.

[117]Smith, *Correspondence,* 124.

The meeting opened with a motion by Shaw that the Executive Committee reject the proposal of the alteration of the Basis, "because of the prolonged discussion and waste of time that would be caused."[118] Wells followed with another motion for an amendment to the Resolution regarding an increase in members of the Executive Committee. He moved that the "Executive Committee [approved] the spirit and purport of the Report of the Committee of Enquire and [desired] the outgoing Executive Committee to make the earliest possible arrangements for the election of a new Executive to give effect to that report."[119] In essence, Wells called for the immediate resignation of the Executive and new elections to fill the vacancies. In a seventy-five minute follow up to his motion for the amendment, Wells explained the basics of the Special Committee Report.

According to *Fabian News*, Wells's speech described the proposals of the Special Committee, which included an internal reconstruction of the Society with a view on increasing the energy and efficiency of the organization with "a fuller and better statement of Socialism in the Basis" and a "defining of the Society to the political world."[120] He held that an Executive with only fifteen members was incapable of the task at hand and should be increased by ten along with the sub-committees recommended. He then condemned the submitted response from the Executive as "an irritating, irresponsible and mischievous document, not devoid of misrepresentation…a stupendous piece of bluff."[121]

Following Wells's address, many members, both for the Special Committee's proposals and against, made their cases. Sidney Webb argued the Special Committee was not a representative body considering the fact that Wells himself had selected its members and its proposals therefore not representative of the society as a whole.[122] He then argued that it

was the duty of the Executive to advise the members as to the value and necessity of the changes suggested by the Special Committee and that in the past, the Society had valued and accepted the leadership of the Executive. His closing words threatened his resignation if the society passed the report of the Special Committee. Wells, too, threatened resignation if the report of the Special Committee failed, which threatened a split within the society that none present were prepared to allow.[123]

Due to the length of the debate, the members moved to continue the debate at a later date and adjourned for the evening. The debates ensued and continued until mid March, but the correspondence during those weeks show the level of panic that escalated within the Executive as well as Shaw's attempts at damage control. Shaw sent a post to members on December 11 urging their presence at the next meeting, "I find that many members have not noticed that the amendment by Mr. H.G. Wells, on which a division will be taken, is drawn in such a manner that, if carried, it will act as an instruction to me and my colleagues on the Executive Committee…to resign AND NOT OFFER OURSELVES FOR RE-ELECTION."[124] In a letter to Hubert Bland, written the same day, Shaw claimed that Wells came to him with his hat and an apology in hand, which Shaw refused, telling him he had put himself into the corner he now occupied. Shaw instructed Bland to keep silent at the next meeting so he could address the matter, giving Wells the chance to "unconditionally surrender" and withdraw his amendment. He felt confident he could "smash" Wells on every point of detail and believed he would emerge with a "smashing victory." His only concern was that due to his overwhelming fatigue from events of late, he might appear to be "in bad form."[125]

Pease, Fabian secretary and a member of the Executive, claimed that behind closed doors many of the "Old Gang" questioned whether to let the "society…be controlled by those

---

[118]*Fabian News*, January 1907, 9.

[119]Ibid.

[120]Ibid.

[121]Ibid., 10.

[122]Ibid.

---

[123]*Fabian News*, January 1907, 10-13.

[124]Laurence, *Bernard Shaw, Collected Letters,* 665. Emphasis in the original.

[125]Ibid., 666.

who had made it or…[let it] be handed over to Mr. Wells."[126] Mrs. Pease, however, did not agree with her husband that these were the only two options. In a letter from to Jane Wells, she wrote, "The more I think of Mr. Wells Fabian reforms the more do I welcome them and if only everyone will be sensible and broad minded I foresee a new era for Fabianism."[127]

In the next week's debate, Wells withdrew his resignation, which opened a window for Shaw who then replied, "That is a great relief to my mind. I can now pitch in to Mr. Wells without fear of consequences."[128] Wells was at a disadvantage; he was a gifted essayist but no match when going head to head with the likes of Bernard Shaw. Shaw defeated Wells easily in the open debate and by the end of the evening Wells not only withdrew his threat of resignation, but the proposed amendment as well.

Before the resumption of debate in January, Wells sent an angry letter to Pease, intending him to publish it in the *Fabian News*. Shaw urged him to recall the letter, but Wells refused.[129] If he was going to be publicly humiliated, he wanted fire back in a way comfortable to him, in print. He accused the *Fabian News* of slanting their report and leaving out statements he had made concerning the withdrawal of his resignation and the proposal. According to Wells, "the wording of the concluding paragraph seems contrived to present me as overwhelmed and penitent in 'unconditional surrender' to Mr. Shaw. It is an entire misrepresentation of the spirit of the situation. It is grossly unfair not to report what I had to say in withdrawing the amendment. I withdrew it solely in order to save the Society from the split threatened by the unreasonable interpretation thrust upon my amendment by Mr. Shaw [that the Executive should resign and not run for re-election]."[130] Wells concluded by stating that he was going to take up a "secondary position for a time in the

campaign for an effectual reform of the Society's constitution."[131] The letter was followed by a rebuttal from Pease, editor for the *Fabian News*. The wording clearly demonstrates Pease's loyalties:

> the above letter will help to give the Society some idea of the extreme difficulty the Executive Committee finds in making the most of Mr. Wells's powers as a popular writer on the side of Socialism, and at the same time defending itself against his apparently incurable delusion that the ordinary procedure at public meetings is chicanery, and that the Executive Committee is a conspiracy of rogues to thwart and annoy him.

Shaw, too, responded to Wells's letter, stating that he stood by the report of his speech in the *Fabian News*. While personalities certainly had a hand in the language used, it was still political rather than personal. However, not all those involved agreed. Internal gossip led many astray by convincing them that Wells was part of a coup, causing them to abandon their support. Shaw later accused Wells of a quest to become the "sole Fabian emperor."[132] Many of the derogatory remarks made by both sides were during periods of inflammation, and most of the personalities involved were best described as megalomaniacal. Shaw had a rather high self-opinion: "with the exception of myself, none of us can be described as perfect; and even with me Wells could not work."[133]

On January 18, 1907, the debates ended with the adoption of the Executive's Resolution. They agreed to the increase the number of Executive Committee members, but reduced it from Wells's suggested twenty-five to twenty-one. They opposed the idea of a triumvirate, but approved the appointing of sub-committees for propaganda, publishing and general purposes. Membership requirements were reduced to a signing of the Society's basis and a contribution to the general fund required.

---

[126]Pease, *The History of the Fabian Society*, 173.

[127]Mrs. Edward Pease to Catherine Wells, Spring 1906. Wells Collection

[128]*Fabian News*, January 1907.

[129]GBS to HGW 16 January 1907, Wells Collection.

[130]*Fabian News*, February, 1907.

---

[131]Ibid., 1907.

[132]Hyde, "The Socialism of H.G. Wells," 218.

[133]Ibid.

Finally, the only change in the Basis would be to add a clause addressing the equal citizenship of women.

The Executive had spoken, but the revisions, especially concerning the Basis, were not a dead letter. At the February meeting, members had persuaded the Executive to appoint a committee to revise the basis. The newly formed committee consisted of Bernard Shaw, Sidney Webb, H. G. Wells, and Sidney Ball. The debate over revisions lasted for over a year and ultimately nothing was accomplished.

Wells was annoyed. He knew the Executive would not accept all his ideas completely, but they had asked for his input and then rejected all but a few of his suggestions. With the exception of an increase in the Executive (four less than he had hoped for) and some alteration in membership requirements, most of his ideas were abandoned. Turning from problems of conflict, he decided to move forward with a campaign for election of candidates for reform.

Wells and Guest began actively promoting candidates to run for the Executive. Wells, Guest and others attempted to create a reform ticket, which they hoped would bring the reformers into power on the Executive. When the ballots went out to members in March of 1907, they included a manifesto from the reform party. They called for a "reorganization and revitalization of the Fabian Society," promising, if elected, "a revival in which the Society and its members should take a leading part." They also stressed that changes in the Society's constitution would result, leading to a more democratized society, "organized on a federal basis with an annual general conference of delegates representing them."[134] Despite their best effort, members voted only a portion of the reformers into office, nine in all.  Members gave Wells the fourth highest number of votes after Shaw, Webb and Pease.  It was the highest turnout for voting in the history of the society, with nearly eighty percent of the 1220 members voting. With 954 members casting 16, 926 votes, Sidney Webb

---

[134]Manifesto of the Fabian Reform Association, Undated but can be assumed as late 1907-early 1908. Wells Collection.

earned the top slot with 819 votes, Edward Pease followed with 809, Shaw with 781 and then Wells with 717.[135]

Much to Wells's chagrin, after the elections the society turned itself toward more to political agendas, offering public support to the Labour Party. In May, Wells circulated an open letter among several members, asking for signatures of those willing to resign if the society could not agree that it should not force collective political action upon its members.[136]

> We the undersigned, consider that the chief value of the Fabian Society lies in its development of socialist theory and social method, and in its work of propaganda and education in the country…[and that the society] should abandon rather than increase its present limited intervention in the direction of the Labour Party, and that it should abstain from any share whatever in the development of any fresh political socialist organization.[137]

Sidney Webb took issue with Wells on this point: "Now it [the Fabian Society] has been since 1888 at any rate, a very definitely political society, with essentially *political* aims. Pressing *political* proposals, and exercising a good deal of *political* influence. Personally I am not in it for anything else."[138]

Shaw chastised Wells for sending out the petition, "forgetting his committee manners" as well as his lack of public etiquette.[139]  Shaw again assumed the role of father and instructor, pointing out that Wells did not observe proper form for a public meeting, interjecting comments out of turn and using inappropriate language, which in Shaw's opinion were thankfully unheard due to Wells's poor oratory skill. However, Shaw offered to Wells that he would "make a decent public man of [him] yet, and an effective public speaker, if I have to break

---

[135]*Fabian News*, April 1907, 33.

[136]HGW to Fabian Society, May 1907. Petition attached. Wells Collection.

[137]Petition from members of the Fabian Society. May 1907. The copy in the Wells Collection is an attachment sent to G. M. Trevelyan.

[138]SW to HGW, June 1907, Wells Collection.

[139]GBS to HGW, 22 March 1908, Wells Collection.

your heart in the process.  [T]hank Heaven [I] am an ORATOR, and not a mulish draper's assistant."[140]

In spite of winning his seat on the Executive, Wells lost his enthusiasm. He attended less than half of the Executive Committee meetings over the next year and although he was appointed to two sub-committees, he rarely attended their meetings and resigned from both in October. He tendered his formal resignation from the society in September of 1908, claiming he still was in disagreement with the Basis as well as a continued discontent of the general form of the society's activities. He also explained that he had considered mounting another campaign for revising the Basis, but when calculating "the forces against such a campaign, the inevitable opposition and irritation that must ensue and the probable net results of what would certainly be an irksome and distressful conflict, I am forced to conclude that the effort is, for me at least, not worth making."[141] He added, "the period of opportunity for propaganda to the British middle classes on Fabian lines is at an end. That opportunity came and found us divided in theory and undecided in action. The petty growth that is a mere mockery of the things we might have done."[142] The Executive agreed to publish the letter in the *Fabian News*, but according to Pease, they worried it would "mislead the non-Fabian public in a way they do not suppose you to intend."[143] Despite Pease's request, Wells's letter of resignation appeared in full in the September 1906 edition of the *Fabian News*. With that the 'Episode of Mr. Wells' was finished.

### Reminiscing: Wells and the Fabians

In the decades that followed, Wells and the other Fabians looked back on their years together. Pease wrote *The History of the Fabian Society* in 1918, Shaw wrote his version in *Pen Portraits*

*and Reviews*, in 1932 and Wells responded in 1934 with *Experiment in Autobiography.* Beatrice Webb too had a story to tell in 1948 with *Our Partnership*. Bernard Shaw went so far as to commission a stained glass window depicting Webb, Pease and himself re-molding the world with Wells thumbing his nose at the Fabian elders kneeling in supplication to an altar of Fabian works and governmental theory.

Pease's *History of the Fabian Society* depicted Shaw as the hero and Wells as the goat. His obvious allegiance to Shaw is evident. He accused Wells of being "a masterful person, very fond of his own way, very uncertain what that way was, and quite unaware whither it necessarily led.  In any position except that of leader Mr. Wells was invaluable, as long as he kept it!"[144] Not to let Pease or Shaw have the satisfaction of the last word, but careful to avoid an invitation to debate, Wells wrote almost casually of the imbroglio in his autobiography; he saved his vitriol for his novels. Sidney and Beatrice Webb found themselves thinly veiled as characters, Oscar and Altiora Bailey in *The New Machiavelli* and Amber Reeves (Wells's sometimes lover) disguised only by a name change. The novel dealt with social questions, particularly that of sex, with the character of Remington (Wells) destroyed by a scandal involving his lover, a scandal manufactured by the Bailey's (Webbs.)  Beatrice Webb read the novel, considering Wells's caricatures, "really very clever in a malicious way."[145] She also thought the book laid "bare the tragedy of H.G.'s life—his aptitude for 'fine thinking' and even 'good feeling' and yet his total incapacity for decent conduct."[146]   Despite the venomous prose, the Webbs still considered Wells a friend.

After Wells left the Fabians, he continued to have warm personal relationships with those he had formerly regarded as enemies. For many years, the Shaws and the Webbs were regular dinner guests of the Wells and often stayed for the weekend at

---

[140]Ibid. The last words were especially cruel, as Wells had been a drapers assistant before his literary success.

[141]HGW to ERP, 16 September 1908, Wells Collection

[142]Ibid.

[143]ERP to HGW, 26 September 1908, Wells Collection.

---

[144]Pease, 173.

[145]Beatrice Webb's Diary 5 November 1910; quoted in MacKenzie, 270.

[146]Ibid.

the Wells's home at Sandgate. He frequently corresponded with the Webbs, offering advice on political issues as well as societal concerns.[147] In addition, Wells's wife Catherine[148] continued to be a member of the Fabians, and sat on the Executive Committee for an additional two years. The influence he had on the society after his resignation, through his wife as well as his correspondence with Bernard Shaw and Sidney and Beatrice Webb could benefit from further research.

Wells's published memoirs of his time with the Fabians are remarkably brief, less than three pages in fact. He admitted that his behavior was a case of "bad judgment, gusty impulse and real inexcusable vanity," but essentially that his "motives were misunderstood" and he lacked in his effort to make them understandable.[149] He confessed antagonizing both Bernard Shaw and Beatrice Webb, but contended that fundamentally he was right. Wells, upon reflection, realized his hope for the Fabians was public action and their hope for themselves was public awareness. He puts the affair into perspective, "A vast revolution was going on swiftly and irresistibly all about us, but with perfect sincerity this Fabian group posed as a valiant little minority projecting a revolution reduced to its minimum terms. It was to permeate the existing order rather than change it. There was no real hope in their revolutionary project. It was a protest rather than a plan.[150]

### Conclusion

The Fabians had looked for someone to "make Fabianism interesting again"[151] and H.G. Wells served them well in this

regard. In the two years following his delivery of "Faults of the Fabian," the society had an upsurge in membership. Between March of 1906 and March of 1907, 455 persons sought membership, an increase of 288 over the previous year. The next year the number was 817 and the next, 665. In 1904, the society had only 730 members. By 1909, the total was 2462. The financial state of the society benefited as well, during the years of Wells's membership. Income from subscriptions rose from £473 in 1904 to £1608 in 1908—according to Pease a high-water mark for contributions to ordinary funds.[152]

Wells had hoped to move socialism from a drawing-room catch phrase to a well-realized social movement—"make socialists and you will achieve socialism; there is no other way."[153] He had hoped the Fabians would provide a forum for his ideas and experiments. The society needed stronger organization and a fully engaged program of propaganda if Wells was to fulfill his vision and while membership bloomed during his association with the Fabians, Wells felt the increase paled in comparison to the thousands he believed they could recruit.

Considering that both Wells and the Fabians sought several of the same things—increased membership, financial stability and public education—what kept them from working in harmony? It is clear that Shaw, mouthpiece for the "Old Gang," had set Wells up. He learned from previous dealings with Wells that he was easily manipulated, and could readily be drawn into a conflict. Shaw orchestrated much of the debate. He asked Wells to contribute a report to make Fabianism interesting again, he encouraged his drafts of the special committee proposals and even enticed Wells with the promise of his (and the rest of the Executive) stepping down from controls and Wells taking over. Previous scholarship has agreed that Wells was the odd cog that did not fit the Fabian wheel and most argue that Wells was a spoiled child, bent on having his own way, even if he unsure of

---

[147]In a letter dated 22 February 1909, he told Beatrice Webb that a recent reprinting of a old essay would be "as aimless & silly a proceeding as it is possible to imagine. HGW to Beatrice Webb (BW) 22 February 1909. Other letters to Beatrice Webb are similar in style. Wells Collection.

[148]Wells referred to her as Jane, although most everyone else called her Catherine.

[149]Wells, *Experiment in Autobiography*, 564.

[150]Ibid., 198.

[151]GBS to HGW, Wells Collection.

---

[152]Pease, 186.

[153]Wells, "Faults of the Fabian," 18.

what that was. While it is true that Wells did feel better when steering the ship, he was willing to take advice, as he had from Graham Wallace, and indeed even Bernard Shaw. Given that all of the main actors had outsize personalities it is not surprising that scholars have focused on personality conflicts in the episode of Mr. Wells, but the underlying conflict was one of mismatched objectives.

Wells was firmly established in the literary arena and as a widely published author already had not only the medium but also an audience for his ideas. Therefore, as some have suggested, Wells was not ego-driven to join the Fabian movement, although with some prodding he was enticed to join with the idea of having a society that was not only willing but eager to put his ideas into practice. The Fabians, particularly the Executive Committee, however, were not so much interested in making socialists as they were in making Fabians. Encouraged by the swell of numbers, they wanted to hold on to the society as they knew it. The triumph of socialism would mean Fabian obsolescence. Wells had hoped for a symbiotic relationship where he could promote socialism, but instead, found himself in a group wishing primarily to promote itself.

### *Appendix*

*The Basis of the Fabian Society until 1919*

The Fabian Society consists of Socialists.

It therefore aims at the reorganization of Society by the emancipation of Land and Industrial Capital from individual and class ownership, and the vesting of them in the community for the general benefit. In this way only can the natural and acquired advantages of the country be equitably shared by the whole people.

The Society accordingly works for the extinction of private property in Land and of the consequent individual appropriation, in the form of Rent, of the price paid for permission to use the earth, as well as for the advantages of superior soils and sites.

The Society, further, works for the transfer to the community of the administration of such industrial Capital as can conveniently be managed socially. For, owing to the monopoly of the means of production in the past, industrial inventions and the transformation of surplus income into Capital have mainly enriched the proprietary class, the worker being now dependent on that class for leave to earn a living.

If these measures be carried out, without compensation (though not without such relief to expropriated individuals as may seem fit to the community), Rent and Interest will be added to the reward of labour, the idle class now living on the labour of others will necessarily disappear, and practical equality of opportunity will be maintained by the spontaneous action of economic forces with much less interference with personal liberty than the present system entails.

For the attainment of these ends the Fabian Society looks to the spread of Socialist opinions, and the social and political changes consequent thereon, *including the establishment of equal citizenship for men and women*.[154] It seeks to achieve these ends by the general dissemination of knowledge as to the relation between the individual and Society in its economic, ethical, and political aspects.

---

[154] Words in italics were added in 1907. Pease, 284.

*CREATION IN THE HAND: THE LIFE IN FOLK ART DOLLS*

**Megan Mac Gregor**

As museum curators, our strongest efforts in first person interpretation seek to connect the visitor with the period of the site around them. Get them to think and relate, view the past as a reality instead of an unknown fairy tale, and make them understand that people who lived in the past were real human beings like them. People will be more willing to step into this foreign country if they are shown familiar territory; something they know that makes them feel safe in a strange land. Dolls are the perfect mechanism for interpretation because we can all relate to them. Almost every child growing up possessed a Barbie, a GI Joe, or any other of the countless action figures and dolls whose ads saturated the breaks between Saturday morning cartoons.

As a member of the museum going public, my encounters with dolls have been almost forgotten. They are part of the half remembered jumble of lifeless toys strategically placed on the second story of a house museum's nursery, or in hands on activities where groups of tiny hands create watered down versions of the original. In both cases they are dismissed with the simple interpretation of, "They had dolls back then." These small ambassadors have so much more to offer than that. My research into the history of dolls has shown that they have been companions to human kind almost as long as the dog has, and they have been a part of every culture. They have united the whole of the human experience, and so I ask, why not use them to bridge the gap between the present and the past? Folk dolls in particular are excellent guides. These little handmade beauties are an interpreters dream. They reflect the people who created them and allow for a wide ranging dialogue about children, trade, money, and family.

Dolls have been the constant companions of children since almost the beginning of time; or at least since the beginning of human settlement. The earliest dolls were wooden paddle shaped ones found in Egypt in 2000 BCE. In Greece in the 6th century BCE, there were articulating dolls with painted on clothes, and a century later people were making and selling dolls that could be dressed throughout the eastern Mediterranean.[1] It is believed dolls like these came into the world as simplified versions of the religious idols carried in pockets or standing watch in temples. The earliest known European idols are those of a fat-hipped goddess from the Paleolithic and Neolithic cultures of Europe; archeologists have been uncovering them since the beginning of the profession.[2] The shift from idol to toy can be seen in the word for doll. In Latin the word for a votive image, "pupa" or "puppa," also means girl and, more importantly, doll. From this, we can see verbally how the idol of a goddess became a toy.[3]

The religious ritual of creating corn dollies in England, serves to illuminate how easily an idol could become a doll. Early Britons believed that the spirit of the crops lived in their wheat, and when they harvested it in the fall the spirit became homeless. To provide a home for the spirit and cultivate his good will, the last sheaves of the harvested wheat was plaited into a corn dolly in which the spirit could live.[4] As the skill of plaiting was passed down to the next generation, the children probably practiced their new skills by plaiting their own toys. The children would not have been hindered by the religious connections of their craft since in later years, during the English

---

*Megan MacGregor, of Pepperell, Massachusetts, is a graduate student in the Historical Administration program. She wrote this paper for Dr. Debra Reid's History 5330, Material Culture and Decorative Arts 1600- present, in the Fall of 2006.*

[1]Deborah Jaffe, *The History of Toys; For spinning Tops to Robots* (Gloucestershire: Sutton Publishing, 2006), 124, 125.

[2]E.B. Renaud, "Prehistoric Female Figurines from America and the Old World," in *The Scientific Monthly*, 28, No. 6 (Jun. 1929): 507-512.

[3]Jaffe, *The History of Toys*, 122.

[4]Ibid., 123.

Reformation, children adopted the religious icons they found in plundered monasteries as dolls.[5]

Dolls became commercialized fairly early in their history. In the Middle Ages, dolls made of wood, solid wax, or molded paper pulps were sold at fairs in Florence and Venice.[6] But it was in Germany that the doll industry took off. In the fourteenth century, Nuremberg and Sonneberg's guilds each specialized in making dolls out of their respective trade's materials. In 1465, Ott and Mess began to carve wooden dolls as a profession. These early craftsmen made their dolls by hand. Guildsmen created them as sidepieces, made from scraps during the spare time. In this sense, they were not mass-produced. When doll-making became a specialized industry; hundreds of pieces were turned out every day and shipped great distances. Through this industrialization, the process of conscious individual creation was lost. Individual people still made the dolls, but they were making a large number of them all at once.

By the Sixteenth century, Germany turned out very sophisticated wooden and white clay dolls for the rest of Europe.[7] By the seventeenth century, Nuremberg alone had seventeen doll makers.[8] Paris also produced dolls at the same time as Germany. These wooden and wax dolls were fashion dolls; they were meant to display the latest fashions to provincial adults.[9]

European manufactured dolls arrived in America with the first European explorers. Trade trunks contained wooden dolls called Bartholomew babies. These dolls were sold in the street and at Bartholomew Fair in England.[10] In 1585, the painter John White depicted an Indian girl holding one of these dolls. Shop-made dolls became more widely available with the beginning of

---

[5]Ibid., 126.

[6]Wendy Lavitt, *The Knopf Collectors' Guides to American Antiques: Dolls* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1983), 10.

[7]Lavitt, *The Knopf Collectors' Guides to American Antiques: Dolls*, 10.

[8]Ibid., 11.

[9]Ibid.

[10]Wendy Lavitt, *American Folk Dolls* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1982), 3.

the consumer revolution in the eighteenth century. The growth of the middle class created a wider market; toyshops opened in England for the first time, and stores began to carry toys on their shelves.[11] In Salem, Massachusetts, a farmer was recorded as purchasing a doll for his child.[12] George Washington ordered a "neat dress'd wax baby" from England for his stepdaughter. [13]

Dolls became even more available during the Industrial Revolution, which enabled dolls to be made on a massive scale, and shipped to distant places. By 1880, Sonneberg in Germany was producing and shipping fifteen million dolls a year.[14] At this point we can definitely say that commercial and folk art dolls became two separate categories. Conscious individual creation and hand craftsmanship were lost as the factory assembly line created uniformity among the products.

> Before it is completed a doll passed through many hands. The heads, hands, and feet are made by one person, the body by another, the hair is fixed on by another and the face is pained by two other different people, one doing the rough work and the second the finishing touches. Clothes are made by another person and the dresses are put on by still another.[15]

A girl in England could have a tea party with her doll while an American girl took its identical twin to see the cows out back. New technological innovations, such as the perfection of the china head, allowed formerly expensive dolls to become affordable for the middle class.[16] To reach a wider market, companies began to sell china heads and limbs separately so that parents could buy them and sew them onto a homemade body created with their newly-acquired sewing machine.[17] Magazines

---

[11]Lavitt, *The Knopf Collectors' Guides to American Antiques: Dolls*, 11.

[12]Lavitt, *American Folk Dolls*, 4.

[13]Ibid., 11.

[14]Jaffe, *The History of Toys*, 127.

[15]"Where Toys come from," in *Current Literature* (Vol. 3, No.6, Dec. 1889), 535.

[16]Lavitt, *The Knopf Collectors' Guides to American Antiques: Dolls*, 12.

[17]Ibid.

and books further facilitated this by featuring articles on, or wholly devoting themselves to, the making of dolls. These factors, and the decrease in wooden doll quality because of poor manufacturing, lead to a growth in the popularity of rag and cloth dolls.[18]

The outbreak of World War I shifted the doll manufacturing market from Paris and Germany, which had been considered the cradle of doll manufacturing, to America and Japan.[19] The Great Depression put an end to many of America's doll manufacturers and the few that survived held on by producing dolls modeled after movie stars.[20] It was not until 1949 that the creation of hard plastic, which allowed for the creation of Barbie and G.I. Joe, revolutionized the American doll market, and raised dolls to a new level of consumerism.[21]

The Tarble Arts Center at Eastern Illinois University defines folk art as objects created by a non-academically trained artist that connotes some form of individual expression; they should also represent the shared aesthetic traditions of a community or geographic area, and those of a specific ethnic, religious, or family group. Usually such art passes from one generation to the next and often comes from a craft tradition, rather than a fine arts tradition, and may also include self-taught artists, along with those historically classified as 'naïve,' 'primitive,' or 'outsider.' Beneath this definition fits all manner of arts and crafts that every day people have been creating for their own needs since the beginning of human civilization. While this may stir up images of baskets and portraits, it also includes those small things easily forgotten. Such is the nature of dolls. The key factor that separates a folk art doll from Barbie is how it is made. Folk dolls are created by hand, rather than by machine, out of any materials available to their creators. People who make them do it for both the enjoyment found in the process of making

them, and for the finished doll itself. Each doll is a conscious individual creation; they are not just rattled off in piles. The individualistic nature that's comes from conscious creation of folk art dolls makes them rich sources on information about their maker's past, economic and cultural traditions.

They are rich with exhibit possibilities. Marilyn Kinnett, who learned to make dolls growing up in Ohio during the Great Depression, came from a tradition of folk dolls. By looking at her process and her creations we can extract a very wide sweeping narrative about her and her world. For Marilyn, doll making is equated with family, especially its female network. Her mother and grandmother both taught her to make dolls. They showed her how to sew by hand and sewing machine. They also taught her how to make dolls with available odds and ends, such as potato mashers, wooden spoons and corn husks. This tradition of making dolls out of any available material is a common feature of folk dolls.[22]

Marilyn was born in 1931, in the midst of the Great Depression, when toys were the last thing a family would spend money on. This frugality is reflected in the rag dolls that she and her mother made. They never bought cloth specifically for dolls. The material always came from her mothers "endless rag bag," and Marilyn described stuffing them with "anything we could find, from old hoes, old cotton hoes, to comfort bedding, ya know. Anything we could find to stuff with."[23]

The materials that children and adults used to make dolls reflected the environments in which they lived, and their economic status. For example, a middle class farming family in the late 1800's might have a doll with a homemade body and a china head bought from a local store or peddler.[24] The stuffing of the dolls body, animal hair or plant fibers, would reflect the natural environment in which they lived, whereas the china head shows that they had disposable income, connections to,

[18]Ibid.
[19]Ibid., 13.
[20]Ibid., 14.
[21]Ibid.

[22]Jaffe, *The History of Toys*, 122.
[23]Ibid.
[24]Lavitt, *The Knopf Collectors' Guides to American Antiques: Dolls*, 12.

and participation in, the industrial market. On the other hand, a doll that a London street urchin made from a discarded shoe in 1901 reflects her manufactured, urban environment and destitute condition.[25] In Marilyn's case the materials she used were also used by her mother, and grandmother: wooden spoons, cloth, corn husks, potato mashers, apples. We can discern that she grew up in a semi rural farming environment. Potato mashers, cloth and wooden spoons are store goods but apples and cornhusks are products of a rural farming community. Marilyn states that "we made things from everything imaginable. Everything nature had to make dolls."[26]

Marilyn's mother's specialty was rag dolls. She used her own patterns, as well as those which her husband's mother passed down to her. These patterns were part of a wider commercial trend that began around 1880 with the invention of the domestic sewing machine. Factory production had decreased the quality of wooden dolls, and as a result, combined with the sewing machine, there was an increase in the home manufacturing of rag dolls. This was accompanied by a flurry of magazine articles and books on doll making, as well as pieces of cloth that had dolls preprinted on them so that the maker only had to cut out the doll, sew it, and stuff it. Harper's Bazaar published an article in 1902 which gives detailed instructions on how to make a "well-made and well-dressed rag doll," along with a pattern to make a doll with.[27] The closure of the major doll factories in Germany and France due to the First World War strengthened the cloth doll movement even further.[28] It is likely that some of the patterns that were passed down to Marilyn's mother came from this emergence of popularity for the rag doll.

Just as her mother- in- law had done, Marilyn's mother passed on the patterns and the art of doll making to her

daughter. In turn, when Marilyn married and had children she taught them how to sew and make dolls just as her mother and grandmother had taught her. In a way, doll making became a way of initiating new female members into the family. This was done in the passing on of patterns for stuffed animals from Marilyn's paternal grandmother, to her mother, to Marilyn herself, and then to her daughter- in- law. "I told my daughter-in-law, who's married to my youngest son, that she could make animals…. So we sat down one day [with] all the patterns and… she started in and she makes beautiful animals."[29] Sewing was a way of interacting with and creating relationships among the female members of the family, as well as a means of passing on the tradition of doll making. The passing on of doll making from one generation to the next serves as a bonding experience between those generations. These learning experiences create memories carried with the student for the rest of their life. Thus to create a doll revives memories of family.

> I have an apple head grandmother and grandfather up on the beam. And those are the ones that my grandmother taught me how to do in an old summer kitchen. She would sit with the apples and she would peal the apples first and then cut the pieces and then hang them up to dry and as it dried I'd watch the pieces change and when it was thoroughly dried she's (unintelligible) with the pipe cleaners that were my grandfather's (unintelligible), dress them as people and they'd be believable. …Nice warm feeling to think that I can pass something on that my grandmother helped me learn. Everyone always has a favorite grandmother.[30]

Marilyn was still able to recall this at the age of fifty-two, with grandchildren of her own. By passing on the art of apple head doll making to her children and grandchildren, as it was taught to her, she symbolically passes on her grandmother to what would have been her great and great, great grandchildren.

---

[25]Jaffe, The History of Toys, 123.

[26]Marilyn Kinnett, interview by Jan Laude, ½ inch reel, Folk Art interview, Rossville, IL, Aug. 16, 1983, Tarble Arts Center.

[27]M. E. Acker, "Home Made Dolls For the Children," in Harper's Bazaar (Vol. 36, No. 1, Jan.1902), 72.

[28]Jaffe, The History of Toys, 137.

---

[29]Kinnett, Interview.
[30]Ibid.

The apple head dolls are particularly auspicious in the passing on of familial memories. Dried apple remains have been found in Switzerland that date back to the Neolithic era.[31] Like humans, the humble apple is "a readily adaptable form of life. Its rich gene pool yields to infinite variations both in fruit and in the adaptability of the plant to climactic conditions."[32] This wondrous variety gives each apple its own personality. This personality is revealed when the apple is peeled, carved, and set up to dry. Each head, despite the fact that they might have all been carved alike, takes on the face of a unique character.[33] By making apple head dolls, Marilyn keeps her grandmother's memory alive, but at the same time creates something new and unique for the next generation.

By teaching Marilyn how to make dolls, her mother and grandmother taught her a skill and a medium through which to be creative. Being good at something instilled confidence in Marilyn and made her feel more comfortable in the world. People admired her skills and she felt confident enough to set up a small shop in Rossville, Illinois called *Little Folks N' Country Critters*, where she sold her dolls. In this respect, her doll making allowed her to communicate with the people and children who came into her store. The original American apple head dolls served the same purpose. The Oneidas and Seneca who lived in the northeastern United States made them from crabapples and later, after European settlement, apples. They were used to make "happy heads or wish dolls" that represented the spirit Loose Feet, who granted small children wishes. These dolls were given to children not as playthings but as symbols of good fortune.[34] Dolls allowed children to talk directly to Loose Feet and ask him

for assistance. This gave children a sense of protection, which in turn, could foster self-confidence.

Apples themselves have a history in America as being a sign of control and comfort. The first apple trees came with French and British settlers.[35] "By 1638 William Baxton of the Massachusetts Bay Colony had established the first American apple orchard [only eight years after the founding the colony]."[36] The early settlers were afraid of the wilderness in which they found themselves, and the apple tree, became a way for them to symbolically tame the land and give them of stability in the unknown. A representative of Charles I decreed, in 1641, "that anyone receiving 100 acres must plant apple trees."[37] This stipulation continued later on when the Northwest Territory was opened up. A land grant there "required a settler to 'set out at least fifty apple or pear trees' as a condition of his deed. The purpose of this rule was to…[encourage] homesteaders to put down roots. Since a standard apple tree normally took ten years to fruit, an orchard was a mark of lasting settlement."[38] In this way, apples were a sign civilization that gave a settler some reassurance and confidence that the wilderness he found himself in would not swallow him up.

Apple, and the dolls made from them, became a security blanket for the early settlers and pioneers to cling to as they faced the greater wilderness of the world. A settler looking out his front door into a small grove of reassuring apple trees could stand a little taller, feeling secure in the wilderness and confident that he could make it, even if this confidence was falsely brought on by applejacks.

This brings us back to Marilyn. One of the first things Marilyn remembers about doll making is her mothers "endless rag bag, because she made some for everyone in town, rag

[31]Boria Sax, "Apples," in David Scofield Wilson and Angus Kress Gillespie (eds.), *Rooted in America; Folklore of popular Fruits and vegetables* (Knoxville; University of Tennessee Press, 1999), 2.

[32]Fred Lape, *Apples and Man* (New York; Van Nostrand Reinhold Company, 1979), 9.

[33]Lavitt, *American Folk Dolls*, 59.

[34]Ibid., 92.

[35]Lape, *Apples and Man*, 17.

[36]Boria Sax, "Apples," 4.

[37]Ibid., 5.

[38]Michael Pollan, *The Botany of Desire; A Plants view of the World* (New York: Random House, 2001), 16.

dolls…."[39] In this way dolls, for Marilyn became associated with community and giving, especially to the communities smallest members; its children. Like her mother, her doll making "started out as a hobby with my own children and my neighbor's children and all my relatives too. Always had to have a doll or a [stuffed] animal for a birthday, Christmas or whatever."[40] The shop was a larger manifestation of her mothers "endless rag bag." This is apparent in the nature of the shop. Marilyn allowed the children who came full range of the store, allowing them to pick up and play with everything.

> The kids were all, don't touch anything when they went into a store. Nothing was to be touched. An in this store they can come in and pretty well pick things up, do what they want to with them. They don't damage um. I have very little damage from…children except picking things up and putting things down maybe in the wrong place, which I do when I deal with them.[41]

Marilyn's store was not about profit; it was about seeing the children's faces and interacting with them. "…this is the main point of it, to see the children's faces when they walk in the door and they see this animal or this doll and 'oh molly!' you know, 'oh molly!' Well I really enjoy this. The children are so good."[42] Marilyn's dolls were made to be played with and used by the community's children, not to be used as display pieces. *Little Folks N' Country Critters* made dolls a sign of community by bringing children and their parents in contact with Marilyn and her family.

In early America, apples achieved the same importance. As stated above, apples were a sign of community. "Every small village had its cider mill operating during late summer and fall." The mill became a meeting place for the community. Apple head dolls are also community oriented. It is very common to find

them in pairs, as is the case with the old man and woman that the Tarble Arts Center acquired from Marilyn. More recently "apple head dolls [have been] made in groups as part of scenarios holding special meaning for the doll maker."[43]

Folk dolls have not gone untouched by consumerism. The most striking case of their brush with it can be seen in the story of Mary McAboy of Montana and her Skookum dolls: she represents the darker half of Marilyn. Mary McAboy appears to have learned how to make apple head dolls from her mother. Mary had also learned how to make dolls from her mother for friends when she was growing up. She also sold them at social events. When Mary's husband, Frank, died she remembered this skill and sent in an application to the United States Patent office for a patent on a man and a woman apple head doll dressed as Indians, which she called Skookums.[44] "Skookum" means "good" in the language of the Chinook Indians.[45] She was granted her patent four months later, in February 1914 and began to make and sell her Skookum dolls. They became very popular, so much so that she was able to sell the business to Harry Heye Tammen, of H.H. Tammen Company, who began to distribute them in San Francisco, New York, Canada, and Mexico.[46] While Mary remained in charge of the dolls assembly for 38 years, the materials used to make the dolls changed. The apple heads were replaced with composite heads and later, in the 1940's, by plastic heads.[47] The instant that Mary's dolls left her hands and were produced on the large scale they ceased to be folk dolls. The making of the doll is the key to whether or not it is folk art. Making the dolls by hand is what separates mass produced dolls from the folk dolls.

---

[39]Kinnett, Interview.
[40]Ibid.
[41]Ibid.
[42]Ibid.

---

[43]Lavitt, *American Folk Dolls*, 59.
[44]Linda Larouche, ed., "How it began," in *Skookum News: An online Newsletter for Collectors*, 1, No. 1 (Summer 2001) <www.skookumnews.com>
[44]Kinnett, Interview.
[45]Larouche, ed., "How it began," <www.skookumnews.com>
[46]Ibid.
[47]Ibid.

While folk dolls cannot be mass-produced by machines, the materials and reasons for making them can change. With the Industrial Revolution and modern technology, materials have become more widely available and, according to Marilyn, have improved in quality: "yarn has improved, you know by the way. Beautiful yarn now, and everything is better; the thread the material."[48] Since what is available to people has changed it is only natural that the material out of which dolls are constructed would follow suit. It is the natural process of folk art dolls; use what is available. Marilyn bought and scavenged material for her dolls. Naturally, the amount of disposable income played a part in how much material she could buy and how much she had to scavenge. When she had her children, she made dolls out of the material scraps from the clothes she made them, but once they were gone she began to purchase material specifically for making dolls.[49]

Consumerism has also changed the look of folk dolls through its cultural influence. Prior to the arrival of the Europeans the Oneidas and Seneca's dolls "were unclothed except for occasional husk garments. Later dolls wore a blend of European and Indian costumes, reflecting the tribal habit and contact with the white settlers."[50] The same was true for folk dolls around the turn of the twentieth century. German doll manufactures had perfected the use of China for a doll's heads, and began selling the heads, arms, and legs separately so that parents could buy them and attach them to home made bodies. In this way folk doll hybrids were created.[51]

Pop culture has also affected folk dolls. Marilyn made a Jiminy Cricket doll after the character in *Walt Disney's Pinocchio*.[52] He is a pop culture icon but Marilyn created the pattern for him and sewed him by hand. Consumerism has also changed the way the dolls are used. While all of Marilyn's dolls

were meant to be used and played with by children, many of the apple head dolls made today are created to be works of art or for display. Today "apple head dolls [are] often made in groups as part of scenario," which recreate "local settings, scenes from American history and famous plays."[53] In the end, what sets folk dolls apart from industrial dolls is the fact that they are born from one set of  hands and placed directly into another's. There is heart and memory placed into each doll which transfers over to the new owner who builds onto the memories. They do not arrive fresh from the box without context behind them.

Dolls hold a special place in folk art. Their creation can inform us about the physical and mental world in which their creators grew up. No matter whether it's an apple head doll, a rag doll or a lovingly revamped discarded shoe, these dolls cannot be swallowed up by commercialism. Like a magic trick, the instant the hands and mind of a maker and their conscious individual creation are replaced with doldrum repletion of the machine or multiple hands, the trick is revealed and the magic is lost. This is not to say that folk dolls cannot be made and sold in large numbers. Marilyn Kinnett's Little Folks N' Country Critters is proof that a maker of folk dolls can retain their artistic integrity and function in harmony with consumerism.

A folk doll, because it is a conscious creation with so much put into it, becomes a small window into the world of its makers and owners. Using a doll as a bridge for the time period of your site would be a good way to guide children's groups. By simply asking them, 'What is it made of?' you can lead them into the natural and man made resources available to people and the kinds of skills people possessed that allowed them to make the doll. Or you could jump off into family ties and holidays and the lives of children. 'Imagine if this single doll was your only real toy. What are some of the games you could play with it?' Even if your talking to a group of boys and girls, you could easily grab the boys attention by pointing out that this was the equivalent of an action figure, or that a sisters doll would need accessories

---

[48]Kinnett, Interview.

[49]Ibid.

[50]Lavitt, *American Folk Dolls* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1982), 92.

[51]Ibid., 11.

[52]Kinnett, Interview.

[53]Lavitt, *American Folk Dolls*, 59.

such as carved horses and beds and houses. A doll table of contents could work just as well for guiding a group of adults. By posing the same question of 'What is it made of, and how did they get it?' you can invite them to pose that question to all of the artifacts they see and begin to construct an idea of the processes that made up the life of people during that time. Or you could put on a work shop where people are invited to bring their old cloths and rags and learn how to make rag dolls. You could go round the room and try to interpret people's lives from their dolls. The possibilities are truly endless. So let us take our dolls off the shelf and breathing life into them so that others may be caught in their glow and stop to wonder why.

*THE EMERGENCE OF NARCISSISM IN AMERICAN CULTURE: THE LAMENTATIONS OF CHRISTOPHER LASCH IN* THE CULTURE OF NARCISSISM

**Sonya Leigh Scott**

*Introduction*
Lamenting the loss of resolve and the diminishing confidence found in contemporary American life in the aftermath of the 1960's, Christopher Lasch unleashed strong criticism of American culture and the self-preoccupation, loss of individualism, and the growing therapeutic climate he observed. Lasch, along with other critics, such as Tom Wolfe and Jim Hougan, identified this self-serving tendency that was rapidly permeating society as "'collective narcissism.'"[1] In *The Culture of Narcissism* Lasch persuasively pointed to loss of family authority and traditional skills, reliance on others to guide and manage family life, and the changing roles of women as contributors to and outcomes of the "malaise" that gripped Americans.[2]

The debate over Lasch's assertions has persisted, especially among liberals, over the decades since the publishing of his book in 1979 and has remained alive well beyond his death in early 1994. Intellectuals, social critics, and historians have commended and condemned his role as a social critic, criticized his notions, and applauded his efforts to explain the problems of a declining American culture. Many felt he took a bold stance and praised his refusal to succumb to the indignant left with their wounded pride and insulted self-righteousness.[3] Others accused him of nostalgia for an imagined "heroic strength of character" in his

---

*Sonya Leigh Scott, of Champaign, Illinois, is a post-Baccalaureate student in History. She wrote this paper for Dr. Jon Coit's History 4970, The History of American Ideas, in the Fall of 2006.*

[1]Christopher Lasch, *The Culture of Narcissism: American Life in An Age of Diminishing Expectations* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1979; Norton, 1991), 6.

[2]Ibid., 10.

[3]Robert Erwin, "The Critic of Progress," *Massachusetts Review* 45, no. 2 (Summer 2004): 291.

description of nineteenth century bourgeois patriarchy.[4] And some feminists expressed concern that Lasch possessed a masculine viewpoint, avoided the oppression women had experienced in the patriarchal family structure, and supported a return to the domination of men over women.[5]

This paper will describe Christopher Lasch's assertions regarding the loss of family authority, the rise of therapeutic controls in relation to the family, and the role of feminism and its connection to the decline of the family as well as the debates surrounding Lasch's role as a social critic. Discussion of Lasch's viewpoints will also include critique and debates found among historians that will demonstrate the insight and validity of Lasch's notions and that will also expose some of the problems found with clarity and interpretation that created much controversy. Despite the differences in interpretation that left *The Culture of Narcissism* wide open for criticism, Lasch successfully illustrated what he observed as a declining society and the many ways that this decline was evident. Lasch's warning to and chastising of the American public is clear and as will be shown, his criticisms and concerns were valid and relevant notwithstanding the variety of interpretations; his main premise of a society deteriorating into destructive narcissism.

### Narcissism Defined

Lasch explained that Americans had become "pessimistic" and had lost confidence as a result of the loss of the Vietnam War, the slowed economic situation, and fear of depletion of natural resources as well as being generally fatigued after the tribulation of the sixties and that this pessimism brought forth a loss of resilience and creativity to confront problems of contemporary life.[6] Lasch defined "narcissism" as the "psychological dimension" of reliance on experts resulting from

the loss of "productive" and "reproductive functions" of the family.[7] By "productive functions," Lasch was referring to skills required to meet material needs and "reproductive functions" to having and raising children.[8] Confidence in leadership had waned and with the lack of solutions to the nation's problems, the American public had lost the resolve to overcome this pessimistic outlook.[9]

Narcissism presented as a way to overcome the "repressive conditions of the past," to forget the past, and as a means to find some level of happiness in a hopeless world, according to Lasch.[10] Americans resorted to self-centered preoccupations with an emphasis on "psychic self-awareness," recoiled from political involvement and concern for social issues, immersed themselves in material consumption, and divorced themselves from the sense of belonging to the past and the future instead, "living for the moment."[11] Lasch provided radicalism as a more extreme example of narcissism that, for some, was a means to fill emptiness, provide a sense of importance, and to feel significant by being associated with others deemed of some magnitude. Despite the outward appearance of social concern and political interest, Lasch contended that radicals, too, were mired in self-centeredness and the need for validation by their group leaders.[12] Lasch described the longings of Susan Stern, of the radical group the Weathermen as an example of narcissism in radical attire.

Early in his book, Lasch elaborated on narcissism from a clinical perspective and used descriptions found typically in the arenas of psychology and sociology to describe this phenomenon. He suggested that in order to fully comprehend narcissism as a "social and cultural phenomenon" it was necessary to look at the expanding corpus of writing that

---

[4] Fred Siegel, "The Agony of Christopher Lasch" in *Reviews in American History*, 8 no.3 (Sept. 1980): 285.

[5] Michele Barrett & Mary McIntosh, "Narcissism and the Family: a Critique of Lasch," *The New Left Review* no.135 (Sept.-Oct. 1982): 43.

[6] Lasch, *Narcissism*, xiii.

---

[7] Ibid., 10.

[8] Ibid.

[9] Ibid., xiii.

[10] Ibid., xv.

[11] Ibid., 12, 5.

[12] Ibid., 7.

addressed it.[13]  In *The Culture of Narcissism* Lasch offered detail regarding clinical narcissism found in contemporary clinical literature and studies, and imparted a description of Freud's work and research into human personality and behavior. However, for the purposes of this paper, the discussion will center on the disintegration of family life, the therapeutic climate, and the changing relationships and roles between and of men and women, as well as Lasch's role as an historian cum social critic.

### *Family Authority and Its Demise*

Lasch explained that having and caring for children was historically a function of the family who provided the training needed to live independently in the world and that this function had slowly eroded in contemporary America. This training included basic and essential skills; work, domestic duties, manners and morals, and sex education.[14] Children's lives were conducted in close proximity to adults where valuable guidance and modeling of work behaviors and social skills would aid in their maturing into productive citizens. Strong parent-child relationships helped to provide a firm foundation from which children would grow and develop.[15]

The problem of family authority developed, according to Lasch, with the advent of industrialization and its subsequent "invasion" of family life.[16] The factory system took work out of the sight of children, thus separating them from the adult world and the instruction they had previously received from parents. The "deterioration of child care" (or "transfer of functions" as Lasch chided using a sociological term that he considered "jargon") occurred as the primary care of children left the home and was taken over by assorted institutions.[17]

As the rearing of children left the home, other agencies, such as schools, assumed roles previously held by parents and other family members and with the loss of traditional parental roles, parents found themselves uneasy about their ability to skillfully raise their own children.[18] Out of this came the "helping professions"; experts who advertised themselves as essential to the well-being of the family and inferring that families were incapable of taking care of themselves.[19]

Convinced by these experts that they had fallen short of the "ideal of perfect parenthood," parents grew increasingly dependent on the expanding social service industry.[20] Lasch saw this as a catalyst in the deteriorating parent-child connection already being experienced in families from industrialization coupled with the narcissistic tendencies that were emerging. Gone was the confident mother who possessed skills passed down through the generations, who understood her children and had strong emotional bonds with them, and who displayed fearless belief in her own judgment.[21] She now wallowed anxiously in ever-changing advice from child development specialists and pediatricians and teachers giving up her own authority and passing it off to others.

Aiding in the deterioration of family authority, fathers became enmeshed in the corporate world, striving for wealth and comfort, selling themselves to achieve material success, and assuming an image of social and corporate savvy.[22] They, too, relied on the experts and designers of programs to find success becoming more dependent on agencies outside the family for a sense of competence and importance thereby relinquishing their authority in the family and the family's loss of individualism, influence, and indeed, accountability.[23]

---

[13]Ibid., 35.
[14]Ibid., 154.
[15]Ibid., 169.
[16]Ibid.
[17]Ibid., 169.

---

[18]Ibid., 154-155.
[19]Ibid., 155.
[20]Ibid., 169-170.
[21]Ibid., 170.
[22]Ibid., 58-59.
[23]Ibid., 167.

Deprived of the fathers influence and smothered by insecure yet increasingly distant mothers, children were unable to develop psychologically and, Lasch says, what occurred was "the development of a harsh and punitive superego based largely on archaic images of the parents, fused with grandiose self-images."[24] This set up children to enter adulthood in an already ailing society with, as Lasch credited Henry and Yela Lowenfeld for describing, "'restlessness, discontent, depressive moods, craving for substitute satisfaction.'"[25]

Thus, the family of the nineteenth century, with its independence, individualism, and strength of character, slowly disintegrated as the socialization of children left the authority of the home and was scattered amongst experts and agencies that assumed control of all aspects of the children's lives. That which remained under the auspices of the mother was coerced by experts, science and technology, leaving the floundering and confused mother doting on her children, while at the same time preoccupied with her own performance and how it appeared to others.[26]

### The Rise of the Therapeutic Climate

As the authority of the family wasted away, Lasch observed and described the emerging power of a new industry that supplanted the lost functions previously contained inside of nineteenth century family structure; the social service industry. Parents now either willingly relegated or were forced to give up their roles as primary caregivers and decision makers for their children.  Schools, child advocacy organizations, the juvenile court system, and agencies providing parent education became the regulators of all aspects of child welfare with parents becoming subordinates.[27]

Especially vulnerable to social service agencies were working class and immigrant families as it was assumed by many of these agencies that the family structure was quite limited in its ability to promote "sociability and cooperation" and that outside interference was essential in order to preserve the integrity of the family.[28] Lasch asserted that there was the assumption among experts that poor immigrant families "exploited" their children, if given the opportunity, to escape poverty by sending them to work to help provide for the family.[29] In the guise of advocacy, child welfare agencies used their systems to "Americanize" or "civilize" these families and impose their agendas upon these unwitting newcomers.[30] Child labor laws were proposed to protect these children but in addition to this advocates called for the schools to assume custody of these alleged at-risk children.[31]

Lasch charged many of these obtrusive systems with actually creating the needs they supposed to relieve by playing on fears, creating "jargon," and mocking self-help.[32] Already ripe for accepting these notions, parents, especially mothers, sought out the experts for either their own narcissistic compulsions or in an attempt to blend in with the pervasive American trend toward submission to the latest fad in child rearing.[33]

So strong was the prevailing belief by many in social service agencies that parents would somehow inadvertently hurt their children, child advocates pushed for addressing children's mental health concerns to the schools as this was a more accessible arena to reach children as opposed to their homes. The juvenile court system was another example Lasch offered that was also used as a means to replicate what was believed parents should be providing for children who were in trouble or at risk

---

[24]Ibid., 178.
[25]Ibid., 179.
[26]Ibid., 154.
[27]Ibid., 156.

[28]Ibid.
[29]Ibid., 155.
[30]Ibid., 160.
[31]Ibid., 155.
[32]Ibid., 228.
[33]Ibid., 161.

of being in trouble.[34] Lasch believed that this system in particular was a good example of how "altruism," or the state as therapist, had usurped family functions.[35]

The power of social services meant to preserve the family ultimately served to diminish its authority, in Lasch's view, and by this helped to reinforce the growing narcissism seen in American life. In its wake was left weakness, insecurity, and anxiety among parents that promoted reliance and dependence upon others for basic family functions and was where individualism and the parent-child relationship suffered its demise.

### Feminism and Its Impact

Lasch found in his observations that not only had the parent-child relationship suffered in contemporary American life but that the relationship between men and women had begun to "crumble" as women began to assert independence from their domestic roles and as they had begun to detach from maternal inclinations.[36] Changes in the functions of the family indeed had lead to the "marriage contract having lost its binding character."[37] Managerial style controls imposed by bureaucracy coupled with the removal of the familial model freed women from "many of its former constraints" and created tensions in the form of troublesome reactions and responses by men.[38] Women were no longer content to live under the protective subordination of men with both its benefits and outrages and "rejected their confining position on the pedestal of masculine adoration, and demanded the demystification of female sexuality."[39] Lasch suggested that with this change, men, no longer in a position of dominance and chivalry, responded with increased violence and aggression towards women in both "fantasies and occasionally in acts of raw violence."[40]

As women's demands for satisfaction in relationships both emotionally and sexually grew, men's responses varied from feeling emasculated and threatened, to that of possessing the expectation of sexual favors from liberated women as if that was what liberation meant.[41] Women, on the other hand, with their increasing demands for equality in the relationship and responsiveness by men to emotional, intellectual, and sexual needs, were angered if men did not respond in the desired manner.[42] The impact this had on the family also served to undermine it as divorce became more common when compromise was not achieved and children were exposed to the aftermath of disintegrating families.

Lasch, however, commend feminism as the movement in which sexual stereotypes were "discredited," that allowed women to break out of submission to and domination by men, and that also created a situation that "made it possible to acknowledge sexual antagonism without raising it to the level of all-out warfare."[43] But this had its problems as well. Lasch noted that as women began to view men from a position of equal footing, they lost the safety that was found in their previous situations. Now, although feeling that men were "human beings," forgiving their shortcomings had become increasingly difficult.[44] In the feminist view, settling for less implied surrender and that could not be tolerated.[45]

According to Lasch, the primary concern with feminism was not so much the movement itself, but some of the problems it spawned. He stated that feminism created an institutionalization of women's activities that resulted in avoidance of confronting challenge and competition with men. Instead of waiting for men

---

[34]Ibid., 156.
[35]Ibid.
[36]Ibid., 188.
[37]Ibid.
[38]Ibid., 189.
[39]Ibid., 190.

[40]Ibid.
[41]Ibid., 191-192.
[42]Ibid., 196.
[43]Ibid., 195.
[44]Ibid., 196.
[45]Ibid.

to catch up with feminist viewpoints, women worked to create a world without men thereby further separating them from men.[46] In turn, this produced a whole new set of experts whose goal it was to generate dependence rather than inspire the independence of women.  This helped to set up a "protective enclave" similar to what women had experienced before in the patriarchal family structure that they so despised.[47]

Lasch particularly criticized "radical lesbians" accusing them of "withdrawing at every level from the struggle against male domination while directing a steady stream of abuse against men and against women who refuse to acknowledge their homosexual proclivities."[48]  He suggested that this brand of thought served primarily to separate women from men when the dream of a cohesive relationship was difficult to achieve and served as "only one of many strategies for controlling or escaping from strong feeling."[49] Lasch argued that this escape convinced women that their needs would not be met in heterosexual relationships or perhaps in any other way that this promoted retreat from "intense emotional encounters."[50]

Men, therefore, were left with the belief that women were impossible to satisfy, which fortified "early fantasies of a possessive, suffocating, devouring, and castrating mother," and reinforced dichotomous responses to women.[51] In a narcissistic society, this furthered self-preoccupation, emotional detachment, dependence on experts, and propagated loss of individualism and the breakdown of family life.

### General Impressions of Lasch and his Work

Not surprisingly, Lasch provoked a barrage of debate with his assertions in *The Culture of Narcissism*, as might be expected with any work of this nature, with   discussions that ranged from

---

[46]Ibid., 199.
[47]Ibid., 199.
[48]Ibid.
[49]Ibid.
[50]Ibid., 202.
[51]Ibid., 203.

Lasch's role as a social critic, to what he asserted, to assorted interpretations of what he meant. The critique of Lasch's work frequently began with his role as an historian and social critic, his method of imparting his criticisms, and the validity of his work.

In his article in *American Studies*, Steven Watts explained that Lasch left "academic scholarship" and entered the "realm of social criticism," becoming a "public intellectual" rather than a "professional historian" as most were familiar with.[52] He suggested that the problems with Lasch's approach were his intellectual proclivities and the unfamiliarity many had with his resources that made following his line of thinking quite difficult. Watts noted that throughout Lasch's work he often appeared as a "disembodied intellectual historian at work."[53] Michael Heale agreed with Watts characterization of Lasch being somewhat detached, but found Lasch to be "engaged" despite this detachment which created the insistence that "society confront itself."[54]

Apparently, the problem with detachment, according to Watts and Heale, was that it made Lasch suspect in the eyes of the public as if looking down from on high. Still, Robert Westbrook noted that Lasch sought to maintain "intellectual independence" and that he felt it important to have a variety of perspectives available, one of which would be a view from the outside.[55] The question then would be, must one be immersed in that which he or she seeks to criticize? Lasch, like most historians, was familiar with looking at culture from an outside perspective to whatever degree that is possible. In what ways should or could Lasch have been engaged with contemporary

---

[52]Steven Watts, "Sinners in the Hands of an Angry Critic: Christopher Lasch's Struggle with Progressive America," *American Studies,* 33, no.2  (Fall 1992): 114.
[53]Ibid., 119.
[54]Michael J. Heale, "The Revolting American Elites: Christopher Lasch and his Enemies," *Journal of American Studies* 31, no. 1  (April 1997):  102.
[55]Robert B. Westbrook, "Christopher Lasch, The New Radicalism, and the Vocation of Intellectuals," *Reviews in American History* 23, no.1 (1995):  187.

American life that he was not?  To be completely detached from American culture would have required an almost monastic existence and while Lasch may have had some level of detachment he certainly did not lead the life of a monk.

Criticizing Lasch in harsher terms than being somewhat detached, Fred Siegel, in "The Agony of Christopher Lasch," renounced Lasch strongly suggesting that Lasch was "cut off from the intellectual authority from the past even as he echoes its ideas."[56] Siegel argued that Lasch was separated from society and that his separation also distanced him from the past. In Siegel's opinion, those who are so isolated tend to crave acceptance by others and in that way Lasch was actually displaying the very notions he was criticizing and questioned why Lasch's work had received so much attention.[57]

When looking at Siegel's criticisms, their strength is lost with his accusations of Lasch's isolation and the narcissistic tendencies that Siegel seems to believe are on display. He decries Lasch's use of psychology and sociology and appears to be of the mindset that this somehow diminishes Lasch's observations. Siegel becomes lost in his anger at how Lasch has interpreted intellectual history but does not offer his views on the problems of contemporary American culture. Rather, he chooses to disagree with Lasch at every turn and seems to miss the point of what Lasch proffered thereby nullifying the entire body of work.

Jeremy Beer, Kevin Mattson, and Steven Watts all agreed that Lasch's work was of great value as he opened up the awareness of how the narcissistic personality was created by "contemporary social conditions" and was willing to anger all sides without allegiance to the Left or the Right.[58] Robert Erwin suggested that much of the criticism directed toward Lasch was because he "antagonized" radicals and wounded their "source of esteem."[59]  Lasch's friend Jean Elshtain noted that he "courted

---

[56]Fred Siegel, "The Agony of Christopher Lasch," *Reviews in American History*  8, no. 3 (Sept. 1980): 295.

[57]Ibid., 285, 295.

[58]Jeremy Beer, "On Christopher Lasch," in *Modern Age*  47, 4 (Fall 2005): 336.

[59]Robert Erwin, *The Critic of Progress*, 291.

controversy" which opened him up to much of the criticism offered, especially from liberal factions.[60]

Many critics did not find Lasch's transition from historian to social critic problematic rather gave merit to the broad perspective it offered social criticism by incorporating an historical perspective. And most were impressed by Lasch's willingness to swim against the current of popular liberal thought despite the outrage hurled against him and, as Robert Erwin wrote, made Lasch "unforgivable" in the eyes of postmoderns.[61]  Jeremy Beer offered this; "His [Lasch's] work confirms the truth of T.J. Jackson Lears's observation that 'the most profound radicalism is often the most profound conservatism.'"[62]

Lasch's willingness to open himself up to the fury of the Left along with his ability to incorporate psychology, sociology, and history gives his work as a social critic distinct credibility. Whether or not his peers or those reading his book were familiar with his resources in no way minimizes his observations. By moving away from the Leftist enclave and his aversion to submitting himself to any single discipline's authority suggested a freedom and flexibility of thought so necessary to engage in social criticism. Lasch also placed himself in the public eye, a place he was never comfortable with, to offer insight into what he was observing in American culture and engage in the conversation and problem-solving efforts that might help move the country forward.

### Lasch and the President

A pollster and adviser to President Jimmy Carter, Patrick Caddell was moved by *The Culture of Narcissism*, and with the encouragement of First Lady Rosalynn Carter wrote a seventy five page memo to the President discussing the diminishing

---

[60]Jean Bethke Elshtain, "The Life and Work of Christopher Lasch: An American Story," *Salmagundi*  nos. 106-107 (Spring-Summer 1995): 146.

[61]Erwin, *The Critic of Progress*, 291.

[62]Beer, *On Christopher Lasch*, 331.

confidence of the American people in their government and leaders.[63] Caddell provided a summary of Lasch's book and suggested to the President that restoring the nation's confidence and unity by returning to more traditional values would solve the nation's serious economic and energy problems.[64] Communications adviser Gerald Rafshoon suggested a domestic summit at Camp David to work on resolving the nation's problems.[65]

Christopher Lasch was one of 150 people from a variety of disciplines invited to Camp David to meet with the President and his staff to discuss policy issues and the crises faced by Americans, in particular, the spiritual crisis. Following this summit, President Carter prepared his speech on the energy crisis based on his discussions with those attending. Much of this speech was based on what Caddell had summarized from Lasch's book highlighting loss of confidence, of traditional values such as hard work and consumer restraint, and the pessimism that had rendered Americans spiritually deficient and helpless.[66]

The angry Fred Siegel criticized Lasch's inclusion in Carter's summit and suggested that the "celebrity" Lasch gained from this was another example of the desire of "isolated intellectuals" to find political esteem that, in Siegel's mind, minimized the value of Lasch's work.[67] Jeremy Beer acknowledged that Lasch did find "national stature as a social critic" with the call to the White House summit, but noted that Lasch was primarily concerned with the way Carter and Caddell had interpreted *The Culture of Narcissism.*[68] Siegel's critique seems to stem more from

Lasch being asked to participate along with many others rather than how his work was viewed by Carter and appears quick to dismiss the importance of the event itself. President Carter's willingness to engage in conversation with such a diverse and inclusive assembly that included the historian and social critic Lasch certainly must be considered of greater significance than notoriety as a consequence of participation in the summit.

Kevin Mattson noted that Lasch's work "struck a chord" and that the resulting fame was something that Lasch was quite uncomfortable with.[69] He applauded Lasch for his ability to maintain his role as a social critic despite newfound fame and also credited Lasch for possessing the resolve to argue with power—as Lasch did in a letter to Patrick Caddell regarding the tone of Carter's speech as well as the interpretation of the book.[70] Siegel's insistence that Lasch craved the celebrity he experienced would suggest that the White House invitation left Lasch starry-eyed with his inclusion in the band of notable people although evidence of this is not apparent. As noted by Robert Erwin, Lasch shouldered criticism from liberals, conservatives, and radicals and stayed firm in his convictions, refusing to acquiesce to what fame or the influences of fame might bring.[71]

### Arguments Surrounding Family Authority

The overwhelming argument against Lasch's comments on the demise of family authority as an indicator of the decline of American culture was that Lasch was nostalgic for a way of life considered outdated and irrelevant in modern society. Fred Siegel accused Lasch of a "Victorian longing" and that he presented himself as "a guardian of tradition" suggesting that Lasch's arguments stood on shaky ground.[72] Siegel asserted that what Lasch tried to present was not cohesive, as it appeared that

---

[63]Daniel Horowitz, *Jimmy Carter and the Energy Crisis of the 1970's: The "Crisis of Confidence" Speech of July 15, 1979. A Brief History with Documents"* (Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2005), 16-17.

[64]Ibid., 18-19.

[65]Ibid.

[66]Ibid., 24.

[67]Siegel, *The Agony of Christopher Lasch,* 294.

[68]Jermey Beer, "On Christopher Lasch," in *Modern Age* 47, no. 4 (Fall 2005): 338.

[69]Kevin Mattson, "The Historian as a Social Critic: Christopher Lasch and the Uses of History," *History Teacher* 36, no.3 (May 2003), Database available online from Academic Search Primer no. 10011259: paragraph 24.

[70]Ibid. paragraph 25.

[71]Robert Erwin, *The Critic of Progress,* 289.

[72]Siegel, *The Agony of Christopher Lasch,* 285-286.

he, on one hand, suggested a conservative return to patriarchal authority and on the other supported a more radical inclination.[73]

Feminist writers Michele Barrett and Mary McIntosh criticized the reliance of Lasch on nineteenth century families as a guide and suggested that this model was representative of the "mythology of the 'real' family."[74] They observed that Lasch's discussion of this family model did not provide the time that it existed and that class and cultural conditions had been ignored, which, they asserted, created a historical vagueness.

Barrett and McIntosh provided the most valid critique of Lasch's discussion of family authority and while offering criticism, did not completely dismiss his notions as Siegel did. Rather, Barrett and McIntosh succinctly described the confusion surrounding what Lasch was asserting and it is apparent how it was possible to miss the point or misinterpret what Lasch was attempting to represent. Siegel opted to limit his exploration to complaints of nostalgia and a lack of cohesion that creates a hole in his argument.

Steven Watts did not interpret Lasch's reference to authority as meaning the power to control, rather he referred to a larger definition that included "loyalty by a moral consensus of a community" and the "self-restraints of character to which it [authority] is linked."[75] Kevin Mattson, in *Polity*, suggested that Lasch's concern was for "internalization," not nostalgia, and that this was simply praise for the working class without the assumption that it was somehow better.[76] Mattson, despite his opinion that the accusations of others that Lasch was nostalgic were not fair, did note that it was not clear how to understand the positive attributes of history regarding the family but still dismissed this as merely problematic.[77]

---

[73]Ibid., 286.

[74]Barrett & McIntosh, *Narcissism and the Family*, 39.

[75]Watts, *Sinners in the Hands*, 116-117.

[76]Kevin Mattson, "Christopher Lasch and the Possibilities of Chastened Liberalism," *Polity* 36, no. 3 (April 2004): 428, 442.

[77]Kevin Mattson, "The Historian As a Social Critic," paragraph 35.

Steven Watts elaborated on the nature of the criticism lodged against Lasch when he was damned as "upholding traditional values," as "authoritarian," and as romanticizing the "bourgeois family, patriarchal power, and bourgeois character of self-control."[78] Explaining that Lasch's viewpoint was not understood, Watts noted that what actually came out of the demise of the family was decreased freedom, increased conformity and repression as individualism was lost. Watts felt that these attacks, primarily from the Left, were out of a sense of betrayal and that they simply missed the point Lasch was trying to make.[79]

Agreeing with Watts, Jean Elshtain echoed that Lasch was often misunderstood and that he was better at asking questions than coming up with answers. She also noted that Lasch's "insistence" on self-restraint that was characteristic of nineteenth century family and an important part of its teaching demonstrated his understanding of human weakness and the need for authority.[80]

Barrett and McIntosh were in support of Lasch in that he questioned why family life had become difficult and alluded to the implications of materialism along with the "idiocy and hypocrisy of much contemporary thinking."[81] They were also in agreement with Lasch that with the "degeneration of the family and individual integrity" a new class was created that benefited from this.[82] Lasch's "concern for real needs" and his study of family disintegration and its causes addressed what tended to be missing in most studies, according to Barrett and McIntosh, and for this they praised Lasch highly.[83]

Clarity was ultimately the most significant problem with Lasch's discussion of the decline of family authority and, in particular, his use of the nineteenth century family as a way to

---

[78]Watts, *Sinners in the Hands*, 117.

[79]Ibid.

[80]Elshtain, *The Life and Work of Christopher Lasch*, 152.

[81]Ibid., 38.

[82]Barrett and McIntosh, *Narcissism and the Family*, 39.

[83]Ibid., 38.

present this decline. Had he provided a variety of models that represented a cross section of American culture, less confusion and disagreement might have resulted. Still, Lasch's assertion that the family unit slowly collapsed under the weight of industrialization and corporate control and that parental influence was subsequently undermined is easily surmised as are the problems that grew out of the loss of individualism, especially in an ever increasing narcissistic society. Lasch did not presuppose a return to the bourgeois family as a means to correct an ailing society but merely presented this model to note the advance of corporate controls and the subsequent loss of skills in parenting as well as healthy child development inside of the family structure that was previously brought about by the lessons found in family relationships.

The strength in Lasch's observation with regard to the loss of family authority clearly lies in his exploration of what facilitated its disintegration, sustained the downward spiral, and resulted in significant deskilling of parents in many household functions, in particular, childrearing. Although this comes through, some of his notions are perhaps lost with the distraction of the nineteenth century family model that detracted from the more important aspects of his discussion. This distraction may have resulted in some of the difficulties found with interpretation and focus on the main issues concerning the family as well as the numerous interpretations that can be found among reviewers of Lasch's work.

### Family and the State

Lasch lost a considerable amount of his support in his assertions that social service agencies had taken over parental authority and had lead to the deskilling of parents. Jean Elshtain explained that Lasch's criticism of the "helping professions" as he called them revolved around the harm they inflicted because of their desire to "reform."[84] Kevin Mattson suggested that what Lasch was criticizing included therapeutic manipulation and a

---

[84]Barrett and McIntosh, *Narcissism and the Family*, 156.

desire for dominion over the natural and human world. What Lasch had forgotten, though, was that many Modernists had asserted the view that there was a need to see the limitations in what therapy proposed. Mattson noted that Lasch often ignored pragmatism and that reform could take many paths. He believed that Lasch, in this instance, had a "one-sided perspective" and did not consider the "potentials of modern reform."[85]

Barrett and McIntosh offered a significant amount of criticism of Lasch's assertions as they applied to social services stating that Lasch had assumed that "collective responsibility" for child rearing was "*necessarily* invasive and totalitarian."[86] Agreeing with Lasch that a capitalist state and many agencies concerned with welfare did exert a significant amount of social control and encouraged consumerism, they accused him of setting aside the importance of the welfare state as an outcome of the "struggle of the working class and some collectivization of care."[87] Social services are valuable even if flawed, as Barrett and McIntosh surmised, in order to avoid the family needing to assume full responsibility for those needing assistance with women usually providing the care.[88]

Among those critiquing Lasch, this area of his work was not subject to the level of criticism as that of his discussion of the family. It is possible, as explained by Kevin Mattson, that concern of state control and the manipulation found in some therapeutic institutions were not lost on liberals and Modernists and therefore did not warrant argument.[89] Barrett and McIntosh provided sufficient and compelling arguments alone to bring Lasch's concern into question although they considered his questioning valid.

Lasch does cause some concern in his critique of social service agencies as he is not clear on where they do fit in and at first glance it appears that he does not believe that they fit in at

---

[85]Mattson, *Christopher Lasch and the Possibilities*, 443.
[86]Barrett & McIntosh, *Narcissism and the Family*, 42.
[87]Ibid., 41.
[88]Ibid.
[89]Mattson, *Christopher Lasch and the Possibilities*, 443.

all. However, if viewed from the perspective of how the family has lost authority and that much of this authority has been virtually abducted, it is possible to understand Lasch's disquietude. One of the problems that emerges is the sizable gap between what might be helpful and what is coercive and authoritarian, which is completely missing from Lasch's discussion. Again, with a more meticulous explanation of how social agencies might provide some benefit and how and where their role should be, Lasch's criticism would have been better received. The absolute control and the creation of an industry was certainly well described by Lasch and this alone was strong enough to garner at least some level of support of his viewpoint and a minimum of suspicion regarding the social service industry as a whole. Lasch's questioning of the social service industry was indeed valid but the discussion seemed incomplete and thus easy to misinterpret the main points.

### The Problem with Feminism

Lasch ended up with considerable criticism regarding his remarks that the feminist movement presented a significant problem for women and that family and relationships had been strongly affected. Agreeing that much of the feminist movement had "been caught up in the dominant-culture discourse of self-fulfillment and gratification," Steven Watts found that the problem in Lasch's work was that he did not talk about where the feminine place *should* be.[90] He believed that this presented a serious problem for Lasch in his critique of feminism.

The objections of Barrett and McIntosh revolved around what they saw as Lasch's masculine viewpoint. His failure to adequately mention the oppression of women in the patriarchal family and his focus on the benefits only presented a serious problem.[91] They also took issue with the impression that Lasch left, that feminism attacked the family and that he seemed to

---

[90]Watts, *Sinners in the Hands*, 119.

[91]Barrett & McIntosh, *Narcissism and the Family*, 43.

mourn the loss of the bourgeois patriarchal family despite its oppression of women.[92]

Barrett and McIntosh vehemently disagreed with Lasch's suggestion that feminism was included with drug use and suicide as a way to avoid deep emotion. That women should somehow learn to live with "sexual antagonism" was further proof of his masculine point of view.[93] Agreeing with Lasch's assertions that marriage had become more fragile and "full of hostility and recrimination," they would not agree that the feminist movement should assume responsibility, but rather underlying social conditions confronting both women and men in contemporary America.[94]

Opposing this point of view, Kevin Mattson suggested that Lasch was not longing for a traditional past where men where men were dominant.[95] He supported the notion that Lasch was actually of the belief that feminists could reshape the frame of the family and that the public had actually misinterpreted Lasch's commentary on feminism as selfishness.[96] Jean Elshtain explained that Lasch felt women were lost in the battle for progressive versus traditional knowledge and were being managed by the feminist movement.[97]

Lasch's critique of feminism does in some ways appear to revolve around the creation of a new form of control over the lives of families by establishing yet another way to relinquish individualism and relegate authority to another body, in this case, the feminist movement. He certainly provided compelling observations of the more radical elements found in some lesbian and militant feminist enclaves where conformity is insisted. This portion of his observation is easily supported and appears to have validity. The problem here, though, is that he limited his discussion to what he surmised as radical and escapist and

---

[92]Ibid., 38.

[93]Ibid., 44.

[94]Ibid.

[95]Mattson, *Christopher Lasch and the Possibilities*, 428-429.

[96]Ibid., 429.

[97]Elshtain, *The Life and Work of Christopher Lasch*, 158.

missed the highly emotional nature of and real problems encountered in lesbian relationships. Grouping lesbianism with the feminist movement is also problematic and presupposed a common goal that does not necessarily exist. And although the increase in the failure of many marriages warranted exploration of the role of feminism especially when coupled with narcissistic tendencies, he does not include the role of men in the equation, merely stating that men were confused and unclear about how they should respond to the new demands of women. .

Another problem with Lasch's criticism of feminism comes with the omission of the progress afforded women through the movement and that feminists' demands for equal pay and opportunities would benefit not only women, but also the family as a whole. He either was not able to see, or opted not to mention that economic independence had the potential to liberate women and release them from subordinate roles outside the family unit. It is possible, however, that Lasch concerned himself primarily with the disintegrating family and loss of individualism and that this consumed him to the point of neglecting to find or seek out the positive elements of the feminist movement as it was at the time but this limitation caused considerable problems in this portion of his criticism.

### Conclusion

In *The Culture of Narcissism*, Christopher Lasch was able to uncover the problems of twentieth century American life stemming from the pessimistic outlook found in the aftermath of the turbulent 1960's and the narcissistic tendencies born of this pessimism that expanded with industrialization and corporate control of all aspects of family life. Many critics and reviewers of Lasch and his book found his work to be "both democratic and anti-liberal" in the words of Jeremy Beer; "an independent intelligence resistant to intellectual fashions," by Michael Heale; a call to "toughen liberalism," offered by Kevin Mattson, as well as his suggestion that Lasch demonstrated how historians are

relevant in debate.[98] Lasch effectively drew upon a scholarly background and added to that his skill as an intellectual with the result being a very comprehensive work that crossed disciplines and party lines.

Lasch was able to explore the problems of the social services industry and the feminist movement and look beyond his own socialist and leftist inclinations to issue strong criticism at the risk of alienating those he was typically affiliated with. Willing to place himself in a very public position that caused him great discomfort, Lasch agreed to engage in discourse with others at the invitation of President Carter and endured the brief moment of fame that resulted without abandoning his role as a social critic. He remained an independent observer of culture with all the praise and criticism that entailed.

The primary problem found in *The Culture of Narcissism* was the occasional lack of clarity that gave rise to a variety of interpretations especially in his use of the nineteenth century family as a marker to determine the level of deterioration experienced by the contemporary American family. He did not elaborate on his choice of the middle class family as a sort of model and it was assumed by many that he held up this model as an ideal. This caused great consternation among the Left and among feminists, as Lasch seemed to be favoring a return to conservative patriarchal mores of the previous century. There were those who were able to see what Lasch was aiming at, however they too felt that Lasch might have been more explicit in his discussion of the changes he observed in the family and how he viewed what had been lost and what could be gained from looking at the family structure of earlier times.

Likewise, Lasch provided little in the way of positive attributes of social service agencies and the feminist movement and this coupled with the problem of the nineteenth century family authority model created significant misunderstanding of what Lasch proffered. The narrowness of his viewpoint in these

---

[98]Beer, *On Christopher Lasch*, 331; Heale, *The Revolting American Elites*, 102; Mattson, *The Historian As a Social Critic*, paragraph 39.

areas negated the benefits that could be found in his critique and minimized his arguments.  It was not with ease that one was able to see that what Lasch was actually criticizing was the pressure to conform and the loss of independence and individualism found in the firm embrace of some social service agencies, schools, and feminist groups.

Christopher Lasch, regardless of the problems of interpretation, did provide a persuasive and compelling look at the decline of American culture following a particularly difficult and transforming time and how this decline was perpetuated by self-preoccupation, submission to outside controls, and the deskilling of Americans by corporate controls and reliance on technology.  His warnings of the dangers of a narcissistic society and the demise of culture were meant not just as criticism, but also as a wake-up call.

At the close of *The Culture of Narcissism* Christopher Lasch states, "In a dying culture, narcissism appears to embody—in the guise of personal 'growth' and 'awareness'—the highest attainment of spiritual enlightenment.  The custodians of culture hope, at bottom, merely to survive its collapse. The will to a better society, however, survives. Along with traditions of localism, self-help, and community action that only need the vision of a new society, a decent society, to give them new vigor." [99] This statement probably best sums Lasch's concerns and his motivation to engage in social criticism and where his willingness to extend beyond his own world as an academic into the harsher world of social critic shows courage and strength as he opened himself up reluctantly in a very public way to the trials and tribulations of the dual roles of historian and social critic.

---

[99]Lasch, *Narcissism*, 234.

## *NAZI OLYMPICS*

## Daniel Cuthbert

The Olympic ideal since 1896 has been one of fairness and equality, the chance for a variety of nations to come together peacefully and compete. Various cultures can intermingle amongst each other and compete for their respective countries. The Olympics are supposed to be above politics, but this is not typical.  Cold war tensions between the United States and Russia were illustrated in the American boycott of the Moscow games in 1980, and the Russians returned the favor in Los Angeles four years later. However, boycotting the Olympics for political reasons is not a recent phenomenon. The threat of boycott loomed large over the landscape of the 1936 games in Berlin. The fact that these threats were never realized is not because the international community refused to get involved in German affairs, but because of the Nazi Party's ability to placate the concerns of foreign countries, most notably the United States, regarding Jewish racism while continuing to maintain anti-Semitic policies.

Germany itself had only recently returned to the games. After being excluded from competing in 1920 and 1924, they returned in 1928 and finished second to the American team in total medals in the summer games held in Amsterdam.[1] Therefore, their selection as the host country for the 1936 Olympics in 1931 was a considerable achievement.  The Committee met in July of 1931 in Barcelona to decide between Germany and Spain.[2]  Yet this selection should not be seen as a gesture of good will towards the recently returned German flock

---

*Daniel Cuthbert, from Lansing, Illinois, is a senior majoring in History and History with Teacher Certification. A member of Phi Alpha Theta, he wrote this paper for Dr. Sace Elder in History 3450, Modern Germany, in the Fall of 2006.*

[1]Alfred Senn, *Power, Politics, and the Olympic Games* (Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics, 1999), 51.

[2]Ibid., 50.

for the International Olympic Committee. It had much to do with politics and problems of the time. The threat of a Spanish civil war was gaining strength, and the potential for future political instability certainly played a role in the decision to give the games to Berlin, as the vote was 43-16.[3]

Within two years the Nazis would find themselves in power in Germany but the prospect of hosting the Olympics was not initially well-received. The Nazi party, referring to the 1932 games held in Los Angeles, denounced the Olympics as a "festival organized by Jews."[4] Individual leaders within the party went even farther in their denunciations. Privately, Hitler himself considered the Olympics as nothing more than a "ploy inspired by Judaism which cannot possibly be put on by a Reich ruled by National Socialists."[5] These negative feelings towards the games, while more racially explicit, were not restricted solely to the Nazis. Negative views of the Olympics were pervasive throughout German political society. German conservatives felt the Olympics were a foreign intrusion into German culture, and Communists in the Reichstag saw the games as only a way to serve nationalist pride.[6] It would take the work of two organizers for the Berlin Games to alter that perception.

The two most prominent German organizers for the 1936 games were Dr. Theodor Lewald and Dr. Carl Diem who had previously advocated for and had been organizing the 1916 games in Berlin before they were canceled by World War I.[7]

---

[3]Ibid., 50

[4]Richard Cohen, *By the Sword: A History of Gladiators, Musketeers, Samurai, Swashbucklers, and Olympic Champions* (New York: Random House, 2002), 348.

[5]Ibid., 348.

[6]Senn, *Power, Politics, and the Games*, 51-52.

[7]Arnd Kruger, "The Ministry of Popular Enlightenment and Propaganda and the Nazi Olympics of 1936," in *Global and Cultural Critique: Problematizing the Olympic Games*, Robert K. Barney, Kevin B. Wamsley, Scott G. Martyn, and Gordon H. MacDonald, eds. (London: International Centre for Olympic Studies, 1998), 34.

They quickly seized their second chance. Dr. Joseph Goebbels, who had been propaganda minister for less than a week, was visited by Lewald, who persuaded him to see the Olympics as a potential windfall for propaganda.[8] Goebbels wasted little time. A separate propaganda committee was set up, headed by one of Goebbel's subordinates, Haegert, who informed Goebbels of everything dealing with the games and functioned as part of the German Olympic organizing committee that Dr. Carl Diem was responsible for.[9] Unfortunately, his and Dr. Lewald's Olympic responsibilities were made virtually worthless.

Dr. Lewald and Dr. Diem became some of the earliest victims of Nazi policies regarding the games. Both Lewald and Diem had been members of the Olympic committee since before World War I and then under the now despised Weimar Republic, Lewald also had a Jewish grandmother, thereby making him a non-Aryan in the eyes of the Nazi party.[10] As a result, they were both stripped of any real power. Hans von Tschammer und Osten, who was a National Socialist, became the Reich Sports Leader, and held the real power in the Organizing Committee.[11] However, Dr. Diem and Dr. Lewald were not discarded entirely. They would still remain General Secretary and President, respectively, of the German Organizing Committee. Their subservient position was illustrated in the American report after the summer games.[12] The treatment of Lewald and Diem would be characteristic of the way the Nazis would control the games.

---

[8]Ibid., 35.

[9]Ibid., 35-36.

[10]Cooper C. Graham, *Leni Riefensthal and Olympia* (Lanham, Maryland: The Scarecrow Press, 1986), 9.

[11]Ibid., 10.

[12]Fred Rubien, ed., *Report of the American Committee* (New York: American Olympic Committee, 1936), 21. While not explicitly stated in the report, the fact that the Reich Sports Leader's picture is listed first, followed by Diem's and Lewald's is telling as to whom the Americans saw as the leader of the German committee.

Almost immediately upon assuming control, the Nazis' took to shutting out the Jews from most of public society, including sports. By June of 1933, Jews were expelled from participating in youth, welfare, and gymnastic organizations.[13] Individual sports also enacted their own regulations. The German Boxing Federation barred Jewish fighters or referees.[14] These actions were fairly limited in scope, but quickly expanded. By 1935, Jews would not even be allowed on public or private practice fields in Germany.[15] The 1935 Nuremberg Laws, while not specifically mentioning sports, would still have an effect on who could compete in the games. The Macacabee League of Jewish athletes in late November of 1935, announced that they were withdrawing their athletes from competing, because they were not considered citizens and therefore could not compete.[16] These policies, just as quickly, resulted in skepticism and concern by the International Olympic Committee. The Committee met in June of 1933 in Vienna where Dr. Lewald had to pledge to the committee that Jews would not be excluded from Olympic teams.[17] German officials grew worried that the Olympics would be taken away from Berlin. The President of the IOC himself, Baillet-Latour, had warned the German members about the concern over how foreign Jews would be treated during the games.[18]

Some Jewish participants of the games seemed oblivious to what was going on in Germany or ignored it, choosing the prestige of playing in the Olympics over any concerns of mistreatment. Many Polish, Czechoslovakian, and Hungarian Jews were on their respective Olympic teams.[19] Others, however,

did speak out against the games. Expression of disgust, and tentative movements towards boycotts were voiced in Sweden, the Netherlands, and Czechoslovakia.[20] However, out of all the countries to express concerns about the 1936 Olympics, the United States received the brunt of Nazi persuasion. United States participation was essential in the eyes of the Nazi party. Germans saw the United States as moderates after the war and willing traders.[21] Events occurred in America that encouraged German intervention. American officials began considering a boycott of the games in April of 1933.[22] The actions of the Nazis towards the Jewish population had reached the ears of some in the United States. Bernard S. Deutsch, president of the American Jewish Congress, sent a letter to the American Olympic Committee stating how Jews were being barred from sports organizations.[23] Avery Brundage, the president of the committee, also shared Deutsch's concern. A resolution voted on by the Amateur Athletic Union in November of 1933, to boycott the Olympics until Jewish athletes were allowed to compete, had Brundage's support.[24] Brundage soon, however, changed his opinion, thanks to Nazi efforts.

The American Olympic Committee initially refused Germany's invitation to the games.[25] This was a major concern for Germany as the idea of an American boycott of the Olympic Games scared the Nazis considerably.[26] They were determined to keep it from happening. They invited Brundage to come to Germany and experience for himself that Germans were not discriminating against the Jews.[27] The German propaganda machine worked quickly to back up these claims. In June of

---

[13]Graham, *Leni Riefenstahl and Olympia,* 5.

[14]Senn, *Power, Politics, and the Games*, 52.

[15]Graham, *Leni Riefenstahl and Olympia,* 5.

[16]"Diplomats Exempt in Nuremberg Laws," New York Times, 1 December 1935, 35; in D.A. Kass, "The Issue of Racism at the 1936 Olympics," *Journal of Sports History* 3, no. 3 (Winter 1976): 226.

[17]Graham, *Leni Riefenstahl and Olympia,* 5-6.

[18]Senn, *Power, Politics, and the Games,* 53.

[19]Richard Mandell, *The Nazi Olympics* (New York: Macmillan, 1971), 80.

[20]*Olympiade a Berlin?* ( Paris: Editions universelles,) 3; cited in Ibid., 68.

[21] Arnd Kruger, "United States of America: The Crucial Battle," in *The Nazi Olympics: Sports, Politics, and Appeasement in the 1930's,* Arnd Kruger and W. J. Murray, eds. (Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2003), 44.

[22]D. A. Kass, " Issue of Racism," 229.

[23]Ibid., 230.

[24]Graham, *Leni Riefenstahl and Olympia,* 6.

[25]Senn, *Power, Politics, and the Games*, 53-54.

[26]Mandell, *Nazi Olympics*, 76.

[27]Graham, *Leni Riefenstahl and Olympia,* 6.

1934, the Nazis named five candidates for the Olympic team and would later declare that twenty-one Jewish candidates had been nominated.[28] Brundage appeared satisfied; as he later wrote,

> every sort of social, political, and economic pressure was exerted…against the American Olympic team. The Committee had no funds with which to oppose this assault and the country was flooded with misleading propaganda until many people, who should have known better, were influenced.[29]

Brundage may have been assured that the Nazis were non-discriminatory, but appearances were deceiving. He would meet prominent Jewish leaders that assured him things were fine, yet he always met them in cafes and they were always chaperoned by Nazi officials.[30] While Brundage may have been satisfied, the Nazis maintained their anti-Jewish policies. None of the 21 Jewish candidates invited showed up, without any explanation.[31] However, it still appeared the concerns of the American Olympic Committee were placated by the Nazi party. Two Jews, Helene Mayer, a fencer, and Gretel Bergmann, a high jumper, were supposed to be invited to compete in the summer Olympics for Germany; one Ruid Bell, would compete in the Winter Olympics.[32] Once again, though, appearances were deceiving. Mayer, who did eventually compete, never received an official notice inviting her to the team, and Gretel was told her results at the last Olympic trial were not good enough to make the games, even though she won her event and equaled the German record.[33] Nevertheless, the American boycott never materialized. The Nazis' true intent towards potential Jewish participants in

the games was not known by other countries until it was too late. The letter informing Gretel that she would not make the Olympic team was not mailed until the day after the Nazis knew the Americans had left for Berlin.[34]

Within Germany, care was also taken to appear as non-discriminatory as possible before the arrival of the foreign Olympic teams. The openly racist policies against Jews were temporarily suspended.[35] This resulted in some unusual situations. The Nazi party explicitly stated to Bavarian Police minister, that all signs or banners relating to the Jewish population, needed to be removed from railway lines and roads by January 1 of 1936, which meant the SS had to obey these orders, temporarily restricting its own newspaper.[36] Other German newspapers were also restricted in the types of things they could cover. These newspapers, under government control, denounced a potential American boycott as hostile to those around the world who should compete in a festival that was supposed to stand for friendship.[37] Even those papers who printed articles that would have otherwise been welcomed in Nazi Germany were affected. A newspaper, *Die Sonne*, was reprimanded for printing a section of a particularly racist book on sports before all the foreign nations had returned home.[38] Even the Nazi's desire to broadcast their Aryan superiority was suppressed. Medal totals, which had originally been published to show how well the German team was doing, were prohibited so as to not offend other countries.[39] This censorship continued to be seen throughout the Olympics against foreign competing countries. No other country except Germany, whose Leni Riefenshtahl would create *Olympia*, could make a film of the Olympics, and foreign cameramen had to be accompanied by a

---

[28]"Jewish Athletes Named," *New York Times*, 9 June 1934, 10 and "Jews Propose 21 for German Team," *New York Times*, 19 June 1934, 26, in D.A. Kass, "Issue of Racism," 225.

[29]Avery Brundage, "Report of the President," in *Report of Committee,* ed. Fred W. Rubien, 31.

[30]Mandell, *Nazi Olympics*, 73.

[31]Graham, *Leni Riefenstahl and Olympia,* 7.

[32]Cohen, *Power, Politics, and the Games*, 351 and 354.

[33]Ibid., 351-353 and 355.

[34]Ibid., 355.

[35]Kruger, "United States of America," 37.

[36]Federal Archives, Koblenz, NS 19/1641 of 12 March, 1935, in Ibid., 37.

[37]Senn, *Power, Politics, and the Games*, 55.

[38]Kruger, "United States of America," 37.

[39]Ibid., 37

German official who would act as an immediate censor.[40] All of this was done in an effort to discourage dissent, but Nazis were helped by past precedents that fit their propaganda needs. While only German photographers were allowed into the stadiums where the games were held, the Olympic Games in Amsterdam in 1928 also saw photography rights being tightly controlled.[41] New technologies, which worked to the Nazi's advantages, had their start in earlier Olympics. An early television station that showed pictures of the Olympics within Berlin had been experimented with in Amsterdam, but the Berlin Games were considered the first Olympics to broadly incorporate the use of television.[42] These efforts culminated in what many participants considered to be the grandest Olympics that had been held up to that time. Avery Brundage himself wrote in his report of the American Olympic Committee that the games, "were unquestionably the largest and most magnificent yet held."[43]

The Nazis succeeded in staging an Olympic games that had, despite the intervention of the international community, placated concerns over Jewish racism while continuing, secretly, the practices and policies that the party stood for. Their ability to not only meet the problems of building the Olympics, as well as eliminate almost all political objections to their staging in Berlin, speaks volumes of the Nazis' highly effective efforts. The fact that they had only been in power no more than three years prior to the games itself makes their feat even more remarkable. Unfortunately, this ability was only furthered by the United States and other countries' gullibility when it came to believing German promises of fairness and equality.

---

[40]Graham, *Leni Riefenstahl and Olympia,* 68-69.
[41]Kruger, "United States of America," 38.
[42]Senn, *Power, Politics, and the Games,* 60.
[43]Rubien, *Report of Committee,* 31.

---

## *"THERE IN EFFIGIES ARE THEY SENT TO HELL": THE POPE-BURNING PROCESSION AS INDICATIVE OF ENGLISH CULTURAL VALUES.*

**Patrick Harris**

> In that place where the *Fire* made a stand,
> Which was *Inkindled* by their *Flaming Brand*:
> Where all its *Rage* in *Smoky Ashes* fell,
> There in *Effigies* are *They* sent to *Hell:*[1]

The above passage represents the climax of the famous Pope-burning procession at Temple-Bar on November 17th, 1679. Such a grand celebratory display of anti-Catholic sentiment had not been seen before or since in London. But what was the mass mood behind this sentiment, what gave rise to it, and what did it mean for the English people? The strange circumstances behind the murder of Sir Edmundbury Godrey and the revelation of a supposed Popish Plot against the government, the recent marriage of James VII to the Catholic Mary of Modena, and the persecution of nonconformist Protestants by Charles II all helped stimulate the fervor behind the public display.[2] However, anti-Catholic sentiment can be traced back to that initial break of England from the Roman Church, which in turn raises the question about the relationship between anti-Catholicism and English nationalism. However, my argument is not just that Protestantism is an essential part of English national identity as conceived by the masses at large in early modern times, but that there are certain fundamental differences between English concepts of authority, or to use David Sabean's term–*herrschaft*,

---

*Patrick Harris is a graduate student in History, from Harrison Township, Michigan. He wrote this paper for Dr. Newton Key's seminar, History 5400, European Social and Cultural History, in the Fall of 2006.*
[1]*A Poem on the Burning of the Pope*, (London: 1679).
[2]Tim Harris, "The Parties and the People: the Press, the Crowd, and Politics 'Out-of-doors' in Restoration England," in *The Reigns of Charles II and James the VII and II*, ed. by Lionel K.J. Glassy (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1997), 130; David Cressy, *Bonfires and Bells: National Memory and the Protestant Calender in Elizabethan and Stuart England* (Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1989), 175.

and those of the Catholic Church. This ideological rift is at the core of anti-Catholicism in England. Using a micro-historical style of approach, I will attempt to prove this point by giving a close examination of the Pope-burning procession of 1679 in London, as well as by examining certain types of popular literature, and I will also attempt to show how anti-Catholic sentiment and its display are indicative of English values and an English *mentalite*.

Though the Pope-burning procession was a cultural display, the impetus behind it was essentially political. As briefly mentioned above, there had been a number of recent events that helped rekindle paranoia about Catholics. One pamphlet reads:

> there hath been, and still is a most cunning, strong, execrable Conspiracy contrived at Rome: And for many years together most vigorously pursued in *England* will all industry, policy, and subtilty, by many active and potent Confederates of all sorts, to subvert the Government, to re-establish Popery, and to destroy the Protestant Religion.[3]

Parliament was certainly not immune to such feelings as their debates from the time show. Parliament member Colonel Birch remarked, "Nothing can stand against a popish design when ripe."[4] The Whigs were capitalizing on this feeling by launching an extensive mass media campaign to exploit such feelings.[5] Tim Harris states the Whigs:

> managed to saturate the market with both printed and published materials reflecting their interpretation of political developments…whilst they also developed a sophisticated distribution network to ensure that their

---

propaganda reached as broad a geographical and social base as possible.[6]

Here, one may raise the issue of literacy, or the lack thereof, and question how effective such a campaign may have been. However, if one considers the arguments of Barry Reay in *Popular Cultures in England 1550-1750* one realizes that sentiments initially written can reach far beyond the literate public. Therefore, judging by the amount of participation in the Pope-burning procession, "by a modest computation it is judged there could not be less then Two Hundred Thousand Spectators," as well as that, "so many came in Voluntiers, as made the number to be several Thousands,"[7] one can confidently say that the Whig campaign was largely effective.

With so successful a campaign, the Whigs were able to mobilize enough support to put on a grand display. David Cressy relates, "Young people paraded diabolic and papal effigies, and called at the houses of eminent persons demanding money. The exchange of coins linked the crowd with the elite, and turned selected merchants and gentleman into informal sponsors of the processions."[8] Of course, one may question Cressy's conclusion that these elite figures were in fact only "informal" sponsors, especially if they could be linked with the Whig party itself. In a sense, the Whig campaign at this point had already come full circle by influencing the young people to come back to them and ask for sponsorship. In addition, artisans and apprentices were constructing figures and floats to be used in the procession.[9] This mobilization of apprentices was especially important because some of them would be the future civic leaders of the community.[10] One could say that the Whigs

---

[3]*The True Protestants Watch-Word* (London: 1679), 1.

[4]"Members of Parliament's Speeches on Religion (1674-8)" from *Sources and Debates in English History 1485-1714*, ed. by Newton Key and Robert Bucholz (Malden: Blackwell, 2004), 244.

[5]Tim Harris, *Politics under the Later Stuarts: Party Conflict in a Divided Society 1660-1715* (London: Longman, 1993), 125.

---

[6]Harris, *Politics under the Later Stuarts*, 205.

[7]*An Account of the Burning of the Pope at Temple-Bar* (London: 1679).

[8]Cressy, *Bonfires and Bells*, 181.

[9]Alexander Dove, "The Autumn Celebrations of the Ritual Calender in the later-Stuart Period," Master's Thesis, Eastern Illinois University, 1997, 61.

[10]Tim Harris, "Perceptions of the crowd in Later Stuart London," *Imagining Early Modern London*, J.F. Merritt, ed. (New York: Cambridge University Press: 2001), 259.

were not only looking to influence, but also initiate the young into their fold. This particular type of appeal to the commoners is especially important in establishing the idea of an English *mentalite* for reasons that will be elucidated later.

On the evening of November 17th, the procession began:

1. First marched six Whisslers in Pioneer Caps and Red Wastcoats. 2. Bellman ringing his Bell, and with a dolesome voice, crying all the way, *Remember Justice* Godfrey. 3. A dead Body representing Justice *Godfrey* in the habit he usually wore, and the *Crevat* wherewith he was murdered…4. A Priest came next in a Surplice, and Cope imbroidered with Dead mens *Sculls* and *Bones,* and *Skeletons*, who gave out Pardons plentifully to all that would murder *Protestants*, and proclaiming it *Meritorious*. 5. A Priest alone with a large Silver Cross. 6. Four *Carmelite Fryars* in White and Black Habits. 7. Four *Grey Fryars* in their proper Habits. 8. Six *Jesuits* carrying bloody Daggers. 9. Four wind-Musick, called the *Waits*, playing all the way. 10. Four *Bishops* in Purple…11. Four other Bishops in their *Pontificalibus…*12. Six Cardinals in Scarlet Robes and Caps. 13. Then followed the Popes Chief Physician with *Jesuits* powder in one hand, and an Urinal in the other. 14. Two Priests with Surplices, with Two Golden Crosses. Lastly, the *Pope* in a Glorious Pageant, or Chair of State, covered with Scarlet…at his feet was a Cushion of State, and Two Boys sate on each side of the Pope, in Surplices with White Silk banners, painted with Red Crosses, and bloody Consecrated Daggers for murdering *Protestant* Kings and Princes…at his Back stood the Devil, *His Holiness* Privy Councillor, Hugging and Whispering, him all the way, and oftentimes instructing him aloud to destroy His Majesty.[11]

---

[11]*An Account of the Burning of the Pope at Temple-bar;* see appendix A for image.

The account relates further that, "Never were the Balconies, Windows and Houses more filled, nor the Streets more thronged with multitudes of People, all expressing their Abhorrence of Popery." The procession ended at Temple-Bar where four statues representing Kings Charles I and II, James I, and Queen Elizabeth with a Golden Shield inscribed with the words "The Protestant Religion and Magna Carta." There the effigies of the Pope and the Devil were burned, followed by fireworks and bonfires in general celebration throughout the streets of London.[12]

Tim Harris states that the procession represented a mock papal coronation ceremony.[13] The procession also traces the murder of Sir Godrey back to the Pope and even the Devil himself. But the most compelling symbolism is at the end of the procession where the effigies are burned in front of the statues of the former monarchs and the inscriptions of *The Protestant Religion* and *Magna Carta*. This symbol juxtaposes Catholicism with figures that represent English cultural values—the autonomy of England as represented by the monarchs and republican values as symbolized by the Magna Carta. Also, the symbolism of fire is important in the context that it mocks the burning of Protestants by Mary Tudor and the burning of London by Catholic conspirators, also perhaps with an allusion to Guy Fawkes' foiled plot to blow-up Parliament.

In order to know the true significance of these symbols, one must understand how these symbols were appropriated by the different types of people participating in the procession. The organizers of the procession were very conscious of the images they were using. Tim Harris states that the procession had a triple function for the Whigs: to satirize Catholicism, narrate the Popish Plot, and condemn those who were hostile to the Whigs.[14]

---

[12]Ibid.

[13]Tim Harris, *London Crowds in the Reign of Charles II: Propaganda and politics from the Restoration until the Exclusion Crisis* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 103.

[14]Ibid.

They were also very conscious as to who they were expressing this symbolism. The procession took a route with a heavy concentration of non-conformist Protestants—a route taken by no other civic ritual.[15]  However, I do not wish to focus on the aspect of popular manipulation by the Whigs here.  I would rather examine the idea of why the Whigs believed it necessary to rally popular support, and why their propaganda was so effective amongst the masses.  David Cressy states that, "The London processions were designed to impress members of Parliament and to intimidate the Court."[16]  However, this view is contradicted by the fact that, "Most literary and political figures in the period harbored none but ill feelings toward the masses,"[17] and that, "if the pope-burnings were…massive expressions of popular feeling, they had little or no coercive influence on a government that was determined to ignore them."[18]  Therefore, though the Whigs were successful at mobilizing the masses, they were not so successful in influencing the elite.  This fact is further proved when one considers once the processions began to lose their appeal for the masses, they began to be suppressed by the authorities who, though previously would have found it difficult to suppress over two hundred thousand people, once the numbers declined, were quick to assert themselves.

But, the fact that the Whigs were trying for popular appeal in a language the masses could understand in order to establish their legitimacy in the eyes of the elites is extremely important.  "To be legitimate, they [the Whigs] felt, government had to rule in accordance with the wishes of the people."[19]  And as the work of E.P. Thompson suggests, this was a view that was also shared by the masses at large.  The contemporary accounts of this

---

[15]Ibid., 121.

[16]Cressy, *Bonfires and Bells*, 180-1.

[17]Michael A. Seidel, "The Restoration Mob: Drones and Dregs," *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 12, no. 3 (Summer, 1972):  430.

[18]John Miller, *Popery and Politics in England 1660-1688* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1973), 184.

[19]Harris, "The Parties and the People," 135.

particular Pope-burning procession reveal this idea in the language praising Queen Elizabeth for taking into account the will of the people which consequently endeared her to them.  For example, in the introduction to an account of the 1679 procession:

If we may inquire by what *Charms* she Conciliated this *Universal Renown*, we shall find it was not by any *Sham-Maximes* of little *Matchivellian Policy*, but by those of truly Royal Qualifications of Generous *Honour*, *Clemency*, *Justice*, and *Love* towards Her People, particularly in firm Relyance on their *Advice* in *Parliament*.[20]

With Elizabeth's Honor, Clemency, and Justice, one begins to gain a sense of the English *mentalite*.  In his article, "The Mystery of Property," Alan Marfarlane states that England was "an island of common law and a powerful, but not absolutist, state where the crown was ultimately beneath and not above the law."[21] He goes on to argue that it is the relative security that living on an island provides which gives the commoners more confidence in asserting themselves against state authority.

So how is this *mentalite* indicated by the Pope-burning procession of 1679? First, let us look at the idea of anti-Catholicism. As stated previously, there is something unappealing about the power structure of Catholicism to the English people, which is perhaps why England was able to escape the violence schism created in other countries such as France.  Catholicism is a centralized, authoritarian religion, with dogma being dictated solely from above. If one takes Macfarlane's ideas into account, one can see why such a structure, and especially an idea like infallibility, goes against English sensibility.  Consider the following satirical passage from the balled *An Invitation to Popery* from 1674:

---

[20]*London's Defiance of Rome* (London: 1679), 1.

[21]Alan Macfarlane, "The mystery of property: inheritance and industrial-izetion in England and Japan," [alanmacfarlane.com], 116.

As for matters of faith,
believe what the Church saith,
But for Scripture, leave that to the Learned:
For these are edge tools, and you Laymen are fools,
If you touch them y'are sure to be harmed.[22]

In a culture where the commoners are confident to assert themselves, it is no wonder why Protestantism, with its shift to a more individualistic understanding of the Bible, was able to root itself so strongly. The Catholic system of organization seems fundamentally opposed to the English *mentalite*.

One may question how conscious the crowd at the Pope-burning procession was of such issues. Undoubtedly, the circulation of popular literature and the oral tradition did have an effect on raising awareness of these fundamental differences. But, let us also consider the act of the procession itself as both a festive ritual and also as a sort of charivari. One may argue that in the minds of the crowd the procession was just a part of the festive nationalistic celebrations associated with Queen Elizabeth's coronation day and did not have any deeper cultural significance for them; in other words, that the procession was purely nationalistic in nature and not a larger statement against absolutism. It is true that much of the language in the popular literature indicates more concrete reasons for anti-Catholic sentiment, most namely the seemingly perpetual attempts by Catholics to overthrow the English government. Barry Reay states, "civic rituals were secular morality plays where the virtues of order, loyalty to the monarch, civic and guild pride were impressed through dramaturgy and spectacle,"[23] however, the necessity for these rituals themselves seems rooted in republican ideals when Reay also relates that Charles I in his "failure to exercise this cultural representation of political authority…weakened his charisma and hence his control of

---

[22]*The Catholick Ballad: or an Invitation to Popery* (London: for Henry Brome at the Gun at the West-end of St. Paul's Church-yard, 1674).
[23]Barry Reay, *Popular Cultures in England 1550-1750* (New York: Addison Wesley Longman, 1998), 147.

London."[24] Therefore, it is the act of the procession itself that is the representation of the English *mentalite.* The sponsorship of such exhibitions on festive calendar days was necessary for the legitimization of authority. The Whigs probably understood this since it was in line with their ideology, which is why their appeal to popular sentiment is also indicative of the English *mentalite.* Legitimization by the public was not just an idea held by the public itself but also realized by the elites who sought the public's favor.

The assertion of public opinion can be seen further by viewing this Pope-burning as a sort of charivari. Charivaris were public assertions of popular values and could be viewed as vigilantism when directed at particular individuals. But, the prevalence of these rituals is indicative of the English view that one must conform to popular opinion. Therefore, the fact that a charivari was used to express the rejection of Catholicism is symbolic in and of itself. And this was a charivari. The aspects that particularly make it such are the use of rough music and the inversion of symbols; rough music itself was a satiric inversion.[25] The overall mockery of Church officials and the Pope, effigy burning, along with the inversion of the use of fire itself are all aspects of a charivari. Reay and Thompson also allude to the issue of the charivari as displaced violence. The procession of 1679 seems to fit this aspect especially if one considers that later, when Pope-burning processions were suppressed, actual violence against Catholics and Catholic symbols occurred.[26] The main issue here though, is that a charivari is a public assertion of the public's authority and values; this is what connects it to the English *mentalite*.

This conclusion is problematic however if one takes into account that charivaris are not solely an English phenomenon. France, Germany, Italy, and later the United States had their

---

[24]Ibid., 143.
[25]E.P. Thompson, *Customs in Common: Studies in Traditional Popular Culture* (New York: the New Press, 1993), 469.
[26]Cressy, *Bonfires and Bells*, 182-3.

own versions of these rituals.[27] However, this does not necessarily contradict the idea of public assertion of a popular moral consensus, it may be better developed in England, but a comparative study is necessary to prove this. We must also distinguish between absolute authority coming from a singular individual and a sort of absolute authority coming from the public body. It is this latter form of absolutism that seems to embody the English *mentalite.* This is a key idea when thinking of where individual rights fall in the view of the English masses. The complaint against Catholicism is not that it suppresses individual autonomy, but that it does not allow space for public opinion. Individualism seemingly has little to do with the English *mentalite* of this time and actually may be in contradiction to it. Conformity to the consensus of public opinion seems to be the value held above all by the English public—it is an absolutism of the masses.

The commoners were not afraid to assert themselves in the face of higher authority either. E.P. Thompson, in his important work, "Moral Economy of the Crowd," rejects a spasmodic view of riot as applied to early modern England, and points to the fact that the crowd was willing to assert its own idea of what was "right" when powerful figures attempted to exploit market conditions. These ideas can be directly applied to the Pope-burning procession. The spasmodic schema would suggest that size and fervor of the procession resulted directly from Whig manipulation of the political circumstances of the time. But, I would choose a Thompson-like interpretation in that, I would agree that the political circumstances had an effect on the size of the procession, but there were also deeper cultural sensibilities being displayed by the crowd itself. Suzanne Desan criticized Thompson's "Moral Economy" by stating that he did not focus at all on the individual motives of those within the crowd.[28] But

---

[27]Thompson, *Customs in Common*, 467,470.

[28]Suzanne Desan, "Crowds, Community and Ritual in the Work of E.P. Thompson and Natalie Davis," in *The New Cultural History*, ed. by Lynn Hunt (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989), 60.

if, as argued above, popular consensus is one of the most highly held values by the English masses, though individual motives certainly come into play, we are dealing with popular mobilization and the mentality of the crowd at large, and not selfish individual motivation. Also, individual motivations must be in line with the motivations of the crowd or else the individual risks being ostracized perhaps even through a charivari.

Once the accusations of the Popish Plot had begun to be seen as less than credible, the Whigs lost some of their support and the Pope-burning processions lost some of their appeal. The Tories capitalized on this by launching a media campaign of their own and responded to the Pope-burnings with Jack Presbyter burnings in mockery of the Whig celebration. One Tory pamphlet reads:

*Jack Presbyter's* up, And hopes at one Swoop,
To swallow *King, Bishop*, and All-a:
The *Miter* and *Crown*, Must both tumble down,
Or the Kingdom he tells you will Fall-a.[29]

While the Whigs were emphasizing the attachment to liberty and Parliament, the Tories sought to emphasize duty and loyalty.[30] However, one value the Whigs and the Tories had in common was the contempt for the arbitrary dictation of religion. Again, it is the placement of religious authority into one person or one body without public consent that was the crime. This idea coincides with the English *mentalite.* Also, coinciding with this *mentalite* was the appeal for popular sentiment by the Tories. However, a problem may occur when one looks to the Tory idea of loyalty to the monarch. Is this not a form of appeal to absolutism? This problem can be reconciled when one considers that the monarch is a figure-head and an embodiment of English values, and if the monarch strays from the popular values, the masses are indeed willing to assert themselves. Queen Elizabeth was brilliant in her public displays which helped legitimize her

---

[29]*The Present State of England* (Edinburgh: 1681, reprinted London: 1681).
[30]Harris, "Perceptions of the crowd in Later Stuart London," 265.

rule in the eyes of the masses. While, as previously stated, Charles I, by not appealing to the public in such a way, contributed to his own downfall. Later, James II would suffer a similar fate.

Barry Reay asked the question whether there was an English culture as opposed to English cultures in early modern times. By attempting to establish the idea of an English *mentalite*, I would argue the former. Reay stated that cultures could be draw upon lines of class, occupation, and geography. In terms of my argument, geography may not be applied since I deal only with the procession of London though Pope-burning processions occurred in a multitude of regions. Concerning occupations, political figures helped to organize the procession, artisans and apprentices help build the props, and the lower classes participated in the celebration. But the most compelling argument for a singular culture comes from the shared values across class lines. As I had mentioned, the need for public legitimization was a value held by all levels of society. The Whigs and the Tories battled for the hearts of the masses because they knew if they had the public then they had the power. This is also the reason why Catholicism ultimately failed in England and why it was subject to such ridicule. Furthermore, Catholicism implies duel loyalty—loyalty to the Pope as well as to the state. But in a society where conformity to popular opinion is held most high, such a division of loyalties would naturally raise suspicion. This is why I used the term absolutism of the masses, because there seems to be little room for individuality within such a society. Either one conforms to popular opinion or one is ostracized; it does not matter if one is a commoner or a monarch. If one is not legitimized in the eyes of the public then one is doomed to humiliation. Therefore, I feel confident in saying that the idea of popular consensus as the ultimate authority is at the heart of the English *mentalite*.

## *MAKING THE METROPOLIS MONARCHICAL: ELIZABETH I'S INNOVATION IN THE URBAN SPHERE*

**Amanda Terrell**

The morning of 10 July 1561 was probably like any other summer morning in London. The metropolis must have been bustling with business early; however, normal business of the day soon yielded to intents of the Crown. At noon, Elizabeth I sailed down the Thames towards the Tower of London. The queen had official business at her Mint. The specific reasons for Elizabeth's visit are unknown. What is known, however, is that she toured the Mint and distributed gold pieces to her hosts and entourage. Recipients included the Marquis of Northampton and Lord Hunsdon. Elizabeth's activities inside the Tower took the whole day. She did not emerge from the Tower until five o'clock in the evening. Instead of returning to her barge on the Thames Elizabeth left through Iron-gate and processed through London by litter. This was no ordinary commute. The Queen was "attended in great state."[1] Her progress included, all on horseback, "trumpeters, the Gentlemen Pensioners, the Heralds of Arms, the Serjeants at Arms, then Gentlemen, then Lords, and the Lord Hunsdon bearing the sword immediately before the Queen; after the Queen was the Ladies."[2] The procession took Elizabeth through the city. She started over Tower Hill, to Aldgate, to Houndsditch, to Spittle, to Hog Lane and ending at Charterhouse. Undoubtedly Londoners noticed their queen's presence. How could a person miss the long train of nobles

*Amanda Terrell of Danville, Illinois is a graduate student in history and a member of Phi Alpha Theta. She wrote this paper, while an undergraduate at Eastern Illinois University, as her departmental honors thesis, under the direction of Dr. Newton Key, in the Spring of 2006.*

[1]John Nichols, *The Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth: Among Which Are Interspersed Other Solemnities, Public Expenditures, And Remarkable Events, During The Reign of That Illustrious Princess, Collected From Original Manuscripts, Scarce Pamphlets, Corporation Records, Parochial Registers, Illustrated With Historical Notes* (London: John Nichols and Son, 1823), 1: 91.

[2]Ibid.

escorted with the sound of trumpets? The question that must be raised is this, was this public behavior typical of Elizabeth? Moreover, was this behavior common among other monarchs? Did Elizabeth, or other monarchs, use the metropolis? In other words was the city manipulated in order to achieve royal goals? And if so, what were those goals?  This work will seek to uncover Elizabeth's relationship with London and its citizens, both elites and commoners. Was Elizabeth innovative in this public sphere? Were public actions consistent throughout her forty-four year reign? Did she vary her interactions between elite and commoners? Finally, how was Elizabeth's interaction with London similar or different from that of her predecessor, Mary I, or of successor, James VI and I?  For the comparative question one must ascertain Mary's and James's relationship with the metropolis as well, although, at present, information on these topics is sparse.  Despite the abundant research on Elizabeth and London individually there has been little research on the two as a whole, though many historians touch on Elizabeth's interaction with London in other writings.

Biographies are the richest form of writings on Elizabeth; despite the focus on the personal, some offer pertinent information on Elizabeth's broader relationship with London. Carolly Erickson, in *The First Elizabeth*, provides a lot of information on Elizabeth and London. Erickson records, in detail, Elizabeth's formal entrance into the city as well as her coronation procession.  In addition to Elizabeth's feelings about London and its citizens, Erickson relays the reaction of the people to Elizabeth's presence in the city.[3]  Another older, but still classic, biography of Elizabeth is *Queen Elizabeth* by J.E. Neale. In this book, Neale goes into great detail describing Elizabeth's coronation procession, a crucial interaction between a sovereign and subjects.[4]  Jasper Ridley, author of *Elizabeth I: The Shrewdness of Virtue*, describes the crowd's reception of Elizabeth

---

[3]Carolly Erickson, *The First Elizabeth* (New York: Summit, 1983), 122, 168, 177-78.

[4]J.E. Neale, *Queen Elizabeth* (New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1934), 58-62.

and, also, where Elizabeth resided when she was in or around London.[5]

More specialized articles or monographs highlight Elizabeth's interaction with London more directly. Richard C. McCoy, in "'The Wonderful Spectacle:' The Civic Progress of Elizabeth I and the Troublesome Coronation," portrays Elizabeth's coronation procession as a "performance" and, furthermore, discusses her motives for her public behavior. McCoy also expounds on Elizabeth's involvement with her procession. This proves important because it shows Elizabeth's desire to personally construct her public image.[6]  Sandra Logan's article, "Making History: The Rhetorical and Historical Occasion of Elizabeth Tudor's Coronation Entry," analyzes the primary sources that detail Elizabeth's coronation procession, a ceremony vital for any monarch to establish a rapport with the people and city.[7]  Maintaining good relations with her people was important to Elizabeth.  Tarnya Cooper, in her article, "Queen Elizabeth's Public Face," relays other ways Elizabeth remained visible to her subjects and, thus, retained her people's favor.   Cooper specifically discusses Elizabeth's regulation of her portraiture. This pertains to London because urban dwellers were much more likely to own a portrait of Elizabeth than their rural counterparts.[8]

Mary Hill-Cole, in a book explicitly devoted to the rural progresses of Elizabeth, entitled, *The Portable Queen*, does pay attention as well to Elizabeth's experiences in the metropolis—London—in order to compare these with Elizabeth's rural

---

[5]Jasper Ridley, *Elizabeth I: The Shrewdness of Virtue* (New York: Viking, 1988), 76.

[6]Richard C. McCoy, "'The Wonderful Spectacle.' The Civic Progress of Elizabeth I and the Troublesome Coronation," in *Coronations: Medieval and Early Modern Monarchic Ritual*, ed. Janos M. Bak (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990), 217-227, 218.

[7]Sandra Logan, "Making History: The Rhetorical and Historical Occasion of Elizabeth Tudor's Coronation Entry," *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 31, no. 2 (2001): 251-282.

[8]Tarnya Cooper, "Queen Elizabeth's Public Face," *History Today* 53, no. 5 (2003): 41.

travels.[9]  Ian Dunlap wrote *Palaces and Progresses of Elizabeth I*, in which he describes in detail Elizabeth's palaces. This proves relevant to a study on Elizabeth and London because Elizabeth had many palaces in and around London.   These include: Greenwich, just east of London on the Thames; Whitehall, on the Thames, technically in Westminster; Richmond, southwest of London on the Thames; and Hampton Court, further south than Richmond and also situated on the Thames.[10]  In understanding where Elizabeth resided, why and when she occupied the palaces, and what kind of activity the palaces could accommodate, one can learn a lot about Elizabeth's relationship with London.

Other historians write about Elizabeth's interaction with London and her people while covering a totally different topic. This occurs because of the breadth of Elizabeth's reign. For example, books on the Spanish Armada allude to Elizabeth's public persona.  Books on the Armada that mention Elizabeth's interaction with London include: *The Armada*, by Garrett Mattingly; *The Spanish Armada*, by Colin Martin and Geoffrey Parker; and *The Confident Hope of a Miracle: The True History of the Spanish Armada*, by Neil Hanson.  Each of these books discusses the procession in which Elizabeth participated to celebrate England's victory over Spain. The procession took Elizabeth through London to St. Paul's where there was a victory service.[11]

---

[9]Mary Hill Cole, *The Portable Queen* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1999), 8, 18-32.

[10]Ian Dunlop, *Palaces and Progresses of Elizabeth I* (New York: Taplinger Publishing Company, 1962), map on inside cover.  Dunlop does not give the exact distance of each palace from London.  Also, Dunlop excludes Somerset House and St. James Palace both within the London and Westminster city limits. However, all the palaces he references are in the Thames River Valley, therefore, one can conclude that each palace was within one day's journey to and from London.

[11]Garrett Mattingly, *The Armada* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1959), 396; Colin Martin and Geoffrey Parker, *The Spanish Armada*, rev. ed. (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999), 236-237; Neil Hanson, *The Confident Hope of a Miracle: The True History of the Spanish Armada* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2005), 383-386.

Although these various works mention Elizabeth's relations with London, no work has devoted itself entirely to this relationship; furthermore, none assesses Elizabeth's possible innovations in this sphere.  Before one can develop such a study, however, one must fully understand the models available to Elizabeth for royal interaction with the metropolis.  Likewise, one must understand the impact Elizabeth had on future monarchs and their relations with London. Therefore, one should look at Elizabeth's predecessor, Mary I, and successor, James VI and I, and their respective interaction with London and its citizens.  Like previous work done on Elizabeth, information pertaining to Mary and James in London tends to be buried in various sources.

The majority of writings on Mary I take the form of biographies or more generic writings on the Tudor dynasty. Extensive biographies on Mary I include: *Mary: The First Queen of England*, by J.M. Stone; and *Mary Tudor*, by H.F.M. Prescott. Both of these books describe the life of Mary I in abundant detail; therefore, they reference when Mary was in London and her relationship with the city.  For instance, both devote a significant amount of attention to Wyatt's Rebellion during which Mary entrenched in London and rallied the people with a speech.[12]  Penry Williams wrote *The Later Tudors: England 1547-1603* about the reigns of Mary I and her half siblings, Edward VI and Elizabeth I, including much information about her interaction with London.  For example, Williams describes how London played a significant role in Lady Jane Grey's attempt to steal Mary's throne. In addition, Williams tells how Mary eventually entered the city triumphantly.[13]  Dale Hoak authored a brief article entitled "The Coronations of Edward VI, Mary I, and Elizabeth I, and the Transformation of the Tudor Monarchy."   In this work Hoak portrays the changes that

---

[12]For a thorough discussion on Wyatt's Rebellion, see H.F.M Prescott, *Mary Tudor* (New York: MacMillan, 1953), 239-254, and J.M. Stone, *Mary: The First Queen of England* (New York: E.P. Dutton & Co., 1901), 275-292.

[13]For more detail, see Penry Williams, *The Later Tudors: England 1547-1603* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), 82-87.

occurred in each of the coronation ceremonies and procession, as well as the people's reaction to the events.[14]   During the coronation procession the monarch rode through London to Westminster; thus, it was important to both the city and citizens. Mary's interaction with London appears to be crucial and complicated; nonetheless as with Elizabeth, in order to determine Mary's relationship with London, one must sift through a variety of sources.

Many historians have attempted to answer the question of why James VI and I detested the public pomp and pageantry that accompanied monarchy.   James's attitude towards his public duties most likely affected his relationship with London. In order to understand the relationship one has to look at the many sources dedicated to James's life and reign. There are many biographies on James, some include: *James I*, by Christopher Durston; *King James*, by Pauline Croft; *The Cradle King: The Life of James VI and I, The First Monarch of a United Great Britain*, by Alan Stewart; and *King James VI and I*, by D. Harris Wilson.  All of these books discuss James's dislike for the public side of his office and the people's reaction to his aloofness.[15] Moreover, Stewart provides detail of James' formal entrance into the city in addition to his coronation procession.[16]   James's interaction with London was peculiar and different from Elizabeth's.  Judith M. Richards, in "The English Accession of James VI: 'National' Identity, Gender, and the Personal Monarchy of England," compares and contrasts James's and Elizabeth's public appearances. Furthermore, Richards discusses how the public perceived both Elizabeth and James and how

[14]Dale Hoak, "The Coronations of Edward VI, Mary I, and Elizabeth I, and the Transformation of the Tudor Monarchy," in *Westminster Abbey Reformed: 1540-1640*. ed by C.S. Knighton and Richard Mortimer (Burlington: Ashgate, 2003), 114-151.

[15]Christopher Durston, *James I* (London: Routledge, 1953);  Pauline Croft, *King James* (New York: Palgrave, 2003);  Alan Stewart, *The Cradle King: The Life of James VI and I, The First Monarch of a United Great Britain* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2003);  D. Harris Wilson, *King James VI and I* (New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1956).

[16]Stewart, *The Cradle King*, 167, 169, 172.

that affected the latter.[17]  This proves pertinent to London because much of a monarch's public duties occurred in the city; moreover, a large chunk of the population was centered in and around London.  Clearly James was at a disadvantage when it came to interacting with London and the people.  He hated public performance and he followed Elizabeth who seemed to hold the people in the palm of her hand.  Nevertheless, one can find insinuations of James's relationship with London in several different sources.

Since Elizabeth made use of the public sphere and much of her activities can be classified as ritual works dedicated to these topics in the pre-modern world prove especially useful.  Among these is Edward Muir's *Civic Ritual in Renaissance Venice*.  In this book Muir argues that a calendar filled with civic rituals shaped the attitudes of Venetians. Ultimately Venetians lived with a "the myth of Venice."[18]  The results of civic ritual in Venice are not inconsequential to a study on a monarch's use of public space and rituals to ingratiate him or herself to the people.  One can juxtapose how Venetians lived with "the myth of Venice" to England's "Elizabethan Age."  Both were glorified ideas that were perpetuated by public actions of leaders.  Another valuable source is *Politics, And the City in Fatimid Cairo,* by Paula Sanders. This is a study of how a monarchy, the Fatimids, manipulated urban space in order to establish and stabilize their dynasty.[19] Finally, James Saslow's *The Medici Wedding of 1589: Florentine Festival as Theatrum Mundi* describes the work put into one elaborate ritual. Saslow accounts the months of work, hundreds of people, as well as money and supplies that go into putting on a public spectacle.[20]  All  of  these  works  give  pertinent

[17]Judith M. Richards, "The English Accession of James VI: 'National' Identity, Gender, and the Personal Monarchy of England," *English Historical Review* 472 (June 2002): 513-535.

[18]Edward Muir, *Civic Ritual in Renaissance Venice* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1981).

[19]Paula Sanders, *Ritual Politics, and the City in Fatimid Cairo* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1994).

[20] James Saslow, *The Medici Wedding of 1589: Florentine Festival as Theatrum*

background information to how royalty manipulated urban space, the costs of manipulation and the results of that manipulation.

In order to establish Elizabeth's work in the metropolis, London, one must determine what London was at the time of Elizabeth's reign. John Stow (1525-1605) wrote a survey of London in 1598. Of course, this was near the end of Elizabeth's reign; nevertheless, Stow's descriptions still prove useful. Just in the eighty year span of Stow's life London underwent monumental change. By the time of Elizabeth's death in 1603 London was thriving and had outgrown its medieval walls. With the growth of London also came the growth of its suburbs. In fact, during this time London seemed to swallow up its surrounding areas.[21] With the burgeoning of London, also came the formation of neighborhoods or boroughs. Londoners tended to settle in one suburb or neighborhood. However, there was still movement within the metropolis. People formed their own small communities, but still moved freely within the London metropolitan area.[22]

Moreover people from all over the globe flocked to London. In the words of Clark Hulse, "London connected England to the world."[23] With a population over 200,000 by the year 1600, London ranked as one of the dominant European capitals.[24] Liza Picard argues that at the time of Elizabeth's death London "had become a world power." Indeed, at the beginning of Elizabeth's reign Paris's population was twice the size of London's.

*Mundi* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996).

[21]Peter Ackroyd, *London: The Biography* (New York: Doubleday, 2001), 95-96 and J.F. Merritt, *Imagining Early Modern London: Perceptions and Portrayal of the City from Stow to Strype, 1598-1720* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 4.

[22]Merritt, *Imagining Early Modern London*, 12-14.

[23]Clark Hulse, *Elizabeth I: Ruler & Legend* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2003), 31.

[24]Current scholarship estimates that more than six thousand people immigrated annually to London in the years between 1500 and 1600. Arthur F. Kinney and David W. Swain eds., *Tudor England: An Encyclopedia* (New York: Garland Publishers, 2001), 441.

However, by time of Elizabeth's death the gap had diminished and London's population nearly equaled that of Paris.[25]

Stow described the metropolis as a "city of tradesmen" because it was "the principal storehouse and staple of all commodities within this realm."[26] Nevertheless, London was more than just a depot. London was also viewed as the "center of civilization" in England.[27] After the Renaissance, cities were viewed as good because they offered cultural and social opportunities that were previously unavailable.[28] Thus London attracted all kinds of people. The gentry and courtiers found the latest fashions in London. And the lower classes usually found more economic and social opportunity.[29]

Opportunity was manifest in that, during Elizabeth's reign, nearly all males in London were considered citizens. A man could become a citizen by either joining a Livery Company or being labeled a freeman. Citizens enjoyed the benefits of the vote as well as the opportunity to establish a business.[30] The opportunities of London did not extend to government, however. During this time London was ruled by an impenetrable oligarchy. Each of the twenty-six wards in London elected one alderman who served for life. From the alderman one mayor was chosen. The mayor was usually the alderman with seniority. These men ran London and consequently were powerful, wealthy, influential elites. There was also a Court of Common Council that handled the day to day business of the city. However, to be a member of this council one had to be among the top ten percent of the income bracket.[31] In

[25]Jan De Vries, *The Economy of Europe in an Age of Crisis, 1600-1750* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976), 156.

[26]John Stow, *A Survey of London: Written in the Year 1598,* with an introduction by Antonia Fraser. Edited by Henry Morley (Guernsey: Sutton Publishing Limited, 1994), 43.

[27]Merritt, *Imagining Early Modern London*, 14.

[28]Ibid.

[29]Ackroyd, *London: The Biography*, 96.

[30]Kinney and Swain, eds., *Tudor England,* 442.

[31]Ibid.

Elizabethan London there was a clear demarcation between the classes. There were the city elites and everyone else.[32]

How does a modern historian decide what constituted Elizabethan London geographically? Today, London is defined as London Corporation and its surrounding thirty-two boroughs. Currently this serves as the Greater London area. Unfortunately there is no such consensus for London in the sixteenth century. Certainly London officially was the "mile square," old corporation founded by its walls. Even by Elizabeth's time, however, the city included parishes "without" (outside) the walls. Nevertheless the quandary continues. If a historian does happen to define London in his or her work, rarely are two definitions the same. Liza Picard in *Elizabeth's London: Everyday Life in Elizabethan London* concluded that London encompassed London proper, Westminster, and Southwark.[33] David J. Johnson took Picard's definition further in his book *Southwark and the City* by stating that "the history of the capital is the history of its suburbs."[34] According to Johnson, London extends much further than the city limits. However, this confusion is not new. The line that separated London from its suburbs has been blurred since at least the twelfth century. William Fitzstephen wrote that it was the Thames that made London inseparable from its suburbs. Because the river "joined" the two and they became one.[35] Hence the fact that most historians do not define London in their work is not surprising. It is hard to define the ambiguous.

---

[32]For more detail on London's development during this time period see Ian Archer, *The Pursuit of Stability: Social Relations in Elizabethan London* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991).

[33]Liza Picard, *Elizabeth's London: Everyday Life in Elizabethan London* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2003), xxiv.

[34]David J. Johnson, *Sothwark and the City* (London: The Corporation of London, 1969), v.

[35]William Fitzstephen died in 1190 and in his lifetime was a clerk to Thomas Becket. After Becket's death, Fitzstephen wrote a biography of Becket. Fitzstephen included a description of London in the book, which is where he discussed both London and Westminster. Stow, 23.

This work will provide a definition of London. It is important for this study that the reader be aware of Elizabeth's exact location. London means London, not the suburbs. The reader will be made aware if Elizabeth ventures into Westminster or another suburb. It was not unlikely, due to close proximity, for Elizabeth to progress through London to a suburb and back to London. Therefore, on a given day Elizabeth could be in either place several times. However, for this work London and Westminster are not interchangeable. Due to Elizabeth's residence at Whitehall and duties at Parliament Elizabeth was frequently in Westminster without any public relations agenda. Since this study will focus on Elizabeth's use of London for public relations and her relationship with the city and citizens, the times when she is within the city limits are paramount.

When most historians write about Elizabeth's public activities; her interactions with her people, her public relations agenda, or her use of public space they point to her summer progresses as her most important tool. During most summers Elizabeth would progress to the English countryside. These progresses were never very far. Throughout Elizabeth's forty-four year reign she went on twenty-three progresses. Of the twenty-three only five were to destinations more than ninety miles from London. Elizabeth's average country progress was forty miles from London. Moreover, out of England's fifty-three counties Elizabeth visited only twenty-five.[36] Still, Elizabeth's excursions to the country were more frequent and grander than those of any other European monarch. There was genuine excitement when the queen went to a town and, Elizabeth regularly received a warm welcome and impressive entertainment.

Townspeople anxiously awaited Elizabeth's arrival. Thus when Elizabeth neared a city the people rejoiced. Thomas Churchyard recorded the reaction of the people when Elizabeth visited Woodstock. He wrote that at seeing the "most redoubted

---

[36]Hill Cole, *The Portable Queen*, 23-24. It must be noted that despite Elizabeth's limited travel she still traveled more than any of her predecessors.

Queene a multitude of people" began "runing" ahead of him to see Elizabeth.[37]   However, the people did not just want to see Elizabeth, they had "rare inuentions" and "deepe deuices" with which to honor Elizabeth.[38]  Once Elizabeth reached her destination, usually the home of a noble, she was presented with various entertainments.  Ordinarily nobles hired actors to put on plays, give Latin speeches, or stage athletic competitions.  Also, nobles would arrange for singers to serenade Elizabeth.  There is one instance of Elizabeth being serenaded early in the morning from the garden below her bedroom as she prepared for the day.[39]  Furthermore there are countless examples of Elizabeth hearing poems and watching performances during her progresses.[40] Elizabeth's country progresses served as part of her public relations agenda.

Consequently, historians use these progresses as evidence of Elizabeth's political and public relations savvy. For example, when discussing Elizabeth's popularity, J.E. Neale wrote that the country progresses "offered supreme opportunities to her genius in winning the hearts of the people."[41] Anne Somerset commented that "progresses served as an invaluable means of interaction between subject and sovereign."[42] Furthermore,

Carolly Erickson wrote that "nothing did more to spread and enrich the cult of the queen than her summer progresses."[43]  And lastly, Mary Hill Cole stated that the progresses "gave the queen a public stage on which to present herself as the people's sovereign."[44] However, by focusing on Elizabeth's country progresses one only gets a glimpse of her public relations genius. Elizabeth usually visited nobles when on progress, hence the people, entertainment, food, gifts, presented to her mostly reflected the upper classes' way of life. Indeed, when on progress, Elizabeth was only exposed to small cross-sections of people. A common person's ability to see and interact with Elizabeth was slim and usually at her host's discretion. Perhaps Elizabeth allowed for such limited exposure because the nobles proved to be a vital asset to Elizabeth in keeping her throne. Contemporary records of Elizabeth's country progresses remain and describe what seem like vacations rather than public relations efforts.

Evidence of the host noble's control over Elizabeth's progresses can be seen in the queen's visit to Elventham. Before Elizabeth arrived her host, the Earle of Hertford, set about remodeling his house. He added extra rooms for "the Nobles" and a "large Hall, for entertainment of Knights, Ladies, and Gentlemen."[45] During her stay Elizabeth "dined, with her Nobles" and after dinner watched water games under a canopy which Hertford "caused…to bee set [sic]." Hertford's other contributions included having poems read in Latin for Elizabeth, a display of fireworks, music played under her window, and having his servants serve the queen in "plentifull abundance."[46] Hertford controlled what Elizabeth saw and experienced at Elventham.  In the record of Elizabeth's visit there is no mention of her interacting, one on one, with anybody. The closest she came was to request to see a "spectacle" twice, and the source

---

[37]Thomas Churchyard, *A Handefvl of Gladsome Verses, giuen to the Queenes Maiesty at Woodstocke this Prograce* (Oxford: Ioseph Barnes, 1592), A2.

[38]Ibid.

[39]*The Honorable Entertainment given to the Queens Maiestie in Progress, at Eluetham in Hampshire, by the right Honorable the Earle of Hertford* (London: John Wolfe, 1591), E.

[40]For more descriptions of Elizabeth's country progresses see:*The Ioyfvll Receyuing of the Queenes most excellent Maiestie into hir Highnesse Citie of Norvvich: The things done in the time of hir abode there: and the dolor of the Citie at hir departure* (London: Henrie Bynneman, 1578); Robert Laneham, *A letter whearin part of the entertainment vntoo the Queenz Maiesty at Killingworth Castl in Warwik sheer in this soomerz progress 1575 is signified / from a freend officer attendant in coourt vntoo hiz freend a citizen and merchaunt of London* (London: 1575); *Speeches Delivered To Her Maiestie This Last Progresse, At The Right Honorable the Lady Rvssels, at Bissam, the Right Honorable the Lorde Chandos at Sudley, at the Right Honorable the Lord Norris, at Ricorte* (Oxforde, Ioseph Barnes, 1592).

[41]Neale, *Queen Elizabeth*, 203.

[42] Anne Somerset, *Elizabeth I* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1991), 372.

[43] Erickson, *The First Elizabeth*, 274.

[44] Hill Cole, *The Portable Queen*, 1.

[45]*The Honorable Entertainment given to the Queens Maiestie in Progress, at Eluetham in Hampshire, by the right Honorable the Earle of Hertford*, A2.

[46]Ibid., B.

only states that it "so delighted her Maiesty, that shee desired to see and hear it twise ouer."[47]  Elizabeth was the guest of Lord Montacute while on progress to Cowdrey in Sussex.  The record of this visit reads much like that of her visit to Elventham.  Elizabeth enjoyed lavish meals, entertainments, and hunting on Montacute's estate.[48]  Of course, Elizabeth did all of this in the company of nobles.

Most records of Elizabeth's country progress will report much of the same as the previous two sources.[49]  But these accounts of Elizabeth's interaction with her people prove futile because they do not reveal the full scope of Elizabeth's objectives regarding public relations.  Furthermore, these sources do not portray Elizabeth as active and intentional with her subjects since she was always the guest.  In order to ascertain Elizabeth's mindset towards public relations and gauge her ability and goals in that realm, one must also study Elizabeth's public interactions with in the urban sphere as well as the rural.  The latter has been documented.  This work, an in-depth study of Elizabeth's actions in London, will seek to show that Elizabeth radically changed the way monarchs' utilized the metropolis.  In addition we shall find that Elizabeth's public image was always in the forefront of her mind and, consequently, she groomed that image through excursions in London.  And that Elizabeth continually interacted with her people, both elites and commoners, from the first days and months of her reign to the last years.  Ultimately, Elizabeth's relationship with London proved unique and transforming.

### Elizabeth I's Performances in London during Her Formal Entry into the Metropolis and Coronation

Elizabeth I ascended to the English throne on 17 November 1558; however, she delayed her entrance into London, and

---

[47]Ibid., E.

[48]*The Speeches and Honorable Entertainment giuen to the Queenes Maiestie in Progresse, at Cowdrey in Sussex, by the right Honorable the Lord Montacute* (London: Thomas Scarlet, 1591), A4.

[49]See note 36.

taking formal possession of the Tower, by over a week.[50]  Elizabeth had opted instead to remain at her home, Hatfield, to update herself with the matters of state and establish a privy counsel.  Nonetheless there was no lack of celebration when she did enter London on 28 November 1558. When news reached London that Elizabeth began her journey toward the city, people flocked to the countryside and roads in order to catch a glimpse of their queen.  When Elizabeth finally reached the city, she was greeted with cannon fire, and the sound of trumpets blaring. In addition, Londoners did not hesitate to show their adulation for their queen; the streets of London were lined with people.  There was not an empty spot along the procession route. The enormous crowd shouted support to Elizabeth. The people were so happy that they could not help but convey it. Londoners "declared their inward rejoisings [sic] by gestures, words and countenance…."[51]  Elizabeth was actually surprised by the amount of praise lavished on her during her entrance.[52]  Clearly this was a successful first interaction between Elizabeth and London. It proved the beginning of a substantial bond between the ruler and the ruled that would only grow.

Elizabeth's entrance into London was not the first time the city embraced her. Indeed, Elizabeth had a relationship with London long before she assumed the throne.  Elizabeth's half-sister Mary I, Queen of England from 1553 to 1558, often called her sister to London and required her to stay in the city.  For instance Mary imprisoned Elizabeth in the Tower for a period of many months on the suspicion of the latter's compliance in

---

[50]The formal entrance into London and subsequent acquisition of the Tower was a critical action by a new monarch.  Both served to legitimize the sovereign's hold on power and allowed the public to see and cheer its new leader. Thus London proved crucial in the early days of monarch's reign.

[51]John Nichols, *The Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth: Among Which Are Interspersed Other Solemnities, Public Expenditures, And Remarkable Events, During The Reign of That Illustrious Princess, Collected From Original Manuscripts, Scarce Pamphlets, Corporation Records, Parochial Registers, Illustrated With Historical Notes* vol. 1 (London: John Nichols and Son, 1823), 32.

[52]Erickson, *The First Elizabeth*, 167-68.

Wyatt's Rebellion.[53]  Consequently, Elizabeth's early experiences in London were not as happy as those during her reign.  Thomas Heywood detailed Elizabeth's imprisonment and stated that she was taken abruptly to London, while her household was reduced to only a few people.  Furthermore Heywood acknowledged that "the very name of Tower struck a deep horrour into her, insomuch that the cheerful bloud forsaking her fresh cheeks, left nothing but ashy paleness in her visage."[54] Elizabeth's first trips to the Tower did not evoke the pleasure that would come.  The fear Mary aroused was not partial to her ordinary subjects; indeed, it resonated with her own sister. When Elizabeth left London after her imprisonment she did so amidst an atmosphere of jubilation.  In addition to the sound of ringing church bells and cannon fire, Londoners thronged to see Elizabeth off.  Clearly the city supported and held Elizabeth in high regard, even when she was not queen, much to the chagrin of her sister.[55]

Elizabeth also visited London for formal occasions during her sister's reign.  Francis Bacon records, in *The history of the reigns of Henry VII, Henry VIII, Edward VI, and Queen Mary*, Elizabeth processed through London on 30 July 1553 on her way to meet Mary in Wansted and congratulate her on her accession.[56]  Furthermore, Bacon notes Elizabeth's presence and prominent position in Mary's formal entry into London.  Mary entered the city on 3 August 1553 and Bacon described it as

---

[53]For a more thorough discussion, see Jane Dunn, *Elizabeth and Mary: Cousins, Rivals, Queens* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2004), 116-125; Thomas Heywood, *England's Elisabeth: Her Life And Troubles, During her minoritie, from the cradle to the Crown, Historically laid open and interwoven with such eminent passages of State, as happened under the reigne of Henry the eight, Edward the sixt, Q. Mary, all of them aptly introducing to the present relation* (Cambridge: Ph. Waterhouse, 1632), 90-91.

[54]Heywood, *England's Elisabeth*, 91.

[55]Dunn, 121.

[56]Francis Bacon, *The history of the reigns of Henry VII, Henry VIII, Edward VI, and Queen Mary the first written by the Right Honourable Francis Lord Verulam, Viscount St. Alban; the other three by the Right Honourable  and Right Reverend Father in God, Francis Godwyn, Lord Bishop of Hereford* (London: W.G., 1676), 162.

"triumphant."[57]  Another contemporary author described Mary's entrance by stating, "she came to *London*, through which she passed to the *Tower* with all imaginable Grandure…."[58]  Despite the description of the elegance in which Mary entered and processed through London, neither author discussed the reaction of either Mary or her people during this crucial ritual. This omission is pronounced.  The country had just endured a passionate struggle for the throne between Mary and Jane Grey.[59]  Yet the excitement of the time was missing from Mary's entrance and procession through London. The cheers and excitement present in Elizabeth's entry were either markedly absent or unrecorded in Mary's.  If the people did hold Mary in high esteem, it was not conveyed or at least not as much as it was towards Elizabeth. Was the people's behavior in Mary's or Elizabeth's entry extraordinary?  In other words, was the city's reaction to Elizabeth's presence a new phenomenon?  Or did Londoners usually lack enthusiasm when a monarch entered the city limits?  One way to settle the question is to examine James VI and I's, Elizabeth's successor, entrance into the metropolis after his accession.

James entered London on 7 May 1603 after a prolonged journey from Scotland, through the English countryside, and finally to London.  Thomas Millington chronicled James's trip to London and also noted the reaction of the people along the way. The reaction and reception of Londoners will prove crucial for this study.  Millington documented that as James neared the city:

> The multitudes of people in high wayes, fieldes, medowes, close and on trees were such, that they covered the beautie of the fieldes, and so greedy were they to behold the countenance of the King, that with much unrulinesse they iniured and hurt one another, some even hazarded to the daunger of death: but as

---

[57]Ibid.

[58]Anon, *The History of the life, bloody reign, and death of Queen Mary, eldest daughter to H.8* (London: Black Swan, 1682), 32. Author's italics.

[59]For more detail see Penry Williams, *The Later Tudors: England 1547-1603* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), 83-85.

uncivill as there were among themselves, all the ways
his Maiestie past with shoutes and cryes, and casting up
of hattes [sic]….[60]

Clearly, James was well received. However Elizabeth's entrance still stands as unique because of the revolutionary strides she made in public relations throughout her reign. By the time of James's accession flocking to the monarch and shouting praise was the norm, thanks to Elizabeth.

After Elizabeth's formal entrance into the city she further consolidated her power in London through her coronation procession six weeks later. Much has been made about Elizabeth's procession through London the day before her coronation. A recapitulation of the days events are in nearly every biography of Elizabeth.[61] Why is this? Elizabeth made a rare connection with her subjects that day.

Elizabeth processed through London on Saturday, 14 January 1559. All of London turned out to see their queen. Nevertheless, this was no ordinary parade or procession. This event was a demonstration of the shared love between Elizabeth and her people awkwardly veiled in regal pomp and pageantry. Despite the tradition and solemnity of the occasion, the people's affection for Elizabeth' could not be restrained. When Elizabeth made her way out of the Tower and began the procession she was saluted with "prayers, wishes, welcomminges, cryes, tender wordes, and all other signes, which argue a wonderfull earnest love of most obedient subjects towarde theyr soveraigne…."[62] The people's love did not go unnoticed. Elizabeth responded by "holding up her handes, and merie countenaunce to such as

---

[60]Thomas Millington, *The True Narration of the Entertainment of his Royall Maiestie, from the time of his departure from Edenbrough; til his receiving at London: with all or most speciall Occurrences* (London: Thomas Creede, 1603), 42.

[61]See Erickson, *The First Elizabeth* 177-179; Susan Frye, *Elizabeth I: The Competition for Representation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), 24-26; Jasper Ridley, *Elizabeth I*, 80-81; Neale, *Queen Elizabeth*, 60-62; Christopher Haigh, *Elizabeth I* (London: Longman, 1988), 7.

[62]Anon, *The Passage of our most drad Soueraigne Lady Quene Elyzabeth through the citie of London to Westminster the daye before her coronacion* (London: Richard Cottill, 1559), A ii.

---

stode farre of, and most tender and gentle language to those that stode nigh to her grace…."[63] From the outset, the procession was a dynamic interaction between Elizabeth and London. Neither Elizabeth, nor her London people, was content to spend the day in passive recognition of one another. The monarchs' relationship with London was maturing.

At Fenchurch Elizabeth was formally welcomed into the city. A child welcomed her with an oration that described the primary gifts the city would give her. The first gift was "blessing tonges that would praise her "to the sky."[64] The second gift was "true heartes that love thee fro their root."[65] This affection was not just spewed as lines from a script, for after the child was finished the whole crowd erupted in praise for their queen.[66] After Elizabeth's initial greeting she made her way through the sprawling metropolis. The city had prepared five pageants for Elizabeth to view while on her journey. Elizabeth stopped at each of these pageants to absorb the warmth of the people and to reflect her own good feelings.[67]

The crowds and noise in the metropolis that day was overwhelming. At the first pageant at Gracious Street, Elizabeth could not see or understand the pageant, so she had to stop her chariot and go back in order that she could see and hear the pageant again. The pageant portrayed Elizabeth's family: her grandparents, Henry VII and Queen Elizabeth; her parents, Henry VIII and Queen Anne; and lastly, herself. This portrayal

---

[63]Ibid.

[64]Ibid., A iii.

[65]Ibid.

[66]*The Royall Passage of her Maiesty form the Tower of London to her Palace of White-hall, with all the Speeches and Devices, both of the Pageants and otherwise, together with her Maiesties severall answers, and most pleasing Speeches to them all* (London: S.S., 1559).

[67]The substance of the pageants will only be examined when it is critical to understand the interactions between Elizabeth and the people. For reference, the pageants emphasized: unity, virtue trumping vice, Elizabeth having all the attributes discussed in the Beatitudes, truth in the form of Protestantism, attributes of both a rising and declining society, and Deborah from the Bible as a model woman leader for Elizabeth to emulate.

of the Elizabeth's lineage was to represent the uniting of the Houses of Lancaster and York and the subsequent end of the Wars of the Roses. Furthermore, the pageant conveyed the anticipated unity Elizabeth would bring to the country since she sprouted from the portrayed family tree. Also, this pageant rehabilitated the image of Elizabeth's mother who was executed by her father. In a way the pageant rewrote the past to omit the violence and treachery to portray a version of Elizabeth's past as perfect and peaceful. At the pageant's conclusion, Elizabeth promised to uphold the spirit of the pageant and see that England remained unified.[68] Due to the confusion of the fist pageant, because of the noise and crowding, Elizabeth sent messengers ahead of her to each pageant to ask the people to restrain themselves during the orations so she could hear and understand. Also, she had the messengers find out what each pageant was going to be about so she could prepare herself.[69] This shows Elizabeth's desire to really understand what was being imparted to her that day. Similarly, it demonstrates Elizabeth's awareness of the atmosphere and her wish to work around it, even stoke it, but not squelch it. Indeed, at every pageant Elizabeth made some kind of interaction with the people. She had resolved to be an active participant in the day's events. Sometimes she even led the people in their praise. For instance it is noted that at several times in the procession Elizabeth "held up her handes to heavenwarde and willed the people to say, Amen [sic]."[70] Similarly, Elizabeth realized the importance of this day for her subjects. For ordinary townsfolk seeing a monarch could quite possibly be the highlight of their lives. Elizabeth never hesitated in allowing the people to simply look at her. Heywood wrote that "she would many times cause her chariot to stand, that the people might have their full sight of her."[71] Whether it was a smiling face, words of thanks, loving

gestures, or simply being, Elizabeth willingly and intentionally interacted with the people.

Besides simply interacting with the people, Elizabeth made gestures and speeches that would endear her to the population. For example, she received an English translation of the Bible with dramatic emotion. When handed the book, Elizabeth took it with two hands, kissed it, held it to her chest, and thanked the city profusely for such a gift.[72] This act had to have gone over well with the audience. London was predominantly a Protestant town; even more, they were weary of Catholicism. After Mary's tumultuous reign, in which she persecuted Protestants, the city was ready for a change and, moreover, stability.[73] The fact that Elizabeth embraced the gift and showed such emotion had to have been reassuring and put Elizabeth's in the people's highest esteem.

Elizabeth further ingratiated herself with Londoners with several speeches she made. One in particular she gave after receiving one thousand gold pieces from the Lord Mayor and the city. She said:

> I thanke my lord maior, his brethren and you all. And Whereas your request is that I should continue your good ladie and quene, be ye ensured, that I will be as good unto you as ever quene was to her people...I will not spare, if nede be to spend my blood, God thanke you all.[74]

---

[68]*The Passage of our most drad Soveraigne Lady Quene Elyzabeth through the citie of London to Westminster the daye before her coronacion*, Bii.

[69]Ibid.

[70]Ibid., Eii.

[71]Heywood, *England's Elisabeth*, 181.

---

[72]*The Passage of our most drad Soveraigne Lady Quene Elyzabeth through the citie of London to Westminster the daye before her coronacion*, Cv.

[73]Evidence of London's religious climate is found in many sources. John Stow in his classic *Survey of London* chronicled the religious leaders of London and how some under Mary were imprisoned and burned at the stake. John Stow, *A Survey of London: Written in the Year 1598*, with an introduction by Antonia Fraser; Henry Morley, ed. (Guernsey: Sutton Publishing Limited, 1994), 433. For a thorough discussion on London's religious climate see Liza Picard, *Elizabeth's London: Everyday Life in Elizabethan London* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2003), 270-279; Alison Weir, *The Life of Elizabeth I* (New York: Ballantine Books, 1998), 54-69; Jasper Ridley, *Elizabeth I: The Shrewdness of Virtue* (New York: Viking, 1988), 82-88.

[74]Ibid., civ.

Elizabeth made promises in this statement that have often been quoted. It is significant that she made these assurances when and where she did. Elizabeth's reign began on shaking footing. However, she gained some stability in assuring her support in London. Further, she assured her support in London with statements recognizing her people and reiterating her dedication.

Elizabeth further fueled the people's love through more discrete interactions with citizens during the procession. On several occasions, poor women approached Elizabeth's chariot wanting to speak with her or impart a gift. Elizabeth did not turn these women away. Instead she welcomed their gifts and kind words. Also she made impromptu stops to interact more with citizens. Once she ordered her chariot be stopped so she could hear children, patients in a hospital, recite verses to her.[75]

Elizabeth revolutionized monarch-subject relations in the course of one day. Many more loving interactions occurred than were mentioned in this chapter. Besides the pageants and shouts of praise rendered to Elizabeth, people wept at the sight of their queen.[76] Pageants and praise were not unique to Elizabeth or even London; however, the love showed towards her was. Neither Mary I, Elizabeth's predecessor, or James VI and I, Elizabeth's successor, received or courted the adulation that was lavished upon Elizabeth.

Mary's coronation procession took place on the 30 September 1553. She processed through the city in all stateliness. Documents describe her chariot, dress, crown, and the scores of nobles and diplomats who participated in the event.[77] However, lacking is the mention of the people's reaction to Mary's presence. In one document there is a vague mention referencing

the feelings of the people. It states "that the joy seemed great; Nor was any cost spared by the Citizens and Merchants Strangers, to make the Triumph compleat [sic]."[78] The welcome given to Elizabeth was not "seemingly" great or affectionate. One can clearly understand the emotions of Londoners that day. The same cannot be said about Mary's coronation procession. If great emotion was showed towards Mary it is omitted from documents describing her coronation procession.

Something else emphasized in depictions of Mary's procession is the involvement and prominence of foreigners. The Genoese produced a pageant at Fenchurch, the Florentines at Grace Street, and a Dutchman provided entertainment at St. Paul's.[79] One may glean from this information that Mary's coronation procession was an international affair. One cannot do the same for Elizabeth's. In fact, both documents describing Elizabeth's coronation procession make a point to mention that the city received the queen without any foreigners present.[80] Elizabeth's procession seemed to be a thoroughly English affair, while Mary's was not. This might be another reason why Elizabeth was beloved. Elizabeth's procession and pageants embraced and emphasized England and the English, and what they had to offer.

James's coronation procession took place on the 15 March 1604, nearly a year after his accession.[81] Gilbert Dugdale recorded James's procession in *The Time Triumphant*. Dugdale stated that the people's "heartes were wilde fire, and burned

---

[75]*The Royall Passage of her Maiesty from the Tower of London to her Palace White-hall, with all Speeches and Devices, both of the Pageants and otherwise, together with her Maiesties severall Answers and most pleasing Speeches to them all*, D3-D4.

[76]Ibid.

[77]Holinshed, *Chronicles of England, Scotland, and Ireland*, 6 vols. (London: 1808), IV, 6-7 in Richard Titler, *The Reign of Mary I*, 2nd ed (Harlow: Longman, 1991), 84-85.

[78]Anon, *The History of the life, bloody reign, and death of Queen Mary, eldest daughter to H.8*, 47.

[79]Titler, *The Reign of Mary I*, 84-85.

[80]See, *The Passage of our most drad Soveraigne Lady Quene Elyzabeth through the citie of London to Westminster the daye before her coronacion*, Eii, and *The Royall Passage of her Maiesty from the Tower of London to her Palace White-hall, with all Speeches and Devices, both of the Pageants and otherwise, together with her Maiesties severall Answers and most pleasing Speeches to them all*, D2.

[81]James acceded on 24 March 1603. There are several reasons for the delay. First, James had to travel from Scotland to London. Second, an outbreak of plague caused the initial date for the coronation procession. For more detail see, Stewart, *The Cradle King*, 172.

unquenched in love….”[82]  Londoners were excited to see their new monarch. However, all was not equal to Elizabeth's procession.  Elizabeth offered kind words and gestures to her people, James did not.[83]  At one point, frustrated with the noise and commotion, James exhorted the people to “doe as they doe in Scotland stand still and use silence, so shall you cherish his visitation and see him….”[84] James did not relish the atmosphere like Elizabeth, nor did he encourage the crowd in their praise. For James he was the main event, for Elizabeth, it was her subjects. Similarly, James did not reciprocate his subjects' affections; although his family did.  His wife, Queen Ann, and son, Henry, Prince of Wales, smiled and waved to the crowd. Thus the crowd's affections were as much for James's family as for him.[85]

Dugdale also noted a foreign presence at James's procession. Several times he mentions foreigners and their stake in the procession. He states that the Italians, Dutch, and French all “spared for no cost, to gratifie [sic] our King….”[86] This fact points to James's acceptance of foreign presence and harkens back to Elizabeth's repudiation of the same.

In neither Mary's nor James's coronation procession did the public display the emotion they did at Elizabeth's.  In addition, neither Mary nor James showed the type of emotion towards the people that Elizabeth did. Elizabeth's coronation procession

---

[82]Gilbert Dugdale, *The Time Triumphant* (London: R.B., 1604), B1.

[83]James did finally offer kind words for his people; however it was in the privacy of Parliament.  In a speech to both the House of Commons and House of Lords, James acknowledged and thanked the people for their hearty welcome. However, given the context of the speech one begs to question whether James was only thanking the MPs or did he actually recognize the love and affection of the people? Unlike Elizabeth, James did not reciprocate, much less acknowledge his subjects' affection in their presence. *The Speech of King James the I. To Both Houses of Parliament Upon his Accession to, and the Happy Union of Both the Crowns of England and Scotland, Regally Pronounced, and Expressed by him to them, Die Jovis 22th Martii 1603* (London: Old-Baily, 1689), 1.

[84]Dugdale, *The Time Triumphant*, B2.
[85]Ibid.
[86]Ibid., B3.

stands out as one of a kind, different from her predecessor and unmatched by her successor. Elizabeth transformed monarch-subject relations in a single day. Whether it was through mass interaction, or interaction on a smaller scale, or gestures and speeches, Elizabeth altered the relations, or expected relations, between sovereign and subjects.

Neither the volumes that have been written by historians on Elizabeth, her life, reign, and the Elizabethan Age, nor those devoted to London; aptly describe the affect Elizabeth had on Londoners and monarchical public relations in the city. If one examines the contemporary sources documenting the formal entrances into London and the coronation processions of Mary, Elizabeth, and James, closely, however, one sees clear differences, and must acknowledge Elizabeth's initial brilliance in the sphere of public relations.

### Elizabeth I and Her Londoners: Public Performances under Mary, Elizabeth and James Compared

Chapter one has shown that Elizabeth quickly established a rapport with her London people. Her formal entry into the metropolis and her subsequent coronation procession sought to procure a hold on her subjects' hearts. However, the peoples' affection can be fickle.  People may turn against monarchs or any authority if they lack food, money, or security. Thus, Elizabeth needed to work to make an indelible mark on London. This chapter examines how Elizabeth strategically developed her public activities and worked to strengthen her image in London during her long reign amongst both the London elites and commoners. Similarly, this chapter will analyze the similarities and differences in Elizabeth's public actions throughout her rule. One will see that Elizabeth's work would never be completed. Until the last years of her reign, Elizabeth's public image was in the forefront of her thoughts.  Elizabeth's main objective: remain visible.  Over the years the reasons for public outings varied, but Elizabeth's public performance remained constant.

Take for example her St. George's Day outings or Accession Day celebrations.  These celebrations were events marked on the

royal calendar and thus both Londoners and Elizabeth could expect a public show. Also, there were other unexpected times when sovereign and subjects were given an excuse to unite in celebration. For instance, the thanksgiving celebration in London following England's defeat of the Spanish Armada proved to be a valuable time for Elizabeth to publicly reiterate her dedication to her people and the people to recognize Elizabeth as a ruler capable of leading their country through the perils of war. In other words, the event was both celebratory in nature and a functional tool in order to sharpen Elizabeth's public image. Whether early or late in Elizabeth's reign, crisis or celebration, she was often ready for public performance and used it to her advantage. She did, however, fluctuate in her use of public ceremony or spectacle. Perhaps the cost or the openness of public days was not to her liking. But she did apply her public performances selectively to further her relations with the metropolitan dwellers in times of emergency. Furthermore, both her predecessor and successor lacked this skill.

In the months following her coronation, Londoners showered Elizabeth with praise. This affection, however, was encouraged. In the first year of Elizabeth's reign she took advantage of anytime she could publicly move in and about London.[87] Early as well as late in her reign going from her residence to Parliament, or any of Elizabeth's movements around London, proved to be a spectacle and is recorded in the annals of her reign.[88] However Elizabeth made particular use of St. George's Day, a quasi English holiday dedicated to the country's patron saint, to bond with her people.[89] England annually recognizes St. George's Day on 23 April with a feast. On this date in 1559 Elizabeth went beyond the customary

---

[87]Remember, she made a spectacle of going to her Mint in July 1559.

[88]For specific examples please see G. B. Harrison, *The Elizabethan Journals: Being A Record Of Those Things Most Talked Of During The Years 1591 – 1603* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1955), 1:98, 3:50, 3:125, 3:205.

[89]For more detail regarding St. George's Day and the myth of St. George see www.woodlands-junior.kent.sch.uk/customs/stgeorge.html, and www.stgeorges day.com.

observances and celebrated St. George's Day in a new way. Elizabeth kept the tradition of a feast, but also made the event reflect her own personality and public goals. After Elizabeth dined with clergy and nobility in Westminster (as was the custom) she boarded a barge and sailed up and down the River Thames. Elizabeth did not intend for this to be a quiet or private affair. She ordered trumpets, drums, flutes, and artillery to sound accompanying her progress. Also, Elizabeth's barge was surrounded by hundreds of other vessels. Of course, Elizabeth's excursion did not go unnoticed. John Nichols recorded that thousands of Londoners went to see her, "thronging at the waterside…rejoicing to see her."[90] Besides the music, there were games and fireworks. The festivities lasted late into the evening, until Elizabeth retired to Somerset House. Clearly, Elizabeth's intent for this evening was an opportunity for her and her subjects to bond via fun activities and not a formal occasion. Even though the city warmly had welcomed Elizabeth in both November and January, she evidently ordered this special display a few months later in April. Her plan appears to have worked. This event proved crucial to Elizabeth's nurturing her relationship with London and its citizens. Nichols also recognized this fact because he wrote that "by these means…she made herself dear and acceptable to them [Londoners]."[91]

This particular St. George's day celebration proves special for another reason; there is no other record of Elizabeth celebrating St. George's Day in this manner during the rest of her reign. Nichols documents the St. George's Day festivities for 1560 as well, and in it he does not mention Elizabeth sailing on the Thames or her interacting with any commoners for that matter. Furthermore, Nichols does not mention St. George's Day

---

[90]John Nichols, *The Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth: Among Which Are Interspersed Other Solemnities, Public Expenditures, And Remarkable Events, During The Reign of That Illustrious Princess, Collected From Original Manuscripts, Scarce Pamphlets, Corporation Records, Parochial Registers, Illustrated With Historical Notes*, 3 vols. (London: John Nichols and Son, 1823), 1: 67.

[91]Ibid.

after 1560 in his voluminous work that chronicles Elizabeth's progresses and processions.[92] Why was St. George's Day 1559 special? This celebration was part of Elizabeth's plan to ingratiate herself with Londoners early in her reign. According to her more-or-less official contemporary historian, Elizabeth's major goals at her accession were: the safety of England, the safety of her subjects, and: "that she might purchase herself Love amongst her Subjects, amongst her Enemies Fear, and Glory amongst all Men."[93]  From the beginning Elizabeth coveted the love and admiration of her subjects. At points this desire seemed to dictate all she did, as one seventeenth-century author wrote, everything Elizabeth "did or said was by her designed to draw upon herself the Good Wills of her Subjects."[94]  Five months after her accession, Elizabeth transformed a holiday steeped in England's past to meet her political needs. Similarly, once the celebration accomplished Elizabeth's ends she let it revert back to tradition.

Later, the nationwide celebration after England's defeat of the Spanish Armada showed that Elizabeth continued to manipulate events, days, and people to achieve her public relations goal. Throughout Elizabeth's reign England shared a tense relationship with Spain, a reflection of Elizabeth's personal relationship with the king of Spain, Philip II, her former brother-in-law. Elizabeth and Philip were former allies turned enemies. Philip had intervened to spare Elizabeth's life during her sister Mary's reign and subsequently expected Elizabeth's gratitude.[95]

---

[92]Ibid., 89.

[93]William Camden, *The History of the Most Renowned and Victorious Princess Elizabeth, Late Queen of England; Containing All the most Important and Remarkable Passages of STATE, both at Home and Abroad (so far as they were linked with English Affairs) during her Long and Prosperous REIGN* (London: Post Office in Convent-Garden, 1688), 32.

[94] Edmund Bohun, Esq., *The Character of Queen Elizabeth. Or, A Full and Clear Account of Her Policies, and the Methods of Her Government both in Church and State. Her Virtues and Defects. Together with The Characters of Her Principal Ministers of State. And the greatest part of the Affairs and Events that Happened in Her Times* (London: Rose and Crown in St. Paul's Church-Yard, 1693), 305.

[95]The nature of Philip and Elizabeth's personal relationship is ambiguous.

After Elizabeth's accession Philip was suggested as a suitor. However, Elizabeth rebuffed Philip's proposals and the relationship soured, mainly for political and religious reasons. In addition to Philip's personal intentions towards Elizabeth were other motives. After Elizabeth acceded she steered England back towards Protestantism, thus angering the Vatican and other Catholic nations. Thus Philip, a Catholic and one of the most powerful men in Europe, saw it as his duty to bring England back into the Catholic fold.[96] Philip's mighty Armada in 1588 was what he intended to use to force England, and Elizabeth, into Catholic submission. However, Philip's plans did not succeed.  England's navy, under the command of Admiral Lord Howard, forced the Armada off its course during the summer of 1588 and the butchered Armada returned on the perilous route around the rough northern seas around Scotland and Ireland to Spain without ever landing troops on English soil as planned.[97]

Elizabeth's behavior during and after the Spanish Armada suggests she was always conscious of her public perception. Elizabeth entrenched near London to wait out the fighting.  In early July she stayed at Richmond, a royal palace on the Thames near London.  However as the situation intensified Elizabeth moved to St. James's Palace in Westminster.  Elizabeth stayed in Westminster for the duration, only leaving to visit English troops at Tilbury on 8 August.[98] At a time when Elizabeth

---

We do know he did help her when he was married to Mary and she was grateful. Rumors of romantic feelings between the two cannot be verified.  For more detail see Jasper Ridley, *Elizabeth I*, 63, 66-67.

[96]Pope Pius V issued the papal bull that excommunicated Elizabeth on 25 February 1570. The Pope also called for Elizabeth to be deposed and gave his support for those who would try to do so.  Now Catholics all across Europe devised assassination plots and plans to overthrow Elizabeth.  Philip proved no different.  For a thorough discussion see Ridley, *Elizabeth I*, 171.

[97]For a more detailed account of  the Spanish Armada see Garrett Mattingly, *The Armada* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1959); Colin Martin and Geoffrey Parker, *The Spanish Armada*, Rev. Ed. (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999); Neil Hanson, *The Confident Hope of a Miracle: The True History of the Spanish Armada* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2005).

[98]Ridley, *Elizabeth I*, 284-285.

normally went on progresses to the countryside, she remained near London because of the crisis that England faced. Elizabeth needed to remain close to her capital city during the tense period in order to stay connected to her centers of power and support.

After the victory, Elizabeth celebrated both privately and publicly. Privately, Elizabeth celebrated with her court which was situated around London most likely at Richmond. Different courtiers staged different celebrations for the queen. The Earl of Essex presented mock battles and jousts while others prepared feasts.[99] Lord Howard of Effingham went to see Elizabeth at court to report on the status of the navy and found it in an atmosphere of revelry.[100] Clearly Elizabeth was enjoying her victory over her old nemesis; although, the celebrations were not exclusive to the royal household.

The entire nation celebrated England's victory. Church leaders called for services of celebration and thanksgiving all over England. From August through December it was not uncommon to partake in several celebratory church services. Clergy preached sermons reiterating God's grace and favor towards England. Also, Spanish booty captured during the battle littered London as visible proof of the spoils of war.[101] Despite the apparent atmosphere of jubilation, Elizabeth acted to unite the country in observance of English victory and provide a public stage on which she could praised. William Camden states that Elizabeth "commanded publick Prayers and Thanksgiving to be used throughout all the Churches of England."[102] A central celebration would be held in London, in which Elizabeth would be the star.

The metropolis prepared for the festivities and the presence of the queen. In a letter to the Livery Companies in London the Lord Mayor, Sir Martin Calthorpe, stressed the city be prepared for Elizabeth's visit. He wrote:

> Where the Queene's moste excellent [Majesty] entendeth to come in her [Majesty's] moste royal [person], on the eighteenth day of the present moneth, from [Somerset] House to Pawles to heare a sermon: Theise therefore shal be to require and charge you, in her [Majesty's] name, that you take especiall care that all persones of the Livery of your saide Companye may be in readynesse againste the said tyme, with theire liverye hoodes, attyred in their best apparel, to wayte and attend her [Majesty's] cominge; and that you and the Livery of youre said Companye receave direction from Mr. Martin, Mr. Allott, Mr. Rowe, Mr. Radcliff, Alderman, and others of the worshipful [Commoners] of this Citie, appointed by me and my brethren the Aldermen, for orderinge and disposinge of all things needful for that service; requiringe you not faile hereof, as you will answere the contrarye at [your peril] [sic].[103]

Clearly, the city, especially the city's leadership, took great pains to accommodate Elizabeth and see that the day went smoothly. In this letter the Lord Mayor's respect for the queen is apparent from the orders he gives the Livery Companies. The Mayor directs the companies to be dressed in their best and accompany the queen; moreover, he warns them that if they shrink from

---

[99]Hanson, *The Confident Hope of a Miracle*, 383.

[100]Martin and Parker, *The Spanish Armada*, 236.

[101]Nichols, *The Processes, Procession, and Magnificent Festivities, of King James the First*, 2:537.

[102]Camden, *The History of the Most Renowned and Victorious Princess Elizabeth*, 418.

[103]Ibid., 537-538. Elizabeth was staying at Somerset House which is located on the Strand and is technically in Westminster. However, since she was set to progress through London to St. Paul's this information is pertinent. Somerset House was built between 1547 and 1550 for Lord Protector Somerset. Elizabeth received the residence in 1552 in exchange for Durham House. Elizabeth rarely stayed at Somerset. Nevertheless it was from Somerset that Elizabeth departed to meet her sister Mary on 3 August 1555 to accompany Mary into London. In 1558 Elizabeth returned part of the residence to Edward Seymour (the Protector's nephew) and other parts of the home served as meeting places for her council. After 1558 Elizabeth only stayed at Somerset for a few days at a time, usually before she left for a summer progress. Ben Weinreb and Christopher Hibbert, eds., *The London Encyclopedia* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1983), 795-796.

their duties it would be at their "peril."[104]  A visit by Elizabeth was so important the Lord Mayor wanted to leave nothing to chance and reminded the companies not to disappoint him or the city. From the Mayor's letter it is clear that along with the great amount of affection the city leaders held for Elizabeth there was an equal measure of respect. Similarly, it is clear that the Mayor, and city, took this event seriously; hence the stern warning given to the Livery Companies of the consequences if they should have failed at their tasks. Besides stressing the preparedness of the Livery Companies the Lord Mayor alluded to the atmosphere and affection that could be expected that day. He mentions that the several of the people in charge of the festivities were "worshipfull [Commoners] of this Citie."[105]  The feelings of at least some of the people were evident to the Lord Mayor. Were these few leaders representative of the greater populace? Taking into account Elizabeth's earlier interactions with London and the current mood of the nation, it seems likely the majority of London would be "worshipful" towards Elizabeth.

The day of thanksgiving and celebration was initially scheduled for mid-November.[106] This was so the city could celebrate both the anniversary of Elizabeth's accession and the victory over the Armada. However, for reasons unknown, Elizabeth did not go to London that day.  Instead the celebration was rescheduled for Sunday 24 November.[107] One can assume Elizabeth did not want a double celebration. If she celebrated both her accession and victory on the same day another opportunity for public festivities about her accession day would

---

[104]Ibid.

[105]Ibid.

[106]The date for the initial date for the procession and service is disputed. Some sources claim the date to be the 17th others the 18th.

[107]This date is also disputed.  Some sources say the procession and service were held on 4 December, some claim the 29 November.  However the 24 November is the date most often claimed as the day the celebration took place.

be lost.  By pushing the thanksgiving celebration back one week Elizabeth allowed Londoners to double their celebrations.[108]

Elizabeth's procession to St. Paul's on 24 November was no ordinary procession; Elizabeth used it to demonstrate her power and majesty. There are many similarities between this procession and Elizabeth's coronation procession. Perhaps Elizabeth was trying to recapture the magic of her first days on the throne. Records state Elizabeth processed "in Triumph" and "went with a very gallant Train of Noblemen through the Streets of *London*, which were all hung with blew Cloath."[109]  Like her coronation procession, Elizabeth was taken through the city in a horse-drawn chariot.  There were also other parallels to the coronation procession. For example, Elizabeth received several gifts while riding through London.  The city leadership gave her a fine jewel set in gold, as well as a book entitled *The Light of Britaine*, and a scepter.[110] Each of these gifts can show how Londoners felt about their queen or, better yet, how Elizabeth wanted them to feel. The Crown was undoubtedly involved the preparations for this celebration, as it was for all others. The jewel is a gift fit for royalty; it shows Elizabeth was worth all that London could bestow on her. There was undoubtedly symbolism in giving Elizabeth a book entitled *The Light Of Britayne* written by Henry Lyte.  The book chronicles the origins of Britain combining both reality and mythology. Lyte praises the mythic founders of Britain and likens Elizabeth to her mythic forbearers. In the opening Lyte describes Elizabeth as "the Phenix of the worlde:

---

[108]Even though Elizabeth was absent from London on 17 November does not mean celebrations ceased. Indeed, by this time in Elizabeth's reign her Accession Day or the Queen's Day had been transformed into a national holiday. All over England, and in London particularly, people lit bonfires, rang bells, and celebrated late into the night.  John A. Wagner, *Historical Dictionary of the Elizabethan World: Britain, Ireland, Europe, and America* (Phoenix: Oryx Press, 1999), 3.

[109]Camden, *The History of the Most Renowned and Victorious Princess Elizabeth,* 418. Author's italics and capitalization.

[110]Nichols, *The Processes, Procession, and Magnificent Festivities, of King James the First*, 2:539.

the Angell of Englande…the chast Diana of Calydonia."[111] The author and city must have believed Elizabeth to be the nations light, a high distinction.  Finally, the scepter is a symbol of royal authority. The Lord Mayor was symbolically giving Elizabeth authority of the city that day. And, of course, the streets of London were lined with people. Along with the Livery Companies, dressed in their finest attire, commoners flocked to see Elizabeth and join her in the celebration.[112] Besides gifts the city also decorated for the occasion, like the days leading up to the festivities, the city was bedecked in Spanish booty.  Camden wrote that even St. Paul's was adorned with battle paraphernalia; he documented that "banners taken from the Enemy were hung up to be seen."[113]

Once Elizabeth arrived at St. Paul's she was met by the Bishop of London and the clergy.  The queen did not hesitate to show God, and the people, her gratitude.  Elizabeth, in the plain sight of the crowd, knelt on the outside steps of St. Paul's and "made her heartie prayers unto God."[114] Elizabeth's prayers were no doubt genuine but it is apparent from her actions she had not lost her knack for public performance. The service consisted of a time of thanksgiving, a sermon, and recognition of Admiral Lord Howard and the men who fought valiantly for England. During the service Elizabeth supposedly conferred many honors on Howard and his men.[115] This last point has been often refuted.  Some scholars argue that the sailors were not recognized or were only given token recognition.  These scholars maintain that the celebration was nothing but propaganda used by Elizabeth to enhance her own public image.[116] As we have

seen public relations was always in the forefront of Elizabeth's mind so this not necessarily an erroneous claim.

After the service, Elizabeth attended a dinner at the Bishop's Palace in Lambeth.[117] Then, after dinner, she processed back through London to Somerset House. By this time it was night, so Elizabeth's way was lined with torches.[118] The day of thanksgiving and celebration was indeed an all day affair. Undoubtedly, this church service and procession were celebratory, but also propagandistic in nature.  Elizabeth wanted to display not only England's victory, but her power and majesty. Paradoxically she also wanted Londoners to see her humbled and gracious. This accounts for her public actions on the outside steps of St. Paul's.  Elizabeth wanted to be seen as the perfect prince. A perfect prince was powerful and majestic as well as humble and thankful.  Even though Elizabeth had strived to establish religious uniformity in England, religious divisions still remained.  By her acknowledging God's grace as she did she pushed divisions aside and presented what united England, herself and God's provision and protection.  Furthermore Elizabeth was able to interact with London's elite, the city leaders and clergy, while the common populace watched with admiration.  Hence, Elizabeth was able to satisfy both groups.

How did her subjects respond to her performance? The people's reaction was probably just what Elizabeth anticipated. One contemporary account stated that Elizabeth's actions were "observed by her Subjects with the highest Expressions of Joy and Gratitude towards God, and of Loyalty and Affection towards her…."[119] London's admiration for their queen was undiminished. Actually, Elizabeth went up in the people's

---

[111]Henry Lyte, *The Light Of Britayne: A Record of the honorable Originall & Antiquitie of Britaine* (London: J. Charlewood, 1588), A3.

[112]Ibid.

[113]Camden, *The History of the Most Renowned and Victorious Princess Elizabeth*, 418.

[114]Nichols, *The Processes, Procession, and Magnificent Festivities, of King James the First*, 2:539.

[115]Camden, *The History of the Most Renowned and Victorious Princess Elizabeth*, 418.

[116]See Hanson, *The Confident Hope of a Miracle*, 386.

---

[117]Lambeth is and was a borough in the Greater London area surrounded by Southwark on the East and Wandsworth on the West. Weinreb and Hibbert, 441-442.

[118]Nichols, *The Processes, Procession, and Magnificent Festivities, of King James the First*, 2:539. This in fact became a tradition throughout the rest of Elizabeth's reign. Lit torches or beacons came to represent England's defeat of the Spanish Armada, and subsequently, Protestantism triumphing over Catholicism.

[119]Bohun, *The Character of Queen Elizabeth*, 277.

estimation. After steering the country through the tensions with Spain and facing the enemy head on, Elizabeth "was now in the height of all her Glory both at Home and Abroad."[120] Not surprisingly, Elizabeth used a very public situation and later a public celebration to interact with both London's elite and commoners and it was definitely to her benefit. Her popularity soared as never before.

How did Mary and James perform in times of national crisis? Did they rally Londoners to their cause? Did they use the city as a stage to perform, or publicly display their power and dedication? If they did, were their means of garnering support as effective as Elizabeth's? Both Mary and James faced moments of extreme national crisis. As we will see, however, neither Mary nor James resorted to the level of public performance or interaction as Elizabeth. Likewise, neither received the same reception from the people or even used what praise they did receive to their advantage later in their reigns.

Mary faced a situation similar to Elizabeth's early in her reign. On 16 January 1554 Mary's marriage contract was final. She was now pledged to marry Philip of Spain. However, given the religious divisions of this newly re-Catholicized country, there were many people who did not want to see the queen marry a Catholic and give birth to a Catholic heir. Therefore, already unhappy with the country's present circumstances and convinced the future had to be different, several conspirators schemed to thwart the marriage and even take Mary's throne. One of the conspirators was Sir Thomas Wyatt.[121]

The conspirators planned a wide-spread rebellion. They plotted an uprising in the Welsch Marches and Southern England. However, Wyatt was the only one who was able to muster men for a revolt. Wyatt, accompanied with nearly three thousand men rebelled against Mary's regime on 24 January

1554.[122] Wyatt and his troops were in Kent, a county just southwest of London. Hence Mary and her capital city were under a serious threat. In fact, Kent had been a hotbed of discontent with the religious settlement and Mary's prospective marriage.[123] Thus the rebellion took hold and panic struck through London and the royal court. Mary remained near London throughout the crisis. She stayed at Whitehall in Westminster, near her counselors and government officials.

Mary did not stay idle. London was sympathetic towards Protestantism and the queen worried the rebels' cause would take hold in the metropolis. Yet Mary did not just feel worry for the city, she was also suspicious. One admittedly later account of the rebellion states that Mary was "mistrustful of the Londoners" because they in "no ways favoured Popery."[124] However, Mary had to act because if she lost London her throne would be in the greatest peril. Hence Mary went to London on 1 February to rally support. She did so by speaking to the city leadership and Livery Companies at Guildhall. There is no detailed account of how Mary went to London. One source states she "came attended by several of the Nobility"; nonetheless, given the time and situation, Mary most likely did not travel to London with any elements of grandeur.[125]

In her speech, Mary condemned the rebels and contended that the revolt was not simply against her marriage, but that the rebels desired to see her dead. Mary then strove to defend her marriage. She appealed to the crowd by saying she had spent her whole life as a virgin and it was Parliament that wanted her to marry. Mary also stated that she would remain single if that is what her government wanted. Finally, she ended the speech by asking the people to "persist therefore in your Loyal

---

[120]Ibid., 277-278.

[121] Prescott, *Mary Tudor*, 234-235. Some have accused Wyatt of also wanting to kill Mary. It seems the queen herself believed this rumor to be true; however, Wyatt denied it.

[122]World History at KMLA accessed at http://www.zum.de/hkmla/ military/16cen/wyatt1554.html. Posted on 17 November 2004, accessed on 2 March 2006.

[123]Prescott, *Mary Tudor*, 236.

[124]Anon, *The History of the life, bloody reign, and death of Queen Mary, eldest daughter to H.8* (London: Black Swan, 1682), 66.

[125]Ibid.

Resolution, and assist us in Executing our Revenge upon these Traytors….”[126] Immediately following the speech Mary returned to Whitehall, there is no record of her interacting with the people beyond the speech. Moreover, the sources do not mention the presence of ordinary Londoner at the speech.  Since one had to be a member of a Livery to be a citizen or freeman one can assume that there were many Londoners not present for Mary's speech. Francis Bacon did write that Mary "confirmed the minds of the Citizens."[127] Unfortunately we do not know how many citizens Mary spoke to and consequently convinced.

Likewise, the documents do not explicitly state Londoners' reaction to Mary's speech and presence in the metropolis. Again referring to Bacon, his wording that Mary "confirmed the minds of the Citizens" is the only description historians have of London's reaction to Mary.[128]  Nonetheless, one must look to the outcome of the situation in order to gauge the city's response. After the speech, the city, at Mary's command, fortified London Bridge and thus refused Wyatt and his men entrance. Next Wyatt tried to march around London in order to gain entry; however, he was again turned away. Wyatt eventually surrendered on 4 February, having never been able to take London.[129] Therefore, one must conclude that Mary's actions during this crisis proved effective; she did, after all, keep her throne.

The atmosphere in London after Wyatt's rebellion is unknown.  Apparently there was no victory parade, the spoils of battle were not displayed, and Mary received no gifts. Although London did not openly support Wyatt's Rebellion, there is a sense that the city did not wholeheartedly support Mary either. There was not a proliferation of literature to support Mary after

the crisis as there was for Elizabeth after the Armada.[130]  Clearly Londoners did not and would not support the usurpation of the throne.  London had supported Mary's claim to rule over that of Jane Grey's. The fact that Mary was a daughter of Henry VIII and sister of Edward VI evoked loyalty even if citizens did not agree with her religious reforms.  Mary must have been aware of this because she referenced her lineage in her speech at Guildhall.  She said to the people "you…unanimously admit our Government, decerning us the undoubted Successor to our Royal Father, and Royal Brother, whom you gratefully did acknowledge."[131]  Mary worked for the support of her people in a way that was different than Elizabeth. Elizabeth craved the spotlight and was always looking for ways to interact with the people. The few times Elizabeth's throne was in jeopardy she went to public extremes to maintain her hold on it.

Moreover, Elizabeth usually made compromises so not to upset a large contingent of people and maintain her popularity. On the other hand Mary stubbornly found herself constantly battling for the people's affection.  Mary's actions on the throne, re-establishing Catholicism, met fierce opposition. Once, Londoners strung a cat from Cheapside Cross.  The cat was clothed like a monk and clutched a communion wafer between its feet. This was a blatant affront to Mary's regime and her religious reforms. And Mary took it seriously.  She tried to hunt the people down.[132] Mary's tactics did not set well with the people. Both queens endured serious crises that risked their

---

[126]Ibid., 67-68.

[127] Francis Bacon, *The history of the reigns of Henry VII, Henry VIII, Edward VI, and Queen Mary the first written by the Right Honourable Francis Lord Verulam, Viscount St. Alban; the other three by the Right Honourable and Right Reverend Father in God, Francis Godwyn, Lord Bishop of Hereford* (London: W.G., 1676), 172.

[128]Ibid.

[129]Ibid., 172-173.

---

[130]Documents that came out after the Armada in defense of Elizabeth and England include: William Cecil, Baron Burghley, *The Copie Of A Letter Sent Out of England To Don Bernardin Mendoza Ambassadour in France For the King of Spaine, declaring the state of England contrary to the opinion of Don Bernardin, and of all his partisans Spaniards and others* (London: I. Vautrollier, 1588); and  I.L., *A n Answer To The Untruthes, Published And Printed In Spaine, In Glorie Of Their Supposed Victorie atchieved against our English Navie, and the Right Honorable Charles Lord Howard, Lord high Admiral of England, and Sir Francis Drake, and the rest of the Nobles and Gentlemen Captaines, and Soldiers of our said Navie* (London: Iohn Iackson, 1589).

[131]Anon, 68.

[132]Anon, 117.

thrones. Although both survived, one did so amidst a tense atmosphere while the other in an air of jubilation.

James also faced crises in his reign. The time between November 1605 and March 1606 proved especially trying. During these four months James endured a failed attempt on his life as well as rumors he was dead. However, James did not use these times to increase his public image. Although London did show some affection for him, he certainly did not encourage it.

The first crisis James faced in his reign came on 5 November 1605. Parliament was scheduled to meet and have its formal opening. Keeping with tradition, James and his family were set to attend. Part of James's formal duties was to give a speech on this occasion. However Parliament did not meet that day. A plot was discovered to blow up the Parliament building with the intent of killing all present including James and his family. Catholic dissidents who wanted religious toleration had planned the scheme.[133] The conspirators believed James would grant toleration and were upset when he did not. In fact James did the opposite; he put more restrictions on Catholics. Thus the Gunpowder Plot, as it came to be known, was an open attack on James, his royal authority, and his throne.

London was ecstatic to learn the plan had been thwarted. That night bonfires illumined London's night sky. Though the people did seem happy their monarch was safe, the celebration was not for James. Instead Londoners thanked God for his protection from Catholicism. A contemporary document noted that the "the people" were "praising God for His mercy, and wishing that the day may for ever be held a festival."[134] Primarily this appears to be a celebration amongst the local Londoners. There is no reference to the king or courtiers being present. James had a distaste for public appearances. Granted

he may have been wary of going out in public since his life had just been threatened. Nevertheless, he did not make use of the situation. He did not process through town nor in any way engage the people; hence, when the people wanted to celebrate, they honored God not their king. This is a striking difference to Elizabeth's actions. After she had survived a threat she rejoiced with her people. She made herself visible and created a reason for interaction. Consequently, Londoners expressed thanks to God and love for Elizabeth. James did none of this and Londoners simply thanked God.

James faced another crisis on 22 March 1606. While James was in the country town of Woking, approximately twenty miles west of London, a rumor spread that James had been assassinated. Quickly all of London feared their king was dead. Immediately the city went into defense mode. The gates were secured and the Lord Mayor ordered all "traind souldiers…to reapire unto their knowne London Captaines [sic]."[135] The city anticipated trouble and was ready to defend itself. The state of panic lasted for several hours until it was confirmed by members of the Court that James was indeed alive. However, all was not settled. London was still in an uproar. To ease tensions and fears James eventually went to London to prove to the people he was in fact alive. When entering the city James was met by the Lord Mayor, city officials, members of Parliament, and "thousands of the people flocking that way."[136] Clearly the people were happy to see their king alive and well. But how would James react to the city's affection?

The next day, being Sunday, James went to church. On his way he was greeted by exuberant Londoners. They lined the king's way and rejoiced at seeing James.[137] Although the people showed great affection towards James he did not seek out more. He did nothing out of the ordinary that day, but went simply to

[133]For a more detailed account of the Gunpowder Plot see Nichols, *The Processes, Procession, and Magnificent Festivities, of King James the First*, 1:577-588; G.B. Harrison, *A Jacobean Journal: Being a Record Of Those Things Most Talked Of During The Years 1603 – 1606* (London: Gordon Routledge & Sons, 1946), 240 – 243.

[134]Harrison, *A Jacobean Journal*, 243.

[135] Nichols, *The Processes, Procession, and Magnificent Festivities, of King James the First*, 2:39.

[136]Harrison, *A Jacobean Journal*, 287.

[137]Ibid.

church. It was the people who sought him out to celebrate his safety and wellbeing. Unlike Elizabeth James did not embrace or provoke the public's affection. For instance, in contrast to Elizabeth, James did not pray on the steps outside St. Paul's. The proof of James's dislike of and ineptitude at public appearances lie in what happened to James the next day.

James's accession to the throne on 24 March might have become a day of jubilation and celebration. This was not the case. James observed his accession day by attending the scheduled events. However, he did not once engage the people. John Nichols reported that the day "passed with ordinary solemnities."[138] Also, that James spent the day *present but unseen*."[139] One day after the people greeted James with rejoicing, he avoided any kind of contact with them. James did nothing to further his public image, nor his relationship with London. In the following years of his reign, Nichols reported nothing concerning the common Londoners' actions that day. Perhaps there was nothing special to report. How might Elizabeth have handled the situation? Knowing her attitude and the goals of her reign, she would not have passed up an opportunity to intermix with the city. Elizabeth usually returned from her country progresses in November to spend "her Winter in London in the procuring the safety of her People."[140] One assumes that, since she was usually in London for her accession, she would have made the occasion as celebratory as possible and utilize the already present joy. This is the marked differenced between her and James. Elizabeth strategically utilized opportunities to interact with her people and later died as one of England's most beloved monarchs. James did not employ the same public relations methods and thus has not reached the level of Elizabeth's distinction.

---

[138]Nichols, *The Processes, Procession, and Magnificent Festivities, of King James the First*, 2: 43.

[139]Ibid. Author's Italics.

[140]Bohun, *The Character of Queen Elizabeth*, 350.

It seems public relations or establishing a rapport with subjects was an afterthought to Mary and James. One can glean from evidence that their personal agendas came first and public relations were not part of that agenda. Or, perhaps, these two did not believe it to be a monarch's role to interact with its subjects. Elizabeth could not be more different, yet still the same. Her public image and perception were always in the forefront of her mind. She made use of opportunities to increase or strengthen her popularity amongst her subjects. Though, Elizabeth did this in order to strengthen her hold on power and thus secure her personal agenda. Elizabeth realized that a monarch's greatest asset was public approval. Consequently, Elizabeth centered most of her public activity in and around London. This is where Elizabeth could access a large concentration of her people; thus, she could receive massive exposure for one single event. There were times in both Mary's and James's reigns they sought London's affection, although the times were less frequent. And, the results of Mary and James's efforts were not met with the same reaction. On the other hand, Elizabeth always seemed to be ready to embrace the people and their metropolis. Whether at annual St. George's Day festivities or at a national celebration Elizabeth played to her audience and subsequently received the people's affection and loyalty. Mary and James may have had the respect of Londoners, but Elizabeth held their hearts. This fact has assured Elizabeth a place among the most esteemed and beloved British monarchs.

### Conclusion: Elizabeth's London Interactions and Her Public Relations Goals

Clearly the events on 10 July 1559 were not unusual to Elizabeth's reign. We have seen how Elizabeth I manipulated the urban sphere as well as her public relations abilities. Compared to her predecessor and successor Elizabeth used the urban sphere, London, uniquely and to her advantage. She seized opportunities to bond with the people of the metropolis. Furthermore when Elizabeth was in London she was active and intentional. She did not let her subjects do all the work. Rather

she made great efforts to encourage the crowds. Whether by means such as orchestrating the entire event, or simply raising her hands or smiling, Elizabeth made sure Londoners paid proper respect to their queen. Similarly, Elizabeth conveyed her own feelings toward the city and citizens. In doing so, she established a bond with Londoners, both elite and commoner, that endured throughout her reign and, subsequently, provided her stability in the political, diplomatic, and religious realms. These London interactions are not Elizabeth's sole public relations agenda and experiences; however, I argue that these interactions proved more important and a better tool to gauge Elizabeth's public goals and savvy. If one just looks at Elizabeth's country progresses and declares, "nothing did more to spread and enrich the cult of the queen" without considering the enormous strides Elizabeth made in the urban sphere, one grossly underestimates Elizabeth's intentions and ultimate brilliance.[141]

In establishing this argument I have used several sixteenth century pamphlets: compiled shortly after the events they covered. The value in sources like these is their detail, not their causal explanations. It is in the sources printed long after these events that controversy arises as to dates and locations. Value lost in sources such as these are objectivity and perspective. The authors were undoubtedly influenced just like everyone else by Elizabeth's theatrics in London. Nonetheless, further steps could be taken in this study if one examines who these authors were. Were they Elizabeth's pawns? Moreover, this study could be taken further if one examines the letters, diaries, and papers, of the elites of London that Elizabeth came in contact with. How did these men perceive and describe Elizabeth when she was not around. These are just a few examples how this study could be broadened.

Nevertheless, this work has sought to uncover Elizabeth's brilliance. We have learned that from the first weeks of Elizabeth's reign she set out to bewitch London. From her

formal entry into the city (28 November 1558) and subsequent coronation procession (14 January 1559) through London we see Elizabeth spared no cost to make London her city. Even more, we find Elizabeth continually courting London. Up to the last years of her reign Elizabeth saw the importance of having solid support in the metropolis. Hence, we see her using public spectacle early (St. George's Day 1559), as well as late into her reign (victory celebrations in 1588) to sure up support and further her public image. In doing this Elizabeth set herself apart as a monarch.

There are similarities between Elizabeth's rural and urban interactions. For instance the entertainments were usually similar and included pageants, speeches, and plays. Moreover, Elizabeth always arrived with great pomp and accompanied by a large train of courtiers. Lastly, whether in an urban or rural setting, Elizabeth found herself greeted by large crowds and in magnificent fashion. However, despite the parallels between the rural and urban interactions, the latter prove more indicative of Elizabeth's overall public relations goals and actions. And furthermore, show Elizabeth innovations in the urban sphere, resulting in making the metropolis monarchical.

While in London, both Elizabeth and the people actively participated in public spectacle. Nobody was relegated to the role of spectator. Even more, when in London Elizabeth intermingled with all kinds of people. Both elites and commoners had access to the queen. In addition, when Elizabeth went on progresses she was the guest of one specific noble. When Elizabeth visited London she was considered the guest of the city. Therefore, all the people could collectively claim to be the queen's host. Perhaps the best indicator of the urban sphere being more valuable in evaluating Elizabeth's public savvy was her intentions. When examined, Elizabeth's purpose becomes clear. We can plainly see she was there to accomplish the initial aim of her reign to "purchase herself Love amongst her Subjects."[142] Elizabeth achieved her goal in London. Elizabeth I

---

[141] Erickson, *The First Elizabeth*, 274.

[142] William Camden, *The History of the Most Renowned and Victorious Princess*

made London the primary stage for royal spectacle and its people the primary players. Indeed, before her reign monarchs and London seemed mere acquaintances; however after Elizabeth's reign, the two were old friends.

---

## POLITICS OF HISTORY AND MEMORY: THE RUSSIAN RAPE OF GERMANY IN BERLIN, 1945

**Krishna Ignalaga Thomas**

The marching of the Russian Red Army into eastern Germany in the spring of 1945, at the close of World War II, was full of promise and hope, a promise of a new era of peace in Europe and an end to political isolation and economic deprivation at home. In 1994, almost half a century later, the return of the Soviet troops to the motherland signaled the surprising collapse of the Soviet Union and ultimately, the end of Soviet occupation and a reunified Germany. At the same time, however, the Russians also left behind them a legacy of resentment and anger. Much academic scholarship has focused on the years of Soviet occupation, 1945-49, as being the most brutal on the Germans in the Eastern Zone than their counterparts in the West. The plight of the German women raped by Soviet soldiers during this difficult period is of vital importance in discussing sexual violence in Europe, and in understanding the interesting interplay of history and public memory. The extent of German-inflicted destruction and atrocities in Europe and the corresponding hostility of Soviet troops need not and cannot be repeated within the scope of this paper. However, it is still necessary to examine the issue of these women within the context of World War II, of European lingering ideals of manhood and military service, as well as debates in recent scholarship that have focused on Germans being victims as well as victimizers.

Indeed, the issues underlying the rape incidents stir up the question of military responsibility, transforming into one of sexual slavery based on race, class, and ultimately, gender. While one cannot precisely determine the numbers of women raped and killed, estimates of rape victims from two of Berlin's

---

*Krishna Ignalaga Thomas is a graduate student in History and a member of Phi Alpha Theta. She wrote this paper for Dr. Sace Elder in History 4845, Women in Modern Europe, in the Spring of 2006.*

major hospitals ranged from 95,000 to 130,000; one physician estimated that out of 100,000 women raped in Berlin alone, 10,000 died as a result, with a large majority committing suicide.[1] With the sheer velocity of women raped by Soviet troops, it is incredible to discover its neglect by earlier seminal works, such as that by John Erickson, who wrote *Road to Berlin*, and even William L. Shirer of *Rise and Fall of the Third Reich*. At the same time, the opening of the Russian State Military Archives and the Central Archive of the Ministry of Defense, a whole array of primary source material and other information media are now open for scholars to understand this contest of brutality from first, the German soldiers and then the repatriating Soviet troops.

Natalya Gesse, a Soviet war correspondent, gave a first-hand estimation of Red Army's activities, and stated that "The Russian soldiers were raping every German female from eight to eighty. It was an army of rapists."[2] While my initial interest is on the Soviet-induced rapes, I will draw on the creative approaches of many scholars to highlight the issue of rape from a different perspective – that of Memory. Indeed, post-war Germany's relation to its past is undeniably filled with tension, and the issue of raped German women is one of a number of World War II legacies through which Germany asserts its victimization. In a larger context on the specific example of post-war Germany, there is an interesting dichotomy between the struggle to forget war aggressiveness and the need to remember it, as this very justifiable issue of mass rape dictates.

Many of the questions that I grapple with are universal ones. Yet the debate over the viability of Germany as a victim or a victimizer has its own peculiar inflections within the German context. The centrality of the rape issue in this contest over public memory has tied questions of war guilt to the problem of

---

[1]Antony Beevor, "Red Army Raped Every German Woman, Says Author," interview by Dave Eberhart, *NewsMax*, (May 2, 2002), Accessed March 26,2006 from http://www.newsmax.com/archives/ articles/2002/5/2/80440.shtml.
[2]Ibid.

sexual violence in Europe as well as issues of militarized concepts of manhood. With the emergence of a German version of historical revisionism, the rape issue has become a contest of beliefs about war responsibility and ultimately, the construction of public memory.

Several questions drive this study: first, why was rape used as method of revenge for German-induced atrocities? Second, is it truly possible to make silenced voices speak? How is the nation-state involved in this history? Who is to be held accountable for the difficult legacy of the war? How should war atrocities, on both sides, be represented, recognized and remembered? How and can we reconcile the difference between official and oppositional versions of history in the context of the contemporary politics of the rape controversy? In this paper, I propose to show that the issue of rape by Soviet soldiers has a dramatic place in this debate of national memory in Germany, and plays a role in how public memory of Germans as victims or victimizers is constructed. Furthermore, these rapes can also be seen as touching on women's traditional and symbolic roles of mother, moral guide and body politic.

### Rape and Musculinity

It is an immense undertaking to research and summarize the vast amount of significant scholarship on the use of rape in military campaigns as a strategy, both intentional and unintentional, to victimize a populace. Historically, the rape of women in war is relatively invisible, or comes to light only as part of war-diplomacy, on questions of the victor's aggressiveness or the loser's innocence. Indeed, military histories are largely silent on the issue of rape, even where mass rape and forced prostitution has been systematic and militarily endorsed, as in the case of Korean comfort women, victims of Japanese aggression in World War II.

In her analysis on the use of rape during wartime, Ruth Seifert draws tentative conclusions about wartime rape as a symbolic expression of the humiliation of the male opponent. Drawing from the traditional European concepts of the male as

the head of the household, and the protector and provider of wife and family, Seifert contends that the rape of women additionally carried significant messages for their absent 'protectors,' that their masculinity was wounded and they were judged incompetent. In brief, the abuse of their women is seen as compromising their masculinity and as such, can be seen as a direct attack on them, and not the violation of women. Seifert emphasizes that this elevation of masculinity is an integral part of military service, at least in the European context, stating that:

> The military profession provides subjective identities that are connected to ideas of masculinity in different ways depending on the country and that have connotations of power and dominance as well as eroticism and sexuality.[3]

Furthermore, symbolism plays a dynamic role, characterized by a mixture of violence with eroticism and sexuality, especially in language. Some examples include how the Germans' invasion of Belgium at the beginning of World War I was labeled the "rape of Belgium", while a weapon is also referred to as "a soldier's bride." As such, there is a distinct connection between sexual symbolism and militarized masculinity. Finally, perhaps one of the most disturbing elements of war is the total destruction of an opposing culture. With such an ideology in mind, it is no wonder that women are seen as tactical objectives, in their traditional roles as mothers and perpetuators of culture and family structure. There is a distinct focus on how the female body serves as a symbolic representation of the social body, of the community, and ultimately of the nation. As such, "the violence inflicted on women is aimed at the physical and personal integrity of a group,"[4] and can be seen as the symbolic rape of the social body.

---

[3]Ruth Seifert, "War and Rape: A Preliminary Analysis," *Mass Rape: The War Against Women in Bosnia-Herzegovina*, ed. Alexandra Stiglmayer (Lincoln, NB and London: University of Nebraska Press, 1994), 60.

[4]Ibid., 63.

In the context of European, and more specifically, the Third Reich's emphasis on 'militarized masculinity', Annette Timm highlights the functionalization of male and female sexuality for the war effort. Indeed, sexual gratification, whether through the legal and widely-accepted family, or even illegal through the use of prostitutes, was equated with masculine power in Germany, and even in Italy. Increased vigor in combat and male vitality was seen a direct consequence of sexual gratification.[5] And while Timm frames this discussion of masculine vitality within the context of achieving the racial state, it is also important to realize that such concepts of militarized masculinity transcended the Third Reich's pro-natalist policies to the Soviet Union itself.

As James Messerschmidt points out, there is an interesting interplay between nationalism, militarism and patriarchal masculinity in Stalinist Soviet society. With the emphasis on rapid industrialization and modernization, traditional notions of women as mothers and workers were integral in reinforcing patriarchal gender relations, resulting in the view that the Soviet Red Army was the hyper-masculine institution and that membership in this institution significantly increased nationalism. Indeed, Messerschmidt emphasized how the mass rape committed by Soviet soldiers were a function "to establish masculine domination over Other Women, Other Men and Other Nation…[symbolizing] the defeat of entire Nazi nation by the masculine Red Army solider-hero."[6] Accordingly, mass rape, though not a strategic policy of the Soviet Army, functioned as "an unofficial masculine maneuver to frighten and intimidate the Berlin civilian population into complying with the wishes and demands of its Soviet occupiers."[7]

---

[5]Annette F. Timm, "Sex With A Purpose: Prostitution, Venereal Disease and Militarized Masculinity in the Third Reich," *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 1, no. 1, (2002),: 224.

[6]James W. Messerschmidt, "The Forgotten Victims of WWII: Masculinities and Rape in Berlin, 1945," Forthcoming in *Violence Against Women*, 12, no. 7 (July 2006); accessed March 2, 2006, from http://www.usm.maine.edu /crm/faculty/ jim/raphael/htm

[7]Ibid.

### Breaking the Silence: *Schändung*[8] of German Women

*A Woman in Berlin* is the diary of a woman, who recounts the mass rape and wonton chaos in the Soviet occupation of Berlin in 1945. Recalling statistics cited earlier from Antony Beevor, 130,000 women, of all ages and ethnicities were raped and sexually victimized by Red Army soldiers. As Messerschmidt points out, this diary is replete with examples of "degradation, humiliation and domination as part and parcel of physically violent Soviet rape."[9] A shocking account of mass rape during the fall of Berlin in 1945, the diary is the work of as yet unnamed thirty-four year journalist, first published in Germany in 1954, and translated into English the following year, was quickly condemned by German readers, for "besmirching the honor of German women"[10] and went out of press. Indeed, perhaps the most pressing issue in this diary is not just the violent domination and devaluation of German women, but also the choices that women had to make in order to survive.

Describing herself as "a pale-faced blonde always dressed in the same winter coat," the authoress describes the brutal nature of the Soviet rapes, especially aimed at devaluing and humiliating German women. She describes the plight of a nineteen-year old Gerti, who:

> [Was] hauled out of the basement into a stranger's apartment on the first floor, [thrown] on a sofa and [three Russians] had their way with her – first one after the other, then in no particular order…. They rummaged through the kitchen, but all the found was some marmalade and ersatz coffee…spooned it onto Gerti's hair… sprinkled it generously with ersatz coffee.[11]

A disturbing component of the Soviet mass rapes was the rape of Jewish women, of women who had suffered both from the Nazi regime as well as the Soviet occupation. Detailing how one Jewish couple, who had been in hiding for months, had finally emerged from a basement, seeing the Soviet troops as their liberators, the authoress described how with the husband fatally wounded by a gun-shot, his wife was "[taken] into the hallway, three men on top of her, as she kept howling and screaming, "But I'm Jewish, I'm Jewish.""[12]

A bone of contention for German readers is how the authoress details various individual strategies that German women use to survive the initial harrowing days of rape and pillage. One of these was the informal agreements with Soviet soldiers and officers, also known as 'Ivans' for protection from other soldiers. The authoress herself is the victim of a brutal assault:

> One of them grabs hold of me and shoves me into the front room…suddenly his finger is on my mouth, reeking of horse and tobacco…. A stranger's hand expertly pulling apart my jaws…. Then with great deliberation, he drops a gob of gathered spit into my mouth…. I'm numb. Not with disgust, only cold. My spine is frozen: icy, dizzy shudders around the back of my head…. I stand up—dizzy, nauseated. My ragged clothes tumble to my feet. I stumble through the hall…into the bathroom. I throw up. My face green in the mirror, my vomit in the basin.[13]

As a result of such a humiliating experience, the authoress declares her intention to seek protection from groups of rapists, clamoring to find "a single wolf to keep away the pack. An officer, as high-ranking as possible, a commandant, a general, whatever I can manage."[14] She finds this "single wolf" in the person of Anatol, who at 200 pounds, will matter more because

---

[8]The use of the noun "*Schändung*" is used to mean rape, but can also mean defilement or desecration.

[9]Messerschmidt, "The Forgotten Victims of WWII: Masculinities and Rape in Berlin, 1945."

[10]Anonymous, *A Woman In Berlin: Eight Weeks in the Conquered City,* (New York: Metropolitan Books, 2005), xv.

[11]Ibid., 225.

---

[12]Ibid., 197.

[13]Ibid., 63-64.

[14]Ibid., 64.

of his size than his rank. For the authoress, this becomes her survival, her crossing of the Russian-German divide, her realization that she can "tell who's truly evil from who is bearable, can picture them as separate human beings, distinguish them as individuals."[15] Through her diary, the authoress also details how "Ivan" (that is, the male Russian soldier) has his rare, touching and human moments, especially when she describes how Russian soldiers spared two German women from rape on account of their little children. She also describes how since Russian troops are farm boys, "used to living close to the earth in homes with only a single floor,"[16] many German women living at on the upper floors of apartment buildings were spared rape.

With no limits on which women were to be raped, the Soviet mass rapes indeed transcended various lines of class and ethnicity, a direct challenge to the masculinity of German men. Indeed, the sexual violence against the German women can be seen as both as emasculation of the German male, as well as a direct attack of the German corporate body. Another crucial element in the diary is the reception of German men to the rapes of their wives, fiancées, mothers and sisters. A German distiller, for example, is stubbornly silent when confronted with the violent rapes of his wife and female employee, "[shrugging] his shoulders, doesn't want to say any more and walks out of the kitchen."[17] The authoress' own fiancé, Gerd, refuses to talk about the *Schändung* and returns her diaries to her. Indeed, by the spring of 1945, the widespread impression was that the women had succumbed too easily to the temptations of the Soviet soldiers. Indeed, as Ernste Stecker states, "A Negro said: 'The German soldiers fought for six years, the German woman for only five minutes!' That's a fact from beginning to end. I was ashamed."[18]

---

[15]Ibid., 77-78.

[16]Ibid., 135.

[17]Ibid., 136.

[18]Robert G. Moeller, *War Stories: The Search for a Usable Past in the Federal Republic of Germany*, (Berkeley, Los Angeles, CA and London: University of

The mass rape of these women was indeed a smear on Communist rhetoric. Alexander Solzhenitsyn, who was also an officer in East Prussia, provides a fitting testimonial to what he witnessed in that region:

*Zweiundzwanizig, Horlingstrasse*
It's not been burned, just looted, rifled.
A moaning, by the walls half muffle:
The mother's wounded, still alive.
The little daughter's on the mattress,
Dead. How many have been on it
A platoon, a company perhaps?
A girl's been turned into a woman.
A woman turned into a corpse…
No point in driving on – eh, fellows?
Unless we leave them some mementos?
Well, now we're getting our revenge, lads.
We've hit him good and hard, the foe![19]

### Reconstructing the National German Memory

Within this essay, it is imperative to provide an overview of this very point of debate in German scholarship, as debates on the German public memory are incredibly intertwined and reflective. While a complete history of the politics of memory in the Federal Republic and in a subsequently unified Germany is not possible in this paper, it is necessary to understand the construction of the public memory within the historical context of the founding traditions of the two Germanys. Jeffrey Herf asserts that the political memory of the Holocaust and crimes of the Nazi era emerged in both German states immediately after 1945, but retained an almost indigenous flavor in each, as a result of both postwar Soviet dictatorship and Western democratic traditions respectively. The politics of Holocaust memory played an important role in the shaping of national

---

California Press, 2003), 67.

[19]Norman N. Naimark, *The Russians in Germany: A History of the Soviet Zone of Occupation, 1945-1949* (Cambridge, MA and London: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press), 73.

memories in both states. For example, while the East German government was not an anti-Semitic regime in any sense that the Nazi was, it still did not "display the kind of warmth or empathy that might be expected from any German government after the Holocaust."[20] At the same time, within West Germany, major parliamentary debates focused on the extension of the statute of limitations on the persecution of crimes of the Nazi era, the trials of death camp personnel, the blunt confessions of major political leaders as well as the legacies of the Nuremburg trials. In the 1980s, however, in the *Historikerstreit*, conservatives aimed to reduce the presence of such discourse from the official West German narrative.[21]

The suppression of the Holocaust memory was a distinct episode in the history of postwar East German efforts to face a Nazi past. Herf emphasizes that as relations with West Germany began to deteriorate, making the two states' public memories incompatible, the Communists focused on the primary role of the Red Army in defeating Nazism, a "vindication of Communist dogma with victory."[22] The Holocaust, with its suffering and unmitigated disaster, just could not fit in the dominant Communist rhetoric. Herf even asserts that the Marxist-Leninist assaults on Western imperialism combined with anti-Western nationalist resentment, even though a disproportionate number of the Jews who had died during the Holocaust had been from Eastern Europe and Russia. Such a disparity is probably even more distinct with the election of East Germany's first democratic government in 1990, after the collapse of the Soviet Union. The link between democracy and discussion of the Holocaust and the Nazi past was immortalized in the April 1990 statement of the East German government, essentially admitting war guilt.

We, the first freely elected parliamentarians of East Germany, admit our responsibility as Germans in East Germany for our history and our future and declare unanimously before the world: Immeasurable suffering was inflicted on the peoples of the world by Germans during the time of National Socialism and racial madness led to genocide, particularly of the Jews in all of European countries, of the people of the Soviet Union, the Polish People and the Gypsy People. Parliament admits joint responsibility on behalf of the people for the humiliation, expulsion and murder of Jewish women, men and children.[23]

Even with unification in the 1990s, there is still much contentious debate on whether Germany itself was a victim of the Nazi party, or where they all Nazi victimizers and aggressors. From the mid-1980s, there has been an argument that the Holocaust alone cannot be the defining moment of twentieth-century German history. As such, much debate has risen on how histories of National Socialism were remarkably inadequate in describing the suffering of the *Germans* themselves, first as soldiers, then as refugees, and finally, as rape victims.

Robert Moeller, a leading historian on the Nazi past, asserts that there a number of perspectives to choose from when dealing with how German public memory about World War II came about. Providing an overview of the historical debates on German scholarship, Moeller also highlights the opposing view that any revisionist attempt would be akin to:

apologia and the false equation of German suffering with the crimes committed by Germans. They feared a tendency toward *Aufrechnung*—a reckoning up or settling of accounts –and charged that creating such moral balance sheets allowed Germans to avoid guilt and responsibility.[24]

---

[20]Jeffrey Herf, *Divided Memory: The Nazi Past in the Two Germanys*, (Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press, 1997), 384.
   [21]Ibid., 387.
   [22]Ibid., 382.

---

[23]Ibid., 365.
[24]Robert G. Moeller, "Germans As Victims? Thoughts on a Post Cold War

Moeller emphasizes that the construction of public memories on Nazism after 1945 tended to divide the world stage, from aggressors to victims. Thus, it is not surprising that considering the stigma attached to perpetrators, most Germans would probably want to identify themselves as victims as well of a Nationalist Socialist regime. At the same time, Moeller takes to task several episodes of German history that have been given from a one-sided perspective, though at the same time, are fully justified in themselves. The story of the Sixth Army, for example, is told as a tale of German victims, of an entire army encircled by Soviet forces outside of Stalingrad, and forced to suffer during the bitter Russian winter. As a tale of aggressors, the Sixth Army had had a hand in the mass execution of Jews at Babi Yar.[25]

In the end, Moeller states that the academic debate in German scholarship is primarily a *re*-visiting of a history that has been discussed endlessly since 1945. Illustrating how the opening of the Cold War opens up space for discussions on both German barbarism *and* suffering, Moeller advocates finding alternatives to patterns that have long dominated the German national memory. Indeed, for Moeller, studying this history is tantamount to understanding how "memory can block historical understanding and impede an open discussion of the past"[26] and ultimately, the question of whether the Germans were victims or not can only be addressed by highlighting how "some Germans were victims, some Germans were perpetrators, and some Germans were both."[27]

### Rape as a Part of the Debate

The 130,000 rapes that occurred in Berlin in 1945 with the arrival of the Red Army are themselves an integral component of the debates on whether Germany itself was a victim or a victimizer. Theodor Schieder and Hans Rothfel's 1953 *Documentation of the Expulsion of Germans from East-Central Europe* was replete with personal testimonies from various women who had suffered at the hands of Soviet troops. Anna Schwartz was one of these women, for whom "the Soviet occupation of eastern Europe commenced, literally and symbolically, with the forceful occupation of German women's bodies."[28] Furthermore, visual imagery and sexual undertones are replete here as well, as German women bore scars of rape by Red Army soldiers as their war wounds. Indeed, the general consensus from the women interviewed focused on how once the Russians arrived, "no woman or girl was safe from the liberators."[29]

The massive evidence of Red Army rapes, forever immortalized in Schieder and Rothfel's project, made no attempt to disguise Germans as victims. Indeed, here, German women were the victims, with no excuses or apologia. Rape of these German women became the 'Rape of Eastern Germany' by the Soviet Army, a powerful and intriguing glimpse into their psyche. As Moeller states, these evidences of mass rape created such a powerful rhetoric of victim ideology that "women's violated bodies took on an enormous emotional value, and women's suffering came to symbolize the victimization of all Germans."[30]

Popular culture too plays a distinctive role in the formulation of national memory of this symbolic rape. Helke Sander's film, *BeFreier und Befreite* (Germany 1992; the title was translated into English as *Liberators take Liberties*) is the most in-depth investigation on this topic of rape by Soviet troops, and is probably also one of the most controversial. In this documentary, Sander examines the mass rapes of German women by Soviet soldiers as well the atrocities committed by German troops. Opening with documentary footage of Soviet soldiers on the streets of Berlin in May 1945, the film investigates

---

History of World War II's Legacies," *History & Memory*, 17, nos. 1 and 2, (Spring, Summer 2005): 150.

[25]Ibid., 157.

[26]Ibid., 182.

[27]Ibid.

---

[28]Robert G. Moeller, *War Stories: The Search for A Usable Past in the Federal Republic of Germany* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, CA and London: University of California Press, 2003), 65.

[29]Ibid.

[30]Ibid., 67.

the situation in Germany following the end of World War II, with an especial emphasis on the city of Berlin. Asserting that there never was much public discussion about the mass rape in either German state, Sander interviews fourteen German women throughout the course of the film, as well as Soviet soldiers and doctors who treated the raped women. While the second part of the film focuses on the consequences of the rapes, such as the birth of interracial children, the abortions and the abandonment of children, Sander makes it clear that her intent is to focus on the historical amnesia of the mass rape of German women.

Much of the criticism leveled at the film, and perhaps essentialist versions of history, is based on the accusation that Soviet soldiers and their actions are investigated without giving the necessary historical context in which the rapes actually occurred. Much debate focuses on what has been left out versus what has been included in the film, and indeed, the missing piece is the Holocaust and other German atrocities during World War II. Yet another important criticism is how German women are depicted as innocent victims, a direct contradiction to the vast body of evidence that documents their complicity with the Third Reich. Atina Grossmann provides a compelling overview with a more than adequate historical contextualization of the rapes, detailing at the same time, the "re-masculinization" of the West German state in the 1950s.[31] Asserting that the topic of rape was repressed in order to build up the confidence of German male veterans, Grossmann emphasized that the fact that so many women had been raped was perceived of as an injury to male pride, and not a direct violation of women's bodies, in order to rebuild traditional male roles and the male institution of an army. At the same time, Grossmann elsewhere emphasizes that women can both be victims and perpetrators, albeit in particularly gendered ways. While highlighting how they are

agents in history and in their own lives, although at times, "not under conditions of their own choosing,"[32] Grossmann also emphasizes that women have a particular susceptibility to sexual violence and play both a material and symbolic role in the nation as reproducers, of people and of the body politic.

Richard W. McCormick raises a very difficult question in his own criticism of Sander's film. He questions the importance of the degree of complacency that a woman had regarding the rapes. He takes to task the societal belief that was reinforced by the German male reception of *Schändung* immediately after the war, that the rapes were justified. Instead, McCormick highlights that many of the rape victims were young children, and that national and ethnic identity did not seem to matter much, as both Jewish and German Aryan women were raped. At the same time, McCormick acknowledges the specific wartime hardships and atrocities suffered by both German men and women, but emphasizes that this should be remembered in the context of aggressive victimization and extermination of targeted groups. However, McCormick also emphasizes that it is incredibly short-sighted to restrict our thinking to just nation-states and national identities in terms of complicity with the Third Reich.[33]

Since the collapse of the Soviet Union, the Red Army has been represented by stories of brutal rape and indiscriminate violence, which by all means, are completely justified. At the same time, it is also important to take into consideration the overall context, just as Grossmann and McCormick have emphasized. Perhaps even more salient is the use of victimization narratives by occupied nations to bolster nationalism, and to construct memories that they were the "wronged victims of war"[34] and to stigmatize the group that did

---

[31]Atina Grossman, "A Question of Silence: The Rape of German Women by Occupation Soldiers," *West Germany Under Construction: Politics, Society and Culture in the Adenauer Era*, ed. Robert G. Moeller (Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 1997), 34.

[32] Atina Grossman, "Foreword," *Conquering Women: Women and War in the German Cultural Imagination,* eds. Hilary Collier Sy-Quia and Susanne Baackmann (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2000), x.

[33] Richard W. McCormick, " Rape and War, Gender and Nation, Victims and Victimizers: Helke Sander's *BeFreier und Befreite,*" in *Camera Obscura*, 16, no. 1 (2001): 130.

[34]James Mark, "Remembering Rape: Divided Social Memory and the Red

the raping. An interesting sub-category in this is how the suppression, and at times, the denial of rape, in the national memory can be seen as a preservation of the occupying country, especially in terms of their vested interest in suppressing the memory of rape.

As seen by the vast amount of contentious debate on the nature of these rapes and how they play into the national memory of Germany's Nazi past, these rapes constitute a distinct section of the national memory and have been constructed to fit the changing political, economic and social circumstances. This wide spectrum of the memory landscape is a distinctive feature on any study that incorporates a study of how memory plays a role in determining people's remembrances of particular events. Furthermore, and perhaps even more illuminating, is how the construction of the national memory in Germany can never be adequately encapsulated into one official and all-encompassing national history. It is just not humanly possible to incorporate the stories of rape and atrocities, as well as their own different facets, and conclude with an unbiased, objective collection of history.

Yet another important facet discussed by these many scholars is the place that the woman holds in symbolizing the body politic. Indeed, as Grossmann highlights, it is the male pride and not the actual dominance of women's bodies that is seen as injured. Furthermore, in a metaphorical sense, the literal intrusion of the women's bodies is seen as the physical dominance of the occupying force over the occupied nation.

### Conclusions

Once again, I feel oppressed by our German disaster. I came out of the cinema [after a night of revelry] deeply saddened but helped myself by summoning things that dull my emotions…. "A tale told by an idiot, full of

sound and fury, signifying nothing." Losing two world wars hits damned deep.[35]

In retrospect, it is integral to realize that no single position dominates the politics of memory in contemporary Germany. Indeed, the end of the Cold War has made is possible for historians to access and write on the archived materials of the Soviet Union, without fearing the context of Russian-German hostility in the present time. Even before May 1995, the fiftieth anniversary of the war, completely unleashed an entire program of commemorative events, and even today, it is still apparent that the pasts of both German victims and the victims of Germans are still in contest for space and recognition within the public consciousness. Nevertheless, finding a position from which to offer a balanced assessment of any war's end is probably the most difficult to accomplish. Instead, I believe that it is far more imperative to move beyond a language where "victim" and "perpetrator" are mutually exclusive, and instead, explore the realities of both suffering and causing suffering. Furthermore, as the recent wars in Bosnia-Herzegovina and Rwanda have shown, sexual violence against women in the name of a country is not a thing of the past. In fact, it is probably even more important to write analyses of women's roles in wars, and the sexual violence to which they are susceptible, before the lessons of history are forgotten.

---

Army in Hungary, 1944 – 1945," in *Past and Present*, no. 188 (August 2005): 159.

[35]*A Woman in Berlin*, 255.

# VIOLENT CRIME IN VICTORIAN ENGLAND: A GENDER ANALYSIS OF SHERLOCK HOLMES

**James Hysell**

The work of Arthur Conan Doyle provides an insight into the mindset of the Victorian man and his understanding of women in connection with violent crime.  The Victorian public was not quite ready to accept the belief that a woman could participate in a violent crime and not have something be wrong with her mentally.  This is demonstrated in Doyle's work with Sherlock Holmes, most notably in "A Scandal in Bohemia," "The Adventure of the Noble Bachelor," and "The Musgrave Ritual." In all of these stories, with the exception of the "Musgrave Ritual," a woman acts as the perpetrator of the crime that Holmes is investigating.  Out of these three stories, only one woman is the perpetrator of a violent crime, and her motives are explained as being caused by mental duress.  This shows the mindset of the Victorian world clearly illustrated through the writings of Conan Doyle.

Conan Doyle was a product of the cultural environment in which he lived.  His use of women as mostly passive actors in the stories of Sherlock Holmes clearly demonstrates Victorian ideas of domesticity.  However, this was not the only way that Doyle portrayed women; he also portrayed a few as criminals, but only in ways that would have been seen as acceptable to the Victorian mind.  In Victorian England women of good standing were not supposed to commit crimes, especially not crimes that were violent in nature. This is all clearly demonstrated in the work of Conan Doyle, who offers a view of gender ideals in relation to crime.

In many ways, Sherlock Holmes serves as a mirror for the attitudes of Victorian England in regards to women and their involvement in crime; as both victims and perpetrators.  Sir

*James Hysell is a graduate student in History from Crete, Illinois. He is a member of Phi Alpha Theta and completed this paper as a senior History major in the Spring of 2005 for Dr. Sace Elder's History 4845, Women in Modern Europe.*

Arthur Conan Doyle would rarely use a woman as Holmes' main antagonist.  They would usually be the victims of crime or merely bystanders.  When he did, these women were usually not the perpetrators of violent crime. In fact, the most notable female criminal in the annals of Sherlock Holmes was one Irene Adler, who was a blackmailer of an aristocratic former lover.[1]  Doyle also seems to focus primarily on greed as a factor in most of his writing, ignoring sexual violence altogether.  This mirrors the reluctance of the Victorian era to give any overt attention to sexual motivations.  Overall, in Doyle's writing, women were seen as being more emotional, and incapable of the blatant degeneracy that men were capable of.  This is a reinforcement of Victorian ideals, in which women involved in violent crime were seen as a "hideous perversion."[2]

In areas outside of crime Doyle reinforces the gender roles of the period with examples such as Watson saying, "Because you are within my reach again...these riches sealed my lips.  Now that they are gone I can tell you how I love you."[3] Thus demonstrating how a man must be of the same social standing as the woman, or above her, for a match to be proper.

One of the hallmarks of the Sherlock Holmes series was deductive reasoning.  Holmes would be faced with a baffling and intriguing case requiring his superior intellect to piece together clues and solve the case.  Yet most of the engineers of the convoluted crimes that Holmes encountered were men. Women were rarely seen as capable of creating such ingenious plots as to challenge Holmes.  However, this is not necessarily the case in Victorian England.  In the 1880s there were a string of poisonings in Liverpool, masterminded by women with the intent of collecting life insurance pay outs; a plot which involved

[1]Sir Arthur Conan Doyle, "A Scandal in Bohemia" in *The Complete Sherlock Holmes: Volume 1*. ed.  George Stade (New York, NY: Barnes and Noble Classics, 2003 ), 187-205.

[2]Judith Knelman, "Women Murderers in Victorian Britain," *History Today* 48, no. 8 (August 1998): 10.

[3]Sir Arthur Conan Doyle, *The Sign of Four*, in *The Complete Sherlock Holmes: Volume 1*, ed. George Stade (New York: Barnes and Noble Classics, 2003), 166.

men as pawns. In one case a man was used to pose as a woman's husband for his health inspection, and upon the inspection of the dead body the insurance agent realized that the dead man was not the one who had appeared for the insurance physical.[4] This scheme had come to light with the arrest of two women, Margaret Higgins and her sister Catherine Flanagan. These women had committed a crime that would have fit Doyle's standard motive for his fictitious criminals: greed. These two women had conspired to kill Thomas Higgins, whom they had insured with five different insurance societies for a total of 108 pounds and 4 shillings.[5] It was also suspected that Margaret had also poisoned Thomas' daughter Mary, and that the two women had also killed Catherine's husband along with Catherine's 22 year old son and an 18 year old female lodger in their home, all for the insurance money.[6] These women, and their suspected partners in crime, were perpetrators of violent crime; something which was supposed to be an anathema to their sex in the Victorian period, yet the public was not surprised by it because poisoning for insurance money was considered common place within the lower classes.[7]

Yet why is it that a crime such as this, in the writings of Conan Doyle, would not be committed by a woman, but as a rule would be committed by a man? Perhaps it was because that, while the act of poisoning for insurance money was common, it would be easier for the readers of Sherlock Holmes to accept if it was a man. After all, "male villainy was dismissed as an unfortunate remission,"[8] and for a woman to do such a thing an easily defined motive such as greed would not be enough to explain her actions. In the Victorian mind there would have to be a deeper problem that would cause a woman to betray her sex is such a way.

In the reality of Victorian England, if a woman committed a crime of violence, there had to be something psychologically and fundamentally wrong with her. Sherlock Holmes stories exemplify this belief. Every villain Holmes seemed to face was in complete and total control of their faculties, which was the only reason their crimes were worthy of his attention. The idea that there was something wrong with women who committed crimes are best demonstrated when cases of infanticide, and interestingly enough, shoplifting are examined.

In 1854 Mary Ann Brough slit the throats of six of her children, and then attempted to do the same to herself.[9] At the trial there was no debate as to whether or not Mrs. Brough had committed the crime, but whether or not she was insane.[10] Perhaps this is why female murderers were not, as a general rule, used by Doyle in Sherlock Holmes. The key to a Sherlock Holmes mystery was not just the solving of the crime, but the revelation of the motive and events that created the motive. With an insane antagonist, who generally tended to confess to the crime right away, there was not much of a story. However, only 12 percent of women charged with violent crimes, and 28 percent of women charged with murder (91 percent of which were successful), pleaded insanity.[11] Yet the view of society dictated that, "only an insane woman could have committed the crimes with which she had been charged"[12] in reference to murder. The rate of successful claims of insanity shows how ready Victorian society was to believe that a woman would have to be insane to kill another human being. These ideals were manifested in the fact that from 1840 through 1880, "out of sixty indictments not a single woman was convicted of the murder of a newborn child."[13] This is mirrored in Conan Doyle's work, in

---

[4]Angela Brabin, "The Black Widows of Liverpool," *History Today* 52, no. 10 (October 2002): 3.

[5]Ibid., 1.

[6]Ibid., 2.

[7]Ibid., 6.

[8]Knelman, "Women Murderers in Victorian Britain," 10.

---

[9]Jill Newton Ainsley, "'Some Mysterious Agency': Women, Violent Crime, and the Insanity Acquittal in the Victorian Courtroom," *Canadian Journal of History* 35 no. 1 (April, 2000) 2.

[10]Ibid.

[11]Ibid., 3-4.

[12]Ibid., 2.

[13]Martin J. Wiener, *Men of Blood: Violence, Manliness, and Criminal Justice in*

that his criminals were always sane, at least sane enough to understand what they were doing and what they would gain from their crimes.

Another aspect in which women were deemed insane in relation to crime was in the case of shoplifting. With the rise of consumer culture in Victorian Britain, came the rise of shoplifting, which was one of the first areas in which a woman's crime was seen to be an aspect of mental illness rather than criminality.[14] The use of the "Kleptomania" defense tended to be reserved for the middle class woman who found herself charged with shoplifting.[15] The concept that a respectable woman, who had been caught stealing something which she did not need, was an anathema to a society who could see no reason for a respectable woman to steal something which she could easily afford. Rather than look at the problems in society which created the problem of middle class shoplifting, the courts needed, "a new solution to this apparently rising tide of middle class crime. This solution was the marriage of criminal justice and professional medicine."[16] However, this indulgence of this criminal behavior did not extend to the lower classes, who were charged with the theft without the concept of kleptomania ever being considered.[17]

This mentality was surely known to Conan Doyle, which would help explain the lack of female antagonists in his stories. With such well defined examples of female insanity in reference to crime, it would be difficult for him to conceive of a perfectly sane woman who would be able to commit a crime that would be worthy of the attentions of Holmes. Shoplifting was surely not one of these worthy transgressions, because in the Victorian mind any middle class woman who was capable of such a crime

would most certainly be considered mentally ill. This was also the case for instances of infanticide.

But what about the murder of a spouse? While the "Black Widows of Liverpool"[18] were surely prime examples of women murdering their husbands; their motives also fit in with the recurring motive of greed in Holmes. But, for Holmes, cases such as these were usually attributed to a man because of the implausibility in the Victorian mind of a woman being able to mastermind such a crime. However, there were motives that the Victorian mind would accept for a woman killing her husband, such as spousal abuse.

A woman who committed a murder in Victorian England was often seen as either insane, as illustrated by the realities of infanticide convictions, or the victim of a situation that she had been put into by a man. The "popularity of the scenario of a bad man seducing and abandoning naive women encouraged magistrates, judges, and juries to look for an evil man behind the poor unmarried girl"[19] certainly played a part. In fact, Doyle used this motive at least once, with the murder of Richard Brunton by Rachel Howelles in "The Musgrave Ritual."[20] However, this murder is only implied and never confirmed; there was the possibility that Brunton's death may have been an accident. Perhaps Doyle knew that the idea of a female killer in one of his stories would not go over well with his readership, and thus he decided to leave the ending ambiguous to avoid having a controversial criminal attributed to him.

However, with the motivation for the crime that Doyle gave Howelles, it would not have been seen as outlandish or unbelievable. Whenever a woman killed a former lover, the defense immediately began to put the male victim on trial.[21] This is demonstrated by the case of Annette Myers. Myers was acquitted of killing a former lover, a guardsmen, who was then

---

*Victorian England* (Cambridge, NY: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 125.

   [14]Tammy Whitlock, "Gender, Medicine, and Consumer Culture in Victorian England: Creating the Kleptomaniac," *Albion* 31, no. 3 (1999): 413.

    [15]Ibid., 414.

    [16]Ibid., 418.

    [17]Ibid., 417.

---

    [18]Brabin, "The Black Widows of Liverpool," 1.

    [19]Wiener, *Men of Blood*, 124.

    [20]Doyle, "The Musgrave Ritual" in *The Complete Sherlock Holmes: Volume 1.* ed. George Stade (New York, NY: Barnes and Noble Classics, 2003), 461-475.

    [21]Wiener, *Men of Blood*, 126.

painted as callous and manipulative; with the acquittal Myers was referred to as a "Heroic Criminal."[22] Also, when a woman who had poisoned her husband was hanged, people in the crowd shouted "murder" when the door opened on the gallows.[23]

It was not just the public who felt sympathy for women accused of a violent crime, in 1832 when Mary Ratcliffe was put on trial for having her lover kill her husband, her case was dismissed when a judge declared that the evidence against her was weak. Conversely her separately tried lover was sent to the gallows.[24] This may have influenced Doyle to refrain from using a woman as a killer, because she would generate so much sympathy from the reader. While the occasional criminal in Holmes' world was seen as having just reasons, they were still held responsible for their crimes. A female murderer was not held accountable in the society that Doyle lived in, so there would be no resolution or punishment for the killer woman. She would receive only be sympathy, which Doyle was conditioned to give her.

Doyle, like many of his contemporaries, also tended to ignore the existence of sexual violence. While the Victorian public would later be fascinated with the sexual aspects of the "Jack the Ripper" case, sexuality, let alone sexual violence, was not something that was an acceptable topic in upper class Victorian society. While Doyle would not often use a woman as a primary antagonist, he would use them as victims, with the motive of the antagonist being greed. Doyle focused on this because, in the Victorian mind, there could be no other acceptable motivation for mass produced fiction. In fact the idea of sex in Victorian society was that it was a marital duty, and not something that was done for fun.[25] Also, a young woman who had just been married, and had become pregnant, asked her aunt

---

22Ibid., 127.
23Ibid., 128.
24Ibid., 127.
25Joan Perkin, *Victorian Women* (Washington Square, NY: New York University Press, 1993), 51.

where the baby would come from.[26] While it cannot be ignored that the girl may have been monumentally dense, it does show that sex was not something that was discussed in polite Victorian society, and would thus never enter the pages of Sherlock Holmes. With the idea of sex being a duty there was no room to make it a crime; it would be out of the societal context to do so. Sexual crime did exist in Victorian England, but it was just not acknowledged as such.

While the idea of sexual crime would explode with the emergence of "Jack the Ripper" in London, it was not something that had really been acknowledged before then. In fact, sexual assault and rape tended to be tried as regular assault cases, or as affliction cases when a pregnancy was the result.[27] Apparently, sexual crime did exist; the Victorian mind simply did not want to acknowledge it. This might also explain the complete lack of sexual crime in the Sherlock Holmes stories.

However, no matter how much the Victorian reader was told that sexual crime did not exist, the end of the Victorian era saw a veritable explosion on the subject of sexual crime. In 1885 the *Pall Mall Gazette* printed "The Maiden Tribute of Modern Babylon" which focused on the idea of a white slavery sex trade existing in London.[28] This sparked an immense upsurge in interest in sexual crime, with people actually mobbing the offices of the *Pall Mall Gazette* in hopes of getting copies of the paper.[29] The publication of this work actually seemed to wake Victorian England up to the public acknowledgement of sexuality, and is credited with the passing of an age of consent bill.[30]

This was published during the period that Doyle was writing Sherlock Holmes, and "Jack the Ripper" was terrorizing London, yet sexual violence does not stray into the pages of

---

26Ibid., 52.
27Shani D'Cruze, *Crimes of Outrage: Sex, Violence and Victorian Working Women* (DeKalb, IL: Northern Illinois University Press, 1998), 19.
28Judith R. Walkowitz, *City of Dreadful Delight: Narratives of Sexual Danger in Late Victorian London* (Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press, 1992), 81.
29Ibid.
30Ibid., 82.

Holmes. Perhaps this is because Doyle was a product of the more sexually prudent early Victorian period; when the concept of sexuality was seen as vulgar, and sexual crime was glossed over as being merely violent crime. Never the less, this is one area in which Doyle seemed to stray from the popular ideology of the period, and cling to a more conservative one in the face of an explosion in interest in sexuality and sexual crime.

When Conan Doyle was writing Sherlock Holmes, it was during a period in which the woman was always the victim in violent crime, even if she had been the one who had committed the crime. Her actions were explained away by saying she had been driven to it by an evil man, or that she had merely been insane. Doyle's writing reflects this. The antagonists for Sherlock Holmes had to be clever and calculating, they had to be in complete possession of their faculties. This is why the main female antagonists for Holmes were not participants in violent crime: Irene Adler was a blackmailer and Miss Hatty Doran had run off to be with a man she loved, rather than marry Lord St. Simon.[31] This is also why the women who were victims of crimes in his writings were victims due to the greed of a criminal, and not from any other motivation.

Conan Doyle, and Sherlock Holmes were truly products of their time. They demonstrated the moral, and world, view of Victorian society with regard to women and crime. A woman as a violent criminal went against the world view of the Victorian Era and Conan Doyle. To make a woman a violent criminal, and one who was in complete control, and in full possession of her faculties, would have been seen as absurd. Doyle focused on the intellectual aspects of crime, which thus excluded women to a large extent, and his Victorian worldview only allowed for the limited selection of motives for the crimes that the Holmesian criminal would commit.

---

[31]Doyle, "The Adventure of the Noble Bachelor" in *The Complete Sherlock Holmes: Volume 1*. ed. George Stade (New York, NY: Barnes and Noble Classics, 2003 ), 342- 358.

## THE ORIGINS OF A PEOPLE: THE ETRUSCANS AND THEIR CONTESTED PATERNITY

**Caroline Deters**

The Etruscans of present-day Tuscany are a people whose greatest legacy to the world is the mystery of their appearance in history. As some have noted, "The Etruscans have long been the magical mystery people of antiquity."[1] Their language—non Indo-European—is one of the few languages that remains mostly indecipherable except to translate it into words with no applicable meaning in current languages. The way of life that they led was significantly different than their contemporaries—the early Romans—and their prehistory is something that can only be theorized today.

Before the historical truths of the Etruscans were being discussed, the Greek poet Hesiod wrote, "They arose from the children of Odysseus and Circe."[2] Though this is a fanciful account of the history of the Etruscans, it is evidence to the fact that ancient peoples' earliest attempts to explain origins consisted of legendary tales which have little basis in historical fact. The legend of Romulus and Remus and the founding of Rome is only one example of this type of explanation. The two main modern theories grew out of the ancient attempts to track the source of the Etruscans. It was the Greek historians Herodotus (430 B.C.) and Dionysius of Halicarnassus in the first century B.C. that first wrote of the Etruscans and their ambiguous beginnings. Many historians have come down on one side or the other, creating a debate that has raged since Dionysius cast doubt on Herodotus.

Herodotus' contention was that the Etruscans were migrants from Lydia. When the Lydians were having a particularly

---

*Caroline Deters is a senior History major and member of Phi Alpha Theta from Tolono, Illinois. She wrote this paper as a junior for Dr. Bailey Young in History 3510, Ancient History, in the Spring 2005.*

[1]Rick Gore, "The Eternal Etruscans," *National Geographic* (1988): 705.
[2]Ibid., 718.

severe famine, they split the population by lot and sent the losing half on a journey to find a new place to live in an effort to the lessen food requirements of their nation. The half that sailed from the shores of Anatolia eventually ended up in the northwest part of Italy—for nearly four hundred years, this was the commonly excepted truth. Dionysius, in the first century B.C., hypothesized that the Etruscans were not an immigrant nation, but that they were indigenous to northern Italy. Not through any evidence that he collected, but through logically taking the reasons that Herodotus laid out and applying a separate logic, he came to a different conclusion.

Modern historians have taken these two ancient historians' arguments and expanded upon them, adding archaeological, scientific, literary, and linguistic evidence to support their claims. Scholars like Massimo Pallottino and Larissa Bonfante side with Dionysius and support the autochthonomy of the Etruscans.[3] Pallottino states in an interview with *National Geographic*, "The beginning of the Etruscan people is back in pre history two or three thousand years before Christ. They formed themselves in Italy from a mixture of elements over time."[4] Raymond Bloch is of the faction that supports Anatolian migration. Michael Grant, however, takes the middle road and posits that the Etruscans were neither the product of a wholesale migration nor completely indigenous to northern Italy. He is of the opinion that the Etruscans evolved from the local peoples with the introduction of many different peoples at many different times—not one single migration but many smaller ones.[5]

In the presence of multiple theories of Etruscan origin, a thorough evaluation of all available evidence is necessary. When evaluating the evidence and taking into account the surrounding chronologies, a different conclusion can be reached.

[3]Ibid., 719.
[4]Ibid.
[5]Michael Grant, *The Etruscans* (London, Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1980), 81-85.

This paper seeks to prove that the Etruscan culture was an indigenous one transformed by its contact with the Hellenistic and Near-East world. The Literary evidence, although contradictory, is biased in its perception of the Etruscans and the linguistic evidence, used to support the Anatolian theory, can be examined with different conclusions. The archaeological and scientific evidence shows that there were changes in how and where they lived in the first half of the seventh century B. C. in addition to how they evolved over the years up until their defeat by the Romans.

Beginning with Herodotus, many ancient historians wrote of the Etruscans. Although Herodotus puts forth the Lydian theory, even he admits to its questionable nature. Herodotus acquired this information from the Lydians themselves—they might have been seeking credit for something with which they were not involved. In fact, had there not been a connection made at that point in time, this theory may never have developed. The likeness of the Etruscan culture to the Lydian is comparable to its likeness to many other Near Eastern societies such as Syria and Phoenicia. The Lydian culture was unique when compared to other contemporary societies; the absence of some of Lydia's more distinctive characteristics in Etruscan society is somewhat suspect. With this, it is highly unlikely that any one single migration could have given rise to the Etruscan people.[6] The Greek people, long at odds with both the Lydians and the Etruscans, found ease in comparing the two enemy peoples to one another.

Dionysius of Halicarnassus was the first to question the Anatolian migration theory of Etruscan paternity in his book *Roman Antiquities*. There he questioned the validity of the Lydian claim on the basis of the incongruence in language, deities, and administration.[7] The languages that the two peoples spoke were almost as different as could be possible: one Indo-European and one not. The Etruscan deities were the precursors

[6]Ibid., 71-81.
[7]Dionysius, Ch. 30.

to those of the Romans—a group of deities with little similarities to that of the Lydians. Their order of society had only a few congruencies; their laws and justice system bore no resemblance to that of the Anatolians. Polybios likewise mentions the Etruscans in his *Histories* when he talks about the Po Valley. He names the Etruscans as the "oldest inhabitants"[8] of that plain The Dionysian theory allows for the Etruscan people to form their own timeline with no specific dates attached to it other than that of the transformation from Bronze Age culture to Iron Age culture in the seventh and eighth centuries. Conversely, the Herodotus theory only allows for a migration in the fourteenth century B.C.; the time following the Trojan War, and the time from then to the emergence of the Etruscan culture in the seventh century goes unexplained.

Herodotus maintains that the Etruscans, or Tyrrhenians as he named them, should be thought of as Lydian descendants. The main reason behind that contention, other than the Lydian claim, is the likeness of their name from the Greeks, Tyrrhenian, to the name of a town in Lydia.[9] Tyrrhenian is also purported to have been taken from the name of the leader of their migration, the Lydian king's son, Tyrrhenus.[10] The conclusion that the Greek name for the Etruscans, "Tyrrhenian," was Lydian in etymology is not necessarily correct. If it were Lydian, then there would be a connection between the two languages that the peoples spoke. In fact, no dialect of the Lydian language has ever been found to resemble the non Indo-European language of the Etruscans.[11] Had there been a whole-sale migration of the Lydian people then surely they would have kept the language of their past. However, when the people of Etruria emerged in the eighth century, they came equipped with a fully developed

---

[8]Jim Perry, "The Mysterious Etruscans," http://www.mysteriousetruscans.com/index.html, accessed April 1, 2006.

[9]Grant, *The Etruscans*, 72.

[10]Raymond Bloch, *The Etruscans*, trans. Stuart Hood (New York: Praeger, 1958), 55.

[11]Raymond Bloch, *The Ancient Civilization of the Etruscans,* trans. James Hogarth (New York: Cowles Book Co., 1969), 66.

culture which included a language completely unrelated to any language known even today. From the Etruscan texts and inscriptions that have been unearthed, there are only 300 words of any significance that have been translated.[12]

As the language still confounds the modern linguists, the Etruscan culture is becoming unearthed by Archaeologists day by day in Italy. Every new Excavation reaffirms D.H. Lawrence's statement, "Italy is more Etruscan in its pulse than Roman; and will always be so."[13] The more that is uncovered about the Etruscans, the more they resemble many of the local peoples of Italy. Had there been a large-scale migration of Lydians to the Po Valley, whether in the time following the Trojan War, or in the more probable eighth century B.C., there would be some evidence of the invasion of the people that already occupied the area, the Villanovans. In reality, there was no "archaeological break," no disturbance in the excavations from the time. There was evidence of individual and small group immigrations to Etruria, but none of the upheaval that would have accompanied the arrival of large groups of people was ever evidenced in the excavations in and around Etruria.[14]

The one piece of evidence that the Anatolian theorists hold up as a banner for their cause is the finding of an Etruscan inscription on a stone grave stele dated to the sixth century B.C. on the Island of Lemnos.[15] This is an important find because it places Etruscans in the Aegean. However, the exact date of this artifact lessens its significance to the Anatolian theory. If the theory were to truly be supported by this stele, it would have to be dated in the fourteenth century, the time of the supposed Lydian migration. The fact that it was placed in the sixth century actually weakens the validity of the Lydian claim. The period in which the stele was placed was a time of expansion and growth for the Etruscans. Logically, the northern trek of the

---

[12]Gore, "The Eternal Etruscans," 699.

[13]Ibid., 715.

[14]Ibid., 719.

[15]Perry, "The Mysterious Etruscans," accessed April 1, 2006.

Lydian contingent would not have made sense. If they ended up in the northwestern part of Italy, they would not have started their journey with a little side trip to an island not far enough away to be considered the ancient equivalent of a pit stop. This relic in fact can be seen as evidence to the fact that the Etruscans, at the time of this stele's inscription, were in contact with the Near Eastern world and were making significant forays into that world; maybe even enough to warrant a port in the Aegean. [16]

There are other finds that allegedly support the Lydian theory but when they are examined under a more critical light, they actually weaken the theory. The Etruscans were known for their use of animal organs and entrails to divine the future. The *haruspices* particularly used the livers of many animals because they alone show the greatest differentiation and variety in color. To use as examples there were many models of livers made—some in bronze, some in terracotta. This particular aspect of the Etruscans was thought to have linked them with the Lydians and their particularly divination-concerned culture. As a matter of fact, there have been recent digs in ancient Syria and Babylonia that have uncovered many terracotta livers with predictions written on them specific to the organ.[17] This only adds to the claim that the Lydians are no more connected to the Etruscans than other Near Eastern peoples.

Another connection to the Near East is the status of women. In Etruscan society, it was not uncommon for a woman to be lying with her husband at dinner. It was also not uncommon for her to be dining with other men. Etruscan women did not have to take their father's name and were allowed unprecedented freedoms compared to women in other ancient Italian societies.[18] Thus feminine freedom can be compared to the freedom that many in the Near East experienced. Though not specifically linked to Lydia, the status similarities can stand as a connection.

[16]*Encyclopædia Britannica*, 2006 ed., s.v. "Ancient Italic People."

[17]Bloch, *The Ancient Civilization of the Etruscans*, 66-67.

[18]Special Publications Division, National Geographic Society, *Mysteries of the Ancient World* (Washington: National Geographic Society, 1979), 77.

Throughout their rise and fall, the Etruscans were producing enough iron that merchants across the Mediterranean were flocking to their ports to acquire it. For this and their famously elegant shoes the Etruscans received many luxurious items from people such as the Phoenicians.[19] Though this appears to support the Anatolian theory, it can also be seen as evidence that the people of Etruria had a long-standing connection with the Near East. Likeness does not equal sameness.

The Etruscan culture that came into being in the eighth and seventh centuries was one which grew steadily over the older Villanovan culture. This older culture rose to prominence in the area in the tenth century B.C. The Villanovans formed the villages that the Etruscans would later take over and expand.[20] One of the Etruscan's greatest qualities was their ability to come into contact with the outside world and take from it only what they wanted and bypass the aspects they deemed inferior. When coming into contact with Greece, they adopted some of the Greek art but left behind the Greek view of the afterlife until their dominance of the north of Italy began to decline in the sixth century B.C.[21] If the Etruscans had been originally Lydian, with their culture intact until its emergence into history, then they would not have so easily assumed the constraints of such a different belief system.

Archaeology is not the only science that can reveal more about an ancient people. Recent developments in genetics have allowed scientists to take samples of DNA from the skulls excavated in Etruria. One study compared the mitochondrial DNA of Etruscans to the mitochondrial DNA of other ancient peoples.[22] This experiment used relatively new techniques, and

[19]Gore, "The Eternal Etruscans," 730.

[20]Ibid., 719.

[21]Ibid., 706-707.

[22]Mitochondrial DNA is the only DNA that is transferred directly from the parents to the children—through the mother. Through the mitochondrial DNA it is possible to trace the maternity back an infinite number of years, providing that the mixing of DNA does not cause some genes to die out completely. The assumption here is that if people are marrying within the same ethnic group,

many of the ancient peoples have not been equally profiled. For this reason, the study was not completely flawless.  Through this study, researchers have reached two conclusions. The first is that the people known as Etruscans shared ancestors; that is to say, they were not a group of people who ended up in the same area as each other due to similarities in character.  The second is that there was a distinct similarity between the DNA of modern Turks and the Etruscans. This proves the fact that there were, within the Etruscan population, those of Eastern decent.[23]

Through careful consideration of all manner of evidence on the Etruscans and their origins, the conclusion is that the Etruscans were autochthonous, indigenous to the north and west of Italy, and evolved because of their growing role in the merchant system of the Mediterranean Sea. The literary, linguistic, archaeological, and scientific data all combine to support the autochthony of the Etruscan people rather than Lydian ancestry.  Though scholars may discuss the differences in origin theories, until an Etruscan history is found, written by Etruscans themselves, it will always remain a mystery. As has been remarked in the past, "The Etruscans have long been the magical mystery people of antiquity."[24]

---

there will be repetitive sets of genes that will reoccur frequently.  If there is much intermarrying between different ethnicities, some of those genes die out and others are introduced into the ethnic group.

[23]Cristiano Vernesi, et al., "The Etruscans: A Population-Genetic Study," *American Journal of Human Genetics* 74, no. 4 (2004), 701-702.

[24]Gore, "The Eternal Etruscans," 705.

---

## *"TURNER IS STILL ON THE BURNER:" A ANALYSIS OF FRONTIER AND WESTERN HISTORIOGRAPHY*

**Mike  Swinford**

In the summer of 1893, while the nation celebrated four hundred years of progress at the Columbian Exposition in Chicago, a young historian from Wisconsin argued for the significance of the frontier in the formation of American character. It is traditional to begin any paper on the frontier or the West with some reference to Frederick Jackson Turner's seminal essay. Some authors lovingly invoke Turner as the sage responsible for opening up the field of frontier history. Others cite Turner as an at best quaint, at worst bigoted, foil to their allegedly new interpretation of the American West. But whether historians show respect or disdain for him, they cannot deny the significance he holds to their subject matter. The purpose of this essay is to explore the presence of Turner's thesis in frontier and Western historiography, ranging from the work of Turner himself to the so-called "new" western historians of the present. By examining the pantheon of the twentieth century's "old" and "new" Western historians, this paper will illustrate the indelible legacy and influence of Frederick Jackson Turner in this field of history. Whether historians insist that they are writing to expand or dispel the concepts of Turner, he is always present in their work; in other words, "Turner is still on the burner."[1]

It is scarcely necessary to reiterate the specifics of Turner's frontier philosophy when it has always been such a vital part of American historiography. For the purposes of showing the continuity that is central to this essay, however, one must briefly come to terms with some of Turners most durable tenets. Turner's thesis is typically summarized with one line; "The existence of an area of free land, its continuous recession, and the

---

*Mike Swinford, of Bridgeview, Illinois, is a graduate student in History and a member of Phi Alpha Theta. He wrote this paper for Dr. Edmund Wehrle in History 5000, Historiography, in the Fall of 2006.*

[1]Wilbur R. Jacobs, *On Turner's Trail, 100 Years of Writing Western History* (Lawrence: University of Kansas Press, 1994), 212.

advance of American settlement westward, explain American development."[2] This statement is simple and almost commonsensical; of course the frontier played a defining role in America's path to maturity. But in 1893 Turner was one of the first historians to advocate a new approach to explaining social, institutional, and cultural development. Turner's thesis stated that an environment, specifically the frontier with its "free" land, can have formative effects on culture and institutions. Culture is not simply transplanted wholesale and statically from some metropolitan source. The physical or geographical conditions of the American frontier forced an evolution of culture that produced egalitarianism and individualism. Similarly, as the frontier advanced, old frontiers became unique, autonomous regions. These regions developed distinctive cultures based on their disparate paths of development from frontier to settled region. These individual regions gave rise to the sectionalism that characterized American politics and culture. These aspects of Turner's theory appear contradictory. How can one shared national frontier experience create sectionalism and provincialism? Nonetheless, Turner's formative power of environment and the related idea of sectionalism, continue to be two durable concepts that even modern Western historians cannot put to rest.

The thesis that Turner provided is admittedly general, hegemonic, restrictive, and at times self-contradictory. Turner's essay attempted to apply a broad, static, and universal superstructure of development to a process that was, in reality, far more dynamic. Unfortunately, Turner did not write prolifically so his lectures became the venue for further articulation of his new paradigm. Turner was often praised as an instructor and his greatest asset was the legion of historians that came to maturity under his tutelage.[3] This new generation of Tunerian western historians would dominate the field for the first half of the twentieth century. These former students formulated new expressions and departures from the original thesis that their teacher could not have foreseen.

One of these students was Herbert Eugene Bolton. Bolton's contribution to Western history is nearly as legendary as that of his mentor. Turner and his successors have often been criticized as racist or least ethnocentric in their interpretation of the frontier. For Turner, the West was settled exclusively by white Northern Europeans, advancing from east to west from the Atlantic Seaboard. Bolton took issue with Turner's Anglo-only explanation, because it did not fit with vast areas of the North American continent. In 1911, Bolton argued that

> Turner, of Wisconsin, has directed attention to what he calls the West; but his West is a moving area which began east of the Appalachians and has not thus far reached beyond the Mississippi Valley. He and his school have contributed very little to the history of the Southwest and the Far West.[4]

Bolton focused his frontier research on the overlooked Spanish settlement experience in Florida and the Southwest. Beginning in the 1900s and continuing into the 1950s, H. E. Bolton formulated a new field of Western research which was coined "Borderlands." Contemporary historians like David Weber have shown that the Borderlands are still an active and meaningful area of research today. But this school of thought, even in its modern form cannot shake the influence of Turner's thesis.

---

[2]Frederick Jackson Turner, "The Significance of the Frontier in American History," in *The Turner Thesis, Concerning the Role of the Frontier in American History,* revised edition*,* ed. George Rogers Taylor, Problems in American Civilization Series, ed. George Rogers Taylor (Boston: D.C. Heath and Company, 1956), 1.

---

[3]Jacobs, "Appendix B, Turner as a Teacher—Testimonials from His Former Students," in *On Turner's Trail*, 255-276.

[4]Herbert Eugene Bolton, "Need for the Publication of a Comprehensive Body of Documents Relating to the History of Spanish Activities within the Present Limits of the United States," December 18, 1911 in John Francis Bannon, ed., *Bolton and the Spanish Borderlands* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1964), 25.

Bolton's *Spanish Borderlands* (1921) is, by all accounts, an old fashioned narrative typical of that period of historical writing. But in it, Bolton still addresses his major criticism of Turner's interpretation of the West. He says, "the Southwest is as Spanish in color and historical background as New England is Puritan, as New York is Dutch, or as New Orleans is French."[5] Bolton suggested that the frontier story is far more complex than Turner initially proposed. In addressing the disparate cultural roots of America's regions (still leaving out African and Indian influences) Bolton implied that Turner's rejection of "germ" theory may have gone too far. Bolton believed in the traditional Tunerian culture-making frontier, but he also did not lose sight of the cultural institutions that the Spanish carried with them in their settlement of the Borderlands.

Bolton may have found some fault in Turner's philosophy but he did not completely reject it. Bolton built his Borderlands thesis around the same basic guidelines that Turner set up for his generic frontier; namely that the frontier experience changed culture and society. He recognized the limitations of Turner's Anglo-centric frontier, but still praised his methods. He admitted that Turner was rightly acclaimed in the study of the Anglo-American frontier, "and for him who interprets, with Turner's insight, the methods and the significance of the Spanish-American frontier, there awaits a recognition not less marked or less deserved."[6] Bolton advocated an application of the Turner thesis to the study of Mexican and other Latin American frontiers; a call to action which remains unheeded.

No one has picked up the flag of the universal Western Hemisphere history that Bolton called for, but his interest in the Borderlands has been advanced in the able hands of David Weber.[7] Bolton, like Turner was criticized as an ethnocentric. He tends to illustrate the Spanish frontier with the same rose-tinted lens that Turner used for the Anglo-American one. Bolton ignored much of the brutality of the Spanish mission and presidio systems and often denied the native population of its active role on the frontier. Weber's notion of Borderlands has provided a far more realistic interpretation of the Southwest. He expanded upon Bolton's nascent idea of, "the interplay of cultures on both sides of the frontier."[8] Culture is changed not just through the experience of the physical or geographical conditions of the frontier as Turner argued, but also through the cultural discourse that occurs between two societies. These meeting points are less like "frontiers" of a dominant, conquering culture, than they are "Borderlands" between two equal cultures. What emerges is not Turner's essential progression from savagery to civilization, but rather a hybrid culture. This meeting and melding of cultures, which in America was magnified on the frontier, seems to be the most historically significant aspect of the Western environment. While Turner overlooked this aspect of the frontier environment, it still fits with his essential thesis. Modern Borderlands historians, though they may hate to admit it, are still influenced by Turner's ideology. Weber gave Turner the credit he deserves and explains why he is rarely referenced in Borderlands discourse:

> His remarkable success in challenging the idea that the "germs" of European institutions planted themselves in North America and spread westward unchecked has led to a new conventional wisdom. It appears that most Borderlands scholars see no need to cite Turner's works or to carry on a running dialogue with him when they assert that the frontier altered the society and institutions of Hispanics.[9]

---

[5]Herbert Eugene Bolton, *The Spanish Borderlands, A Chronicle of Old Florida and the Southwest* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1921), vi.

[6]Bolton, "The Mission as a Frontier Institution in the Spanish American Colonies," in Bannon, 189.

[7]Weber's most essential book is; David J. Weber, *The Spanish Frontier in North America* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992).

[8]David J. Weber, "Turner, the Boltonians, and the Borderlands," *The American Historical Review* 91, no.1 (February 1986), 73.

[9]Ibid.., 80.

Clearly, Turner's thesis still implicitly haunts this vibrant interpretation of Western history, even if its practitioners fail to acknowledge its presence.

Just as Bolton argued that Turner's progression from savagery to civilization did not completely fit with the history of the Southwest, Walter Prescott Webb noted that it was also flawed as a model for the Great Plains. Webb was schooled in the early twentieth century when Turnerians still dominated history departments all over the United States. Webb's seminal book, *The Great Plains* (1931), spoke a language that Turner could have understood, but it also featured a new method of looking at frontier history. Webb proposed that the Great Plains region, "affected the various peoples, nations as well as individuals, who came to take and occupy it, and was affected by them."[10] The first half of Webb's thesis is in accordance with Turner: the Plains environment "affected" the settlers that moved there. The second half represents a new departure; those same settlers "affected" their environment. Not only did the frontier, specifically the Great Plains play the classic Turnerian role of cultural crucible, but that same frontier environment was physically altered to fit the culture that settlers carried with them.

Webb implied that Turner's notion of progressive settlement was only applicable to the lands located east of the Mississippi; the same criticism, one might recall, that Bolton addressed. Webb employed a useful image to describe the problem that emerged when a culture designed for the humid East was applied to the semi-arid Plains:

> east of the Mississippi civilization stood on three legs—land, water, and timber; west of the Mississippi not one but two of these legs were withdrawn,—water and timber,—and  civilization was left on one leg—land. It is small wonder that it toppled over in temporary failure.[11]

---

[10]Walter Prescott Webb, *The Great Plains* (Boston: Ginn and Co., 1931), 8.
[11]Ibid., 9.

Grade school images of sod houses and buffalo chips show us how Great Plains settlers were affected by the environment's lack of trees. But far more devastating images emerge when one contemplates the way the environment was affected by the settlers attempts to force Eastern woodland culture on a completely different environment. Webb's book proved prophetic; it was published only one year before the catastrophic Dust Bowl ravaged across the Great Plains. A generation of inappropriate agricultural practices, imported unchanged from the East, had precipitated one of the worst environmental disasters in the nation's history. Webb's attention to the environment as a transformative and exploited entity follows Turner's logic, but his vision of the same environment as a victim of an imported culture makes his work unique. Webb's environmentalism is a major inspiration for the latest attempt at frontier and Western history; the aptly named "New Western History."

It seemed that frontier history as a field of inquiry had stagnated during the middle of the twentieth century. Ray Allen Billington offered *Western Expansion* (1949), essentially the textbook that Turner would have written if he had the ability. It provided a last stand for the purely Turnerian interpretation of the frontier. Aside from Billington's eloquent, but old-fashioned narrative, the field saw little action and scarce innovation. Urban-dominated social history came into vogue and the frontier seemed to wane from its former significance to American history. Perhaps riding the wave of pluralism, multiculturalism, and revisionism, in so many other fields, however, "New Western History" emerged in the 1980s with new analytical tools like race, class, and gender that it had gained in hiatus. Three of the most influential historians to come out of this new school are Patricia Nelson Limerick, Richard White, and William Cronon. Each of these three has a different relationship with Turner, but they have all injected Western history with much needed intellectual vigor.

Patricia Nelson Limerick's, "Making the Most of Words," articulated one of the many new directions that Western history

is taking. In this article, perhaps influenced by the "linguistic turn" and post-structuralism, Limerick turned to an analysis of language in understanding Western History. She argued that one must examine, "what westerners have done to and with words and what words have done to and with westerners."[12] Limerick posited that historians of the past have failed to separate the language of their frontier subjects from the reality. With an implicit stab at Turner and his disciples, she says that the, "the earlier breed of western historians adopted the terms, the point of view, and the assumptions of the people they studied," which "left western scholars echoing, not analyzing, the thinking of Anglo-American colonizers."[13] Limerick believes that the last generation of Western historians had failed to criticize the language of pioneers who were engaged in "the kind of activity that provoked shiftiness in verbal behavior."[14] Overall, Limerick's body of work, including *Legacy of Conquest: The Unbroken Past of the American West* (1987), presented an anti-Turnerian interpretation of Western development. She provided a frontier story characterized not by the positivism that Turner saw in settlers' language, but by the conquest and imperialism they were trying to hide. Limerick presents a strong case, but one must ask if a pessimist's frontier of exploitation could be just as culturally transformative as a positivist's frontier of progress? If so, Limerick has not really abandoned the question that lies at the core of Turner's thesis.

Similarly to Limerick, Richard White also takes a revisionist's stance against Turner. He has set out to write a new history of the West and Turner is conspicuously absent. In *"It's Your Misfortune and None of My Own," A History of the American West* (1991), White attempted to define the West as an autonomous physical region, west of the Missouri River, and not as a part of the frontier process that Turner espoused. "The West

did not suddenly emerge;" at the crest of a Turnerian tide of Anglo-American settlement, "rather, it was gradually created."[15]Although White has explicitly refused to engage Turner's thesis, his book still touches on some of its themes. One critic has pointed out that White, "leans on 'sectionalism' (p.74) and 'safety valve' (p.75) and mentions regions or subsections of the West (p.344). In these terms and ideas Turner is ever lurking."[16] White has demonstrated that it is possible to write Western history without mentioning Turner. Whether or not that makes it good history, however, is debatable.

Like Limerick's, White's tale is one of invasion and environmental disasters which is still arguably not a repeal of Turner's insistence on the frontier's ability to mold American culture. White attempts to make the West, which culturally belongs to the collective American psyche, into just another region on the map. In the national perspective, White's trans-Missouri West was the final frontier, the last of a series of regions to be called "the West." Therefore all of the myth and legacy of America's frontier experience was cemented in this terminus of westward expansion. The very fact that the region holds that national position means that it is more than just a geographical place, it is the manifestation of a concept as well, and must dealt with accordingly. White offered a compelling history of the place we call the West, but he provided very little insight into the more enduring and intriguing idea of the frontier that the West represented for Turner and continues to represent for most Americans.

William Cronon, unlike White and Limerick, still has some measure of respect for Turner. His book, *Nature's Metropolis, Chicago and the Great West* (1991) presented an intriguing interpretation of Western history that openly engaged Turner. Cronon dealt with Turner seriously and academically, avoiding the cartoonish straw man that other new western historians have

---

[12]Patricia Nelson Limerick, "Making the Most of Words, Verbal Activity and Western America," in William Cronon, et al., eds., *Under an Open Sky: Rethinking America's Western Past* (New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1992), 170.

[13]Ibid., 168.

[14]Ibid.

[15]Richard White, *"It's Your Misfortune and None of My Own:" A History of the American West* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1991), 4.

[16]Jacobs, *On Turner's Trail*, 206.

engaged. Even with use of "Great West" in his title and throughout his book, Cronon harkened back to Turner's conception of a West that included far more territory than new western historians like White and Limerick would cede. Cronon's book examined the relationship between Chicago and its massive rural hinterland that he terms the "Great West." Cronon demonstrated that, "The nineteenth century saw the creation of an integrated economy in the United States, an economy that bound city and country into a powerful national and international market that forever altered human relationships to the American land."[17] Cronon concerned himself with the exploitative relationship Chicago had with its Great West hinterland. One illustrative industry that Cronon examined was timber. He traced the role of Chicago as the exploiter of timber stands in Wisconsin, Minnesota, and Michigan, and distributor of the finished lumber to the treeless Great Plains. Chicago could not survive without exploiting the rural hinterland, but conversely farmers could not exploit the hinterland without the resources that Chicago provided. Cronon tried to show that there is little difference between the dense and dirty city and the seemingly bucolic countryside. Both entities exploited the natural resources of the Great West, and each depended on the other for survival.

Cronon's depiction of the growth and development of Chicago and its hinterland would have appealed to Turner. In it one can see remnants of his stages of development from frontier to civilization. But Cronon's picture, in line with new western history, hardly paints a rosy image of progress; he stresses the environmental implications that this exploitation of the frontier holds for the future. In this sense, Cronon has departed from the traditional realm of western history, employing the tools of a newer field: environmental history.

At the center of Cronon's argument and essentially the argument of most environmental historians is Turner's idea of "free land."

> Chicago and other cities of the Great West grew within the ecological context of what historian Frederick Jackson Turner called "frontier" conditions. Despite all the ambiguities and contradictions that have bedeviled Turner's frontier thesis for the past century, it still holds a key insight into what happened at Chicago…The "free land" that defined Turner's frontier was important not because it was "empty" or "virgin" or "free for the taking"…but because its abundance offered to human labor rewards incommensurate with the effort expended in achieving them.[18]

The concept of free land is revolutionary not in the Turnerian sense that it created egalitarianism, but in Cronon's interpretation, because it created a culture of exploitation of natural resources that shaped the American psyche. Rather than completely throwing Turner's ideas away, or ignoring them all together, Cronon has modified them to work with a more sophisticated interpretation of the American West. Cronon and environmental history still owe much to the legacy of Turner. Environmental historians have taken the concept of the frontier and the West out of Limerick and White's narrowly defined region and back into the larger realm of nationwide development. Like Turner, environmental historians are interested in the process of development that began when human beings first arrived in North America and began leaving their mark on the environment. Cronon has shown that Frederick Jackson Turner still speaks in Western historiography especially through the modern environmental historian.

This paper has examined nearly one hundred years worth of historical debate surrounding the role of America's frontier and the West. For the sake of brevity, many scholars with valuable contributions to the field have been left out. In looking at the

---

[17]William Cronon, *Nature's Metropolis: Chicago and the Great West* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1991), xiv.

[18]Ibid., 150.

selection here, however, there is still one unifying point. The historians of yore like Bolton, Webb, and Billington, share commonalities with those on the frontiers of research like Weber, Limerick, White, and Cronon. Each of these men and women owe the existence of their field to Turner. Turner was the first to propose that the West was more than just a single well-defined region. To him it was a process and a cultural symbol that carried a higher significance for America's political, cultural, and social development. Richard White and Patricia Nelson Limerick have done great things in advancing the field of Western history. But promise for the future lies with environmental historians like William Cronon who still search beyond the physical West for the significance of the more tenuous "frontier."

## *FAITH BEFORE THE COURT: THE AMISH AND EDUCATION*

**Jacob Koniak**

The free practice of religion is a concept on which the United States was founded. Freedom of religion became part of the identity of America and was written into the United States Constitution, specifically the First Amendment, by the framers of our government. One cannot question the validity of such a fundamental and deeply rooted principle of government. However, the free exercise of religion can and has become a contested issue in the history of the United States. A prime example of this issue coming to the forefront is the Supreme Court case of *Wisconsin v. Yoder*. The problem in this case was not exactly with the free exercise of religion, but rather its conflict with the law, specifically a state law. When the free practice of religion comes in conflict with a state law, a decision must be made about which has more weight. The case of *Wisconsin v. Yoder* not only provided that precedent but also established that the free exercise of religion can take precedence over a law in specific circumstances. The opinion in this case became a landmark victory for the Amish in America. *Wisconsin v. Yoder* made it known that the Supreme Court would consider the weight of the arguments and, if deemed proper, support the free exercise of religion over the law of a state.

The case of *Wisconsin v. Yoder* was brought before the Supreme Court in 1971. It centered on an argument over the power of the state of Wisconsin to force parents to send children under the age of sixteen to attend a formal school. A Wisconsin law ordered all children under age sixteen to be enrolled in a public or private school. The state law would not be considered unreasonable, as it is and always has been a function of a state to

*Jacob Koniak is currently a junior History major from Gillespie, Illinois. He submitted this paper as a sophomore in Dr. Lynne Curry's, History 3690, Honors United States Constitution and Nation in the Fall of 2006.*

provide public schooling.[1] However, certain Amish groups disagreed with the necessity of school attendance past the eighth grade. Three men from Green County, Wisconsin were charged, tried, and convicted by the state and ordered to pay a five-dollar fee for refusing to send their children, ages fourteen and fifteen, to public schools, as the men planned on keeping the children at home to learn the Amish lifestyle through work and observation.[2] The men were Jonas Yoder and Wallace Miller of the Old Order Amish religion and Adin Yutzy of the Conservative Amish Mennonite Church. The respondents made an appeal, basing their claim on the First and Fourteenth Amendments to the Constitution, specifically the right to freely exercise religion and the right to equal protection under the law.

The Amish men claimed that their children's attendance in a private or public high school would severely damage the children, as the environment would be extremely contrary to the Amish tradition and way of life. The men not only were worried about the exposure of the children to this environment, but also that it kept the children from home. The men believed that when children passed the eighth grade they had learned the math and reading skills essential to the Amish life. Education after this time pertained to how to live the Amish life, including working with and observing members of the community. The skills and work ethic learned during this period were essential to becoming a contributing member of the Amish community, and the men claimed that denying the right to this form of education could even endanger the salvation of their children. This was upheld in the Supreme Court of Wisconsin. The State required the religious beliefs claimed under the first amendment to be sincere, but ruled that the interests of the respondents passed this criterion. The State of Wisconsin appealed this decision, however, and the case came before the United States Supreme Court in December of 1971. The opinions were written in May of

1972, with Justice Burger writing a majority opinion for six members, Justices Stewart and White writing separate concurring opinions, and Justice Douglas writing a dissenting opinion, although it was only a partial dissent.

The case was not the first concerning the free exercise clause presented to the Supreme Court, but it has been one of very few that has come before the court in the last forty years. A precedent on the free exercise clause was established in the 1965 opinion *United States v. Seeger*.[3] The Court ruled that any sincere belief that occupies a person's life similar to the way God occupies the life of an orthodox believer qualifies that person for exemption when considering a conscientious objector law.[4] The idea that theism (belief in a divine being) does not have to be a base for a claim under the free exercise clause made the clause appear to be quite open and broadly interpreted. Another opinion dealing with the free exercise clause, and the only to grant an exemption from a valid law based on religious belief, was that of *Sherbert v. Verner* in 1963.[5] These broad interpretations in former cases might have given the legal team representing Yoder confidence in their case, as they had a very strong and well based theological claim as the basis of their argument. Despite the fact that an opinion pertaining to compulsory school attendance and the free exercise clause was not yet on the books of the Supreme Court, rulings in other cases concerning the free exercise clause gave Yoder's representatives reason for confidence.

Yoder's legal team gave strong support to the claims made by the Amish parents in lower courts. The many reasons presented by the Amish men for keeping their children from attending school past the eighth grade were confirmed and supported by the lawyers representing the men. The lawyers not only confirmed the genuine theological beliefs and lifestyle of

---

[1]Terry Eastland, ed., *Religious Liberty in the Supreme Court* (Lanham: Ethics and Public Policy Center, 1993), 235.

[3]Robert S. Alley, ed., *The Supreme Court on Church and State* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988), 423.

[4]Ibid.

[5]Eastland, *Religious Liberty in the Supreme Court*, 235.

the respondents, but also attempted to explain their actions under these beliefs. The many faceted defense of Yoder was presented in a very in-depth and well supported manner.

First of all, lawyers representing Yoder presented many expert witnesses in support of their opinions in areas ranging from religion to education. All confirmed the relation of the Amish belief concerning compulsory high school attendance to the basic tenets of the Amish religion. In addition, the history of the Amish was presented to the Court, going as far back as the Swiss Anabaptists of the sixteenth century, in order to give the Court a basis for understanding the tenets of the Amish faith. Scholars speaking on behalf of the Yoder legal team explained that the Amish believed in a life in harmony with the earth and apart from the world and its influence. Such a life was important to an individual's salvation. This central principle of the Amish faith flew in the face of the Wisconsin law compelling high school attendance to the age of sixteen, stated the scholars before the Court. Lawyers representing Yoder stressed that the complete avoidance of society and its ways is not only intentional but essential to the Amish community. Separation from, not integration with, modern society is the goal of the Amish.

Another point made by the lawyers representing Yoder was the formerly mentioned "Amish education" the children were receiving at home while not attending a formal school. It was argued that this system of learning through work and modeling more thoroughly prepared the children for the communities they would enter than a formal high school education would prepare a child for the larger society. Dr. Donald Erickson, writing on behalf of the respondents as an expert witness on education, claimed that the Amish system of learning through work and observation at home effectively prepares high school aged children to be productive members of the Amish society.[6] In addition, the physical absence of the child from home in this formative period would also put the child at a severe

disadvantage, as an Amish work ethic and attitude are developed during this time of work and modeling at home, stated Yoder's lawyers.[7] Also, the fact that the Amish families in this case did not oppose but supported the idea of a traditional education up to the eighth grade was presented.[8] The lawyers representing Yoder presented in great detail the argument the Amish were not opposed to education in principle, but simply supported a form of it other than public schooling.

These sound, logical assertions combined to create the argument for Yoder. Considering the sum of such claims, one Dr. Hostetler, supporting the respondents, wrote that compulsory high school attendance could ultimately result in the destruction of the Old Order Amish community in the United States.[9] Yoder's counsel presented the case in such a way that it attempted to prove that the Amish had a valid, sensible reason for violating the law mandating attendance. Strong, deeply rooted, and genuine religious belief and practice lay at the heart of their argument, and the lawyers representing Yoder claimed that the Amish had a valid constitutional claim.

The State of Wisconsin presented an equally in-depth argument before the Court. The first major point the state presented was one traceable back to a forefather of our nation, Thomas Jefferson, who asserted that a certain amount of formal education is necessary in order to create well equipped and adequate participants in the United States political system, therefore preserving both liberty and independence.[10] The state also stressed that formal education at the level the Amish were failing to attend prepared children to grow to be self-sufficient and independent members of society.[11] These points are very valid and could stand alone, but lawyers representing Wisconsin had further reasons for enforcing the compulsory high school attendance law.

---

[6] *Wisconsin v. Yoder* 406 U.S. 205 (1972), 22.

[7] Ibid., 22.
[8] Ibid., 23.
[9] Ibid.
[10] Ibid., 29.
[11] Ibid.

Lawyers for Wisconsin stated that the position of the Amish created a certain ignorance, and argued that the state was acting in the best interest of the children involved by protecting these children from this state of ignorance.[12] Lack of knowledge about American society and its ways could indeed be said to be promoted in the Amish culture, and the lack of formal education until the age of sixteen could foster such an unawareness. It is a fact that a state is at all times expected to operate in the best interests of its citizens. The lawyers for the state of Wisconsin simply attempted to show that acting in the best interest of both society and the children involved was far more important than protecting the religious freedom of a particular group.

Yet another point made by the state of Wisconsin's legal team was the idea that if the law of compulsory attendance was not enforced in this situation, Amish children would be denied a right to formal secondary education.[13] This argument looked at children in an independent legal manner, as it claimed they had their own rights despite the wishes of their parents. This argument was unique in this respect.

The State of Wisconsin's legal team also argued that while the First Amendment protects religious beliefs, it does not cover "actions" such as those the Amish families were being charged with.[14] The state suggested that the activity of withholding the children from school, despite being religiously grounded, was subject to the broad police power of the state. The lawyers attempted to draw a line between belief and action, and claimed that the Amish parents in consideration crossed that line.

All of the ideas presented by the state could be summed up into one idea: The interests of the state in enforcing the compulsory attendance law outweighed the claim being made by the Amish. Contrary to the legal team representing Yoder, Wisconsin's lawyers believed that the scale of importance should tip towards the state law, not the religious interest, in this situation.

The Supreme Court would not have heard *Wisconsin v. Yoder* if a constitutional issue did not lie at its heart. The reason the Supreme Court agreed to hear the case was its association with the First Amendment, specifically the free exercise clause. This clause states that "congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."[15] If the constitutional basis ended here, however, no valid claim could be made. The First Amendment did not allow Congress to make a law prohibiting the free exercise of religion. The law in question in *Wisconsin v. Yoder*, however, was a state law rather than an act of Congress. The law only applied to citizens of the state of Wisconsin. However, another amendment to the Constitution allowed Yoder to bring the case before the Supreme Court.

The Fourteenth Amendment, ratified in 1868, states that "no state shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States."[16] The amendment also states that no state can act "to deny any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws." This amendment opened the door for a claim against the state of Wisconsin. Yoder's lawyers made their case on the basis of the Fourteenth Amendment. If one examines the wording, it is obvious that while Yoder and the other Amish families involved were citizens of Wisconsin and subject to its laws, as citizens of the United States they were protected from state laws abridging their privileges. The state law requiring formal education until the age of sixteen is said to be in conflict with the Amish families' rights included in the First Amendment, specifically the right to the free exercise of religion. To require the children to attend high school would not allow them to practice their professed religion in the eyes of the Amish parents. If the

---

[12]Ibid.
[13]Ibid., 33.
[14]Ibid.

[15]"U.S Constitution, amend. 1," in Waldrep et. al., eds., *The U.S. Constitution and the Nation* (New York: Forbes Custom Publishing, 1998), 98.
[16]"U.S. Constitution, amend. 14, sec 1," Ibid., 315.

Fourteenth Amendment is interpreted as preserving the rights of all individuals, as it eventually would be over time, then a claim by the Amish in these circumstances would be valid. In addition, the Amish believed that repressing their religion by requiring their children to attend school until the age of sixteen did not protect them equally under the law.[17] These questions about Wisconsin's compulsory high school education law combined to make *Wisconsin v. Yoder* a case with very strong constitutional considerations.

The opinion of the justices of the Supreme Court would carry important constitutional implications. If the justices sided with the respondents, a broad interpretation of the Fourteenth Amendment would be upheld, making a statement about the claim of free exercise of religion in contrast to state laws. The idea that the Supreme Court could place the personal situation of a religious group over the concerns of a state would be established. If the justices sided with the State of Wisconsin, however, a narrower interpretation of the Fourteenth Amendment would be adopted. The Court would support the interests of a state over those of an individual claiming free exercise of religion. Regardless of the outcome, therefore, the decision made by the Supreme Court would have significant constitutional consequences. In May, 1972 the Supreme Court published a majority opinion, two concurring opinions, and a partial dissent. The constitutional interpretations were revealed.

Chief Justice Warren Burger wrote the majority opinion expressing the views of himself and six other members of the Court. That opinion addressed each of the issues brought up by both Yoder and the State of Wisconsin's legal teams. Burger started out by affirming the power of a state to provide and control basic education.[18] However, Burger went on to explain that a state's interest in education is not free from a balancing process when the state impinges on fundamental rights, such as

the right to free exercise of religion.[19] In other words, a state's interest must be in the highest order to overbalance a legitimate claim made under the free exercise clause. Justice Burger then described what sort of claims can be made under the free exercise clause, ruling out those of a secular nature.[20] He believed that the Amish do have a claim under this clause. The Amish way of life is deeply rooted in religion and tradition, Burger stated, and being separate from the rest of the world is fundamental to the Amish faith.[21] He believed that exposing Amish children to the public high school system would not only sharply contrast with the Amish system of belief but also harm the children by altering their setting at a crucial time in their development.[22] Burger clearly sided with the Amish on this issue.[23] He also addressed Wisconsin's claim that actions such as those taken by the Amish are not protected under the free exercise clause, as only beliefs are protected. Burger stated that it is the history of the Court to consider religiously grounded conduct to also be protected by the free exercise clause.[24] Justice Burger also addressed the Amish claims of a violation of equal protection under the laws as listed in the Fourteenth Amendment. On this issue also he sided with the Amish, saying that the compulsory education law is not neutral if it "unduly burdens the free exercise of religion."[25]

Burger went on to address the state of Wisconsin's claims that its interest in compulsory education is greater than the claims of the Amish, siding against the state on this matter. The large claim made by the state is in error when considering a fundamental religious claim, he stated. Burger then explained that, while the state had valid points in its requirements for education to the age of sixteen, these points did not apply to the

---

[17]*Wisconsin v. Yoder* 406 U.S. 205 (1972), 28.
[18]Ibid., 24.

---

[19]Ibid.
[20]Ibid., 25.
[21]Ibid.
[22]Ibid., 26.
[23]Ibid.
[24]Ibid., 27.
[25]Ibid.

Amish, because the extra two to three years of schooling provided past the eighth grade would do the children little good when considering the life they will enter.[26] As for the state's claim that compulsory high school education would save the children from certain ignorance, Burger dismissed it on the grounds that the schooling the Amish received in their vocation, as opposed to the high school education they were missing, was an ideal education for children their age.[27] The Justice even brought out the point that compulsory secondary education is a recent development in the history of our country, and if one considers this, it would take a very special reason for the state to interfere with the free practice of religion on these grounds.[28] The law mandating compulsory education would have to be intended for purposes such as preventing child labor, says Burger, and as the agricultural endeavors pursued by the Amish do not qualify as unhealthy or harmful child labor, the state has no claim against the Amish.

Burger then addressed Wisconsin's claim that not allowing the Amish children to attend school to the age of sixteen denied the children the right to a secondary education. Chief Justice Burger wrote that despite the precedent set in *Prince v. Massachusetts* concerning a state's role as *parens patriae*, other precedents such as *Sherbert v. Verner* limited the scope of that precedent.[29] He also stated that the position of the Amish differs from the position that the precedent of *Prince v. Massachusetts* would cover, as the labor performed by the Amish children would be not only in the company of an adult but also would not be harmful to the child or the public.[30] As his last point, Burger refuted the idea that the children were being forced not to attend school against their will, citing the fact that the parents are in legal control of their children as well as the legal entities being charged and dealt with in this case, not the children.[31] He summed up by stating that the religious claim made by the Amish, while it was one that few other groups could provide, was a valid claim against the compulsory high school education law and that the state did not present enough support for the idea that the state's strong interest in compulsory education would suffer if the Court granted the Amish an exception.[32] Burger's opinion, written on behalf of six other Justices, is the most widely known and cited of the majority opinions, but the concurring opinions of Justices Stewart and White shared his views.[33]

Justice Douglas, however, wrote a partial dissent on a very interesting and controversial idea brought before the Court. Douglas' dissent focused on the rights and opinions of the children in the case, not the parents. He was not opposed to the decision made for Jonas Yoder, as his daughter Frieda professed before the court her opposition to high school education.[34] He had a problem with the cases of Adin Yutzy and Wallace Miller, as their views about their own education were never heard before the court.[35] Wisconsin's practice of looking at the child as an independent legal entity whose right to secondary education could be infringed upon by a parent was supported by Justice Douglas. Douglas mentioned many Supreme Court opinions, including *Haley v. Ohio*, *In re Gault*, and *Tinker v. Des Moines School District* in which children of ages similar to those in consideration in the Yoder case were granted both Fourteenth Amendment rights and First Amendment rights.[36] The fact that the opinions of the children of both Yutzy and Wallace were not heard by the Court was the breaking point to Douglas, and he could not support a claim for their exercise of free religion when he did not know if the rights of the children themselves were

---

[26]Ibid., 30.
[27]Ibid., 29.
[28]Ibid., 31.
[29]Ibid., 33.
[30]Ibid.

---

[31]Ibid., 34.
[32]Ibid., 37.
[33]Eastland, *Religious Liberty in the Supreme Court*, 235.
[34]*Wisconsin v. Yoder* 406 U.S. 205 (1972), 41.
[35]Ibid.
[36]Ibid.

being violated. He also wrote that the history of faith, work ethic, and lawfulness of the Amish are not applicable in this case, as a religion should be seen as a religion no matter what its roots or history of providing good citizens.[37] Douglas also disagreed that requests for rights of free exercise of religion must not be made on a secular basis, as this was contrary to the precedent established in *United States v. Seeger*.[38] Douglas used the example of Henry David Thoreau to clarify his point Thoreau's refusal to pay taxes to support a war, Douglas asserted, would indeed have been a valid claim, despite his lack of belief in a power or being, because the precedent set in *United States v. Seeger* did not limit the definition of a "belief" to only those grounded in a divine power.[39] Douglas ended by saying that his view of religion was set up by prior Supreme Court decisions, and that he saw this as most important in our present time in which many religions and sects existed together.[40] While Douglas agreed in principle to much of what Burger wrote in his majority opinion, the exclusion of the views of the Yutzy and Wallace children regarding their own education, combined with Douglas' limited view of what can be claimed under the free exercise clause, gave him grounds to write a partial dissent.

The decision made in *Wisconsin v. Yoder* created a precedent with much historical significance. Few cases addressing the free exercise clause had been heard outside of those concerning conscientious objectors to war service. The decision made in this case, therefore, was both unique and important. The first precedent established was the balancing scale to determine the validity of a claim made under the free exercise clause. No real instances of a religious interest making a successful claim against a valid state law had existed before this case.[41] Justice Burger therefore was able to set up his own method of reviewing the arguments of each side. The result was the consideration of the

strengths of each interest on a sort of "scale of justice," with the side showing the strongest support for its claim being deemed the victor.[42] This method of evaluating claims based on the free exercise of religion allowed future cases to be heard on the matter and established the framework in which the court would make its decisions. Potential claimers of free exercise rights could look at Burger's method of deciding the Yoder case to evaluate the validity of their own claims and decide if they were worthy of pursuance in court. The historical significance of the "balancing of interests" set up by Justice Douglas in *Wisconsin v. Yoder* is not only great, but far reaching.

The fact that a religious interest was granted an exception to a valid state law using the free exercise of religion was a historical first.[43] The precedent that a religious group, albeit one with a very strong claim, could make a case against a valid state law it deemed to be in contrast with the free exercise of religion, and then win that claim, was a very significant one. While some argue that the precedent was too narrow in its scope, dealing strictly with the validity of the argument of the Amish, it still carried a definite importance.[44] The Supreme Court made it known that it would indeed support the free exercise of religion against a state law if a strong enough case were made. The Fourteenth Amendment maintained its broad interpretation, and the federal government continued its position as protector of its citizens' rights.

Religion has been present since the birth of our nation. In fact, many have said we are a nation based on Christian principles. Sometimes religion becomes a contested issue, however. At some point, religion is bound to get in the way of the operation of government, as religious beliefs often outweigh belief in the state. In *Wisconsin v. Yoder*, just such a problem arose. The conflict between the free exercise and practice of a

---

[37]Ibid., 43.
[38]Ibid.
[39]Ibid., 44.
[40]Ibid.
[41]Eastland, *Religious Liberty in the Supreme Court*, 235.

---

[42]Ibid.
[43]Ibid.
[44]Shawn Francis Peters, *The Yoder Case: Religious Freedom, Education, and Parental Rights* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2003), 153.

religion and the powers of a state came to a head and ended up before the highest court in our nation. The Supreme Court set new precedents in dealing with religion in the courts. Through the decision in the case, the Court established not only the way it would consider religious claims, but also whether those claims could prevail. The decision strengthened both the free exercise clause and the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution. *Wisconsin v. Yoder* was truly a landmark case in the history of the United States Supreme Court.