HISTORIA

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

VOLUME 21 (2012)

LETTER FROM THE EDITORS

After many months of difficult deliberation and hard work, we the editors are proud to present the twenty-first volume of *Historia*. The process of choosing which essays would be published was particularly difficult this year due to the record number of submissions—eighty-five in total, from classes in five different departments. Many of these papers were very good and, based on quality alone, were deserving of publication, something that made our decision process even more difficult. *Historia*'s tradition has been to publish those papers which best exemplified the wide variety of papers produced by students in every level of class offered by the History Department at Eastern Illinois University. The students of EIU are lucky enough to have the opportunity to study all different types of history and we are pleased to showcase that depth and breadth.

In recent years, *Historia* has received increasing numbers of papers written for courses outside the History Department; this is a natural evolution for this journal, as history is an interdisciplinary subject. This is a trend we would like to see continue.

We would like to thank several people for making the publication of the 2012 issue of *Historia* possible. Thank you very much to our advisor, Dr. Michael Shirley, for being our guide and support throughout this process. We would not have been able to do this without him. Special thanks also go to Dr. Anita Shelton and to Ms. Donna Nichols, who are essential to our work here. We would also like to thank the faculty of the Eastern Illinois History Department for their help and guidance, and for teaching the students whose work is presented here. Finally, we would like to thank the authors—both published and unpublished—who submitted to this issue of *Historia*. Without their submissions, none of this would have been possible.

We hope you enjoy the 2012 issue of *Historia*.

The Editors

TABLE OF CONTENTS
VOLUME 21

No Room for Gentlemen: Cryptography in American Military History

Rachael Sapp

Gentlemen do not read each others' mail
-- Henry Lewis Stimson[1]

For as long as profitable gain, political disputes, and warfare have existed, cryptography has existed. Cryptography is the contemporary term describing the art of writing messages with hidden meanings. In modern society, cryptography is used every day. When applied to cell phones, computers, and credit cards, cryptography allows personal information to remain personal. Though it is used frequently throughout the world, it is not a new invention. In fact, prior to the nineteenth century, the use of these codes and ciphers was most often referred to as encryption. Encryption, the act of creating a code or cipher, is a practice millennia old. It exists in diverse forms and cultures throughout the world and usage spans thousands of years. Through encoded messages called ciphers or codes, Egyptians, Romans, Greeks, and Hebrews could keep classified information out of the wrong hands.

In its beginning, cryptography was not a tool of governmental power like it is today. Codes and ciphers, mostly created for personal use, once had more common applications, such as keeping the directions to an ideal fishing hole a secret. In many ways, a written language itself was the earliest form of encryption.[2] For hundreds of years the words and pictures of a language were encrypted messages. These "ciphers" were not traditionally made, that is they were not created to be secretive. Few people had the ability to read and write. So, a written language was a highly effective type of cipher, used by the few who could read and write it, that went unsolved for hundreds of years due to widespread illiteracy. As literacy spread the need for a new type of secrecy emerged. Purposefully made ciphers were created to ensure messages remained a mystery. These basic ciphers used an encrypting technique that shifted letters in alphabets.[3] Some of the most basic

---

Rachael Sapp is a sophomore History and Theater Arts major from Tuscola, Illinois. "No Room for Gentleman: Cryptography in American Military History" was written fall semester of 2011 in Dr. Wehrle's section of Historical Research and Writing.
[1] Henry Lewis Stimson and McGeorge Bundy, *On Active Service in Peace and War, Volume II* (Pennsylvania, Harper, 1971), 188.
[2] Gary Blackwood, *Mysterious Messages: A History of Codes and Ciphers (*New York, NY: The Penguin Group, 2009), 5.
[3] Joseph Stanislaus Galland, *An Historical and Analytical Bibliography of the Literature of Cryptology* (New York, AMS Press, 1970), 17.

coded messages need very little encrypting to confuse and conceal. For example, what is known as the Rail Fence Cipher merely shifts every other letter vertically. To decipher the message, one would read the letters in a zigzagging fashion.[4] As these methods became commonplace, more elaborate codes were developed. These ciphers transformed from simple letter arrangements to comprehensive, mathematically based codes that only skilled cryptanalysts, with the aid of codebooks could decipher.

Not war in history is free from cryptography. Without it, the past would have an extraordinarily different story. This being said, America is no stranger to cryptography. Present on United States soil even prior to its separation from Britain, cryptography surfaced in each major American war, including the Revolutionary War, Civil War, World War I, and World War II.[5] Codes and ciphers are perhaps one of the military's most influential weapons. A code or cipher allows covert intelligence to pass undetected and are a necessary part of long distant communication. And although communication is generally secure, decryption by outsiders is an ongoing concern amongst cryptographers. As a result, new ciphers, ones created with precision and careful thought, are produced to fight against unwanted decoding. Though not an instrument of physical force, cryptography's power lies within its utilization of logic, thought, and secrecy. It is a powerful and fundamental weapon at the center of America's military history. Through the use of codes and ciphers, the United States evaded destruction, prevented battles, and won wars.

Secrecy was a major factor that led to the success of the American Revolutionary War. Numerous occasions have warranted cryptography as the tipping element in American victory.[6] At the forefront of all the mystery was General George Washington, who understood the importance of encrypted messages. He relied upon them to send information to his agents in the field. Though at first Washington and his staff's ciphers were primitive at best, they soon improved through dedicated practice. Washington played both "offensively" and "defensively." His offensive attacks were through deception, his greatest ally.[7] Washington was known to have sent out phony telegrams in hopes that British spies would intercept them and believe them truth. In one of his letters to James Madison, Washington tells him of the false

---

[4] Martin Gardner, *Codes, Ciphers and Secret Writing* (New York, NY: Simon and Schuster, 1972), 11, 13.

[5] Ronald Lewin, *The American Magic Codes, Ciphers, and the Defeat of Japan* (NY: Farrar Straus Giroux, 1982), 25.

[6] Walter R. Haefele, "General George Washington Espionage Chief," *American History* 1 (1991): 42-44.

[7] Ibid., 42.

messages he had his agents send out into circulation to fool the British.[8] Within another message written in invisible ink, made using lemon juice and decoded by Madison, Washington discusses the secret journals in which many codes are written and where detailed records are stored. Written in other letters, Washington emphasizes to Madison the need for obtaining British military intelligence on battle location and outposts. [9]

Perhaps cryptography's most significant moment in the Revolutionary War came from one of the most famous traitors in American history: Benedict Arnold. Arnold was surrounded by ciphers.[10] After having developed a negative feeling about the future of America, Arnold began his plot to switch sides. He expressed much grief over the "horrid" situation within the country as well as his discontent of the armed forces.[11] He foretold in a letter to General Nathanael Greene that he saw "impending ruin" in this country's near future.[12] Soon, with his mind made up to switch sides from the Continental Army to that of the British, Arnold began secret correspondence with a British spy named John Andre. Arnold crafted elaborate plans to ensure this communication remained secret. With the use of encrypted messages and the help of his wife Peggy, Arnold was able to pass along letters to Andre depicting his plot to voluntarily surrender West Point, where Arnold was stationed, to British troops. If employed, this surrender would weaken the power of the Continental Army. Arnold was also supplying the British with highly confidential troop locations as well as the strengths and weaknesses of the Continental Army.[13]

This secret communication did not last forever; Arnold's plot was discovered before it was too late. He was found out by giving Andre passes through the Continental Army's lines, as he was British.[14] In order to safely leave the country, Arnold gave Andre passes to escape through Continental Army lines. He also received a letter illustrating the details of the planned surrender at West Point form Arnold. A few days after Andre set out, he was captured, interrogated, and the plan exposed. This was a huge blow to Washington's trust, Arnold having been in his confidence.[15] Immediately, Washington set troops to capture

---

[8]*Washington-Madison papers collected and preserved by James Madison (*Philadelphia, PA: Publisher unknown, 1842), 80.

[9] Ibid.,1780.

[10] Ibid., 1780.

[11] Haefele, "General George Washington Espionage Chief," 41-42.

[12] Ibid.,45.

[13] Barry K. Wilson, *Benedict Arnold: A Traitor in Our Midst* (Quebec: McGuille-Queen's University Press, 2001), 100.

[14] Ibid.,161.

[15] *Washington-Madison papers*, 1779.

Arnold, but he was never caught and went on to serve for the British forces.[16] Had Arnold's plot to surrender West Point succeeded the Continental Army would have faced devastating consequences through the loss of a vital military base.

Moving out of the eighteenth century and into the nineteenth century, America still found great use from cryptography. The Civil War was the earliest American war where telegraphs were used. Telegraphs gave the Union and Confederacy incomparable abilities in increasing the frequency and alacrity by which messages were received. However, this new technology posed one problem: easily tapped lines caused enemy intelligence to readily seize information without detection. As a result, armies of the Union and Confederacy found a simple solution in cryptography. Both sides of the war incorporated cryptography into their weapons arsenal. Most of the ciphers and codes came to pass as basic in comparison to other ciphers in use during the mid nineteenth century, but still proved effective.[17]

Prior to the initial start of the war, the United States War Department was made up of a single man dedicated to the area communication.[18] A major in the U.S. armed forces, Albert J. Myer was in charge of developing the department to include greater means of covert communication techniques.[19] Though Myer was intrigued by ciphers and cryptography, he was more devoted to improving strategic flag signaling. As a result, the department was at a near standstill until after the war between the states erupted. Needing to once again build up the communication branch, the War Department quickly began seeking skilled men.[20] After several months of searching and inquiry, Anson Stager, co-founder and general superintendent of Western Union Telegraph Company was the man called to Washington. Stager eventually designed the cipher adapted by the Union army.[21]

Unlike the easily cracked ciphers at the beginning of the war, this cipher was different. By altering a Scottish transformation cipher some two hundred years old, Stager was able to construct an effective cipher that went undecoded by Confederate forces.[22] The transformation cipher was a simple technique to use. It worked by keeping words in an unaltered text form. By modifying syntax structure, it allowed the message to result in a jumbled mess of words. "Null words," or words void of meaning within the note, also added to further confusion by any

[16] Wilson, *Benedict Arnold*,161-163.
[17] Michael, Antonucci, "Code Crackers: Cryptanalysis in the Civil War," *Civil War Times Illustrated*, 34 (1995): 46.
[18] Blackwood, *Mysterious Messages: A History of Codes and Ciphers*, 93.
[19] Antonucci, "Code Crackers," 47.
[20] Ibid., 47.
[21] Ibid.,47.
[22] Ibid., 48.

interceptor.[23] Only the receiver of the coded telegram would know how to make sense of the scrambled message. A receiver would have a standard key to decode it. Taking the first word written in the text, which they knew to always be a null word, they would match its corresponding number from the key. This number indicated how the receiver should rewrite the message in order to decipher its true form. Whichever number matched the word on the key, the receiver would reconstruct the message by writing the words onto a grid with a certain number of rows and columns. Skipping known null words, they would then read the decoded grid.[24]

There is much speculation as to why the Confederacy did not crack the Union cipher. By merely looking at the encrypted telegrams, along with a little dedicated time, one could easily understand what the sender had written. The Confederate army also intercepted scores of Union messages and even succeeded in apprehending a couple of Union codebooks.[25] So why did the ciphers go uncracked? Little is known as to why. Many historians merely assume that the Confederacy was too engrossed with the use of spies to bother with encryption. They found the use of undercover agents as more efficient means of covert affairs rather then risk the possible capture of information. However, this is not to say that the Confederacy went completely without both encryption and decryption. A confederate man, named Charles Gaston, traveled behind enemy lines and managed with a small force of men to openly tap into Union telegraph lines and obtain encrypted messages.[26] Once arriving back at the Confederate capitol, Richmond, Virginia, however, an unorganized department of cryptology and insufficient support put officials at a loss as how to go about decoding the messages. Southern military lacked skilled cryptanalysts save one named Edward Porter Alexander. Alexander was an intelligent Southerner trained in cryptology.[27] At the time of Gaston's return, Alexander was busy assisting General Robert E Lee as an artillery officer. As a result, the decoding of the ciphers never occurred.

Though it does appear that these ciphers were overlooked, Southern newspapers reported to have encrypted Union telegrams with rewards in hopes of enticing citizens to find their answers.[28] Not much is known about the reasoning behind these printings. Some historians believe them to be a ruse, made by the Confederacy, hoping the Union would think them unsolved. This way, the North would continue to use

---

[23] Blackwood, *Mysterious Messages: A History of Codes and Ciphers*, 94–95.

[24] Ibid., 95.

[25] Antonucci, "Code Crackers," 48–49.

[26] Ibid., 50.

[27] Ibid., 51.

[28] Ibid 51.

these ciphers and, unbeknownst to them, the Southern cryptographers would be able to decipher them.

Nevertheless, the Union War Department, located along side the White House in Washington D.C., expanded considerably. Unlike the Confederacy, who obviously underappreciated the advantages of encoding and decoding messages, the Union relied upon it. David Homer Bates, Charles A. Tinker, and Albert A. Chandler, though only in their early twenties, were the most knowledgeable and qualified cryptologists at the Union's disposal.[29] President Abraham Lincoln regularly visited the department, reading the decrypted messages from the "Sacred Three," as Bates, Tinker, and Chandler were called. While not many in his cabinet were interested in cryptography, Lincoln was. He saw the benefits of encrypting and commended the "Sacred Three" on their dedication and labor.

The three men's most noteworthy achievement, and perhaps the greatest intercepted cipher of the war, took place in December of 1863. After intercepting a letter addressed to Alexander Keith—a known contact of the Confederacy—Bates, Tinker, and Chandler went to work.[30] The messages developed by using sets of cipher symbols common to effective encrypted messages. This message revealed a Confederate spy ring based out of New York City. The Confederacy had constructed the machinery capable of making money. The three immediately sent word to officials who raided the shop housing the machines.[31] Because of their swift decoding, the Sacred Three prevented the Confederacy from receiving the machine. With the interception of ciphered messages, Union forces kept from the Confederacy a vital facet in making secession lasting: the tools needed to print currency. Though the Confederacy's economy appeared to be in shambles due to over production of bills and the capture perhaps helped prevent further destruction, this allowed the Union to print counterfeit bills, a much needed asset to the Union's undercover work. Had the Union not discovered the spy ring, the Confederacy's espionage work in the Union army would have succeeded in obtaining their classified information.

Some fifty years after the end of the American Civil War one cipher caused a declaration of war. After receiving notice of an enciphered telegram, the United States entered into a war in which they initially had no involvement. On January 17, 1917 British intelligence intercepted a telegram heading for Washington D.C. Although its message was encrypted by numerals, nothing was remarkably different about this particular message other than its source: Germany. The

---

[29] Blackwood, *Mysterious Messages: A History of Codes and Ciphers*, 98.
[30] Antonucci, "Code Crackers," 51-52.
[31] Ibid., 52.

message was handed off to the cryptanalysts of Room 40, Reverend William Montgomery and Nigel de Grey, for decoding.[32] While deciphering the numerals one day, a number at the top of the page caught the men's attention. They recognized the construction of the cipher as indeed German, a cipher of which they had previously encountered on numerous occasions. Taking out a book of translated German numerals, Montgomery and de Grey began the painstaking decoding process.[33] The men then began isolating the signature of the telegram.

After some lengthy concentration, Montgomery and de Grey succeeded in changing the numbers to the name Zimmerman, a name they identified as German Foreign Secretary Arthur Zimmerman.[34] As they furthered their examination, however, the two men noticed there was more to the telegram than originally perceived.[35] Strange phrasing such as "For Your Excellency's personal information" and "Most secret" led them to believe that the telegram was intended for Count von Bernstorff, the German Ambassador in Washington D.C. As other words were decoded, such as "Mexico" and "us and Japan," the men began to work with swifter urgency. [36] After several hours of dedicated toil, the telegram became abundantly clear. What was concealed within the numerals of the message would change the course of First World War.

The telegram was constructed in two parts: one part intended for Count von Bernstorff, the German Ambassador in the U.S., and one intended for Heinrich von Eckhardt, Imperial German Minister in Mexico. Bernstorff's portion depicted the German's want of unrestricted U-boat warfare. Von Eckhardt section took a greater amount of time to decipher.[37] After days of persistent struggle to solve the telegram's puzzle, Montgomery and de Grey uncovered the most startling news yet. Von Eckhartdt's segment declared that Germany would assist Mexico in "[regaining] by conquest her lost territory" on United States' soil, specifically the states of Texas, Arizona, and New Mexico and that, should the United States enter the war, Eckhardt was to hand the message over to the Mexican government.[38]

President Woodrow Wilson gave Germany access to the Western Hemisphere, and he did this in hope of remaining neutral, as he believed the end of the war in Europe would come swiftly. However, Germany

---

[32] Barbara W. Tuchman, *The Zimmerman Telegram* (NY: Dell, 1963), 3.

[33] Ibid., 4.

[34] Ibid., 5.

[35] N.D. Scott, *The Zimmerman Cypher*. (United States of America: Trafford Publishing, 2010), ix.

[36] Tuchman, *The Zimmerman Telegram*, 4-6.

[37] Ibid., 8.

[38] Ibid., 100.

took advantage of the president's hospitality.[39] By using the telegraph wires to easily send hypersensitive information to German officials within the United States, they could do so with out detection since the British would not want to openly admit to tapping into American telegraph wires. Another problem facing the British was solving the code. How could they relay the message without tipping off Germany that their cipher had been cracked? The answer came from Mexico. A British undercover agent enticed a Mexican communication's officer to slip him a copy of the message as well as the decoded version. This way, British intelligence could truthfully say they had received the message via Mexico, as well as the decoded version.[40] Germany bought into this lie and continued using the Enigma.

British intelligence officer William Hall showed Edward Bell, an American government official from the United States Embassy in Britain, the telegram.[41] From there the message was passed along from official to official and eventually to President Wilson. Some thought it was a hoax concocted by the British Government to entice the Americans into the war. The press eventually acquired the message, and it outraged the American public.[42] Already having negative feelings toward Germany due to German-Americans supposed sympathy of the war, American citizens grew angrier. Though not the sole reason behind entering the war, receiving this encoded telegram was indeed a determining factor. The discovery of this information, though not uncovered by Americans, led to the United States' entry into the First World War.

Barely twenty years post World War One, America was going to need cryptography yet again. Enigma, a machine used by Nazi Germany throughout the 1920's and the beginning of World War II, remained unbroken. The Enigma enciphering machine was known as unbreakable because of its many years of use and a decade's worth of attempted decoding.[43] Following Enigma's decoding, America, had yet to find an unbreakable code, felt that Enigma's defeat gave them an opportunity to search for the unbreakable cipher. However, the codes and ciphers discovered after this time showed little improvement. After several years passed with no advancement, a single event, an attack made by Japan, changed the course of cryptography.

Subsequent to the attacks on Pearl Harbor, the United States entered into war with Japan. Due to the many hundreds of miles of water lying between the United States and Japan, radio messaging was

---

[39] Tuchman, *The Zimmerman Telegram*, 130.

[40] Ibid., 184.

[41] Ibid., 182, 201.

[42] Ibid., 169.

[43] Blackwood, *Mysterious Messages: A History of Codes and Ciphers*, 141.

crucial for the military. Having developed wireless radios, communication between regiments and other allied forces became swifter and easier for troops.[44] Little did the Americans know, the Japanese military had a few tricks of their own. By using English-speaking soldiers, the Japanese were able to listen to American airwaves, obtaining confidential information. In attempts to combat enemy hacking, American troops were instructed to encode all outgoing messages. This worked for a time until Japanese cryptanalysts were called into action.[45] Realizing that their airwaves were no longer safe, the U.S. neared desperation for seeking an encryption technique Japan could not break.

The solution came not from the military or even cryptographers. The answer turned up from an engineer out of California named Phillip Johnston. Having been raised on a Navajo reservation, he understood the language well. Through this understanding he knew it to be entirely impenetrable to decoding. Lucky for Johnston, he was correct. With his keen insight and knowledge, he led the American armed forces to find the only code to ever go unbroken.

The Navajo are a Native American people who populated the southwestern parts of the United States. Though an old culture, the people maintained many traditional customs over hundreds of years. Navajo are highly spiritual individuals and skilled in numerous arts, such as silver work and weaving. Another art the Navajo use is there language, which is a descendent of one of the southernmost sections of the North American Athabaskan languages.[46] Over the centuries, the language continued to thrive throughout the Navajo peoples. Looking around the Navajo Nation, one will see a large absence of written language; Navajo had little to no need for their language to be written. Unlike European cultures, which had hierarchical governments and organized religious practices, the Navajo had neither of these. Navajo language was taught by word of mouth. Because of this, very few non-native people understood the language.[47] Johnston recognized the Navajo language would make for the perfect coded messages, and the United States government agreed.

The Navajo language is a difficult one to learn. Each syllable holds different meaning, as do tone and pronunciation. Due to this, the language must be faultless in presentation or else it is spoken incorrectly.[48] This makes mastering the language very demanding and explains why so few outsiders spoke it. Johnston, having taken all these

[44] Nathan Aaseng and Roy O. Hawthorne, *Navajo Code Talkers* (New York, NY: Walker Publishing Company, 1963), 8.
[45] Ibid., 9.
[46] Ibid., 12.
[47] Ibid., 12.
[48] Aaseng, *Navajo Code Talkers*, 11.

issues into account, spoke with army representatives about the benefits of using Navajo, or Code Talkers as they are commonly called. Initially, they did not have faith in Johnston's pitch. Marine Corps troops had previously used Choctaw language during World War I to no avail.[49] Japan like many other nations around the world had begun to take interest in Native American cultures and as a result had picked up on the Choctaw words streaming from tapped wires. Eventually, Johnston convinced Marine Corps officer James Jones and Washington D.C. officials to use the language of the Navajo because it remained unwritten.[50]

Accordingly, Navajo men who could speak and understand both Navajo and English were called to arms and a code was created. The cipher worked by Navajo speaking soldiers using pre-agreed upon words in Navajo to describe English military terms. The material and texts taught to these men never left the training rooms. This further prevented outsiders from obtaining information. As Johnston foretold, the Navajo language stumped the Japanese, and even other Navajo, if overhearing conversations of radio, would take notice of an endlessly obscure list of words.[51] The Navajo were celebrated for their service during the war. Although it is no longer used today because it was purposefully unveiled many years later to the public, the Navajo code remains the only military cipher to go unbroken. The Navajo proved the United States' secret weapon because of their dedication, hard work, and their cipher, the Code Talkers helped America win the war.

Thousands of different codes and ciphers are known to man. Hundreds more are added every year. These ciphers differ in creation methods, but are all similar in their secrecy. A cipher need not require overly complex methods to prove effective, as the cipher created by Anson Stage shows, even a cipher hundreds of years old can stump the enemy. They have been the tipping factors in many successful battles from the Revolutionary War and even that of the twentieth century Code Talkers. Through the use of codes and ciphers the history of the United States took shape. Cryptography has many defining moments in American military history. Though easily looked over due to its simple and inconspicuous form, cryptography is a small, yet silent weapon that has the potential to alter the world.

---

[49] Ibid., 11.
[50] Blackwood, *Mysterious Messages: A History of Codes and Ciphers*, 142.
[51] Ibid., 143- 144.

Dirty Work: The Political Life of John A. Logan

Benjamin Joyner

John Alexander Logan, the bright-eyed and raven-haired veteran of the Mexican-American and Civil War, began his career as an ardent supporter of states' rights and a strong Democrat.[1] During his years in the state legislature, Logan was a very strong supporter of enforcing the fugitive slave laws and even sponsored the Illinois Black Codes of 1853. How then did an avowed racist and Southern sympathizing politician from Murphysboro, in the decidedly Southern (in culture, politics, ideology, and geography) section of Illinois, go on to become a staunch supporter of both the Union and the Republican Party? Logan led quite the remarkable and often times contradictory life. Many factors contributed to his transformation including Logan's political ambition and his war experiences, yet something acted as a catalyst for this transformation. The search for the "real" Logan is problematic due to the dearth of non-partisan accounts of his life. Even letters and unpublished materials bear the taint of clearly visible political overtones. As noted by James Jones in *Black Jack*, "No balanced biography of Logan exists."[2] However, by searching through the historical works of John Logan himself, his wife Mary, the various primary documents, articles and literature, and especially the works by prominent Logan historians such as James Jones we can gain a better understanding of Logan's transformation.

To understand John Logan, one must understand the nature of his upbringing. The first settlers moving westward into Illinois had come predominantly to the southern part of the state. These people traveled fixed routes from Virginia, the Carolinas, and Georgia through Tennessee and Kentucky to Illinois. They brought with them slaves and customs, making "southern" Illinois a cultural as well as geographic term.[3] Southern Illinois, or Egypt as it was affectionately known, retained, (and still does even to this day) a distinct "Southern" character despite its location in a northern state. Logan was born into a strong

---

Benjamin Joyner, from Equality, Illinois, earned his BA and MA degrees in history from Eastern Illinois University. He wrote this paper in Dr. Hubbard's Civil War Seminar in the fall semester of 2010.

[1] Mrs. John A. Logan, *Reminiscences of a soldier's wife* (C. Scribner's sons, 1913). 98.

[2] James Pickett Jones, *Black Jack: John A. Logan and Southern Illinois in the Civil War* Era, Shawnee classics (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1995). Xxii.

[3] "John A. Logan Museum | Murphysboro, IL |," http://www.loganmuseum .org/genjal.html.

Democratic family in 1826; his father, a doctor by trade, was a "Scot-Irish immigrant who, having acquired a fortune in Missouri, sold his slaves and moved to Jackson County, Illinois, in 1824."[4] There he met and married Elizabeth Jenkins, the daughter of the most influential and firmly Democratic family in the region. Dr. Logan had married into the foremost political power in the county, and like many wealthy men in his day, Logan's father entered into politics. Having been a Jacksonian Democrat, Dr. Logan served three terms in the state legislature, and was a friend of Abraham Lincoln. He believed "it is no odds how obscure a young man may be Brought up he may aspire even to the presidential chair . . . Man rises on Marrit and falls on Demarit . . .[sic]."[5] This would be an idea that his son, John, would take to heart. While his father balanced a very large and successful medical practice, farmstead, and political career, young Logan enjoyed the benefits of a private tutor and the best education available on the Illinois frontier. From an early age, Jack, as the young Logan was known, took great interest in his father's political machinations. Logan aided his father, when allowed, in his election campaigns, never missing a speech and taking great pleasure in the processes of government.

The outbreak of the Mexican-American War in 1846 (a war his father heartily supported) provided Logan with an opportunity to both aid his country, a duty to which he truly aspired, and hoped to achieve glory. With these goals in mind, Logan joined the 1st Regiment of the Illinois Volunteers earning the rank of 1st Lieutenant but failed to see battle due to a measles epidemic that swept through the encampment at Santa Fe. Disappointed, yet undeterred, Logan returned home. Wishing to follow his father and uncle in the world of politics, the now twenty-two year old Logan spent a few months reading law at his uncle's home before entering the race for county clerk. He easily won due to his familial connections and name recognition. Using this opportunity, Logan saved his pay as clerk in order to finance his attendance to law school, a move he deemed necessary if he was to have a serious political career. With money in hand, Logan made his way to Louisville, Kentucky, and entered law school there. It was there in the moot court sessions that Logan honed his talent for public oratory, a skill for which he would become well known. Having spent little over a year in law school, Logan returned home with his diploma, and with the help of his family's clout, won office as prosecuting attorney of the Third District. Shorty after his victory, Logan resigned in order to run for state representative to the 18th General Assembly. Logan's political ambition is clearly indicated by his calculated movements, from lowly county clerk through law school and into his first race for the Illinois

---

[4] Ibid.
[5] Ibid.

legislature. Logan declares in a letter to his father that "Politics is a trade and if my few fast friends in Jackson will stand by me, the day is not far distant when I can help myself and them to pay tenfold."[6] Politics in this era focused heavily on patronage and the spoils system, an aspect that clearly excited Logan. "Bitterly Anti-Negro," Logan ran as a Jacksonian Democrat, promising support for a bill to exclude free blacks from the state, and sought the enforcement of the Fugitive Slave Act.[7] The 1853 election saw Logan victorious in his first bid for a state level position.

Logan wasted no time in establishing himself firmly as a supporter of the "Little Giant" Stephen Douglas. Logan, along with Democrats in congress in his home state of Illinois, exalted Douglas. Logan's letters and correspondence are filled with praise for the Douglas and his policies. Even his private letters to his family contain denouncements of Douglas's enemies and praise for his triumphs. There is little if any separation in Logan's life between the private and public man. This is evident as early as his first campaign, when Logan is cautioned by his family to "tone down" his boisterous and rambunctious nature during his stump speeches and fundraisers. Logan's penchant for roughhousing with children during these events, even going so far as wrestling with them on the ground, drew criticism from those who saw such behavior as undignified. Logan rejected their advice, deeming it part of his nature and reminding them that the people of Southern Illinois were of a same mind.[8]

Logan announced his wholehearted support of Douglas' famous "Compromise of 1850" on the condition that the Northern states actually enforce the Fugitive Slave Act. Logan's concerns seem to stem more from a regard for the upholding and enforcement of law rather than a support the institution of slavery. Despite this caveat, Logan's views on Negroes cannot be glossed over. It is abundantly clear from his writings, speeches, and manners that he considered the Negro to be inferior to whites in every way, a common held belief by most in his day, including many abolitionists. After the war his disdain for blacks continued; "The negro equality talk … is all bugbear and humbug. I don't consider a nigger my equal."[9] The majority of Logan's constituency agreed with this assessment, and demanded something be done to counter the abolitionists in the Northern part of the state who were fighting for black rights. In 1853 Logan took up the issue with his usual vigor and fervor. Taking advantage of the 1848 Illinois

---

[6] James Pickett Jones, *Black Jack*, 11.

[7] Ibid., 12.

[8] H.E. Kimmel, "Sixty-Sixth Anniversary of Daniel Gill and Lucinda Pyle Gill, DuQuoin Illinois," *Journal of Illinois State Historical Society*, XVII, No. 3, (Sept., 1924), 442

[9] James Pickett Jones, *Black Jack*, 267.

Constitution, which had banned Negroes from voting or participating in the state militia, Logan addressed the issue of Negro immigration. The resulting Negro Exclusion Bill of 1853 banned any Negro from entering the state and placed further restrictions on travel by those already in the state. Logan's actions in championing the cause of his beloved "Egypt" brought simultaneous celebration from his supporters, and condemnation from his opponents. The Benton Standard, a local newspaper, declared Logan, "our worthy and talented young representative who has demonstrated to the North by his talent and eloquence that we, in the South have interests to foster, guide, and protect, and that we have men who are willing and able to do it."[10] It was Logan's role in the Exclusion Bill that cemented his popularity in the state and helped to propel him to the national stage. Logan's private law practice continued to flourish at this time as well, garnering him even greater support and admiration in his home districts. When his hero returned to Springfield, in order to raise support for the Kansas-Nebraska Act in 1854, Logan hastened back to the capital to see Douglas speak. Following a speech by Douglas on the importance of popular sovereignty, Logan declared, "I tell you the time has not yet come when a handful of traitors in our camp can turn the great state of Illinois ...into a Negro worshipping, Negro equality community."[11] Douglas's opponents labeled him a proslavery advocate in the pocket of the Southern slave powers, a charge that is blatantly false as evidenced by his fight with President Buchanan over a federal slave code. Logan, who modeled his own beliefs on those of Douglas, believed firmly in the notion of popular sovereignty and opposed the idea that the federal government should decide any such issue that lay in the prevue of the states.

Logan's re-election campaign to the Illinois House was a rousing success. His second term was marked, much like the first, with highly partisan politics with Logan denouncing "Black Republicans and Know-Nothings with equal fervor."[12] By the spring of 1858, rumors of a possible run for U.S. Congress were being whispered in Little Egypt. These rumors proved to be true when Logan was given the go ahead by party leadership to enter the race. Northern Illinois papers quickly denounced him as a puppet for Douglas and "an arrant trickster of the black-guard order."[13] Douglas greatly aided Logan's campaign, speaking on several occasions in Southern Illinois on behalf of the young politician. The combination of the two fiery orators was apparently quite a sight, and even the Republican Chicago *Tribune* noted their

---

[10] *Benton Standard*, March 24, 1853.

[11] James Pickett Jones, *Black Jack*, 22.

[12] Cairo *Times and Delta*, July 16th, 1856.

[13] *Illinois State Journal*, April 28, 1858.

effectiveness.[14] The November election saw Logan victorious by a landslide, 12,000-vote margin.[15] Logan was headed for Washington.

Logan's journey to Washington was punctuated by a stop at the infamous Harper's Ferry, which had only recently been attacked by John Brown. The still visible signs of the shootout caused the freshman congressmen to write home to his beloved wife Mary about the incident: "There is more danger of a rupture in this government now more than has ever been before."[16] Logan placed blame for this danger firmly in the hands of the radical abolitionists. Logan spoke on the House floor for the first time on December 9th, and the incident bears recollection because it accurately depicts Logan's rabid devotion to both Douglas as well as his highly partisan nature. When opponents of Stephen Douglas took advantage of a lull in House activity to attack the Illinois Senator, Logan sprang to his defense. The young Democrat, with his swarthy skin, jet-black hair, and large drooping mustache, made his auditors take notice as he spoke with a booming voice.[17] He denounced the House for his attack reminding his fellow congressmen that, "Kellogg's cry was "Republicanism! Abolitionism! Sewardism!"[18]

> I tell the gentleman now, since he has refused this morning, to bring forward his proof, that from this time forth, I shall never notice it. I scorn to notice it any further, and the reason for it is this: I made a charge once, in the Legislature of the State of Illinois, and I stood up and did prove it, when called upon for proof, and did not shrink from responsibility, and like a spaniel cower.[19]

These remarks elicited a fierce response from Kellogg and the two men rushed at each other ready to fight. Once order had been restored, Logan turned his fury on those members of the Southern Democrats who had agreed with the attack against Douglas, calling them ungrateful and urging them to remember Douglas, "whose efforts had always been in their behalf."[20] Still yet, his anger was not sated, Logan now turned his attention to the Republicans present, denouncing and railing against "Republican violations of federal law" in regards to the Fugitive Slave Act while defending popular sovereignty in the western territories in regards to slavery. Continuing, the young Democrat declared,

[14] Chicago *Press and Tribune*, Sept. 19, 1858.
[15] Chicago *Press and Tribune*, Nov. 18, 1858.
[16] John Logan to Mary Logan, Nov. 27, 1859, Logan Mss.
[17] James P. Jones, "John A. Logan, Freshman in Congress, 1859-1861," *Journal of the Illinois State Historical Society (1908-1984)* 56, no. 1 (Spring 1963): 38.
[18] *Congressional Globe*, 36 Cong., 1 Sess., Pt. 1, 82-83.
[19] Ibid.
[20] Ibid., 83.

Every fugitive slave that has been arrested in Illinois, or in any of the western States - and I call Illinois a western State, for I [am] ashamed longer to call it a northern State - has been made by Democrats. In Illinois the Democrats have all that work to do. You call it the dirty work of the Democratic Party to catch fugitive slaves for the southern people. We are willing to perform that dirty work. I do not consider it disgraceful to perform any work, dirty or not dirty, which is in accordance with the laws of the land and the Constitution of the country.[21]

The phrase, "Dirty Work" would become his nickname in the Republican press.[22] Logan finally concluded his remarks by urging the Democrats to unite and seize power from the "anti-Constitution, anti-Union, and anti-everything" Republicans. Furthermore, Logan announced his hatred of the opposition from his youth, claiming, "I will never affiliate [with them] so long as I have breath in my body."[23] This first speech on the House floor would be indicative of Logan's entire pre-war career and highlights the highly partisan nature of his politics.

The remainder of Logan's first Congressional term was filled with vicious attacks against extremists on both sides of the aisle, and fierce defense of his hero Douglas. His actions in defending Douglas and fighting to enforce the Fugitive Slave Act gained the Congressman much respect and admiration, both by his constituents and Douglas himself, and easily catapulted Logan into a second term as the Illinois Congressman from Little Egypt. With the threat of secession weighing heavily in the air, Logan, along with his wife and infant daughter, made their way to the capital. When President Buchanan announced the fateful news of the South Carolinian secession on December 4th 1860, Logan was uncharacteristically silent. No record exists of his response to the news. Some twenty years later he described the President as, "a weak and feeble old man…. Well-meaning, doubtless, and a Union man at heart, but lacking in perception, forcefulness, and 'nerve.'" [24] Like the President, Logan held secession unconstitutional and opposed coercion. But while Buchanan remained largely inactive, Logan felt that swift compromise efforts were necessary to save the Union.[25] As the House tried desperately to reach a solution, hope continued to fade. Splits in the Illinois delegation mirrored those in the House itself. The Democrats in the delegation all opposed secession, yet they equally opposed the use of force to solve the problem. Logan followed the opinion of Douglas who wrote, "I will not consider the question of force

---

[21] Ibid., 85.

[22] *Illinois State Journal*, Jan. 10, 1860.

[23] *Congressional Globe*, 36 Cong., 1 Sess., Pt. 1, p. 86.

[24] John Alexander Logan, *The Great Conspiracy: its origin and history* (A.R. Hart & co., 1886). 104

[25] James P. Jones, "John A. Logan, Freshman in Congress, 1859-1861" 50

& war until all efforts at peaceful adjustment have been made & have failed."[26] Despite this sentiment, the tone back in Little Egypt was quite different. A local newspaper wrote of South Carolina's departure, "Let her in God's name go peacefully. The sympathies of our people are mainly with the South."[27] Such sentiments alarmed Logan who wrote a friend stating, "Those who dream that this Confederacy can separate peacefully will wake up to the conviction of their sad error I fear too late."[28] Logan placed blame for the growing conflict and divisiveness equally on both "abolitionist Black Republicans" and southern "fire-eaters" as creators of civil conflict."[29] His hatred of Lincoln is evident in the same letter:

History informs us that Nero, a royal but insane and blood thirsty man fiddled while Rome was burning, and it does seem to me that the President elect and his friends flushed and drunken with victory are plunging deeper into their fanatical orgies, the nearer our beloved country is undone.[30]

Despite this hatred of the Northern Republicans, he sternly warned his Southern colleagues, "The election of Mr. Lincoln, deplorable as it may be, affords no justification or excuse for overthrowing the republic. [We] cannot stand silently by while the joint action of extremists are dragging us to ruin."[31] Logan's message was clear, secession was an outside the law and a traitorous act. Though continuing to work with others in the House to reach a compromise and avert a national disaster, he began to despair over reaching a peaceful solution. The month prior to the firing on Fort Sumter, Logan continued to denounce the radical malcontents of both sides in a series of fiery speeches on the House floor. During one such heated oration Logan compared the Republicans to King George III as oppressors upon the nation. This would prove to be a most unfortunate slip, as his enemies pounced on the opportunity to paint Logan as a "fire eater" sympathizer despite his denunciation of the same group.[32] Despite the pressure, he continued to fight for compromise and maintenance of the Union. With the ending of the congressional session, Logan rushed back to Southern Illinois to decide what he would do.

Details of what Logan did from February to April are non-existent. The historian John Jones believes that the sudden lack of documentation is possible evidence of censorship on the part of Logan and his followers to remove any evidence of his decision making process from the record,

---

[26] Ibid., 51.

[27] *Cairo City Gazette*, Dec. 6, 1860.

[28] Jones, "John A. Logan," 52.

[29] Illinois State Journal, Feb. 15, 1861.

[30] Ibid.

[31] Ibid.

[32] Congressional Globe, 36 Cong., 2 Sess., App., 178-81.

lest it give credence to claims that he contemplated treason himself. These rumors that Logan would stir up rebellion in the heavily Democratic Little Egypt were widespread. The Chicago *Tribune* declared, "if any section of the free states could be lured into secession then, [Little] Egypt was the place."[33] Logan publicly still called for compromise between the factions, yet the accusations continued to fly. His family, including his own brother-in-law publically supported the South. It is clear that Logan was torn over what course he should pursue following the firing on Fort Sumter. When the political leaders gathered in Williamson County to hold a secession meeting to discuss breaking Little Egypt from the rest of Illinois and join the Confederacy, Logan was absent. He denounced their decision not to take up arms against their Southern brethren and recognized the Confederacy as treason, but wrote to his friend that he would:

> Suffer his tongue to cleave to the roof of his mouth and his right arm to wither before he would take up arms against his Southern brethren, unless it was to sustain the Government; and that if war was prosecuted solely with the purpose of freeing Negroes, he would not ground his arms but turn them and shoot North.[34]

Logan headed to Springfield to sit in on the special joint session of the legislature in order to judge sentiment in the capital. A day prior to his arrival Stephen Douglas gave a rousing pro-Union speech in the capital. Logan was furious that his former hero had abandoned the cause of peace and compromise in favor of conflict. Douglas had just returned from a tour of the South and had a better grasp of the Southern sentiment than Logan. In defense of Logan, it must be said that he had always proven to be an accurate representative of his constituency and had yet to definitively assess the will of his people.

May 1861 would prove to be a tipping point for both Logan and Little Egypt. The area was increasingly being swamped with Southern refugees and Union troops building up strength in the city of Cairo. This combination seems to have decreased secessionist feelings as well as suppressed the desire for a peaceful resolution. With the death of Douglas in early June, Logan seemed to have reached his decision. Aided by the swing in sentiment in Little Egypt, he would follow the path of Douglas and advocate the defense of the Union. During a visit to Springfield on June 18th, Logan again condemned the "abolitionists of the North as well as the secessionists of the South," but shockingly pledged support to the government and vowed to join the army

---

[33] Chicago *Tribune*, April 2, 1861.
[34] James Pickett Jones, Black Jack, 79.

immediately following a special session of Congress.[35] What caused this sudden decision is unclear. Perhaps Logan felt some responsibility to carry on the legacy of Douglas. This seems to be the best choice considering that Logan always followed every decision and policy of Douglas with such fervor and determination. Logan returned to Washington for the special session of Congress and while there, managed to insert himself into a most dangerous situation. Like most Congressmen, Logan wished to see the war for himself, and when the opportunity to witness the Battle of Bull Run occurred, he jumped at the chance. Attaching himself to the 2nd Michigan volunteers, he marched with them in civilian clothes to the battle, even firing at rebel troops despite a promise to his wife to stay at a safe distance. Logan then spent the next few days dodging fire and caring for the wounded on the field and behind the lines. Disgusted by the war, yet galvanized to join the fight himself, Logan began his return to Egypt. True to his word, Logan announced on August 19th 1861 in front of a large crowd at Marion Illinois, "I, for one, shall stand or fall for this Union. ... I want as many of you as will to come with me. If you say 'No,' and see that your best interests lie ... in another direction, may God protect you."[36] Logan then began to raise troops from his native state to aid in the struggle against the Confederacy, almost single handedly forming the Illinois 31st Volunteer Infantry Regiment.

During the War he distinguished himself as an outstanding general and was renowned for the respect he commanded with his men as well as his superior officers including Ulysses S. Grant and William T. Sherman. In 1864, Logan, at the bequest of President Lincoln, returned to Little Egypt to rally support for the President and the War. Logan did so while at the same time ignoring pleas by Democratic leadership to aid in their campaigns for election. Instead Logan turned his silver tongue against his former allies. Historian John Dickinson notes that his wrath was great, and that Logan "flailed the Democrats of Illinois without mercy."[37] Speaking against the Confederacy Logan claimed, "I am willing to subjugate, burn, and I almost said exterminate [!]"[38]

Following the cessation of hostilities between the North and South, Logan was tasked with demobilizing various regiments and was stationed in Louisville, Kentucky to ensure the orderly and prompt discharge of these duties as well as protect the civilians from rowdy, belligerent ex-soldiers. With his mind quickly returning towards

---

[35] Morris, W. S., J.B. Kuykendall, and L.D. Hartwell. *History 31st Regiment: Illinois Volunteers Organized by John A. Logan.* 1st ed. Southern Illinois University Press, 1998, xvi.

[36] Dickinson, John N. "The Civil War Years of John Alexander Logan." *Journal of the Illinois State Historical Society (1908-1984)* 56, no. 2 (Summer 1963): 212.

[37] Ibid. 231.

[38] Ibid.

politics, Logan soon returned to his beloved Southern Illinois, but not before urging the Kentuckians to ratify the 13th amendment. When faced by those opposed to the amendment with claims that the document was tantamount to "negro equality," Logan defiantly responded, "negro equality talk about the amendment is all bugbear and humbug. I don't consider a nigger my equal."[39] Yet during the same speech he also ardently insisted "The great questions that have been before the people for the last four years are now settled, the rebellion I suppressed; slavery is forever dead."[40] Evident by this and earlier statements about the issue of slavery, Logan's reasons for fighting the war were based on preserving the Union, not on any sentiments for freeing slaves. Shortly after his duties in Louisville were finished, Logan resigned his commission in the US army and returned to his beloved Little Egypt. He was weary of army life, and seemed disenchanted by the turn national politics were taking. Writing to his wife, he says, "From the way politics seem to be moving, I cannot say that I shall ever have anything to do with them again."[41]

Upon his return to Illinois, Logan was blessed with the birth of a son, and the following months were spent traveling around the state and speaking at various locations, hailed as a hero wherever he went. This attention may have eased his mind and brought him back into the political sphere. The growing threat of Copperheadism in Illinois greatly concerned Logan. He began eyeing the US Senate seat and even turned down offers from the President and Secretary of State to become ambassador to Mexico. This required a trip to Washington to meet with the President and refuse the nomination in person. While there Logan saw firsthand the state of affairs in the Government between Johnson and Congress. According to James Jones:

> By 1866 new issues raised by the war and Reconstruction had led Logan into the Republican party. He was convinced that his new party, not the Democrats, could most effectively handle the problems of the postwar era. He also saw in the Republican party the most certain avenue of his own political advancement.[42]

Amid growing concern of a rebound by the Copperheads in Illinois, Logan announced his candidacy as a Republican much to the shock of all. Logan reentered political life, first as a US Congressman and later as a Senator. He developed a reputation as a fiercely partisan supporter of the radical Republicans and helped lead the push to impeach President

---

[39] James Pickett Jones, *Black Jack*, 267.

[40] Ibid.

[41] Ibid.

[42] James P. Jones, "Radical Reinforcement John A. Logan Returns to Congress." *Journal of the Illinois State Historical Society (1908-1984)* 68, no. 4 (September 1975): 324.

Johnson. His career culminated in the Vice Presidential nomination during the 1884 election. Two years later, John A. Logan passed away (due to complications from wounds received during the war), and mourning across Little Egypt followed. "His body was laid in state under the Rotunda of the U.S. Capitol for one day. At the time of his death, Logan was only the seventh person to be laid in state there, and he is one of only twenty-nine people to receive that honor to date."[43]

What caused this remarkable transformation from a staunch supporter of Douglas and the Democrats to an ardent, radical Republican after the War? From the very beginning of Logan's career we see the portrait of a man deeply devoted to the ideology and politics of Stephen Douglas. Every issue Douglas took a stand on is mirrored by Logan's own stance on the issue. With Douglas's departure from the Southern wing of the Democratic Party during the secession winter, it was only natural for Logan to follow suit. This is one of the reasons for Logan's switch, with another being Logan's war experiences. For his years of service, Logan was forced to work alongside former political rivals day in and day out, while at the same time fighting against former allies. This alone could account for a shift in politics. Seeing the devastation wrought on his Union soldiers would surely bring about a natural affection towards both them and their shared cause. This cause is clear in Logan's mind: The preservation of the Government and the Union. Though many historians seem to believe, Logan's reason is not the abolition of slavery. In an age of commonly held racism by nearly all parties concerned, very few would fight in a war to free slaves. Linked to this war experience is the issue of Reconstruction. Logan is vehement during the war years in his hatred for the Confederacy, and this easily translated to hatred of Copperheads during, and after the war. Time and again he refused to even acknowledge requests by Democrat leadership to aid them by speaking at re-election events. To Logan the choice was clear, the country had to move on and the status quo of the old political system would not facilitate the necessary change. The decision seems natural from a political standpoint, to switch political parties. Logan always accurately represented his constituency. As the War wore on, the people of Southern Illinois lost their close affiliation and affectation with the South. The prewar hope of compromise and peace had given way to the grim reality of a South unwilling to compromise. As his constituency changed, so did Logan. All these factors contributed to the change Logan exhibited, and his natural inclination towards partisan politics exhibited in the antebellum Democratic Party, carried over into the post-war Republican Party-this was his personal style.

---

[43]"John A. Logan Museum. Murphysboro, IL http://www.loganmuseum .org/genjal.html.

The Passion of the Prepuce: The Debate over Routine Circumcision in Britain and the United States, 1870-1949.

Noah Sangster

Circumcision, with its origins shrouded in the mythology and rituals of antiquity, is one of the most ancient surgical practices in the world. The procedure consists of the removal of all or part of the prepuce, or foreskin of the penis. Though a relatively non-invasive surgery, the practice has provoked a longstanding controversy over its usefulness and morality. During the late nineteenth century, the medical communities in Britain and the United States transformed it from an obscure religious ceremony into a common medical procedure, and promoted it as a sort of "wonder-cure" by numerous American and British physicians. However, less than a hundred years later, the two cultures diverged to the point where the practice had become almost standard in America as it became less and less popular in Britain. Neonatal circumcision, performed on males immediately or within the first weeks after birth, tethered the medical practice to a cultural debate; one concerning over practices of childrearing, hygiene, and social control.

Recently, in San Francisco, a group calling themselves "intactivists" began promoting a city-wide ban on the practice of routine circumcision for all males under the age of seventeen. The proposed law would carry a potential fine (not more than $1,000) or even jail time for those continuing the practice illegally. The advocates of the proposed law decry neonatal circumcision as an unnecessary surgery that abuses the rights of the child, while the proponents of the surgery claim it has a place for both medical benefits and as an expression of religious or cultural freedom.[1] A court hearing in the summer of 2011 in San Francisco was held to determine if the proposed law would be included on the November 2011 ballot. Although the court struck down the

---

Noah Samuel Jean Sangster, from Decatur, Illinois, earned his BA in history in 2012 from Eastern Illinois University, where he is currently a graduate student. He wrote this paper for Dr. Sace Elder's Historical Research and Writing class in the 2010 fall semester.

[1] Madison Park, "'Intactivists' to San Francisco: Ban Circumcision," *CNN*, November 19, 2010, under "Health," http://www.cnn.com/2010/ HEALTH /11/19/male.circumcision.sf/index.html (accessed December 8, 2010).

proposed law, the "intactivists" of the Bay Area continue to voice their opposition to the procedure.[2]

The medical community, and American society at large, has become more vocally divided over the issue, raising some fundamental questions about the place of circumcision in modern medicine. The origins of the debate remain ambiguous, as well as the reasons for circumcision in its modern, more medicalized context. The place of neonatal circumcision as a medical procedure becomes more confusing considering that both sides argue over issues of personal and religious freedom, body integrity, and social values. As the contemporary debate in San Francisco demonstrates, the medical context of the arguement becomes overshadowed by questions over cultural values and freedom, and evidence supporting either side has remained contested since the advent of medical circumcision.

Neonatal circumcision of boys as a medical procedure became popular in the English-speaking world during the late nineteenth century and was used to treat or prevent a variety of disorders, but over the course of successive decades the practice came under criticism in the same medical communities that had propagated its growth. Changing attitudes to medical circumcision diverged along cultural and national lines. British doctors increasingly questioned its place in medical science, while many American doctors continued to promote it. After 1900, circumcision rates in Britain dropped. In the United States, however, the practice did not receive the same criticism, and as the rates declined in Britain, they continued to rise in the United States through most of the twentieth century.

Neonatal circumcision remains routine in many American hospitals to this day, although the debate over its use has not subsided. The dispute continues to be influenced not only by medical evidence but also cultural and religious values. The place of neonatal circumcision in the history of medicine seems to have less to do with hard-line medical research than the changing cultural perspectives of the medical community, a process with evidence going back at least to the late nineteenth century. Emphasis on cultural values and their influence on the medical community can be seen not only in the process of adopting circumcision in Britain and the United States, but also in the reasons for its eventual rejection in British medicine while the practice was retained in the United States.

Prior to the nineteenth century, most Americans and Britons knew of circumcision through a religious context, rather than a medical one. Muslims as well as Jews had long practiced circumcision of young or

---

[2] Jonathon Conte, "SF MGM Bill Court Hearing and Demonstration," *Bay Area Intactivists*, July 30, 2011, http://www.bayareaintactivists.org/node/30 (accessed February 12, 2012).

infant males, tracing the ritual line back to the biblical patriarch Abraham. Without the modern conceptions of disease pathology or sexual dysfunction that appear in later advocacy of the procedure, the ancient Semites viewed circumcision as a sign of a holy covenant with God, as well as a feature of society that marked them physically as distinct from many of the surrounding peoples.

As a religious ritual, circumcision was practiced primarily by a few tribal or nomadic societies, mostly living in desert regions.[3] However, Christian nations were familiar with the practice of Jews and Muslims, if not the historical, cultural, or religious connotations of this rite. Many physicians recognized that the quasi-religious ritual of circumcision formed the basis of European knowledge of the procedure. In a lecture given at Middlesex hospital in 1907, the surgeon J. Bland-Sutton states, "The diffusion of the Jews throughout the civilized world after the destruction of Jerusalem, and the spread of Mohammedans (Muslims) in the east has made civilized man familiar with the rite."[4] During the last decades of the nineteenth century, social unrest and persecution in Europe, caused Jewish immigration to the United States to steadily increased. Jewish hospitals and physicians exposed the American medical community to their time-honored circumcision practices, despite being known in Europe for some time prior.[5]

The extent of circumcision outside of the Jewish community remained limited throughout most of the nineteenth century, with members of the medical community hesitant to embrace what they saw as an archaic religious rite. The medical community accepted neonatal circumcision as treatment for congenital phimosis,[6] although they did not embrace it wholeheartedly. In an 1857 publication of the *British Medical Journal*, A. G. Walter wrote that circumcisions in treatment of phimosis "no doubt, relieve the defect; but they also produce artificial deformity of the member."[7] He then goes on to describe a procedure involving the partial cutting, rather than full removal, of the foreskin.

---

[3] Robert Darby, "The Masturbation Taboo and the Rise of Routine Male Circumcision: a Review of the Historiography," *Journal of Social History* Vol. 36 (Spring 2003): 737.

[4] J. Bland-Sutton, "A Lecture on Circumcision as a Rite and as a Surgical Operation. Delivered at the Middlesex Hospital," *The British Medical Journal* Vol. 1 (June 15, 1907): 1409.

[5] Edward Wallerstein, *Circumcision: An American Health Fallacy* (New York, NY: Springer Publishing Company, 1980): 36-37.

[6] Congenital phimosis describes a condition where the child is born with an exceptionally tight or long foreskin that is difficult or impossible to retract. The condition can hamper penile hygiene and make erections difficult or painful in the adult.

[7] A. G. Walter. "New Operation for Phimosis." *The British Medical Journal* Vol. 1 (June 6, 1857): 476.

While this indicates that physicians recognized circumcision in some cases as a medical procedure, the practice remained on the fringe of modern medicine. Doctors thought of it as quaint or of dubious necessity, and even as a barbaric tribal rite associated with uncivilized peoples and savage customs of mutilation. Echoes of anti-semitic, medieval "blood libel" against the Jews[8] and fresh stories of British soldiers in India captured and forcibly circumcised by Muslim opponents,[9] reinforced the suspicion in British hearts and minds. Popular opinion often equated the practice with abuse, mutilation, and humiliation, and at this stage circumcising was hardly accepted as suitable for routine practice on children.

Suspicion and hostility began to lift in the later nineteenth century, and according to David L. Gollaher, the turning point in the United States occurred in early 1870 at the behest of Dr. Lewis A. Sayre, an orthopedic surgeon and leading authority on human anatomy.[10] Sayre investigated a case of paralysis in a young boy, the cause of which had puzzled one of his colleagues. Sayre discovered that the child possessed a highly swollen meatus[11] and a contracted foreskin. Assured by the child's nurse that this was a chronic condition, Sayre came to believe that the inflammation had led to paralysis and recommended circumcision as treatment. The boy began to recover swiftly after the operation took place, leading Sayre to test the method in other cases of paralysis where conventional treatments had failed. These produced similar, promising results. A British doctor named Nathaniel Heckford had conducted similar experiments several years earlier, boasting similarly impressive results at the East London Hospital for Children because prior to Sayre's widely publicized success, Heckford's results went largely unnoticed.[12]

Sayre's results generated intense interest in the practice of circumcision, and when he convinced the American Medical Association

---

[8] An example of this attitude relating to circumcision can be seen in a woodcut appearing in Hartmann Schedel's *Nuremburg Chronicle* or *Buch der Chroniken*, published by Anton Koberger in 1493 (see Figure 1). The woodcut depicts a group of Jews ritually murdering a Christian child named Simon of Trent, a grisly crime at the heart of anti-Jewish blood libel. The woodcut depicts one of the Jews holding a knife or scalpel at the end of the boy's penis, a probable reference to circumcision.

[9] Robert Darby, "Solving the 'Negro Rape Problem,'" History of Circumcision, http://www.historyofcircumcision.net/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=63&Itemid=0 (accessed November 11, 2010).

[10] David L. Gollaher. "From Ritual to Science: The Medical Transformation of Circumcision in America," *Journal of Social History* Vol. 28 (Autumn, 1994): 5.

[11] In medical terms, the meatus refers to a body opening, in this case the one at the tip of the penis (urinary meatus).

[12] Gollaher, *From Ritual to Science*, 6-7.

to begin publication of JAMA,[13] other physicians began to use the publication to advocate the procedure. Their reasons varied; while Sayre had focused on limited use for treatment of certain diseases[14], the wider medical community came to embrace it for a variety of illnesses. Peter C. Remondino, a well-known American physician and author, who had gained some fame as a physician in the American Civil War, published his impassioned and indeed polemic *History of Circumcision from the Earliest times to the Present* in 1891, as the circumcision practice had become increasingly common as medical routine for young boys. In the history, he praised the procedure, claiming its usefulness in combating problems well beyond Sayre's work with paralysis, from alcoholism and "feeble-mindedness" to masturbation and enuresis;[15] the work praises the old Hebrew rite as "wisdom that could be nothing less than of divine origin…forestall[ing] evolution."[16]

As concerns over phimosis rose, as well as the fear of venereal diseases, British and American physicians desperately sought a prophylactic against what was perceived as a crippling moral decay, and venereal disease tied to fears of sexual immorality in Victorian society. Although washing of the glans penis with soap and water prior to and/or after exposure is believed to reduce the risk of some venereal diseases (a method used before the introduction of antibiotics), circumcision promised a more lasting prophylaxis against infection.[17]

A British study in 1855, as well as an American replication study later in 1884, revealed that Jews carried relatively lower rates of venereal disease.[18] Some physicians came to believe that circumcision, a procedure that had set Jews apart from their neighbors for thousands of years, led to the disease gap with the Gentiles. A prophylactic against syphilis provided a powerful lure for American and British doctors to

---

[13] JAMA, or the Journal of the American Medical Association, has been published continually since 1883.

[14] He has worked as an Orthopedic surgeon.

[15] Involuntary urination, generally referring to the condition of nocturnal enuresis, a common concern in childhood and known colloquially as "bedwetting."

[16] Peter C. Remondino. *History of Circumcision from the Earliest Times to the Present.* (Philadelphia, PA: F. A. Davis, 1891), 10.

[17] Kate Bonner. "Male Circumcision as an HIV Control Strategy: Not a Natural Condom" *Reproductive Health Matters* Vol. 9 (Nov, 2011): 151. Kate Bonner's article focuses on a contemporary debate over the use of circumcision as a prophylaxis against HIV, especially in Sub-Saharan Africa. She cites evidence indicating that circumcision can reduce a male's risk of infection, but that studies have shown no preventative effect for a circumcised, HIV-positive man transmitting the virus to a partner, and questions about applying the treatment as prophylaxis in "high-risk" communities echo the social and ethical dilemmas that informed the discourse many years earlier that is the topic of this paper.

[18] Wallerstein, *Circumcision: An American Health Fallacy*, 37.

endorse circumcision. The procedure became popular among army surgeons especially, and an examination of statements from men such as Dr. R. E. Foott reveal that circumcision made the disease much easier to detect, diagnose, and therefore treat.[19] The aid provided to medical practitioners in diagnosing and treating the disease was apparent, while the notion of circumcision as an effective prophylaxis was not. Even so, the idea continued to hold sway over the ensuing decades as the procedure itself became more widespread in both Britain and America, likely contributing to its popularity. In this way, circumcision became a potent form of social and moral control in both societies, very much influenced by rigid Victorian standards of acceptable behavior. Calling to mind the racism prevalent, particularly in the United States during the period, H. H. Hazen (writing for Sayre's JAMA) suggested circumcision as a method of stemming the spread of syphilis among the African-American community. Claiming that this group possessed a heightened sexual desire, he recommended, "all male babies should be circumcised, both for the purpose of avoiding local irritation which will increase the sexual appetite and for preventing infection."[20]

The development of modern medicine in Britain and America was influenced by the strict moral regime of the Victorian era, and perhaps no issue influenced the spread of neonatal circumcision as much as masturbation. The prevailing notion held that retention of the foreskin led to local irritation and itchiness on the penis, which would encourage young boys to touch their penises and facilitate masturbation. For many medical authorities, removal of the foreskin at the earliest possible age (long before sexual impulses began to mature in young boys) provided a convenient preventative against masturbatory impulses. According to Remondino, "the practice of [masturbation] can be asserted as being very rare among the children of circumcised races."[21] Although neither Remondino nor any other circumcision advocate produced reliable evidence, they often perpetuated the notion that Jewish boys rarely masturbated. As with the belief around venereal disease, circumcision became the major source of Jews' perceived immunity to the curses of sexual immorality: masturbation in the young and venereal disease in the sexually active adult. Jewish physicians also supported the practice becoming routine, as "[circumcision] influenced non-Jewish acceptance of circumcision, which, in turn, served to reinforce the Jewish ritual."[22] Rather than persecute the Jews for their adherence to the old Hebrew

---

[19] R. E. Foott. "Letters, notes, and answers to correspondents," *British Medical Journal* Vol. 2 (Aug. 22, 1903): 448.
[20] H. H. Hazen. "Syphilis in the American Negro," *Journal of the American Medical Association* Vol. 63 (August 8, 1914): 463.
[21] Peter C. Remondino. *History of Circumcision from the Earliest Times to the Present*, 224.
[22] Edward Wallerstein, *Circumcision: An American Health Fallacy*, 157.

covenant, many Gentiles now upheld the ritual as a source of strength and an example of clean, moral living.

Regardless of the merit or absurdity of this new generation of Judeo-philic physicians, the desire among Victorian society to impart sexual morality upon its members remained powerful beyond the turn of the century. The moral leaders of the English-speaking nations felt that sexual overindulgence, in addition to the obvious impacts of communicable disease, would drain the energy of their young men.[23] Edward Wallerstein, former communications coordinator at the Mount Sinai School of Medicine in New York City, took this one step further. The upper-class concerned themselves with the enforcement of sexual mores in Victorian Britain and America, and Wallerstein connects these points to add a more diabolical element to the fear of sexual depletion. He states, "It is worth speculating that the powers that be believed that greater self-control was important for upper-class whites in order to maintain their domination over the poor and "inferior" peoples."[24] This prevailing attitude coincided with the height of Britain's imperial power and a period of intense racial oppression in the United States. Notions of White Anglo-Saxon Protestant (WASP) superiority may have factored in the promotion of circumcision as a sexual suppressant. Worth noting, however, Wallerstein's speculation conflicts with the notion that circumcision practices had come from admiration of Jewish ritual and living, as Jews remained outside of the WASP elite in most political circles.

Masturbation remained a primary focus of pro-circumcision advocates in both the United States and Great Britain into the first decades of the twentieth century. The Industrial Revolution saw both a decrease in the onset age of puberty and an increase in the average age of marriage. The presence of sexually mature children sparked alarm in many households, with parents perceiving a need to control sexual behavior in this new generation of adolescents. The sexual tendencies of younger children, including fondling and masturbation, came under closer scrutiny. The consensus held by most medical practitioners of the period, influenced by the Victorians' puritanical mindset regarding sexual and other behaviors, attributed these actions to pathological

---

[23] Robert Darby, *The Masturbation Taboo and the Rise of Routine Male Circumcision: a Review of the Historiography*, 741. This role as "moral protector" in society had traditionally been held by clergy, but in more modern and secular Britain and America, doctors and other medical professionals increasingly took up the mantle of moral agents and enforcers, influencing public law and opinion. Robert Darby also writes at length on the topic of circumcision's rise in Victorian Britain as a method of controlling the male sex drive in *A Surgical Temptation: the Demonization of the Foreskin and the Rise of Circumcision in Britain* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005).

[24] Edward Wallerstein, *Circumcision: An American Health Fallacy*, 35.

causes or corrupting outside influences.[25] Fear of losing children to sexual immorality struck a chord with middle and upper-class citizens, who could afford the variety of "treatments" for masturbation, which could include threats of mutilation (even complete castration). Procedures designed to inflict a degree of pain as a psychological deterrent to self-gratification, included: chastity cages designed to enclose the penis, infibulations,[26] and circumcision. In this environment of paranoia over child sexuality, neonatal circumcision appeared to many as the most humane and effective option.[27]

Although this moralistic justification of circumcision took hold in both Britain and the United States, three differences had manifested themselves by the 1920's that may offer explanation for the subsequent divergence in circumcision practices in the two countries. First, the American focus (obsession according to some) with personal cleanliness and hygiene surpassed the accepted British norm. Second, evidence indicates that surgical options for treatment began to flourish in America, while voices of suspicion over routine surgical procedures (particularly circumcision) became more and more vocal in Britain, until by the 1930's when a substantial opposition emerged, one that was largely absent in America. Third, the American medical establishment became more democratic and privatized than what was to become a state-run British system after the Second World War, when the British government gained a direct hand in determining what medical procedures were going to be covered by medical insurance.

Although some historians have theorized that penile hygiene was an original cause for circumcision, a proven connection remains elusive. P. C. Remondino claimed that the ancient Egyptians "connected circumcision with hygiene and cleanliness," and that the Jews also saw a hygienic benefit to the practice.[28] However, he outlined predominantly religious or cultural associations among the ancient peoples, and so the connection with personal hygiene appears to be a modern one. Americans began their fascination with bodily cleanliness and odor as far back as 1870, when the underarm deodorant began to capitalize on this desire to smell and feel clean as a token of health.[29] Special cleansing products for dental, hair, and skin care followed, and many of these products were innovated by and marketed primarily to Americans.

---

[25] Robert Darby, *The Masturbation Taboo and the Rise of Routine Male Circumcision: a Review of the Historiography*, 742.

[26] Infibulation in this instance refers to tying, clamping, or possibly suturing shut the end of the foreskin to cover and deny access to the penis.

[27] Robert Darby, *The Masturbation Taboo and the Rise of Routine Male Circumcision: a Review of the Historiography*, 738.

[28] Peter C. Remondino. *History of Circumcision from the Earliest Times to the Present*, 34.

[29] Edward Wallerstein, *Circumcision: An American Health Fallacy*, 37.

Because of an association with sin, the lower orifices of the body received special attention when it came to hygiene. Although the relative underdevelopment of the United States during the early twentieth century prevented many citizens from practicing modern standards of hygiene, it had become enshrined in American health and fitness as an ideal, one that received more aesthetic attention than in Britain, where the main focus was on pathology and cleanliness to prevent disease. Wallerstein points out that while Americans expose themselves to a variety of these personal hygiene products, no such device, spray, or lotion is disseminated for the proper care of the penis. He also pointing to the opinion of Dr. Spock, who in his original support of circumcision warned that most parents are unwilling to assist their sons in learning proper penile hygiene and handling of the penis for cleaning; he theorized aversion to this particular area of the body could exacerbate medical problems associated with the foreskin.[30] The widespread adoption of circumcision, and the advocacy of circumcision as a reliable and comparatively carefree measure of clean living by American physicians such as Remondino and Dr. Spock, may in part explain its continued implementation. Circumcision in the United States has come to be regarded by circumcision advocates as the primary method of penile hygiene.

With the progress of the nineteenth century and advances in antibiotic and anesthetic techniques, surgery experienced an increase in British and American medicine. Though once considered a lower class of the medical field, the drop in surgery-related fatality led to a search for surgical solutions to old medical problems. An article from the 1894 *British Medical Journal* contains a letter from Dr. Stanley Haynes detailing the use of chloroform as an effective anesthetic in the circumcision of a young boy, all while the child slept soundly in his bed.[31] A century before, the operation would not have seemed routine, with a lack of effective anesthetics or antiseptics contributing to disdain of surgery and fear of complications. The relationship between phimosis and circumcision indicates that doctors had already accepted a surgical solution for this particular problem, and the increasing popularity of the procedure around the turn of the century followed this trend. The British began to break with this surgical vogue, and sources after 1900 show a slow but tangible increase in criticism of routine surgery.

A 1903 article from the *British Medical Journal* contains a reference to ritual circumcision, and specifically to a pair of infant deaths in the London Jewish community, deaths that were apparently the result of circumcision. Although the article does not attack the procedure of

---

[30] Ibid., 74–75.

[31] "Letters, notes, and answers to correspondents," *British Medical Journal* Vol. 2 (Sep. 29, 1894): 738.

circumcision, it draws attention to possible danger posed by allowing Jewish *mohels*,[32] who might not have medical licensure by the state, to operate on infants. The admiration of the Jewish practice developed in the Victorian Age had begun to shift. Once more, the Jewish circumcision was perceived as an archaic and potentially dangerous ritual, and with circumcision being thought of in purely medical terms, it revived suspicion of the Jewish rite, especially when practiced outside of the controlled and sterilized environment of a modern hospital.[33]

A later article written by A. Ernest Sawday in 1930, under the same publication, indicates that the British medical practitioners still considered circumcision a standard part of their surgical arsenal; however, the routine surgery received a more critical eye among British doctors than it had in earlier decades. Sawday outlined a specific method of performing a non-surgical procedure that may be used in lieu of circumcision. While he outlined situations when the surgery may be called for, he urges that these complications rarely occur, and that the *routine* of neonatal circumcision serves no net gain for society.[34] American physicians did not, at this stage, speak out in these terms against the procedure. Here the schism between American and British physicians becomes clear, with Americans continuing to embrace surgical solutions while the British doctors show increasing skepticism.

The divergence between the American and British practices addresses a fundamental cultural gap. The two medical communities had been united in the Victorian attack on masturbation and syphilis, but when attitudes towards masturbation became less hard-line, the Americans found new reasons to support the practice, with increasing emphasis not only on disease prevention but general hygiene and aesthetics as well. The British, in fact, had never taken to circumcision with the same veracity as Americans. A British study estimates that at its height in Britain, probably about a third of males born were circumcised. The rates in America, by contrast, kept rising, and by 1910 had already reportedly reached fifty-six percent.[35]

Today, many health insurance policies cover the procedure of neonatal circumcision in the United States and this obviously provides economic incentive for doctors to perform the procedure. However, physicians in the United States have often urged these health care providers to cover the procedure as a medical necessity. This may represent a desire by physicians to provide greater coverage for their

---

[32] A *mohel* is the ritual circumciser in the Jewish rite of *brit miloh* or *bris*, ritual circumcision occurring usually on the eighth day after birth.

[33] "Ritual Circumcision in its Operative Aspect" *British Medical Journal* Vol. 1 (Mar. 28, 1903): 748.

[34] A. Ernest Sawday, "Phimosis and Circumcision" *British Medical Journal* Vol. 2 (Jul. 4, 1931): 14-15.

[35] Edward Wallerstein, *Circumcision: An American Health Fallacy*, 27.

patients, or in a more cynical explanation the procedure carries a venal quality that provides money payoff from routine circumcision in the United States, to both the doctor and the hospital. Meanwhile, the British retraction gave way to a forsaking of routine circumcision when the government founded the National Health Service in 1949. Circumcision, the leaders of the new body determined, did *not* qualify for the new national health coverage, and rates in Britain continued to fall.[36]

A great body of evidence, from biblical and classical to medieval sources, attests to the ancient history of the procedure of circumcision. For all its longevity, stretching back thousands of years, the practice has generated a fierce debate that has lasted nearly as long. So simple in concept that it predates the actual discipline of surgery or indeed any modern body of medicine, circumcision still remains a mystery that has confounded histories and excited wild passions. The transformation of circumcision from an ancient and mystical rite, into a modern medical routine has done surprisingly little to shed light on either the origins or the true nature of the practice.

The English-speaking world became, for a brief period, unified together in a sort of cultural war that centered on this ritual. Once considered bizarre or sinister, circumcision transformed into a miracle cure of the Victorian age, and Anglophone physicians on both sides of the Atlantic cheered its prophylactic uses and saw the procedure as their most potent weapon in the battle against immorality. For a few decades, it seemed that the surgery had a new champion in modern American and British medicine, but questions over its medical necessity remained. More recently, the Centers for Disease Control has indicated that circumcision rates have begun to fall in the United States as well, but neonatal circumcision did gain a powerful new advocate worldwide in 2007, when the World Health Organization endorsed male circumcision in the fight to prevent the spread of HIV/AIDS. Studies indicating that circumcision can reduce the risk of a male contracting HIV from heterosexual intercourse factored into the decision, but cultural disputes continue to play a heavy role in the debate over male circumcision.[37]

As for the split between American and British physicians regarding circumcision, it did little to impact the practice worldwide. In fact, rather than provide answers about one of mankind's oldest surgeries, the schism revealed fundamental differences in the way they viewed medicine. Both sides felt that they acted in the best interests of their children and society as a whole, but paid less attention to the rights of

---

[36] Edward Wallerstein, *Circumcision: An American Health Fallacy*, 30.

[37] Rabin, Roni C. "Steep Drop Seen in Circumcisions in U.S." *The New York Times*, August 16, 2010. http://www.nytimes.com/2010/08/17/health/research/17circ.html?ref=health (accessed February 10, 2012).

children or the legitimacy of medical claims than to cultural concerns, and these shifted the aims of the medical community, contributing to a rise and fall of circumcision. It also became clear that once the puritanical dogma over masturbation and sexual control that held British and American doctors to the same convictions had lost favor, the unity was cut away and discarded. Current debates on circumcision across the world only underscore how little conclusive research doctors and medical practitioners have conducted on the subject, and it remains for many an issue of cultural or social control over their children, rather than one of medical treatment.

Teaching the Value of "Stuff:" Appraising Material Evidence Public Programs

Samantha Sauer

In his 1931 presidential address to the American Historical Association (AHA), Carl Becker connected the burgeoning academic field of history to the public. Becker's *Everyman His Own Historian* presents some key themes about the study of history. In relating the study and understanding of history as an everyday, common occurrence with the public through the "everyman," Becker's text acknowledges history as an accessible and present element in society. Becker notes, "In every age, history is taken to be a story of actual events from which a significant meaning may be derived."[1] That meaning, Becker argues, is based on, and inferred from, available records and remains of the past to professional academics and the public. Such records and remains consist of written history and everyday objects or artifacts: known as material culture.

Eight decades later, Becker's address to AHA remains a key document in the field as a historical text for the public and academics – as well as an insight into popular culture. Specifically, Becker's words foreshadowed a lasting and intimate public interest with the history of everyday objects and common artifacts. While the "everyman" has access to written accounts of history in the form of public archives, libraries and the traditional history textbook, the most accessible history are the physical objects or artifacts around him. Specifically, the "everyman," or the public today, looks to personal artifacts and family heirlooms as a primary source of history.

When it comes to interpreting material culture as the past, multiple institutions aid the public in this action. Cultural centers, libraries, schools, universities and even garage sales allow the public to engage with artifacts, objects, and heirlooms. Most tellingly however, museums and auction houses provide clear platforms for the public to view and

Samantha Sauer, of Chicago, Illinois, grew up in Sycamore, IL. She received her BA in History from Eastern Illinois University with a minor in film studies. She is currently a graduate candidate in Historical Administration at EIU. This paper was written in the fall of 2011 for Dr. Barnhart's HIS: 5020, Historical Research and Interpretation for Public Audiences. She is a member of Phi Alpha Theta and the American Association of Museums.

[1] Carl Becker. "Everyman His Own Historian." *The American Historical Review.* Vol. 37, no. 2, p. 221–36. http://www.historians.org/info/aha_history/clbecker .htm. Accessed 27 October 2011.

interact with material culture. These two dramatically different institutions work to engage the public and relate history through objects. Auction house and museum sponsored public programs highlight current methodologies in historical interpretation and education about material culture for public audiences. This paper works to introduce recent cases of collections-based public programs and the resulting issues and consequences facing the public as the "everyman" historian and the involved institutions.

Perhaps the most visual example of America's continuing love affair with everyday material culture may be viewed on—where else—television. Current programs showcases a dramatic interest of the public in popular and accessible history, specifically through objects and artifacts accessible to the "everyman." Current programs such as *The Antiques Road Show* (PBS), *Storage Wars* (A&E), *Cash in the Attic* (BBC), *Treasure Hunters* (NBC), *Buried Treasure* (FOX) and *The Great Big American Auction* (ABC) highlight the popularity, variety and multi-network interest in object-based history.[2]

Tellingly, the programs emphasize the obscurity or ordinary nature of the objects presented by show participants, highlighting an audience connection to the broadcasted material. In addition to creating that connection with televised material, the programs all emphasize the cash value of items presented. With the placement of a dollar sign on history, such television programs showcase the valuable and economic aspects of material culture, while also highlighting the fickle nature of antiquities in an uncertain financial market. This uncertainty, paired with monetary value, adds a game show element to such programs. *Fortune* magazine highlights that, "It's not all about the money. Part of *Roadshow's* appeal is the education viewers get when one of the country's top appraiser's reveals, in minute detail the specific reasons for the estimate he's about to give."[3] Essentially, such programs present a "fascinating look at history, fine arts, and human nature, all wrapped up in the guise of a treasure hunt."[4]

Such television programs target a large demographic. Long-time favorites such as PBS's *Antiques Road Show* (the British series first debuted in 1979) note the longevity and time tested interest in educational entertainment, or edutainment, featuring artifacts. New programs such as ABC's *The Great Big American Auction* feature evolving public tastes and attitudes towards antiquities. Such programs' material serves to both persuade and illustrate popular tastes, fashions

---

[2] Lisa Long, "All Buy Ourselves at Household Auctions," *Acts of Possession: Collecting in America* ed. Leah Dilworth, (Rutgers, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2003), 244.

[3] Ibid.,243.

[4] Ibid.

and interests. Further, such television programs provide creative inspiration to program designers and educators at an array of institutions.

Popular television serves as a clear indicator of public interest and helps highlight the continuing fascination with personal artifacts and objects. Beyond the small screen however, studies and scholarship illuminate the relationship between the public and the material past. In their popular nation-wide survey and resulting study in *Presence of the Past*, historians Roy Rosenzweig and David Thelen found that nearly every American citizen "deeply engages the past" with an emphasis on the fact that the average American is most engaged in the study and history of their own family.[5] While some Americans shy away from the idea of spending an afternoon in a museum or research library, or even pursing history as a route of higher academic learning, many, the study found, enjoyed family archival projects. Such projects include scrapbooking, creating and studying family trees, and oral history through storytelling and anecdotes.[6] In interacting with such projects and activities, individuals act out Becker's idea of the "everyman as historian."

The study of material culture is a primary way in which the public engages in family history. Objects that highlight family history include photographs, slides, furniture, jewelry, and other heirloom objects such as the family Bible, paintings, and antiques. The embedded provenance that artifacts carry with participants on such television programs adds an emotional charge and spark that engages at-home viewers and brings "electric" dollar signs for television networks. Popular programs such as *Antiques Road Show* and *The Great Big American Auction* feature the examination of personal family heirlooms often stored in dusty attics or forgotten closet corners.

The appeal of material culture to the "everyman" historian is clear. Material culture serves as a tangible connection or link to history, acting, in a way, as a time traveling device. Material culture that remains in a family in the form of artifacts and heirlooms enables history to journey generation to generation. Such historical objects or antiques carry countless stories, just waiting to be discovered and shared. In many ways, "Intimate fictions are made tangible through material objects." [7] Such fictions take the form of family anecdotes; tall tales and legends may often be rooted in truth.

Popular interest and academic interest in material culture have not always overlapped. Material culture as an academic study is a relatively

---

[5] Roy Rosenzweig and David Thelen, *The Presence of the Past: Popular Uses of History in American Life* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1998) 22.
[6] Ibid.
[7] Long, "All Buy Ourselves at Household Auctions," 243.

new vein of history. Around the time of the bicentennial, a growth of academic interest and concentration in material culture studies developed. Brown University introduced the course American Material Culture in the early 1970s, focusing primarily on colonial sites such as Plymouth Colony.[8] Since then, the traditional emphasis of material culture research by historians has been focused on the makers of objects rather than the users[9] As objects or artifacts in a personal collection, heirlooms and antiquities often mean more to the "everyman" historian as material evidence of a user, or ancestor. Additionally, such objects work to illustrate ideas, movements and themes in history beyond an individual or maker. The lure of material culture may be compared to a childhood game of "show and tell," as the elements of that game and of historical storytelling are narrative aspects public programs and television networks take note of.

In an effort to tap into the mainstream interest of material culture as popular personal history, many public programs target the "everyman" historian. Many museums and auction houses find themselves teaming up to create public programs focusing on material culture. These public programs are appearing with increasing frequency across the United States; The Rockwell Museum of Western Art in in Corning, New York presented a public program in November 2011 that invited Heritage Auction experts to greet and interact with museum patrons. Primarily stationed in Dallas, Texas, Heritage Auctions is the third largest auction house in the world, and is known as the largest "collectibles" auction house.[10] Officially dubbed the museum's "Appraisal Day," the Rockwell Museum designed a program allowing museum patrons to bring in family heirlooms, antiques, and the odds and ends of their attics for Heritage experts to examine. At the event, Heritage Auctions appraisers offered an estimated insurance value and auction appraisal for each piece brought in. A museum spokesperson noted that "With a 10 a.m. start time, we saw a line form by 8:30 a.m. With popular programs on television like 'Antiques Roadshow,' 'Pawn Stars' and others, we knew this would be a popular event."[11]

---

[8] James Deetz. *In Small Things Forgotten: An Archeology of Early American Life*. Expanded and Revised Ed. Doubleday Dell: New York, 1996. X.

[9] Thomas J. Schlereth. "History Museums and Material Culture," *History Museums in the United States: A Critical Assessment* ed. Warren Leon and Roy Rosenzweig (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1989), 305. For further information about the development of material culture as an academic subject, see this article.

[10] "About Heritage," Heritage Auctions. http://www.ha.com. Accessed 24 October 2011.

[11] Jeff Murray, "Town and Country: Museum's appraisal day feels like Rockwell's 'Roadshow'" *Star Gazette*, 19 November 2011. http://www.stargazette.com/article/20111119/NEWS01/111190359/Town-Country-

Rockwell Museum's first "Appraisal Day" was such a success that museum educators and public programmers on staff are currently considering a follow up program or other possibilities that parallel the patron experience. The hands on nature of the public program, the family history, and the monetary value established by the auction appraisers all combined to a successful event.

This public program designed by Rockwell Museum, with the intent to increase patronage by tapping into the television demographic, educated the public on material culture and invited experts outside of their institution. The Rockwell Museum is following a common public programs path in the museum field today.

Across the country, similar public programs occurred in 2011. Located about sixty miles west of Chicago, the DeKalb Public Library teamed up with a freelance appraiser to design a public program that mirrors Rockwell's "Appraisal Day." A large part of the community, the eighty-year old library teamed up with local historical societies to design a program based on *Antiques Road Show*.[12] The library invited an independent appraiser, who had worked with the PBS program, to serve as the guest expert. Elsewhere, the South Carolina State Museum designed a similar program with their own "Museum Roadshow." The museum called for patrons to bring in a variety of items and cited that the public program was "inspired by PBS' 'Antiques Roadshow,' and detailed that the program offered "informal (verbal) appraisals of a variety of objects."[13] Further, the program at the South Carolina State Museum worked to integrate museum staff as the appraisers on hand, as opposed to working with an auction house or appraising firm. The program additionally allowed museum curators to discuss material culture care.

Further signs of popular public programs are endless, and at every turn institutions are hopping on the bandwagon. Such programs work beyond merely free educational events and often allow museums to present programs as an annual benefit. The Franklin G. Burroughs Chapin Art Museum in Mrytle Beach, South Carolina presents an annual appraisal public program specifically designed as a museum fundraiser. Combining education, entertainment and an institutional fundraiser, the art museum works to embody its mission statement of engaging "our community and visitors through unique exhibitions and interactive,

Museum-s-appraisal-day-feels-like-Rockwell-s-Roadshow?odyssey=nav%7 Chead.

[12] "Antique Appraisal to be held at DeKalb Library," *The Daily Chronicle*. 28 November 2011.

[13] "Museum Roadshow," Programs & Events, South Carolina State Museum. http://www.museum.state.sc.us/events/roadshow.aspx. Accessed 26 October 2011.

educational and creative programs for people of all ages."[14] The annual fundraiser "Art, Antiques & Treasures" is an elegant, black tie affair designed by museum programmers to invite multiple and diverse appraiser firm representatives to lend an expert eye over patrons' artifacts, objects, and heirlooms.

In addition to working with museums and other cultural intuitions like libraries, auction houses, and appraisal firms design their own freestanding public programs as well. With its main branch located in Boston, Massachusetts, Skinner Auctions & Appraisers hosts annual "Appraisal Days" or "Appraisal Open Houses" and "What's it Worth?" events geared toward the general public. Such programs work to target individuals or intuitions that previously have not worked with or partnered with Skinner, thus promoting the auction house to a larger possible clientele. Skinner details its variety of programs as follows:

Appraisal Days and "What's it Worth?" events provide cultural institutions and non-profit organizations with an entertaining educational experience for their membership or other select audience. During a "What's it Worth?" event, a Skinner appraiser will discuss and evaluate an assortment of objects before an audience. During an Appraisal Day, participants meet individually with the Skinner appraiser and receive a verbal assessment of their material.[15]

Heritage Auctions, the company that served as a guest consult for the Rockwell Museum, may be becoming the most visible of auction companies to the public at large. While Christies and Sotheby's are a bit like the Godfather of auction houses with well-recognized names, Heritage Auctions is directly teaming up with ABC's *The Great Big American Auction* serving as the primary auction house consultant for the new program. While shows such as *The Antiques Roadshow* call upon a diverse range of auction houses, firms and independent specialists, *The Great Big American Auction* marks a departure from this. Hosted by the personable Ty Pennington (whose television personality is best attached the ABC program *Extreme Makeover: Home Edition*, where he frequently yells at buses to move and reveal a rehabilitated home for a deserving family), *The Great Big American Auction* travels the country to create "A room full of potential buyers outbidding each other in a suspenseful standoff." The program emphasizes, "Random objects bought for mere dollars will go for hundred of thousands, as their lucky owners lives

---

[14] "Art, Antiques Appraisal Event to Benefit Art Museum, Jan 22," *Alternatives: A News Magazine*, (5 January 2011).
[15] "Appraiser Open House" Event Information, Skinner Auctions & Appraisers. http://www.skinnerinc.com/resources/events.php Accessed 4 November 2011.

forever change."[16]

The consequences and possible social implications of material culture popular public programs are many. Implications affect not only the public and related institutions, but also field professionals such as museum educators and programmers. Further, the consequences of popular public programs are far reaching into classrooms and family rooms, reaching out to society in variety of ways. The long-range reach of such public program directly affects the popular view of material culture as a key primary source of history for the public, or "everyman historian." Additionally, the shared interest of museum and auction houses raises a fair number of issues for the public.

Museums and auction houses often walk fine lines when it comes to discussing the monetary value of their collections and material for the auction block. Specifically, institutions carry a large degree of swaying power in their selection and use of a specific appraiser or firm. As prominent institutions in society, the public looks to museums and auction houses as valid resources of information about the value of material culture. The importance of item appraisal is clear for general monetary as well as insurance reasons. Legal disclaimers and printed statements from involved institutions and organizations make clear the limitations of specific individuals or organizations. The Smithsonian's Museum Conservation Institute (MCI) presents an example:

> MCI does not make warranty, expressed or implied; does not assume any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, orusefulness or any information or process disclosed; nor represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights.[17]

Another consequence of material culture programs is the association of a monetary value on history. Such public programs emphasize the monetary value of material culture, painting the museum patron as a social consumer and placing a price tag on history. In addition to enjoying and engaging in personal family history, patrons of museums and potential buyers at auction houses are conditioned to consider the past in dollar signs through museum sponsored "Appraisal Days." In the first century B.C., Publius Syrus stated "Everything is worth what its purchaser will pay for it."[18] Current market research outlines the following factors as key value-determining aspects of an object or artifact: artist's (or maker's) reputation, rarity of an item,

---

[16] "The Great Big American Auction." ABC Shows. http://abc.go.com/shows /the-great-big-american-auction. Accessed 15 November 2011.

[17] "Artifact Appraisals." Smithsonian, Museum Conservation Institute. http://www.si.edu/mci/english/learn_more/taking_care/appraisal.html. Accessed 11 November 2011.

[18]Tom McNulty. *Art Market Research: A Guide to Methods and Sources* (Jefferson, NC: McFarland & Company, Inc., 2006), 5.

condition of the object, artifact's provenance or background, and additional outside factors such as a collector's specific need or desires. [19]Out of these contributing factors, family heirlooms or artifacts that have been in a family for multiple generations, highlights the personal value.

At times, the value of personal artifacts compared to museum objects is difficult for the public – or "everyman" - to envision. This difficulty is often what creates the surprise and shock at discovering an unexpected value of a family heirloom at such a public program. The reason for this is that often objects in museums are often elevated "into sacred objects" similar to "ecclesiastical property," with the museum's role as a temple of sorts to "man's enlightenment."[20] This ideology fits in with a very traditional view of museums as cloistered buildings of higher learning and elite area of knowledge.

A further consequence of material culture programs is an increased motivation in selling, buying, or collecting material objects. Not only does this interest create potential new clients for auction houses or appraisers directly involved in specific public programs, but this interest also becomes electronic via the Internet. The role of online auctions, or cyber auctions, is increasing as an important route for both potential collectors and auctioneers. Cyber auctions, such as eBay, work to create situation similar to a videogame atmosphere with multiple players competing for goods and various skills (funds) while cyber auctions allow bidders to partake in auctions across the nation or world. While there is an easy and accessible nature to these electronic auctions, they prevent physical contact with the material for sale – bidders are unable to touch, smell or magnify objects to the same degree as they would in person in some cases.[21]

Aside from an interest in buying, selling, or collecting online, a consequence of such public programs is an interest in auctions in general. Popular imagination of an auction is ripe with comparisons. Bonaffee, a French collector, compared auction bidders to cannibals – "When each closeted together, they devour each other."[22] Aside from a cannibalistic atmosphere, the auction house world is often seen as a competitive and very interactive sport:

Bidding at auction is the most exhilarating of all sports. It matures young men in a few seconds and instantly rejuvenates the moribund. It

---

[19] Ibid., 11.

[20] Tom L. Freudenheim. "Museum Collecting, Clear Title, and the Ethics of Power," in *Ethics and the Visual Arts*, ed. Elaine A. King and Gail Levin. (New York: Allworth Press, 2006), 49-63. 50.

[21] Long, "All Buy Ourselves at Household Auctions," 251

[22]Charles Hamilton *Auction Madness: An Uncensored Look Behind the Velvet Drapes of the Great Auction Houses* (New York: Everest House, 1981), 15.

provides all the blood-pounding excitement of a real battle. And into the veins of even the most generous collector it injects the addictive drug of rabid greed.[23] The athletic, and at times theatrical nature of auctions appeals to a wide range audience as participants and observers.

A further factor to be considered when examining material culture programs is the motivation behind the various intuitions. With different motivations, the formats and presentation of public programs sponsored by different institutions and organizations understandably differ. The American Association of Museums (AAM) defines a museum as an institution that presents a "unique contribution to the public by collection, preserving and interpreting the things of this world."[24] In their mission statements, museums stress the process of interpretation through exhibits and public programs events. With a main goal of education and an oftentimes non-profit setting, public programs designed by museums work primarily to educate and increase patronage and public interest in the museum's mission statement.

Auction houses on the other hand present an entirely different mentality in their public programs. Pundits of the for-profit nature of auction houses cry out, "Art and history, beauty and culture are merely products they [auction houses] package and sell."[25] The main goal of auction houses is not to educate, but rather to sell. This motivation is markedly different than that of museums and may affect a presentation or demonstration at such a public program. Yet the role of an auction house often parallels that of a museum. Auctions, much like museums, exhibit change and shifts in history and cultural attitudes. At an auction, there is the visible transfer of items from one place or person to another. In many ways, auctions and their records, whether it is advance catalogues, receipts, newspaper reporting, or filmed transactions, highlight a clear transfer or "social, economic and aesthetic boundaries."[26] While museums and auction houses both perform similar functions in society through exhibiting change and presenting artifacts to the public, the root motivation of each differs and should be taken into account when encountering a public program.

The relationship between museums and auction houses is another element deserving focus with the popularity of material culture programs, which often teams these two diverse intuitions. Auction houses often market themselves as community-invested institutions. While auction houses range in size and scope,[27] most strive to establish

---

[23] Ibid., 13.

[24] Freudenheim, "Museum Collecting, Clear Title, and the Ethics of Power," 52.

[25] Hamilton , *Auction Madness*, 24.

[26] Cynthia Wall. "The English Auction: Narratives of Dismantlings*" Eighteenth Century Studies*, Vol. 31, No.1. (Fall, 1997): 1-25. 21.

[27] International ones with numerous branches versus the tractor auction down the road in central Illinois.

a well-rounded community presence. Skinner Auctions frequently publishes the fact that they "support museums, historical societies, schools, libraries and non-profit organizations around New England with events that are both highly entertaining and excellent fundraisers."[28]

Additionally, museums and auction houses maintain business relationships concerning the very collections and artifacts of each. Often museums, or collectors on a large scale, cosign redundant items to auction houses. Sometimes this practice is a matter of policy, and other times the product of financial need.[29] Further, if a museum is trying to achieve a balanced collection, curators and museum personnel are often found on the auction house floor scouting out potential items to include in collections. Public criticism of the relationship between museums, corporate advertisers, and auction houses keep institutions in check. Much like the thin line museums walk when it comes to offering appraisal advise or references, the influence of auction houses or sponsoring corporations of public programs or exhibits is a careful line to walk. In a 2005 *New York Times* column, a staff reporter critiqued influences of museum exhibits and popular public programs by noting:

> Money rules. It always has, of course. But at cultural institutions today, it seems increasingly to corrupt ethics and undermine bedrock goals like preserving collections and upholding the public interest. Curators are no longer making decisions. Rich collectors, shortsighted directors and outside commercial interests are.[30]

Such criticism points out the sway power of dollar signs when it comes to exhibits, public programs, and collections. Museums hosting material culture programs need to mind such criticism when partnering with auction houses, or appraisal firms to ensure a balanced and objective presentation of material culture education.

The resulting social consequences and issues of material culture programs are numerous. Importantly, public programs at museums, auction houses or other cultural institutions invite the public, or Carl Becker's "everyman" historian to engage in history. Mirroring popular time-tested television programs, this increase in public programs displays creativity on behalf of programmers nationwide encouraging the continuing education of the public and history. This engagement of the public and their own material past results in a shared learning

---

[28] "Appraiser Open House" Event Information, Skinner Auctions & Appraisers. Ibid.

[29] L.G. Hewitt, L.G. *All About Auctions* (Radnor, PA: Chilton Book Company. 1975) 10.

[30] Michael Kimmelamn, "What Price is Love?" *New York Times*, 17 July 2005.

process about objects and artifacts, and creates an academic and often entertaining atmosphere of luck, chance, and scholarship.

The Spermaceti Candle and the American Whaling Industry

Emily Irwin

Burning longer, cleaner, and brighter, the spermaceti candle was the height of candle-making technology for Americans in the 18th and 19th centuries. Important figures in American history, including Benjamin Franklin and George Washington, are believed to have favored the spermaceti candle for its superior burning ability.[1] The spermaceti candle represents a changing society and an evolving culture; a culture that was constantly striving for a clean burning and more efficient means by which to light the darkness.

The spermaceti candle holds even greater historical importance than simply a new artificial lighting source. Demand for spermaceti dramatically impacted the American East Coast whaling industry, as spermaceti can only be found in one species of whale: the sperm whale.[2] The perils associated with retrieving spermaceti from sperm whales, as well as the lengthy production process, kept the cost of the spermaceti candle high and allowed only the richest of Americans to fully enjoy the benefits of this type of candle. However, despite high cost, demand remained high through much of the 18th and 19th centuries, fueling the whaling industry well into the early 20th century. To fully understand the significance of the spermaceti candle on early Americans, the complexities of the American whaling industry must also be explored.

Early American lighting is the subject of many scholarly works. Arthur H. Hayward's *Colonial Lighting* has long been a standard on the topic of artificial lighting. Other, more general works include Leroy Thwing's *Flickering Flames* and F.W. Robins *The Story of the Lamp (and the Candle)*. More recently, Jane Brox's 2010 book *Brilliant: The Evolution of Artificial Light* reinvigorated the subject of early forms of American lighting and discussed the spermaceti candle in more specific detail.[3] Most sources associated with early American artificial lighting

---

Emily Irwin, of Clinton, Wisconsin, is an M.A. candidate in the Historical Administration program. She received her B.A. in History with a Museum Studies minor from Beloit College in Beloit, Wisconsin. This paper was written for Dr. Debra Reid's HIS 5330, Material Life in America 1600–Present.

[1] Marshall B. Davidson, "Early American Lighting," *The Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin* 3, no. 1 (Summer 1944): 3.

[2] Spermaceti comes from the Greek word "sperma," meaning seed and the Latin word "cetus," meaning whale. The name was given to the species because it was believed that sperm was stored in the overlarge head.

[3] Arthur H. Hayward, *Colonial Lighting* (New York: Dover Publications, 1962); Leroy Thwing, *Flickering Flames: A History of Domestic Lighting through the Ages*

examine spermaceti only in general terms and do not delve further into the specific manufacturing process of the candle type or the impact on the American whaling industry.

Sources on American whaling are far more numerous. Its significance as a major industry in early American history led to a wealth of information on the subject. Eric Jay Dolin's *Leviathan* is one of the most useful sources on the subject and gives a detailed overview of whaling. Numerous primary sources allow for an even greater understanding of early Americans fascination with the whaling industry, most notably, Herman Melville's *Moby Dick*. These American whaling sources examine the spermaceti retrieval process from the sperm whale. Such sources illustrate the impact of whaling upon the men who lived and died in the pursuit of whales.[4]

The spermaceti candle has been examined in a multitude of ways, though it has rarely been explored in great detail. This candle represents not only the changing lighting technologies of 18th and 19th century America, but its production resulted from a legendary industry that played a role in shaping the American East Coast, especially in the formation of whaling communities such as Nantucket. This paper will bring together several different considerations including the spermaceti candle as an innovative lighting type, the popularity of the spermaceti candle and the resulting influence on the American whaling industry. These factors are important in understanding how something as seemingly simple as a candle can have far reaching effects on both American lighting and whaling. While the spermaceti candle may at first appear to be a simple innovation, its complex past reveals that is has had a significant impact on United States' history.

(Rutland, VT: Charles E. Tuttle Company, 1958); F.W. Robins, *The Story of the Lamp (and the Candle)* (Bath, UK: Oxford University Press, 1970); Jane Brox, *Brilliant: The Evolution of Artificial Light* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, 2010).

[4] Eric Jay Dolin, *Leviathan* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2007); Louis Edgar Andés, *Animal Fats and Oils: Their Practical Production, Purification, and uses for a Great Variety of Purposes their Properties, Falsification, and Examination* (Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press, 1898); State Street Trust Company, *Whale Fishery of New England: An Account, with Illustrations and some interesting and amusing anecdotes, of the rise and fall of an Industry which has made New England famous throughout the world* (Boston: Walton Advertising and Printing Co., 1915); John MacGregor, *Commercial Statistics: A Digest of the Productive Resources, Commercial Legislation, Custom Tariffs, Navigation, Port, and Quarantine Laws, and Charges, Shipping, Imports, and Exports, and the Monies, Weights, and Measures of All Nations* (London: Whittaker and Co., 1847); Herman Melville, *Moby Dick: or, The Whale* (Boston: L.C. Page and Company Publishers, 1892).

The Spermaceti Candle as Innovation

Candles have a long history of use. Believed to have been invented in the time of the Romans, candles continue to be used as a means of artificial lighting.[5] Animal fat, or tallow, and beeswax were two of the most common sources of candle fuel in early American history. Tallow candles are one of the earliest forms of candles and were far cheaper to produce than beeswax, though burned smoky and produced an unappealing smell. For the majority of contemporary Americans, tallow candles offered the opportunity of prolonging the usable hours in a day without the exorbitant expense of cleaner-burning beeswax.

Tallow candle production occurred in the home. It was a long process, involving multiple days of dipping wicks into melted tallow. The fruits of this extended labor did not last long. Reverend Edward Holyoke, the President of Harvard, noted in a 1743 diary entry that seventy-eight pounds of candles had been produced in two days. Only a few short months later, all seventy-eight pounds were gone.[6] Beeswax candles were a cleaner alternative to tallow candles, though extremely expensive. For much of history, the use of beeswax candles was confined mainly to churches, one of the few places that could afford such a luxury.[7] In the mid-18th century, a third option emerged in the form of the spermaceti candle.

The invention of the spermaceti candle is a mystery and several individuals have been credited with its enterprise. Jacob Rodriques Rivera, a Portuguese Sephardic Jew, is one individual credited with the candle's invention. Rivera emigrated from Portugal to Newport, Rhode Island in the early 18th century and some historians believe he began the manufacture of spermaceti candles sometime around 1748.[8] It is also argued that it was Benjamin Crabb, a resident of Rehoboth, Massachusetts, who invented the spermaceti candle. His 1751 request to the General Court of Massachusetts for the "sole privilege" of manufacturing spermaceti candles suggests an early form of patenting.[9] A March 30, 1748 advertisement in the *Boston News-Letter* for spermaceti candles and the *Chambers' Cyclopedia* of 1743 inclusion of "Sperma-ceti candles" suggest that neither Rivera nor Crabb can be credited with the invention.[10] In any case, spermaceti candles entered

---

[5] Robins, *The Story of the Lamp (and the Candle)*, 16.

[6] Davidson, "Early American Lighting," 30.

[7] Ibid., 17.

[8] Patty Jo Rice, "Beginning with Candle Making: A History of the Whaling Museum," *Nantucket Historical Association*, (accessed November 11, 2011), http://www.nha.org/history/hn/HNWhalingmus.htm.

[9] Dolin, *Leviathan*, 110.

[10] Ibid.

production in the United States in the mid-18th century and became increasingly popular.

Unlike the tallow candle, the spermaceti candle could not be cheaply produced in the home and its superior lighting ability could not overcome its cost; therefore, discussion of the spermaceti candle in American society must be largely constrained to the upper echelons. Marshall B. Davidson stresses this point in "Early American Lightning":

> To the ordinary American colonist, bright lighting simply was not worth the candle. The need of more light, that is, was secondary to the cost and inconvenience of providing it. Enough light for the page of a book or a section of needlework was all that was asked. Anything further, such as lighting an entire room, was an enterprise that provoked comment.[11]

For many Americans, tallow candles were the highest quality of candle that could be expected, as they could be made from kitchen by-products, while the calculated cost of burning a spermaceti candles is twice that of burning a tallow candle. George Washington concluded that the burning of a spermaceti candle five hours each night for one full year would cost approximately eight pounds, which was far beyond the financial reach of most Americans.[12]

For the wealthy few, however, the invention of the spermaceti candle provided greater opportunities for utilizing the nighttime hours. A greater interest in the written word no doubt contributed to the demand for better artificial light sources. Wealthy Americans had little concern for the expense and lengthy manufacture of early candles. Robert Carter, the owner of 70,000 acres and 400 to 500 slaves, burned seven large candles in his dining room per night. Such a luxury would have been unheard of for the majority of Americans.[13] For the wealthy few, however, the spermaceti candle provided the opportunity for brighter and cleaner light. While the spermaceti candle was in no danger of replacing the tallow candle in popular use, it filled a new role in the lighting market for those wealthy enough to afford it.

In 1763, only a few years after the invention of the spermaceti candle, the American whaling industry faced a crisis. Despite regular voyages, the amount of spermaceti refined and made into candles was not nearly enough to meet demand. It was estimated that three or four candle manufacturers could easily process the amount of spermaceti being brought in annually.[14] This low supply and high demand, as well

---

[11] Davidson, "Early American Lighting," 30.

[12] Ibid., 35.

[13] Ibid., 30.

[14] Rice, "Beginning with Candle Making," http://www.nha.org/history/hn/HNWhalingmus.htm.

as American export of spermaceti to England and other European countries, kept the cost of spermaceti extremely high. Increased demand of spermaceti and other whale products dramatically impacted the whaling industry and led to the whaling boom of the 19th century.

The Spermaceti Candle and Whaling

The spermaceti candle could not have been produced without the influence of whaling, a national industry nearly as old as America itself. American interest in whales began at the Pilgrim's earliest moments in the New World. The sighting of whales off the coast of Massachusetts was a primary reason for the location of the Plymouth Colony.[15] The earliest form of colonial whaling occurred when settlers utilized various parts from beached whales washed up on the shoreline. Beginning at the end of the 17th and early 18th centuries, ships became central to the American whaling industry. During this early period, American whaling was largely confined to the immediate East coast. Ships remained in sight of the shore, often patrolling an area in search of whales and the oil they produced. An accident of fate saw the whaling industry gain access to an even greater prize: the sperm whale.

Christopher Hussey, one of the men charged with patrolling the coast off Massachusetts, was blown out to sea in 1712, where he encountered and killed a sperm whale, which was believed to be the first sperm whale killed by a New England colonist.[16] It was soon discovered that oil from the sperm whale was superior to other types of whale oil. Though the sperm whale did not produce as much oil as other types of whales, the quality was much greater. Hussey's discovery pushed the American whaling industry beyond the coast and into the deeper waters of the Atlantic, as the sperm whale is primarily a deep-sea species. While blubber and whale oil remained driving factors in the whaling industry, spermaceti would prove unique, because it can only be found within the head of the sperm whale. This knowledge led to the increased hunting of sperm whales. With the invention of the spermaceti candle and the knowledge of the sperm whale's superior oil, this species of whale became the prize of the whaling industry.

The sperm whale holds a special place in whaling history, in large part because of Herman Melville's 1851 classic *Moby Dick; or, the Whale*. While Melville's book is fictitious, his prior experience as a seaman informed his work, which was based in part on two real incidents: the 1820 sinking of the whaling ship *Essex* by a sperm whale attack and the existence of an albino sperm whale in the 1830s named Mocha Dick.

---

[15] State Street Trust Company, *Whale Fishery of New England*, 13.

[16] Ibid., 19.

While Moby Dick is a fictionalized account, Melville's description of a sperm whale illustrates whaling views on the species:

> In the great Sperm Whale, this high and mighty god-like dignity inherent in the brow is so immensely amplified, that gazing on it, in that full front view, you feel the Deity and dread powers more forcibly than in beholding any other object in living nature. For you see no one point precisely; not one distinct feature is revealed; no nose, eyes, ears or mouth; no face, he has none, proper; nothing but that one broad firmament of a forehead, pleated with riddles; dumbly lowering with the doom of boats, and ships, and men.[17]

Behind Melville's evocative language is the recognition of the very real danger presented by the sperm whale and the whaling industry. Melville's description of the whale remains a fascinating, yet dramatized, account of the sperm whale, a species which would have a large impact on both the whaling industry and the development of new artificial lighting techniques.

The head of the sperm whale takes up nearly a third of the body. Inside this massive head, which Herman Melville described as "at least twenty feet in length," rests the spermaceti.[18] Located in the top cavity of the animal's head, spermaceti or "head matter" is an oily, whitish substance. It is not known precisely why sperm whales produce this material, though it has been suggested that it allows for the sperm whale's head to more easily rise to the surface.[19] The spermaceti floats in a sea of oil in the whale's skull and this oil must be completely removed from the spermaceti before it can be made into a candle. The spermaceti hardens and crystallizes once removed from the whale and is then exposed to colder temperatures. Up to 500 gallons of spermaceti could be removed from the head of an average sperm whale, though larger whales could provide as much as 900 gallons.[20]

The process by which spermaceti was extracted from the head of the sperm whale was both dangerous and arduous. After a whale was killed, seamen tied its head and tail to the ship. After the retrieval of the blubber and other usable body parts of the whale, the head was severed, allowing the body to sink to the ocean floor. A hole drilled in the side of the whale's head provided access to the spermaceti, which seamen then removed with buckets. The size of the whale's head allowed for men to crawl inside the skull for easier access to the prized matter. This process of spermaceti removal continued ceaselessly until the last usable part was removed, sometimes lasting several days. It was far from hygienic

---

[17] Melville, *Moby Dick,* 327.

[18] Ibid., 328.

[19] John George Wood, *Animate creation* (New York: Selmar Hess, 1898), 434.

[20] Brox, *Brilliant,* 44.

and "when they eventually finished, both the men and their ship would be caked with grease, blood and soot."[21] Once aboard the ship, the spermaceti was squeezed by hand to separate the spermaceti from the sperm oil before it was placed in barrels to be transported to New England candle manufactories.

Regardless of the dangers associated with whaling and the lengthy voyages, which occasionally lasted up to five years, the whaling industry did not suffer from a lack of men. In some instances, the promise of riches appealed to men of the lower classes, though the average seaman could only hope to receive about 0.6% of the ship's take.[22] Other seaman were servants or slaves, forced by their masters to work on a whaling ship and return with their wages. Still others were middle-class men, often living in whaling communities, for whom whaling became a lifelong career. Very few of the seamen who hunted the sperm whale could regularly afford the spermaceti they worked so hard to acquire.

Despite setbacks caused by the Revolutionary War and the War of 1812, the whaling industry continued to be profitable. High spermaceti demand contributed to the industry's prolonged profitability. Nantucket, Massachusetts and New Bedford, Massachusetts were the two biggest centers of whaling in the United States, each with whaling ships numbering in the hundreds. The peak of whaling in the United States occurred in the mid-nineteenth century and saw between 8000 and 10000 whales killed per year. While spermaceti was only one of the products removed from the sperm whale, its importance in artificial lighting and its significance in the increased hunting of the sperm whale marks it as a major factor in the history of whaling. Spermaceti was also significant for reasons unrelated to lighting. Its refined form was used in the medical field, in ointments for inflammation, chapped lips, and as a cold cream. It was also taken orally for coughs and colds.[23] The expanded use of spermaceti suggests that the increased importance placed on the whaling industry produced an increase in society's uses for whale products.

Spermaceti Candle Manufacture

The retrieval of the spermaceti from the sperm whale is merely the first step in the lengthy production of manufacturing a spermaceti candle. Unlike tallow candles, an extensive refining process occurs

---

[21] Sarah Lazarus, *Troubled Waters: The Changing Fortunes of Whales and Dolphins* (London: Natural History Museum, 2006), 40.

[22] Ibid., 44.

[23] Robert Kemp Philip, *Dictionary of Medical and Surgical Knowledge and Complete Practical Guide in Health and Disease for Families, Emigrants, and Colonists* (London: J. and W. Rider, Printers, 1864), 652.

before the spermaceti is useable, which contributes in large part to the expense of the candle. Raw spermaceti is delivered to candle manufacturers who take charge of transforming the crude spermaceti into a product which gives "clear white Light, [and] may be held in the Hand, even in hot Weather, without softening."[24]

The first step in the candle-making process requires the boiling of the spermaceti. The removal of impurities is crucial in creating high quality candles. The spermaceti is then placed in barrels and stored in an unheated shed over the winter, allowing it to fully harden. On a warm winter day, the spermaceti is removed, placed into bags, and pressed to remove more sperm oil. After a few more months of storage, the spermaceti is once again heated, hardened, and returned to bags where greater pressure is used to remove any of the last remnants of oil. The remaining spermaceti, a waxy substance brown, yellow, or gray in color is once again heated before being shaped into candles.

Due to the lengthy, complicated process of spermaceti candle-making, as well as the specific chemical makeup of spermaceti, it was deemed impossible to produce a substitute.[25] Each step in the process was crucial and as different lengths and temperatures of storage also impacted the quality of candle produced, shortcuts failed. Several years passed between the killing of a whale and the final stage of candle-making. The dangers associated with whaling and the time and manpower required in the production of a spermaceti candle contributed to the consistently expensive price and the seamen who risked their lives to bring in raw spermaceti remained unable to take advantage of the brighter and cleaner spermaceti candle.

Conclusion

The Civil War and the rise of petroleum in the 1860s ended New England's whaling rule. Though whaling continued on the East Coast on a significantly smaller scale, it never regained the popularity or economic importance once held. In the end, the total value of New England whaling between 1804 and 1876, only a portion of the whaling era, is approximated at $331,947,480.51.[26] Beyond the economic considerations of whaling, the industry dramatically impacted sperm whale populations. Believed to be somewhere around one million prior to widespread hunting, the partially recovered sperm whale population is now estimated at 360,000.[27] The use of the spermaceti candle also diminished during the Civil War period. With the advent of electric lighting came a lesser demand for the stubbornly expensive candle and

---

[24] Brox, *Brilliant*, 44.

[25] Andés, *Animal Fats and Oils*, 223.

[26] State Street Trust Company, *Whale Fishery of New England*, 44.

[27] Brox, *Brilliant*, 46.

the diminishment of the whaling industry led to lesser spermaceti availability. Though the production of spermaceti candles continued into the early 20th century, the end of large-scale whaling signaled its demise.

The spermaceti candle contributed to the American workforce, both in the whaling industry and in the candle-making industry. While it is extremely unlikely that the men responsible for the production of spermaceti candles would have the ability to afford such a luxury, the spermaceti candle became significant in the upper classes of America as an alternative to smelly, smoky tallow candles. Retrieval of spermaceti, creation of spermaceti candles, and the use of these candles touched the lives of multiple generations and economic classes. No longer was candle-making a household activity; it was instead a venture that involved multiple industries outside the home. Though the spermaceti candle was not as widely available as the tallow candle, it marked a new creation in artificial lighting and the demand for spermaceti remained continuously influential on the American whaling industry.

The Small Wars Manual: A Lasting Legacy in Today's Counterinsurgency Warfare

Thomas Griffith

August 1930—While New York Supreme Court judge Joseph Crater went missing in Manhattan, Betty Boop made her debut, and *All Quiet on the Western Front* premiered at theaters in Wilmington, North Carolina, the rainy season settled into the jungles of Nicaragua. A band of no more than 40 men, U.S. Marines and native Guardia Nacional troops, patrolled just outside of Malacate.[1] Company M marched for days under orders to locate and destroy bandits following Augusto C. Sandino, a former Nicaraguan presidential candidate. They traveled by foot, averaging 18 to 30 miles a day, using only mules to haul their gear, which was packed lighter to avoid detection.[2] Intelligence reached the unit describing a bandit troop of horse thieves, so they went on the pursuit. The mud was a thick slop and fatigued the men, but the situation was worse for the bandits. Their horses tired easily in the sludge and had to be rested every third day.[3] By August 19, less than a week later, Company M caught up to the bandits, but they were already lying in an ambush. About 150 Sandinistas opened fire from the side of a hill. The company's commander, Captain Lewis B. Puller, led his patrol through the kill zone then turned to flank the ambush at full speed; however, the bandits already started to retreat. The company only killed two of its quarry, but they captured stolen items including eighty horse, mules, saddles, and corn.[4] Puller was recommended for his first Navy Cross, the Department of the Navy's second highest decoration, preceded only by the Medal of Honor.

Constant patrolling, back and forth tradeoffs of the upper hand, guerrilla warfare, and denying the enemy, all characterize aspects of what are referred to as "small wars." The *Small Wars Manual*, published in 1940, analyzes the experiences of U.S. Marines, such as Lewis Puller, Smedley Butler, and Merritt Edson, during a series of interventions in the Caribbean called the "Banana Wars" from 1915 to 1935. Those

---

[1] Burke Davis, *MARINE! The Life of Lt. Gen. Lewis B. (Chesty) Puller USMC (Ret.)*, (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1962), 62.
[2] Richard J. Macak Jr., "Lessons from Yesterday's Operations Short of War: Nicaragua and the Small Wars Manual," in *U.S. Marines and Irregular Warfare, 1898-2007: Anthology and Selected Bibliography*, ed. Col. Stephen S. Evans (Quantico, VA: Marine Corps University Press, 2008), 82.
[3] Davis, *MARINE!*, 62.
[4] Ibid.

incursions into Nicaragua, Cuba, Haiti, the Dominican Republic, and other countries taught valuable lessons about insurgency, counterinsurgency, nation building, and guerrilla warfare. Since then, it has been used as a basis for the study of counterinsurgency. Although nearly forgotten, it later re-emerged to influence generations of military planners concerned with counterinsurgency. During the Vietnam War, Generals Lewis Walt and Victor Krulak dusted off the manual, finding it could be applied to the quagmire they faced in Southeast Asia. Prior to the initial invasion of Iraq in March 2003, Major General James Mattis, commanding general of the 1st Marine Division, strongly urged his officers and senior-enlisted Marines to read it. Although the weapons and technology have improved, the basic principles first practiced during the Banana Wars are still being implemented today. In 2006, the U.S. military released Field Manual 3-24, the *U.S. Army and Marine Corps Counterinsurgency Field Manual*, a joint publication with oversight from Army General David Petraeus. To understand the influence of the *Small Wars Manual* on today's armed conflicts, requires a look at its roots in the 1920s Caribbean, its near disregard during the Vietnam War, and its effects on the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Small Wars Defined

A long laundry list of terms can be applied to small wars, including operations short of war, asymmetrical warfare, low-intensity conflict, and counterinsurgency operations. Small wars are difficult to define, because they, "like bloody snowflakes, are alike in general terms, but each is unique in detail."[5] The manual itself describes them as "operations undertaken under executive authority," in which military and diplomatic pressures are combined in the affairs of another nation "whose government is unstable, inadequate, or unsatisfactory for the preservation of life and of such interests as are determined by the foreign policy of our Nation."[6] Small wars are "conceived in uncertainty," "conducted often with precarious responsibility and doubtful authority under indeterminate orders lacking specific instructions."[7]

In fifteen chapters, the manual details everything from how to conduct operations during small wars to what equipment the individual infantryman should pack. The manual distilled the lessons learned by

---

[5] Roger Beaumont, "Small Wars: Definitions and Dimensions," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 541 (Sept. 1995): 21.

[6] United States Marine Corps, *Small Wars Manual, United States Marine Corps, 1940* (Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 1940), chap. 1, sec. 1, 1.

[7] Ibid., chap. 1, sec. 6, 9.

U.S. Marines in the Caribbean into a series of generalizations applicable to a wide array of situations. Much of the information presented by the manual details the characteristics of small wars and the most successful practices employed by units at the time. It states that intervention begins with a show-of-force, most often with a cruiser positioned off shore near a port city. Commanders then send landing parties ashore to "suppress disorder, provide a guard for [American] nationals and their property in the port, including our legation or consular buildings, and, in addition, certain local government buildings, such as custom houses."[8] After securing the initial objectives, the U.S. government becomes responsible for the protection of all inhabitants, so it may need to take over military and police duties for the country. Troops then create neutral zones while moving inland and establishing forward operating bases along the way. From there, operations will inevitably "degenerate into guerrilla warfare conducted by small hostile groups in wooded, mountainous terrain."[9]

The manual's most important lessons lay within the first chapter. Since exchanges between U.S. personnel and locals are inevitable, the manual provides guidelines for interaction. Marines should not conduct themselves in a manner that indicates superiority, get involved in politics, or disrespect religious practices.[10] It goes on to explain the characteristics of enemy forces as "patriotic soldiers, malcontents, notorious outlaws, and impressed civilians."[11] The conditions of small wars give guerrilla forces an inherent advantage during the early phases, as they know the terrain better, speak the language, and do not necessarily abide by any laws. Rather than simply trying to destroy the guerrillas, intervening forces should attempt to establish and maintain law and order. Even so, the infantry remains "the most important arm in small wars."[12]

Most enemy contact is in the form of ambushes, so units should conduct aggressive, regular patrolling. Take Puller's August 19th patrol for example, as a few parts of the *Small Wars Manual* seem like they could have come right from that engagement. The ambushing Sandinistas outnumbered Puller's company nearly four-to-one, and the manual suggests that hostile forces typically outnumber the intervening patrol. Puller did not hesitate to command his troops out of the line of fire and into a counterattack, and his decisions seem to be described exactly in the manual: "To stand still, even momentarily, or simply to attract the attention of the person next in column, is usually fatal. If the

---

[8] Ibid., chap. 5, sec. 1, 1.
[9] Ibid., chap. 2, sec. 1, 44.
[10] Ibid., chap. 1, sec. 6, 46.
[11] Ibid., chap. 6, sec. 1, 1.
[12] Ibid., chap. 2, sec. 3, 44.

individual or unit who observes the ambush rushes forward immediately…the enemy may break from his position."[13]

Patrolling is not a revolutionary idea within the *Small Wars Manual*, especially during the early phases of intervention, as "the tactics employed are generally those of a force of similar strength and composition engaged in major warfare."[14] During the Nicaraguan campaign, Marines implemented the new concept of using aircraft to augment ground operations both in combat and logistics. On July 16th, 1927, they conducted what may have been the first organized dive-bomb attack in history during the Battle for Ocotal.[15] By the middle of 1928, Marine air units conducted eighty-four attacks against the Sandinistas.[16] Chapter nine of the manual describes the functions, tactics, and potential operations for the aviation element. The concept is still in practice today, but known as the Marine Air-Ground Task Force.

The *Small Wars Manual* also reminds military strategists that American intervention is only temporary. Besides dedicating all of Chapter fifteen to withdrawal processes, the manual advises the creation of a well-trained constabulary, a military-law enforcement hybrid. During their early formations, the constabularies should be officered by Marines and replaced by locals as they complete the necessary training. Marines should begin this process as soon as possible to "return the normal functions of the government to the country concerned."[17] If called upon by the host nation, U.S. troops may also supervise elections to ensure they are impartial, free, and fair. The goal from the start of a small war is to protect American interests by taking control to restore stability then returning it to the nation.

Origins in the Caribbean

Small wars are fought by the United States to protect the nation's interests. Such was the case with Nicaragua, perhaps America's most important engagement of the Banana Wars. The intervention in Nicaragua from 1926 to 1933 served both economic and political purposes. Industries such as the United Fruit Company were highly successful investments for U.S. businesses.[18] Nicaragua and the United States signed the Bryan-Chamorro Treaty in 1914 giving the U.S. rights to a canal. Nicaraguan politics were divided between liberals and conservatives and resulted in a civil war. U.S. politicians feared that the

---

[13] Ibid., chap. 6, sec. 8, 48.

[14] Ibid., chap. 6, sec. 1, 1.

[15] Macak, "Lessons from Yesterday's Operations Short of War," 83.

[16] Ibid., 83.

[17] *Small Wars Manual.* 12, sec. 1, 1.

[18] Macak, "Lessons from Yesterday's Operations Short of War," 80.

civil war could spill over the borders into Panama and threaten the security of the Canal Zone.[19] If not checked, Nicaraguan instability could invite Germany, Japan, or Mexico to interfere for the purposes of their own interoceanic canal.[20] The shaky security predicament gave the U.S. justification to intervene to protect American lives, property, and economic interest.[21]

On December 23, 1926, Marines aboard the USS Denver and USS Cleveland landed on the east coast of the country and quickly set up neutral zones to defend American fruit, lumber, and mining companies.[22] They then assumed police and military duties from the indigenous forces, while allowing local leaders to retain control.[23] At the same time, the U.S. government started creating a constabulary, the Guardia Nacional. Marines continued to train themselves and the Guardia, patrol, and supervise elections until January 1, 1933, when they relinquished command of the Guardia to Nicaragua. With political criticism at home and lacking funds, their efforts were cut short- the last Marines left the next day.[24] Only forty-seven Marines were killed over the course of the nearly six-year campaign, and the aggregate of those experiences created the basis of the *Small Wars Manual.*

After 1940, operational commitments forced the Marine Corps to refocus itself once again. The World War II campaigns throughout the Pacific were large-scale amphibious assaults. Although the war presented an entirely different type of warfare, the combat, small-unit leadership, and operational experiences Marines gained during the Banana Wars was indispensable. The young officers and enlisted men, who patrolled the jungles of Nicaragua, became senior leaders and led troops through the island-hopping campaigns of the Pacific. Brigadier General Fred D. Beans, who led troops in the occupation of Okinawa, said deploying to Nicaragua was the best thing that ever happened to him.[25] In his book *Savage Wars of Peace*, Max Boot wrote, "If, as the Duke of Wellington once claimed, the Battle of Waterloo was won on the playing fields of Eton, then it might be said with equal justice that the Pacific campaign in World War II was won in the jungles of Nicaragua."[26]

---

[19] Anthony James Joes, *America and Guerrilla Warfare* (Lexington, KY: University of Kentucky Press, 2000) 133.

[20] Ibid., 133.

[21] John M. Collins, *America's Small Wars* (New York: Brassey's Inc., 1991), 219.

[22] Macak, "Lessons from Yesterday's Operations Short of War," 81.

[23] Collins, 109.

[24] Joes, *America and Guerrilla Warfare*, 140.

[25] Fred D. Beans, interview by Thomas E. Donnelly, Annapolis, MD, July 22, 1971.

[26] Max Boot, *Savage Wars of Peace* (New York: Basic Books, 2002), 252.

Vietnam

The conventional warfare experiences of World War II that "convinced America to turn away from small wars to concentrate on winning the big ones"[27], in combination with the fact that the document became classified, forced the manual into obscurity.[28] A Marine officer preparing a guerrilla warfare-training manual in 1960 did not even realize the *Small Wars Manual* existed.[29] When the Vietnam War began, the primary strategy became search-and-destroy missions aimed toward the North Vietnamese Army. At a press conference, Army General William C. Westmoreland, commander of U.S. Military Assistance Command Vietnam and senior U.S. officer in Vietnam, said the answer to counterinsurgency was "firepower."[30] It became increasingly clear to some military leaders that it was time to switch gears. In fact, "They urged Washington to adopt the methods employed by the Marine Corps in the past, the tactics immortalized in the *Small Wars Manual*, but they did not get very far."[31]

In August of 1965, when the Marine Corps began to apply the "velvet glove" strategy in four hamlets north of Phu Bai airfield, lessons from the manual resurfaced. A rifle squad would occupy the village to work with and train with the Popular Forces in the same manner that Marines of the Banana Wars trained with the constabularies they established.[32] Rather than seek-and-destroy missions, the Combined Action Platoons, as they would become known, engaged in civil affairs projects, intelligence gathering, and extensive patrolling. Just as the Marines in Nicaragua, they became analysts, police, trainers, and role models to the Vietnamese. When General Creighton Abrams took command of MACV from General William Westmoreland in 1968, he implemented a similar strategy throughout the entire country. Creighton's "one war" concept placed "equal emphasis on military operations, improvement of the [Republic of Vietnam Armed Forces], and pacification."[33] He showed a particular interest in the Regional and Popular Forces, which allowed them better access to equipment and

---

[27] Editorial, "Think before you shoot; Military doctrine," *The Economist*, December 23, 2006.

[28] Capt. Ian M. Prater, *Rediscovering the Small Wars Manual: A Guide to 21st Century Warfare*, 3.

[29] Ronald Schaffer, "The 1940 Small Wars Manual and the "Lessons of History," *Military Affairs* 36 (April 1972): 49.

[30] Boot, *Savage Wars of Peace*, 294.

[31] Ibid., 295.

[32] Joes, *America and Guerrilla Warfare*, 252.

[33] Lewis Sorley, *A Better War: The Unexamined Victories and Final Tragedy of America's Last Years in Vietnam*, (Orlando: Harcourt Books, 1999), 18.

funding.[34] Abrams revised public affairs policies, moved away from body counts as a measure of success, and implemented a "clear and hold" concept that emphasized defending the hamlets and their inhabitants over killing enemies.

At its height, in 1970, more than 2,000 Marines and Navy corpsmen were involved in the program.[35] But in 1971, the CAPs deactivated and were withdrawn along with the rest of U.S. troops. Many tacticians believe that if CAPs were implemented more widely, the war in Vietnam could have ended on different terms.

Iraq and Afghanistan

Unlike the tacticians of the Vietnam War, military leaders in Iraq and Afghanistan of the War on Terrorism quickly realized the need for a strategy other than attrition warfare. They turned to "the history books as they discover[ed] high-tech firepower [was] of little use."[36] After about 70 years, the practices laid out in the manual remained relevant. During the Banana Wars, U.S. Marines often had to use horses and mules for supply movement or troop transport. The use of animals is "a move necessitated by expediency" and required to solve tactical problems posed by small wars.[37] Chapter three, Logistics, of the *Small Wars Manual* details some basic information on packing mules and taking care of them. Presently, the Marine Corps' Mountain Warfare Training Center in Bridgeport, California, teaches an animal packing course to prepare service members for deployment to the difficult terrain of Afghanistan.[38]

Although operators in the field found much of the information in the manual to be useful, other parts showed its age. By December 2006, three years after the war began, the Army and Marine Corps produced a joint publication called *Field Manual 3-24*, or the *Counterinsurgency Field Manual*. This newer field manual's intent was to fill a "doctrinal gap" and help soldiers and Marines fight terrorism worldwide.[39] FM 3-24 embodied many of the lessons originally conveyed in the *Small Wars Manual*. It warns soldiers and Marines to be prepared to "be greeted with a handshake or a hand grenade" when tackling counterinsurgency operations.[40] Just as the *Small Wars Manual*, the *Counterinsurgency Field Manual* defines counterinsurgency, describes the enemy, types of

---

[34] Ibid., 11.

[35] Joes, *America and Guerrilla Warfare*, 253.

[36] "Think before you shoot; Military doctrine."

[37] U.S. Marine Corps, chap. 7, sec. 1, 1.

[38] Gordon Lubold, "Fighting a high-tech war with a low-tech mule," *Christian Science Monitor*, May 3, 2009.

[39] U.S. Army and Marine Corps, *Counterinsurgency Field Manual* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007), foreword.

[40] Ibid.

operations, and roles of different departments. It relays the importance of intelligence and integrating the local civilian and military activities. Chapter Six even discusses the development of the host-nation's security forces. The U.S. military has been using Military and Police Transition Teams to live with and train indigenous defense forces in Iraq and Afghanistan.

The *Counter-Insurgency Field Manual* parallels the *Small Wars Manual* on many different levels, but applies the lessons learned then and during the early phases of the War on Terrorism to 21st century conflicts. It also presents what the field manual itself terms a series of "paradoxes." It advises troops that "sometimes doing nothing is the best reaction" and "some of the best weapons for counterinsurgents do not shoot."[41] The effectiveness of the U.S. military in conventional operations has caused the nation's enemies to shift tactics. FM 3-24 states that the side that learns and adapts faster, "the better learning organization," usually wins in counterinsurgency operations.[42] Technological and demographic trends "point to the possibility of an increasingly disorderly world—what some strategists are calling 'an era of persistent irregular warfare,' making the manual relevant, despite its age."[43]

Conclusion

The *Small Wars Manual* is not without critics. Some opponents believe that the manual is an outdated publication. The weapons and equipment section in Chapter two is completely obsolete, because armaments such as the bolt-action Springfield M1903 are no longer in service. In fact, the U.S. Army had already replaced it with the M1 Garand by 1936, which has since been replaced by the M16. Other critics argue that the manual contradicts itself and thus is "an imperfect guide to the conduct of future small wars."[44] Certain parts of the manual advocate methods of denying the enemy that could further alienate the local populations, such as bombing villages and destroying crops.[45] Another faction believes the manual and the United States as a whole simply need to sharpen the definition of low-intensity conflicts to "allow better policy, anticipation, or control in the waging of small wars."[46]

---

[41] Ibid., chap. 1, 27.

[42] Ibid., ix.

[43] Nathaniel C. Fick and John A. Nagl, "The U.S. Army and Marine Corps Counterinsurgency Field Manual: Afghanistan Edition," *Foreign Policy* (January 2009): 43.

[44] Schaffer, "The 1940 Small Wars Manual and the "Lessons of History," 50.

[45] Ibid., 50.

[46] Beaumont, "Small Wars: Definitions and Dimensions," 32.

Some consider the *Counterinsurgency Field Manual* to be that much needed improvement and a worthy successor. The trends shaping modern warfare increasingly involve insurgency and less-conventional strategies, so the United States must continue to rethink their counterinsurgency definitions and tactics to remain successful. U.S. military commanders have applied the *Small Wars Manual* to a great deal of different battlefields since its publication in 1940—whether it takes place in jungles, deserts, mountains, or rivers. Lost and rediscovered over time, the manual and its lessons endeavor to remain influential in military operations.

Clubbing on the Chesapeake: Constructing Identities through Association and Sociability among Chesapeake Bay Elites, 1710's-1770's

Benjamin Ill

Introduction

How did the British North American colonists view their own identity, or identities, before the American Revolution established the United States of America as its own separate nation? In short, who did the colonists think they were? Identity is a way in which people define themselves; who they are, what they are, what they do, how they think, and where their personal lives and loyalties fit into the world around them. For colonial historians this was for a long time the search for "American values and despite marked regional-even community-differences, a strong sense of group identity deriving from a set of similar experiences in the New World and manifest in a series of flattering self-images." Historian Jack Greene questioned this model, basically positing a different American identity in the 1760s-70s, in which he argues that the colonies, as late as the 1770's depended upon two social models of "good" and "evil" and "success" and "failure" upon which their values were modeled. Rather than re-examining the "successful" versus the "failure" model of American identity, I want to posit the idea that what we are searching for are expressions of group values.[1] During the eighteenth century, an extensive mercantile system created a British Atlantic world. Participation in the Atlantic World system creates problems for historians attempting to uncover the identities of colonists, as their previous location, new location, economic activity, and status all coalesce to form a colonial self, apparently suffering (or even embracing) multiple-identities. The half-century leading up to the Declaration of Independence in 1776 proves an interesting period to study as the colonies had by that time established their significant involvement in the Atlantic system and, more specifically, the British Empire, but changes in thinking and identification led to an all-out rejection of British sovereignty and Revolution. What caused this separation of identity? How did the

---

Benjamin Ill, of Arlington Heights, Illinois, is currently a graduate student in the History Department at Eastern. He received his BA in History from Eastern in 2011. He wrote this paper as his undergraduate honors thesis in the spring of 2011.
[1]Jack P. Greene, "Search for Identity: An Interpretation of the Meaning of Selected Patterns of Social Response in Eighteenth-Century America," *Journal of Social History 3*, no. 3 (April 1, 1969): 189-220, esp. 189-91.

British North American colonies see themselves in the empire, the Atlantic, and the world?

In an attempt to answer the question of proto-American identity, historians have examined factors that influenced colonial identity. Linda Colley argues that "the majority of American colonists at this time were of British descent" and "they dressed like Britons back home, purchased British manufactured goods and…were the same people as their brethren on the British mainland."[2] The colonists' national identity was clearly British based upon this argument, but their location and involvement in the Atlantic World set them apart from their fellow Britons. The long distance overseas set them apart geographically, but the underdevelopment of the Americas also worked to distance them culturally, as their lives played out on a rural and harsh stage.[3] This setting influenced the way the colonies were perceived but it would not stop the colonists from attempting to build a world of British sociability and association, even if their socio-economic activities hindered them from being completely successful. Stephen Conway argues that "most of the colonists in British North America continued to see themselves as Britons…right until the eve of Independence" and that "the colonists embraced a new identity—that of Americans—only reluctantly and in response to the refusal of successive British governments after 1763 to recognize and accommodate their desire for what they saw as the full rights of Britons."[4] This argument, while sound in the fact that the colonists did indeed see themselves as Britons, suggests that separate identities did not arise until the political crisis that occurred shortly before the Revolution. Other historians have determined that a separate identity was already being created long before then. Joseph Morton argues that "the relative newness of the colony, the heterogeneous population, and the staple crop economy were all factors that worked against imitation," which introduces the argument that even if they did identify with Britain, the colonists were ultimately hindered in doing so.[5] By studying the colonial elite, historians gain a better understanding of the British characteristics and practices that were implemented within the colonies. Customs, material goods, philosophies, cultural institutions, and even club life was very similar to the British associational world, but difference inevitably arose, especially among

---

[2] Linda Colley, *Britons: Forging the Nation 1707-1837* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009), 134.

[3] Linda Colley, *Captive: Britain, Empire, and the World, 1600-1850* (New York: Anchor, 2004), 104.

[4] Stephen Conway, "From Fellow Nationals to Foreigners: British Perceptions of the Americans, circa 1739-1783," *The William and Mary Quarterly* 59, No. 1 (Jan., 2002): 65.

[5] Joseph Morton, "Stephen Bordley of Colonial Annapolis," *Winterthur Portfolio* 5 (1969): 1-14.

colonists in the Tidewater region, encompassing Eastern Virginia and Southern Maryland. Tidewater planters became wealthy through their cultivation of tobacco, which by this time had become one of the most popular and sought after commodities emerging from the New World; by the 1770's they annually exported 100 million pounds to England.[6] Needless to say, this high demand for the lucrative crop had made the planters extremely wealthy and assisted in the creation of large tobacco growing plantations. These very planters with their strong economic and social ties to Britain came to dominate Virginia and Maryland.

In the eighteenth century, sociability amongst the British elite centered on the idea of "politeness," which with its related cluster of words such as "refinement," "manners," and "civility," became by the mid-eighteenth century demarcations of the moral standard for elites.[7] Historians of politeness note how contemporaries placed value on material objects, space, and "social and political identities" used such language.[8] And this was true for both London and Chesapeake elites. While both Virginia and Maryland gained wealth and status mainly through the tobacco trade, there were differences. First, the Virginia elite were landed planters, and they resided in plantations that created separation amongst their peers which limited social interaction. Secondly, due to its port status, Maryland's capital Annapolis stands out in contrast to Virginia's capital Williamsburg as a more cultured urban center. Thus, landed gentry with limited urban interaction dominated Virginia, while Maryland was dominated by a thriving urban metropolis and smaller landed elite. While colonial identity changed dramatically in the second half of the eighteenth century, in order to keep from being swamped by the narrative of events this article has made a somewhat arbitrary distinction between socio-cultural and political identity.[9] It argues that between the years 1710 and 1776, the associational world of both Virginia and Maryland had incorporated British sociability into their cultural makeup, and by studying these two distinct locations historians can gain a better understanding of the factors that helped and hindered the colonists from creating a British identity. Using personal diaries, letters, newspapers, and club records, this study shows how the Virginia and Maryland elite attempted to re-create Britishness within

---

[6] Douglas R. Egerton et al., *The Atlantic World: A History, 1400-1888* (Wheeling, IL: Harlan Davidson, 2007), 229.

[7] Lawrence E. Klein, "Liberty, Manners, and Politeness in Early Eighteenth-Century England," *The Historical Journal* 32, no. 3 (1989): 583.

[8] Lawrence E. Klein, "Politeness and the Interpretation of the British Eighteenth Century," *The Historical Journal* 45 No. 4 (Dec., 2002): 870

[9] For the political narrative of the Imperial Crisis, this work relies on Brendan McColville, *The King's Three Faces: The Rise and Fall of Royal America, 1688-1776* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2006).

their own social interactions and in so doing ultimately created multiple identities. Michael Rozbick's contention that "against the popular backdrop, the high style of colonial gentry stands out all the more as a rather remarkable attempt of a social group to achieve improvement in this manner under frontier conditions," holds true for both Virginia and Maryland.[10]

British Sociability and the Colonial Experience in London

The associational world of the British elite had both rural and urban elements. In the early eighteenth century associational activity expanded as living standards improved among the upper and middling groups of society," and as social organizations and clubs became a part of British sociability in direct response to the Enlightenment. [11] Whether groups gathered to discuss politics, economics, or other highly specialized topics, group discussion and public awareness became a staple within the British associational world. Accelerating economic changes, improving physical communications between different regions and development of influential newspapers all served to further the growth of associational groups.[12] Amongst the landed British elite, activities such as horse-racing and cock-fights became a popular pastime. A 1729 British article, vividly described this budding world of association: "We are now in the midst of out recreations: The Gentry (who are vey numerous) are entertain'd with horse-racing, plays, assemblies, cock-fighting, which is so eagerly pursu'd that both day and night time is hardly sufficient for their diversions."[13] The British gentry were not all noble aristocrats, but also included "middling, and lesser gentry, roughly broken down along the lines first of baronets and knights, next esquires, then gentlemen."[14] These cock-fighting, horse-racing gentlemen were not bounded solely by rural life, however. They were shipping agriculture produced around the world, and increasingly they were drawn by cultural, political, and legal activities to the London metropolis.

As world trade expanded, so too did public interaction and club activity, throughout the Anglo-American world. "In Boston, New York, and Philadelphia, as in Edinburgh and Glasgow, private clubs, where

---

[10] Michael J. Rozbic, *The Complete Colonial Gentleman: Cultural Legitimacy in Plantation America* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1998), 8.

[11] Peter Clark, *British Clubs and Societies 1580-1800: The Origins of an Associational World* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 75.

[12] John Money, "Taverns, Coffeehouses, and Clubs: Local Politics and Popular Articulacy in the Birmingham Area, in the Age of the American Revolution," *The Historical Journal* 14, no. 1 (March 1971): 15.

[13] "Country News," *Universal Spectator* 35 (June 7, 1729), 416.

[14] James M. Rosenheim, *The Emergence of Ruling Order: English Landed Society 1650-1750* (London and New York: Longman, 1998), 4.

pompous, often ridiculously elaborate ritual threw into bold relief the fervor of cultural uplift, were vital social institutions," a process which can also be seen in the club life of Annapolis.[15] These growing provincial, cultural expansions can be directly tied to a rise in education as many club members were recruited from the professional middle and tradesman lower-middle classes."[16] The elite had begun to include men who were not necessarily upper class, but also an increasingly educated middle class that drove the associational world to incorporate a wider array of intellectual association, particularly in urban centers such as Annapolis.

Wealthy Virginians and Marylanders also were heavily involved in the mercantile network that developed between Britain and her American colonies in the seventeenth century, and both were heavily invested in the trans-Atlantic tobacco trade. Virginian merchants in London represented planters in the colonies, and "they cooperated with Maryland merchants to form a Chesapeake lobby."[17] In the years prior to American independence London was where wealthy Americans were most likely to meet.[18] William Byrd of Westover, a wealthy Virginian planter, spent the years 1717-1719 in London as a Virginia representative, and his diary reveals the life of an elite colonist abroad. Virginians made good use of London's public spaces: "the "Virginia Walk" on the London Exchange, the Virginia Coffee House a few blocks away, and ultimately the Virginia Club on one of the upper stories of the coffeehouse."[19] These centers of Virginian business acted as headquarters for the colony's London interests, as can be clearly discerned in Byrd's diary entry on April 8, 1718 in which he wrote that he "went to the Virginia Coffeehouse where I learned that my vessel came out with the Harrison that was arrived from hence."[20] These public spaces acted as the hub for news and business dealings of Virginian merchants, but the interactions and use of public houses were not limited to business interaction. Colonial representatives are often mentioned in the British press during this period, as one such article responds to one anonymous Virginian agent's attempts to better the

[15] John Clive and Bernard Bailyn, "England's Cultural Provinces: Scotland and America," *The William And Mary Quarterly* 11, no. 2 (April 1954): 202.
[16] Ibid., 204.
[17]Alison G. Olson, "The Virginia Merchants Of London: A Study In Eighteenth-Century Interest-Group Politics," *The William And Mary Quarterly* Vol. 40, no. 3 (July 1983): 363.
[18]Julie Flavell, When London Was Capital of America (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2010), 21.
[19] Olson, "The Virginia Merchants Of London," 367.
[20] Louis B. Wright and Marion Tinling, eds., *William Byrd of Virginia: The London Diary (1717-1721) and Other Writings* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1958), 104.

colonies trade position, noting, " if you are as well paid for that, as you are by the Virginians, you'll make a fine Expedition of it."[21]

The colonial presence in Britain, whether welcome or not, was constant throughout the pre-Revolutionary War era. Americans coming to Britain was "the result not only of practical concerns, but of a personal interest in and regard for the motherland," including education for those who could afford it.[22] Young colonial elites came to London to be educated and "to acquire refinement and advantageous contacts." They did so because their parents placed a high priority on attaining "a gentleman's education which measured up to metropolitan standards."[23] This desire to be a polished gentleman through a British education reinforces the argument that the colonies were still holding on to their British identity into the 1770s. In fact, William Byrd himself was sent to London at the age of seven by his father, William Byrd I, and after a brief trip to Holland, was sent back to London to "continue his training in business" at the age of sixteen.[24]

London was the center of the British world, and the center of sociability and club association. "Clubs and societies were primarily urban phenomena" and London was the main urban hub in the Atlantic world.[25] As club activity grew, so did "fashionable urbane entertainments such as assemblies, plays, sporting activities, and concerts."[26] Byrd, while in London, attended the theater on a number of occasions, particularly the Drury Lane Theater. On February 4, 1719, Byrd wrote that he "went to a play of Tom Killigrew's which had abundance of wit in it and was well liked by almost everybody," and on several other occasions he expresses his acquaintances with actors, actresses, and other patrons.[27] Along with a rise in entertainment venues, London also experienced a growth in clubs, and one of the most powerful and elite clubs in London in the eighteenth century was the Royal Society. The club was made up of influential men, many of them claiming nobility and knighthoods, but there were other members of lesser status. While in London, Byrd regularly attended Royal Society events, which were held in a number of public spaces: for example, "Pontack's" was a "fashionable French tavern" in which Byrd "dined

[21] "Observations on the Case of the Planters of Virginia," *London Magazine or Gentlemen's Monthly Intelligencer*, 2 (April 1733): 190.
[22] William L. Sachse, *The Colonial American in Britain* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1956), 5.
[23] Julie M. Flavell, "The School for Modesty and Humility': Colonial American Youth in London and their Parents, 1755-1775," *The Historical Journal* 42, No. 2 (Jun., 1999): 377.
[24] Wright, Tingling, *William Byrd of Virginia*, 9
[25] Clark, *British Clubs and Societies 1580-1800*, 60.
[26] Ibid., 60.
[27] Byrd, *The London Diary*, 231.

with the members of the Royal Society," while regular meetings of the Society were held at Crane Court off of Fleet Street.[28]

Besides his Royal Society activities, William Byrd also made use of public space for his own social pursuits. Byrd records daily meetings with associates and friends in London public spaces. On October 9, 1718, Byrd "dined at the Beefsteak House in the Old Jewry," and on a number of separate occasions Byrd dined at the King's Head Tavern in Canterbury. [29] Taverns and Inns also had other uses. For instance, Byrd recalled a time when he went with his cousin Horsmanden "to discourse Sir George Cooke about his chambers in Lincoln's Inn."[30] On another occasion, Byrd recorded that he "went to dine with Old Mr. Perry and got his note for five hundred pounds to purchase chambers in Lincoln's Inn."[31] Although it is unknown what exactly the chambers were used for, public space was important to men such as Byrd while attending business in London. Along with other coffeehouses and taverns, Byrd also records his dealings at seedier places. Byrd often refers to the Union Tavern throughout his memoirs, and a public house was used for soliciting prostitution as well as carrying out planned affairs. On one occasion, Byrd records "I picked up a woman in the street and lay with her at the Union Tavern."[32] On certain days Byrd made use of a number of public houses and opportunities for assignations. For instance, on July 30, 1718, Byrd wrote:

> After dinner we sat and talked till 3 o' clock and then I walked
> to Garraway's Coffeehouse and then called upon Molly Cole
> and then went home where I stayed till six and then went to
> Mrs. B-r-t and stayed until 9 o' clock and then went to the
> Union Tavern where I met Mrs. Wilkinson. We had a broiled
> chicken for supper and then I rogered her and walked home.[33]

While this is typical of the young Byrd's entries in his London diary, it also suggests that not all use of public space was geared towards creating an associational identity. Some identities, rich male philanderer for example, cross time and space. Nevertheless, Byrd's time in London shows us at least two aspects of colonial elite identity to which we will return when examining their lives in Virginia and Maryland. First, their tie to Britain, at least to London, was not imagined, but based on at least one "Grand Tour" visit to London by

---

[28]Louis B. Wright and Marion Tinling Wright, eds., *William Byrd of Virginia: The London Diary (1717-1721) and Other Writings*, 1ST ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1958), Jan. 9, 1718, 63, Footnote 183.

[29] Byrd, *The London Diaries*, 182, 345.

[30] Ibid., Dec. 8,1718, 204

[31] Ibid. , Jul. 9 1719, 291

[32] Ibid., May 30, 1718, 128

[33] Ibid., July 30, 1718, 142.

many of the richest mid-18th century Chesapeake colonists. Second, Byrd's London experience shows him with both an Atlantic identity (his position as a representative of Virginia's trade interests) and a British or at least cosmopolitan identity which can be seen through his interest in the monarch, King George I. For example, on November 17, 1718, Byrd went "to Court where Mr. Craggs presented me to the King as Agent of Virginia and I kissed the King's hand."[34] But it also shows his colonial identity not only through his introduction as "Agent of Virginia," but also through his dealings with the Virginian coffeehouses and centers of business. When Byrd and other colonists returned to North America they found that London's abundant associational activities, opportunities for sociability, and wide array of public spaces and entertainments were not easily transplanted, as Virginia's dispersed population and the truncated social hierarchy forced the colonial elite to interact on much different plane.

Constructing Identity in the Associational World of the Virginia Elite

William Byrd's London activities and associations differ notably from his Virginian ones. Although he kept a diary in both places, it is scarcely believable that it is the same man recording his daily practices and interactions. Byrd had many more social interactions in London than at his plantation Westover. For example, a typical day for Byrd in London included visiting "Will's Coffeehouse and from thence the play…[;] after the play I went to the Spanish Ambassador's where I stayed till about twelve."[35] A typical day at Westover was much more solitary; thus, Byrd (November, 1739) "rose and read only Greek because I answered Mr. Procter's letter. I prayed and had tea. I danced. I wrote English and walked among my people till dinner when I ate souse. After dinner put things in order and walked again."[36] Even though the Virginia gentry made the attempt to replicate British politeness and sociability at home, the relative isolation and the demands of overseeing tobacco plantations created a different type of associational world. While Virginians' sociability is harder to discern than those in a more urban setting, such as the port cities of Boston and Annapolis, elite Virginian planters' society did have a complexity which was at odds with the rural simplicity of their surroundings.

The Virginia planters were wealthy, so wealthy in fact that one would be hard pressed to find a more fitting example of rich distinct elite anywhere in the British colonies. Historian James Rosenheim notes

---

[34] Ibid., 196.

[35] Ibid., March 1718, 88.

[36] *Another Secret Diary of William Byrd of Westover*, ed. Maude H. Woodfin and Marion Tinling (Richmond, VA: The Dietz Press, 1942): 112.

that British landed gentry held "significant roles in national politics, local communities, and county affairs," and that during the seventeenth century power shifted from the nobility to the landed gentry (esquires and gentlemen) sharing power with the nobility.[37] Virginia's elite, which emulated this larger group of non-titled landed gentry, also oversaw most political and governmental aspects of the colony. Virginia society began with land and tobacco. To be a Virginia planter was to be in a position of wealth and power, but that wealth and power translated into a much different world of association and sociability. Virginian colonial elites produced "a distinct subculture; that is to say, its life experience was markedly different from that of the rest of colonial society."[38]

Virginian historian Rhys Isaac explains that "a man's (or, in the longer perspective, a lineage's) eminence in the social landscape depended on the size of the group of dependents bound to work his land for him in the patriarchal mode; but the visibility of that social unit and the value of the land depended on their strategic location for the purposes of the money-oriented tobacco export trade."[39] In essence, the more land and slaves you owned, the more tobacco you sold, and the higher up on the social ladder you climbed. The Virginia gentry possessed the most land, the most slaves, and produced the most tobacco, and in doing so had become a metaphoric fraternity that dominated Virginian society. Isaac conveys the image of a patriarchal society that centered on production, but he also holds the view that the upper crust of Virginian society had lavish tastes and desires.[40] Plantation houses became arenas to show off one's possessions/status, and, in doing so, actually reinforced a British identity, at least "within a fifteen mile radius of their homes."[41]

Understanding the simplicity of daily life, that is to say the relative isolation in which the gentry found themselves, will help clarify what sociability meant to the Virginians, and how separation from their peers affected Virginia planters' social interactions. Rhys Isaac argues that "The ideal of the home as a center of private domesticity was not familiar to Anglo-Virginians in the mid-eighteenth century." That is,

---

[37]James M. Rosenheim, *The Emergence of Ruling Order: English Landed Society, 1650-1750* (New York: Addison Wesley Longman Limited, 1998), 9.

[38] Michael Rozbick, *The Complete Colonial Gentleman: Cultural Legitimacy in Plantation America* (Charlottesville, VA: The University of Virginia Press, 1998), 31.

[39]Rhys Isaac. *The Transformation of Virginia* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1982), 22.

[40] Ibid., 73.

[41] Emory G. Evans, *A "Topping People": The Rise and Decline of Virginia's Old Political Elite, 1680-1790* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2009), 147.

they lived a public life, surround by "servants and guests."[42] Evans
explains that these guests "brought social contact and news to these
isolated areas…visitors would sometimes stay for several days, they
would eat, drink, play cards, and other activities."[43] The "public" homes
of the Virginians were always open. William Byrd often refers to his
house guests and dinner companions. For example, Byrd wrote on July
19, 1739 that "after church Colonel Eppes, Mr. Custis and Mrs. Duke
dined with us…after dinner we talked and had coffee."[44] But such home-
bound society was an occasional punctuation to the more prosaic
everyday rural isolation of the Virginian gentry. As Isaac also notes,
"The social circle was most complete at celebrations of house and family
rites of passage."[45] Lavish dinners, balls, and other such entertainments
punctuate the few records of the associational world of the landed class.
Many large gatherings in a home or public festivals were followed by a
ball or dance. In his diary, Byrd II notes a number of balls occurring in
his vicinity. Of one particular ball, he writes "At night ventured to the
ball at the capitol [Williamsburg] where I stayed until 10 and ate three
jellies."[46] After Christmas in December 1773, private tutor Philip
Vickers Fithian, who was employed by Robert Carter III, describes the
occasion for such a ball:

> It is custom here that whenever any person or family move into
> a house, or repair a house they have been living in before, they
> make a ball and give a supper— So we because we have gotten
> Possession of the whole house, are in compliance with custom,
> to invite our neighbors, and dance, and be merry.[47]

Balls illustrated the gentry's social interaction, but they also show
how they defined their individual identity within the social scene. The
Virginia Gazette announced many social gatherings, including balls.
For example "Mrs. Degraffendriet gives notice that she intends to have
a ball at her house, on Tuesday the 2nd of November, and an assembly
the next day."[48] The opportunity to interact and show one's nobility was
very enticing to the Virginia elite, as they took pleasure in establishing
themselves as refined members of society. Wit and satire, being so
important to the growing sociability of Great Britain and her provinces,
was also present in certain forms, in Virginia. Although no details of
public theatres could be found for this particular study, plays and
performance were not wholly lost on the Virginia elite. Robert
Munford, a member of the House of Burgesses and veteran of the

---

[42] Isaac, *The Transformation of Virginia*, 71.
[43] Evans, *A "Topping People,"* 147.
[44] William Byrd, *Another Secret Diary of William Byrd of Westover*, 175.
[45] Isaac, *The Transformation of Virginia*, 81.
[46] Byrd, *Another Secret Diary of Westover*, 107
[47] Fithian, 43.
[48] *The Virginia Gazette*, October 7, 1737, 4.

French and Indian War, wrote his own comedy entitled The Candidates in the 1760s, although it was not published or distributed until after his death in the 1798.[49] The Candidates takes a humorous look at a county election, and gives insight into the customs and practices of elections in Virginia, and the role of the important families, the "Worthy's" of each county.[50] The play also shows public meetings in the form of a county barbeque where candidates attempt to charm their voters and outwit their competitors, while displaying public intoxication as a detriment to several of the play's characters. Churches or churchyards were another place where Virginians regularly met. On a typical Sunday;

> The elites would visit and converse at church. Before they would give and receive "letters of business." They would all wait outside until service began and then "they entered as a body." After a brief service, the gentlemen would again wait and then would exit "en masse." Once outside they would spend nearly an hour walking around the church among the crowd. They would discuss dancing, feasts, cock fights, games, and other matters and then would invite people to their home for dinner.[51]

The Virginians used these opportunities to not only interact and socialize, but to display their elite status.

As it has been established that the main venue for sociability for the Virginia elite was the home, it is important to note the lack of public space available. As we saw in the London diaries of William Byrd, there were a plethora of coffeehouses, taverns, and dining places available to the London elite in which they conducted business as well as engaged in sociability. In Virginia, there was a severe lack of public space in which the elite could meet. The diary of William Byrd gives very few references to public space interaction. For example he mentions on May 1, 1740 that while in Williamsburg he "walked to the coffeehouse,"[52]but there is little else to suggest such venues were available elsewhere. In the Virginia Gazette, there are a few references to taverns, for example, on February 27, 1752, it was advertised that "the Subscriber purposes to have a Ball at the Apollo in Williamsburg,"[53] and on October 5, 1769 it was reported that "our worthy representative, gave a genteel dinner at the Raleigh Tavern."[54] While these accounts give evidence that public houses were indeed

---

[49] Jay B. Hubbell and Douglas Adair, "Robert Munford's 'The Candidates'," *The William And Mary Quarterly* vol. 5, no. 2 (April 1948): 217-57.

[50] Hubbell and Adair, 223

[51] Evans, *A "Topping People,"* 148.

[52] William Byrd, *Another Secret Diary of William Byrd of Westover*, 63.

[53]Alexander Finnie, *The Virginia Gazette*, Parks, Feb. 27, 1752.

[54]*The Virginia Gazette*, Parks, Oct. 5, 1769.

available, gentry diaries indicate such establishments were not a large part of elite planters' social lives.

Fithian gives a vivid and detailed account of the goings on between the upper crust of Virginia society. One entry declared that:

> Now you may suppose how small quantity many must have when two or three hundred Landholders reside in each of these small Precincts; Hence we see Gentlemen, when they are not actually engaged in the publick service, on their farms, setting a laborious example for their domesticks, and on the other hand we see labourers at the Tables and in the parlours of their betters enjoying the advantage, and honor of their society and conversation.[55]

This statement shows Virginian landholders interacting with their agricultural and domestic laborers on one hand, and entertaining their own class on the other. Class "domesticks" distinguished from "their betters" was replicated in the "small Precincts" of the plantation. Fithian also remarks that "any young Gentleman travelling through the colony…is presum'd to be acquainted with Dancing, Boxing, playing the Fiddle, & Small-Sword, & cards."[56] These activities, as Fithian suggests, served as much as moments of sociability for Virginian gentry, and exploring "dancing, boxing…, & cards," reveals the competing identities of Virginian gentlemen. Historians have noted that Virginians contested and entertained in a variety of ways, from dancing and attending balls to violent and rigorous bouts of contest and gambling. One perfect example of this tendency was their love of horse-racing. One type of "Chesapeake region" racing "indicated the prevailing taste for strong self-assertion and aggressive contest."[57] This unique form of racing was called a Quarter Race: "At the start the two riders were accustomed to jockey for position, and when the starter's signal sent them hurtling at full gallop down the narrow track, each might be free (depending on agreed rules) to use whip, knee, or elbow to dismount his opponent or drive him off the track."[58] The Virginia Gazette, which otherwise tended to focus on London- or European-based news and advertisements, would promote horse races as well as give information about wagering procedures. From 1746 we learn that, in:

> Hanover County…on Tuesday next (being St. Andrews Day) some merry-dispos'd Gentlemen of the said county, design to celebrate that festival, by setting up divers prizes to be contended for in the following manner, (to wit,) A neat Hunting-Saddle, with a fine broad cloth Housing, fring'd and

---

[55] Fithian, 161.
[56] Ibid., 161.
[57] Isaac, *The Transformation of Virginia*, 99.
[58] Ibid., 99.

flower'd, to be run for the Quarter by any number of horses and mares.[59]

Evidence of races and gambling can also be found in William Byrd's diary: "About 10 I went to Court and sat till one and invited company to Wetherburn's and I ate roast venison. After dinner we had a race which I went not to but won 20 shillings."[60] Byrd's diaries also reference that families went to races.[61] Historian T.H. Breen explains that "Gambling (such as Cock-fights and Horse-races) drew three key elements of Gentry life: competitiveness, individualism, and materialism," but in addition to individuality, gentry associated to identify themselves through sociability, whether British or inevitably Virginian. Breen is certainly correct to note that "The isolated population of Virginia planters created a sense of independence and self reliance."[62] But such isolation was never absolute. When we compare Annapolis with rural Virginia we can see certain distinct forms of sociability among the otherwise urbane Virginian elite. Violent forms of entertainment were all too common amongst the gentry of Virginia, who valued competition while also defensively aware of their own honor and masculinity. Isaac explains that:

> Self-assertive style, and values centering on manly powers pervaded the interaction of men as equals in this society. Everywhere, in play and in talk, amid conviviality would be emulation, rivalry, and boastful challenge, which not infrequently erupted into ugly violence among common planters, as affronted pride demanded satisfaction in bouts of boxing or wrestling.[63]

Such forms of masculinity and honor dominated other avenues of entertainment and socialization as well. Men competed through boat races; Fithian describes one particular race:

> at Hobbs Hole this day is a boat race on the River Rappahanock. Each boat is to have 7 oars: to row 2 miles out & 2 miles in round a Boat lying in anchor— The bett 50 pounds— and that in the evening there is a great ball to be given— I believe both the rowers & dancers, as well as ladies

---

[59] "Advertisments," *The Virginia Gazette*, Parks. Nov. 26, 1746.

[60] Byrd, *Another Secret Diary of William Byrd of Westover*, 107.

[61] Byrd, Another Secret Diary of William Byrd of Westover, 64.

[62] T.H Breen, "Horses and Gentlemen: The Cultural Significance of Gambling among the Gentry of Virginia," *The William And Mary Quarterly* 34, No. 2 (April 1977): 239-57.

[63] Isaac, The Transformation of Virginia, Pg. 91

[63] Fithian, 151.

and gentlemen will perspire freely— Or in plain English they will soak in sweat![64]

When placed in an aristocratic context, this description raises a number of questions, the most important dealing with the comment that all involved would "soak in sweat." This seemingly peculiar behavior for landed gentry, suggests that the Virginians were a new, separate form of landed "aristocracy" that was not afraid to get their hands dirty. It also establishes that the rural nature of the colony played a hand in deciding its identity, as the wealthy would engage in physically demanding practices for some of their entertainment. Boat races also gave another opportunity for gambling, as Fithian describes how "Captain Benson won the first race- Captain Purchace offered to bet ten dollars that with the same boat and same hands, only having liberty to put a small weight in the stern, he would beat Captain Benson- he was taken and came out best only by half the boats length."[65] Any opportunity to outdo or surpass one another was welcomed by the Virginians, who had developed their own sense of glory and personal honor. Gambling amongst the Virginians was another important factor in determining Virginian identity, despite laws limiting gambling being enacted numerous times; the colony's elites simply ignored them.[66] Bets were placed on horse-races, cock-fights, boat-races, boxing matches, fencing matches, and basically every other activity that would provide the opportunity to place a wager.

Gentry diaries and journals suggest that the Virginian social interactions represented more than just casual leisure. There was a constant pressure felt by all of the landed gentry to feel noble and establish themselves as aristocracy. Their land and material wealth set them at a level higher than almost any other colonial population, but they were unable to achieve their goal of recognition as British nobility, even though they were wealthy landowners. Evans explains that

> Although ties with the mother country remained strong, a distinctly Virginian identity was emerging…. They continued to travel back and forth across the Atlantic with some regularity, but this contrast appears merely to have strengthened their view that they were valued only for their economic contribution to the emerging empire and would never attain the status of English gentry…. Even William Byrd II, who spent much of his life in England, felt this way…. In England with his Virginia-born wife in 1716, he wrote John

---

[64] Ibid.

[65] Fithian, 154.

[66] Evans, *A "Topping People,"* 150.

Custis IV that "tho my person is here, my heart is in Virginia."[67]

Evans's argument, that eighteenth-century Virginians developed a distinct identity, echoes what many historians have concluded in recent studies. Virginians wanted to be considered English aristocracy, but it is also clear that their location, practices, and the sheer nature of the colony itself would never allow such acceptance amongst the aristocracy of Europe. While Rochambeau and other European elites thought it "virtually inconceivable" that George Washington, Thomas Jefferson and other Virginians "could have legitimate claims to gentility," on the colonial platform the Virginians stood head and shoulders above other British North American colonists. [68] They proved themselves to be different from their sister colonists, by their mass wealth, their lavish and refined lifestyles, their elitist fraternal bonds with other Virginia land owners and their significant influence over politics before and during the formation of the new republic. Virginia elites such as William Boyd II were connected to Britain, London in particular, in the sense that they not only had business interests, but had spent time or even received their education there in their youth. But in Virginia, the politeness and sociability that had begun to define the British elite did not wholly translate to the Virginia landscape, making it difficult for the elite to truly gain the Britishness they claim to embody. Virginians may have engaged in polite sociability with each other and also engaged in the same social activities such as horse-racing seen amongst the British elite. But the differences between the two elite world's forces historians to question whether their identity can fall under one specific heading.

Like-Minded Men with Like-Minded Humor: Sociability in Annapolis

Trans-Atlantic activity required ports, and colonial ports grew in the mid-eighteenth century, as did associational activity in those ports. Annapolis was not only Maryland's capital, but also its main port of trans-Atlantic trade. It was there that the Marylander elite met, conversed, and in a sense, created itself. Of course the colony's population, economy, and political or governmental structure, as much as the trans-Atlantic exchange, helped shape Marylander's social customs, cultural norms, and their associational world. Annapolis depended on the tobacco-based export economy that propelled the port city to prominence. If "economic growth in a colony is encouraged by rising metropolitan demand for a colonial staple," Maryland, like its

---

[67] Evans, *A "Topping People,"* 121.
[68] Rozbick, *The Complete Colonial Gentleman*, 1, 77.

neighbor Virginia, grew because of Britain's demand for tobacco. [69] With the agrarian system booming and increasing number of merchants and tradesmen "directed their business of shipping tobacco to England," Maryland began to experience a large population boom in the late seventeenth century.[70] European immigrants began to settle in Maryland, largely because of better opportunities and higher "life expectancies, wage rates, job opportunities, access to land and credit, the costs of starting a farm or entering a trade, and the like."[71] Although they remained part of the British Empire colonial elites did not necessarily fit into the British elite's molds for social differentiation. Using Scotland and the colonies as the basis for comparison, Clive and Bailyn argue that "whatever else may remain obscure about the social history of colonial America, it cannot be doubted that advance in letters and in the arts was involved with social ascent by groups who status in Europe would unquestionably be middling."[72] Colonists "readily accepted, and indeed assiduously imitated, the cultural leadership of London in literature, drama, architecture, dress, social customs, and values."[73] However, unlike their Virginian neighbors who established class distinction mainly by family ties, a newcomer could become a member of the Maryland elite he or she "had the requisite attributes of gentility and could demonstrate gentility through wealth, status, and behavior."[74]

Newspaper accounts and letterbooks illustrate the differences between Maryland and British gentility. In one particular address written by a Mr. Lewis, Maryland is described:

> Here every planter opens wide his door; to entertain strangers, and the poor; For them, he cheerful makes the downy bed; For them, with food unbought his board spread; No arts of luxury disguise his meals; Nor poignant sauce severe disease conceals; Such hearty welcome does the treat command; As shows the

---

[69] Allan Kulikoff, "The Economic Growth of the Eighteenth-Century Chesapeake Colonies," *The Journal of Economic History* 39, no. 1 (March 1979): 275.

[70] Constance W. Werner, "Architectural Research in the Annapolis Dock Space," *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 21, no. 3 (Oct. 1962): 140; Kulikoff, 275.

[71] Russell R. Menard, "British Migration to the Chesapeake Colonies in the Seventeenth Century", in *Colonial Chesapeake Society*, ed. Lois Green Carr, Philip D. Morgan, Jean B. Russo (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1988), 105.

[72] John Clive and Bernard Bailyn, "England's Cultural Provinces: Scotland and America" *The William And Mary Quarterly* 11, No. 2 (Apr. 1954): 202.

[73] John C. Morton, "Stephen Bordley of Colonial Annapolis," *Winterthur Portfolio* (1969): 1.

[74] Trevor G. Burnard, *Creole Gentlemen: The Maryland Elite, 1691-1776* (New York: Routledge, 2002), 127.

Donor to mankind a friend; That good Old-English hospitality, When ev'ry house to ev'ry guest was free; Whose flight form Britain's isle; her bards bemoan, Seems here with pleasure to have fix'd her throne.[75]

Lewis emphasizes Maryland's rural nature, the colonists' simplicity, hospitality and relative unprivileged nature. He also emphasizes a trans-Atlantic "Old-English" hospitality that could be found within the province. Men from Annapolis also recorded their experiences in Great Britain, showing similarities as well as vast differences between the two societies. The letters of Joshua Johnson, a partner in the Annapolis firm Wallace, Davidson, and Johnson, describe the considerable shortcomings of his own experience while doing business in London. In a July, 1771, he wrote:

I am frightened at the expense attending one's living here…you have no idea of it. They may talk of 18d. per day but it is impossible, and to support the character I must, why, the washing of my clothes alone will come to 18 or 20 (pounds) per annum; then where is the first purchase, house, rent, meat, drink, etc.?[76]

Along with the financial differences, Johnson experienced cultural friction: "I am getting clothes made and shall have more of the appearance of a Londoner."[77] While Johnson wanted to emulate the metropolitan or cosmopolitan fashions, it proved impossible to do so fully.

As the importance and relevance of Annapolis grew, so did the rising demand for culture and sociability. Out of this demand came the creation of publics, which can be defined as:

a body of private individuals who form a public opinion; or who exercise reason and judge the humanistic, natural, social, and political world about them; or who share assumptions, values, or conclusions about the world; or those who connect emotionally or indulge communally in personally rewarding behavior; or who judge the taste, virtue, value, or education of other people.[78]

---

[75] Mr. Lewis, "A Description of Maryland, extracted from a poem, entitled, Carmen Seculare, addressed to Ld Baltimore, Proprietor of that Province, now there," *Gentleman's Magazine*, Apr. 1733, 209.

[76] Jacob J. Price, ed., *Joshua Johnson's Letterbook*, 1771-1774 (London: London Record Society, 1979), 3.

[77] Ibid., 1.

[78] Jessica Kross, "Mansions, Men, Women, and the Creation of Multiple Publics in Eighteenth-Century British North America," *Journal of Social History* 33, no. 2 (Winter, 1999): 386.

For Maryland, such a public can be seen through the Tuesday Club of Annapolis, a society started and recorded by Scottish immigrant Dr. Alexander Hamilton beginning in 1745. Hamilton's group met "either at some tavern or private house, to converse, or look at one another, smoke a pipe, drink a toast, be political or dull, lively or frolicksome, to philosophize or triffle, argue or debate, talk over religion, news, scandal or bawdy, or spend time in any other sort of clubbical amusement."[79] Such clubs increased throughout the British Empire during the mid-eighteenth century, propelled by the rising population of educated and professional men such as Hamilton.

The nature of clubs and societies was directly influenced by not only by the location, whether urban or rural, but also by the makeup of its populace and the economic strength of the area. Thus Annapolis and Williamsburg- both colonial capitals possessing the same number of inhabitants- differed in associational development because Annapolis, had a more developed urban economy with its administrative and residential functions bolstered by the city's role in Maryland's buoyant import and export trades."[80] As a British province Maryland had royal officials and governors residing in Annapolis who played a central role in the government, business, and "Britishness" of the colony.[81] Maryland had long been dominated by Lord Baltimore, a title held by several generations of the Calvert family. The Calverts were proprietors, but they did not necessarily reside in the colonies, often sending Governors in their stead. One such Governor was Daniel Dulany, who after being sent to England for a period of five years, returned to Annapolis, where he was "received at his Landing by a number of Gentlemen, and saluted by the Town Guns, and from on board sundry ships in the River."[82] The Britishness of the colonists in Maryland can be seen vividly through their government, as officials aided the implementation of British ideals. In fact, in 1764 Governor Horatio Sharpe was responsible for building one of the most "beautiful houses built in America during colonial times" just outside of Annapolis, which he called Whitehall.[83] Besides recreating England physically in the colonies, royal officials also added to the intellectual sociability of Annapolis. Tuesday Club members included the Annapolis' mayor and

---

[79] Dr. Alexander Hamilton, *The History of the Ancient and Honorable Tuesday Club, vol. 1*, ed. Robert Micklus (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1990), 33.
[80] Peter Clark, *British Clubs and Societies, 1580-1800* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 392.
[81] Clive and Bailyn, "England's Cultural Provinces," 207.
[82] Aubrey C. Land, *Colonial Maryland, A History* (New York: KTO Press, 1981), 180.
[83] Ibid., 182.

the Governor's private secretary.[84] William Eddis wrote, upon his arrival in Annapolis in 1771, that the governor:

> introduced me in the most obliging terms to several persons of the highest respectability in the provinces. He treated me with the utmost kindness and cordiality, assured me of his strongest disposition to advance my future prosperity, and gave me an unlimited invitation to his hospitable table.[85]

While government officials played a part in configuring the politics and in Eddis's case, sociability, the non-governmental elite had their own way of practicing Britishness through sociability.

Elite members of the Annapolis population found ways to incorporate sociability within their own circles. The men of the Tuesday Club were professionals and tradesmen: doctors, lawyers, and military men, as well as members of the clergy (among other professions). The Club was made up of fifteen regular members with visiting honorary members gracing the occasional meeting. The club's records demonstrate how these men created "clubbical" publics. On October 25, 1748, there were ten recorded members being entertained in the home of the Club's President Charles Cole, and among the members were a doctor (Hamilton), a Reverend, and a ship Captain.[86] The rising culture of the Annapolis associational world can be directly related to the city's growing population of educated individuals, and the rise of education can be seen in the Maryland Gazette. In an advertisement published in the Gazette, the Kent County School stated its purpose was to teach "Greek and Latin tongues, writing, arithmetic, Merchants Accounts, surveying, Navigation, the use of the globes, by the most accurate pair in America."[87] The term "America" shows an inkling of a further identity, though we cannot push this too far, and at this point, it is more a sense of difference than an embracing identity. In any case, Marylanders were deploying a new terminology to help define themselves.

Some Maryland social activities were quite similar to those in Virginia. In September 1747, for example, the Maryland Gazette advertised two days of horse-racing, "on the Race Ground near Annapolis," including a race with a prize of fifty guineas and another for twenty pounds.[88] Both the racing and the gambling implied are similar to that in Virginia. Elite Virginians and Marylanders also participated

---

[84] Records of the Tuesday Club, ed. Elaine Breslaw (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1988), xxi.

[85] Eddis, 9.

[86] Breslaw, *Records of the Tuesday Club*, 82.

[87] "Advertisement," *The Maryland Gazette*, Maryland State Archives.

[88] "Advertisement," *The Maryland Gazette*, Tuesday Sept. 1, 1747, MSA SC M 127, Maryland State Archives.

in balls. For example, the Annapolis Tuesday Club cancelled their weekly meeting for 19 January 1747, because there was to be a public ball that night celebrating the Prince of Wales' birthday.[89] This suggests that such elite sociability reinforced colonial "Britishness" and, of course, monarchism.

Exploring the rules and practices of the Tuesday Club can show the differences between rural gentry and urban elite sociability. Within mid-eighteenth century social clubs wit and conversation mattered. David Shields explains that "Communities of interest and fellow feeling were invoked by wit, for the most authentic senus communis was that established by spontaneous shared laughter in response to a joke," and men such as Dr. Alexander Hamilton placed an emphasis on the importance of these attributes amongst the growing associational world.[90] While politeness encouraged sociability, wit "was the apposite and novel adjusting of language to thought, to form a memorable expression," and along with good humor and common characteristics, wit could form the basis of a social club. [91] The Tuesday Club was meant to meet on a weekly basis in one of the members' houses, and such rules included that "the member appointed to serve as steward shall provide a gammon of bacon" and "no fresh liquor shall be made, prepared or produced after eleven o'clock at night."[92] The social nature of the club and their status as gentlemen can be seen through another law, in which they decided that "immediately after supper, the ladies shall be toasted, before any other toasts or healths go around."[93] While many of the laws and rules of the club show the social and technical nature of the society, there are laws created to ensure civility, indicating that the club's actual discussions could on some occasions prove too heated and controversial:

> If any subject of what nature soever be discussed, which levels at party matters, or the administration of the Government of this province, or be disagreeable to the Club, no answer shall be given thereto, but after such discourse is ended, the society shall laugh at the member offending, in order to divert the discourse.[94]

The club took its meetings very seriously, and were unwilling to jeopardize the congeniality of their interactions. On November 10th, 1747, a mock trial was held indicting one member, William Thornton, on charges for trespasses against the club. He was accused of censoring a letter to the President, missing a meeting without conveying his

---

[89] Breslaw, *Records of the Tuesday Club*, 63.
[90] David Shields, *Civil Tongues and Polite Letter in British America* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1997), 176.
[91] Ibid., 26.
[92] Breslaw, *Records of the Tuesday Club*, 36.
[93] Ibid., Tuesday, June 4th 1745. 6.
[94] Ibid., 8

pending absence to the proper members of the club, and "being intrusted with nine bottles of English beer presented by Robert Morris, an honorary member of this society, did unjustly, willfully, and pitifully, deprive the society the thereof."[95] While such actions and jests had given the Tuesday Club a reputation of whimsy and humor, the club was more than a group of babbling drunks hell-bent on good humor. Satire worked to both screen without obfuscating important issues and of providing an outlet for aesthetic talents in a popular literary mode."[96] Behind all of the wit and satire was a desire to discuss and comment on the important goings on within their sphere. David Shields discusses the fact that social clubs such as the Tuesday Club took heavy fire from both public and religious institutions. To Shields, "social clubs constituted havens of play and free conversation in which the sorts of expressions most troublesome to church and state could be voiced, whether with seditious plainness or, more artfully, as travesty."[97]

Hamilton's *History of the Ancient and Honorable Tuesday Club* reveals the mores of an entire social circle. It records who could and could not be included in club fellowship, what dangers of society threaten sociability, and what made the club important.[98] Such men that harbored anti-social behavior and were not gentle with the opposite sex had no place in the club world that Hamilton strove to create, and he also felt that "wranglers, disputers, contradictors, falsifiers, and skeptical doubters" should be excluded from club association.[99] As the club's purpose was to "drink and be merry" Hamilton had no time and patience for those members of society that could not enjoy the company of others while stimulating their sense of good humor and merriment.[100] Another enemy of clubs, according to Hamilton, was "that violent propensity in human nature to dispute."[101] While engaging in debate and conversation was a must in the clubs, Hamilton believed that it was dangerous to have a number of men disagreeing with each other without any members of the society conceding his point. Evidence of such an intrusion can be found in the Tuesday Club's records. On October 28, 1746 in the home of Hamilton, the club resolved "no disputes relating to the business of the Club shall be entered upon when any strangers are

---

[95] Ibid.,, 60
[96] Elaine Breslaw, "Wit, Whimsy, and Politics: The Use of Satire by the Tuesday Club of Annapolis, 1744–1756," *The William And Mary Quarterly* Vol. 32, No. 2 (April, 1975): 296.
[97] Shields, *Civil Tongues and Polite Letter in British America*,175.
[98] Hamilton, *The History of the Ancient and Honorable Tuesday Club*, 69.
[99] Ibid., 71
[100] Ibid., 82
[101] Ibid., 132

present."[102] While it is unclear exactly what caused this law to be passed, it does show how the discussions that the club engaged in needed to be regulated. More evidence of this fact arose on November 24, 1741 as the club decreed "henceforth from this day, there shall be no disputes whatsoever, or judicial trials carried on, or negotiated upon that night in which Mr. President Cole serves, or upon the Anniversary night of the club."[103] Discussion and interaction needed to be regulated, as certain issues and topics would cause disorder amongst the club, and negate the purpose of the meetings.

The Tuesday Club did not meet in a purpose-built building like London gentlemen's clubs from the early nineteenth century such as the Athenaeum. Instead, it assembled in various private residences. According to Eddis, by the 1770's "The buildings in Annapolis were formerly of small dimensions and inelegant construction; but there are now several modern edifices which make a good appearance."[104] Perhaps the rise of "modern" buildings allowed the increasing association and sociability. Jessica Kross suggests that during the mid-eighteenth century, colonial homes were being modeled after the British lower gentry, and "they [were] divided up hitherto undifferentiated space into separate rooms where specialized social interactions took place and where the public part of the house could be segregated from the private."[105] This can be directly applied to Maryland as the buildings were becoming larger and more modern, and homes were becoming the center of club life, which can be seen through the Tuesday Club's practice of meeting at each others homes. Apart from the home, social interaction occurred in such places as taverns and coffeehouses, which could be found throughout in the London diary of William Byrd II. While interaction in public spaces would not end, the Tuesday Club serves an example of organized, educated, elite men meeting in private dwellings as opposed to the now dwindling class distinctive taverns.

In the mid-eighteenth century, Annapolis became a cultural center, with public theatres, musical performances, etc. In 1752, The Beggars Opera opened in Annapolis. One advertisement for the opera, performed at the "New Theater in Upper Marlborough" stated the accompanied music would be performed by a "set of private gentlemen" and that the Tuesday Club offered "at least five string players, two flutists, a keyboard performer, and possibly a bassoonist."[106] Along with musical performance, the Tuesday Club engaged in poetry contests, as in the winter of 1745-46, when a few members contested with two "Baltimore

---

[102] Breslaw, *Records of the Tuesday Club*, 36

[103] Breslaw, *Records of the Tuesday Club*, 61

[104] Eddis, ed. Aubrey C. Land, 13.

[105] Kross, "Mansions, Men, Women, and the Creation of Multiple Publics in Eighteenth-Century British North America," 385.

[106] Talley, 13.

Bards": manuscript poems circulated to which others responded with "poetry, insults, and suggested remedies for the cure of bad poetry."[107] The arts and performances were important to the members of the Tuesday Club, as writing songs and poems to commemorate and respond to certain events encompassed an interesting aspect of their interaction. This type of interaction is not found within the records of the Virginia planters, and the presence of theatres in Maryland give yet another example of contrasting forms of sociability.

The trans-Atlantic world of clubs and sociability was effected by a number of different factors; first being location and economic practices, the second being by the demographics of the population. The rise of tobacco farming cultivated economic and financial growth in both Maryland and Virginia, creating the opportunity for a more leisurely lifestyle that allows association; but the rise of urbanization and the diversity of economic growth in Annapolis sent them on a different course in the sense that more and more men and women were reaching "elite" status. The rise of the elite in the more urbanized port city allowed for more opportunities to interact, setting them apart from Virginia, whose lack of urban sociability centers and rural population only provided a small handful of social activities. The main contrast can be seen in the development of the Annapolis clubs while such an associational world was not a major part of sociability in Virginia.

Conclusion

Stephen Conway argues that "There was no smooth and uninterrupted transition in the way in which Britons in Britain looked on Americans; a jagged, broken and faltering movement—like a drunkard lurching forward and then tottering back—is a more appropriate image," and this argument holds true when studying the roots of American identity.[108] As this article has shown, the Virginia and Maryland elite attempted, admirably, to re-create a world of association and sociability comparable to Great Britain but were hindered from fully doing so based upon their social composition. The rural Virginians engaged in similar activities found in Britain, including horse-racing and cock-fighting, and spent as much time entertaining each other in their grand Tidewater plantations. The Marylanders, while also engaged in races and the sort, created social clubs reminiscent of those found in Britain, and built large houses in which to meet and create sociability amongst their urban peers. However, their attempts at remaining wholly British floundered as they faced difficulties that made it impossible to socialize on the same level as the British elite. In a sense, the differences forced upon their sociability aided in the creation

---

[107] Talley, 72.
[108] Conway, "From Fellow Nationals to Foreigners," 67.

of unique identities that incorporated their roots while adapting them to their physical locality. In Virginia, the mock-nobility created by the elite planter class established a wealthy upper-crust desperately wishing to appear and be accepted as British; however their rural location and backwoods/agrarian characteristics created a frontiersman nobility that could not hope to flourish or even appear in Great Britain proper. In Maryland, the wealthy elite established sociability in the form of clubs modeled after the societies from Britain, but their location in the Americas forced their association to transcend class and birth to incorporate a new form of elite that would be considered riff-raff in Europe. The historiography of identity in the colonies would certainly benefit from more club records as precise as those of the Tuesday Club, or from a wider array of personal and fearless journals like those written by William Byrd. However, by studying what is available, it can clearly be seen that the Chesapeake colonies had constructed a world with similarities to Great Britain with slight inconsistencies; horse-racing and gambling was incorporated in the colonies, but the Virginian version of the "Quarter Race" shows a factor of violence that set it apart. Annapolis residents created a society in which the elite could meet in the spirit of wit and association, but lacking the intricate physical spaces for such esteemed meetings, they met in each other's private domiciles. By honing in on one specific class, in a certain region, examining one aspect of daily life, the picture of identity becomes a little clearer as men discovered who they were and who they could not hope to be. Identity, however, can be traced in other ways, as other historians have concluded. Linda Colley argues that "Quite simply, we usually decide who we are by reference to who and what we are not," and using this method we can begin to see that the colonists, in a sense, were not sure who they were or what they were not.[109] One way this theory applies is to the experiences of the Loyalists on the eve of and after the revolution; as some colonials "abandoned their colonial homes because they decided they were more British than American" only to find themselves beginning to "compare America and the British Isles, invariably to the detriment of the latter."[110] The colonists wanted desperately to cling to their British identity, but it would prove an impossible task. The colonists thought they were British, but it turned out they were not. The study of identity amongst the different regions that made up the British empire is difficult, because as Colley suggests, "In practice, men and women often had double, triple, or even quadruple loyalties… according to the circumstances, in a village, in a particular landscape, in

---

[109] Linda Colley, "Britishness and Otherness, an Argument," *The Journal of British Studies* 31, No.4 (October 1992): 309-329, 31.

[110] Mary Beth Norton, "The Loyalist's Image of England: Ideal and Reality," *Albion* 3, No. 2 (Summer 1971): 62 and 67.

a region, and in one or even two countries. It was quite possible for an individual to see himself as being, at one and the same time, a citizen of Edinburgh, a Lowlander, a Scot, and a Briton."[111] This same conclusion can easily be applied to the colonies, as there is ample evidence to support them identifying with Britain, the colonies as a whole, and their own personal location. The colonists saw themselves as British, not just because they were supposed to, but because they wanted to. There is ample evidence to argue that the Virginia and Maryland elite took a great deal of pride in their British sociability. But at the same time, they were "American" in the sense that they needed to look after their own interests. For instance, the diary of William Byrd in London shows the need for Virginia coffeehouses and lobbyists to make sure they were getting a fair shake by the exchange. These instances are important because it shows an intersecting example of multiple identities that is crucial to understanding this "Golden Age" of colonial sociability. Dissention amongst the colonial populous was seemingly unique to the thirteen North American colonies, considering that neither Canada nor West Indies colonies rebelled "despite the sensitivity of their elites on questions of Constitutional principle."[112] Another factor to the rise of a separate identity in America was the way in which they were seen in Britain. By 1775, the British press had published a number of articles showing evidence of disapproval, and in some cases malice, towards the colonies. One article, pertaining to the practice of cock-fighting, states that:

> Cock-fighting is a heathenish mode of diversion…and at this day ought certainly be left to those barbarous nations…the Chinese, the Persians…and the still more savage Americans; whose irrational and sanguinary practices ought in no case to be objects of imitation to polite and more civilized Europeans.[113]

Articles such as these show the growing criticism of North American colonists, and also gives evidence to the argument that American identity was given to them, notwithstanding their attempts to remain British. While activities such as horse-racing, cock-fighting, boating, and club life show the ways in which the colonists attempted to solidify their British identity doing so became an insurmountable task.

---

[111] Colley, "Britishness and Otherness," 315.

[112] Jeremy Black, *The Politics of Britain 1688-1800* (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 1993), 43

[113] Pegge, "Thoughts On Cockfighting," *Edinburgh Magazine and Review,* October 1775. http://proxy.library.eiu.edu:2205/articles/displayItem.do?Query Type=articles&ResultsID=12F1E8D81E2F637B0&filterSequence=2&ItemNu mber=1&journalID=e806(accessed 3/22/11).

Whether it amounted to factors out of human control, a voluntary separation by the colonists, or a fabricated image forced upon the colonials by the inhabitants of the British Isles, the question of a separate American identity remains an elusive study.

The Significance of Nature: a Historiographical Review of Environmental History

Benjamin Aberle

"Not all forces at work in the world emanate from humans."[1] All historians would do well to remember this simple fact articulated by Donald Worster, one of the founding fathers of the growing field of environmental history. But even though this is clearly true, that humans are inseparable from their environment, most of history remains a human story. The environment is just a setting for the human drama, a stage.

For Frederick Jackson Turner, the wild American frontier provided the conditions in which the exceptional identity of Americans could be forged. Although the wilderness was central to Turner's story, it remained the backdrop for a narrative about the progress of democracy and the American nation. Turner's emphasis on environmental forces explains a lot about the time in which he wrote. The nineteenth century witnessed the rise of human awareness about the environment as a powerful entity. This can easily be seen through Charles Darwin's idea that natural selection is responsible for shaping the evolution of life or in the more spiritual outlook of Henry David Thoreau who said that "in wilderness is the preservation of the world."

Not coincidentally, the progressive conservation movement gained momentum as Turner's frontier vanished. Many Americans awakened to the possibility that the nation's resources were limited and that their primitive wilderness areas were threatened. Activists such as John Muir fought to save natural areas such as Yosemite Valley for their intrinsic worth. Meanwhile, the federal government worked to conserve America's forests in the name of "wise-use" efficiency. This dichotomy of preservation and conservation became the lens through which environmental history first took form.

The publication of Samuel Hays's *Conservation and the Gospel of Efficiency* in 1959 and Roderick Nash's *Wilderness and the American Mind* in 1967 marked the beginning of a new history that celebrated the

---

Benjamin Aberle is a graduate student in History. He is from Fairbury, Illinois and his interests are environmental history, nineteenth-century American history and baseball history. He wrote this paper in Fall 2011 for a Historiography seminar led by Professor Mark Hubbard.
[1] Donald Worster, "Transformations of the Earth: Toward an Agroecological Perspective in History," *Journal of American History* 76, no. 4 (Mar., 1990): 1091.

environment as something to be valued.[2] Hays's study is primarily a political history concerned with the utilitarian conservation policies of Theodore Roosevelt's administration, including chief forester Gifford Pinchot. *Wilderness and the American Mind* is an intellectual history about the concept of wilderness as it has changed over time and place. The preservation-minded Henry David Thoreau and John Muir are the heroes of Nash's narrative. Together, these books formed a stark contrast between two poles of environmental thought, around which most histories of the environmental movement have gravitated.

However, these founding works are not in themselves environmental histories. In both of these studies, the environment remains a stage for the human story: the progress of environmentalists. How then, did these political and intellectual histories lead to the growth of an academic field in which one could claim that "the spread of potatoes and lazy bed cultivation certainly had a greater effect on the demography and the physical condition of actual Ireland than [Thomas Carlyle's] hero, Oliver Cromwell [?]"[3] How could historians gain employment who thought, "the story of the prairie bluestem… or the smallpox virus, or the common barnyard pig, may be no less important than the story of a presidential administration or a war [?]"[4]

It wasn't until modern environmentalism emerged in the 1960s and 1970s that the environment became relevant to historians' understanding of the world. One needed only to look at the smog surrounding America's cities or to read about the dangers of pesticides in Rachel Carson's *Silent Spring* to become concerned with the human impact on the environment.[5] Indeed, Richard White has asserted that "environmental history as a self-proclaimed new field emerged on the academic sense deeply involved with, if not married to, modern environmentalism."[6] Even Nash claimed to be "indisputably lucky" in the preface to the 2001 edition of *Wilderness and the American Mind* because he "caught the wilderness wave as it began to crest and became the beneficiary of the very intellectual revolution [he] described."[7]

---

[2] Samuel Hays, *Conservation and the Gospel of Efficiency: The Progressive Conservation Movement, 1890-1920,* (New York: Atheneum, 1959). Roderick Nash, *Wilderness and the American Mind* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1967).

[3] Alfred Crosby, "An Enthusiastic Second," *Journal of American History* 76, no. 4 (Mar., 1990): 1108. In reference to Radcliffe Salaman, *The History and Social Influence of the Potato* (Cambridge, Eng.., 1985), 188-332.

[4] William Cronon, "Modes of Prophecy and Production: Placing Nature in History," *Journal of American History* 76, no. 4 (Mar., 1990): 1122.

[5] Rachel Carson, Silent Spring (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1962).

[6] Richard White, "American Environmental History: The Development of a New Historical Field," *Pacific Historical Review* 54, no. 3 (Aug., 1985): 299.

[7] Nash, *Wilderness and the American Mind,* vii.

Out of the desire to understand "the role and place of nature in human life" historians began to build on the ideas of Aldo Leopold, the famous conservationist and wilderness advocate who claimed that humans were only one part of an interdependent community that included "soils, waters, plants, and animals, or collectively: the land."[8] This new field adopted a structure later expressed by Worster, who stated that environmental history "rejects the common assumption that the human experience has been exempt from natural constraints, that people are a separate and uniquely special species, that the ecological consequences of our past deeds can be ignored."[9]

It was Worster who authored some of the pioneering works in the young field of environmental history. His *Nature's Economy: A History of Ecological Ideas* was published in 1977 and was followed in 1979 by *Dust Bowl: The Southern Plains in the 1930s*, winner of the Bancroft Prize in American History.[10] *Dust Bowl* provided the link between environmental and social change for which contemporaries were looking.

In *Dust Bowl*, Worster details how difficult it can be for people to live on the plains. In a region with little rain, the wind is "the one steady ingredient in plains weather—always ready to tear away whatever is not firmly rooted or nailed down."[11] Moderating this effect of the wind were deep-rooted prairie grasses that held together the sod of the earth. A complex ecosystem evolved around these grasses that involved a multitude of species from bison and butterflies to prairie chickens and pronghorns. Indians became a part of this harmonious ecosystem, or "natural economy" as Worster put it, developing a way of life that could coexist with the harsh environment of the plains. According to Worster, they succeeded on the land because of their "full acceptance of the natural order [and] pattern of ecological restraint." Their "unwillingness to consider that any other relationship with the grassland might be possible" enabled them to survive in such a marginal, foreboding landscape.[12]

Americans moving west in the 19th century did not see the plains this way. They saw it first as a barren desert and then, as the American frontier receded, a place of opportunity- a wilderness to be conquered. Railroads divided the great expanse, the US Army subdued the Indian

---

[8] Worster, "Transformations of the Earth," 1088-1089. Aldo Leopold, *A Sand County Almanac: And Sketches Here and There* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1949), 204.

[9] Worster, "Transformations of the Earth," 1089.

[10] Donald Worster, *Nature's Economy: A History of Ecological Ideas* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1977). Worster, *Dust Bowl: The Southern Plains in the 1930s* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1979).

[11] Ibid., 71.

[12] Ibid., 77.

nations, and cattle replaced the nearly exterminated bison. Eventually farmers settled the plains, embodying America's insatiable appetite for more land. In the years between 1910 and 1930 these American "sodbusters" tore up the land at an unprecedented rate. The surge in wheat prices, caused by the First World War, and the introduction of tractors encouraged farmers to cultivate more land than ever before. The native biodiversity of the plains was replaced by a monoculture of wheat. In this process of industrialization, subsistence farmers were squeezed out by large-scale commercial farms owned by absentee landlords who held "an exploitative relationship with the earth: a bond that was strictly commercial, so that the land became nothing more than a form of capital that must be made to pay as much as possible."[13]

By the time that drought came in the 1930s, most of the native grasses were no longer there to protect the dry soil from blowing away in the wind. The farmland that plains families depended on was swept away in horrifying black blizzards and carried as far away as the Atlantic Ocean. The nation found itself suffering not only from economic depression but also the social and environmental catastrophe known as the Dust Bowl.

In Worster's judgment, the farmers who ripped up the native sod were not entirely to blame for this disaster. Conceding that although man is "forever capable of considerable violence toward nature, he is everywhere materialistic, and he has never paid much attention to the environmental consequences of his deeds" Worster asserts that the reason why plainsmen ignored their environmental limits must be "explained not by that vague entity 'human nature,' but rather by the peculiar culture that shaped their values and actions."[14] A capitalist "ethos" was behind man's alienation of his ecological community.

The "ethos" was one in which "nature must be seen as capital… man has a right, even and obligation, to use this capital for constant self-advancement [and that] the social order should permit and encourage this continual increase of personal wealth."[15] This culture "was ecologically among the most unadaptive ever devised."[16] Indeed, he states that "some environmental catastrophes are nature's work, others are the slowly accumulating effects of ignorance or poverty. The Dust Bowl, in contrast, was the inevitable outcome of a culture that deliberately, self-consciously, set itself that task of dominating and exploiting the land for all it was worth."[17]

---

[13] Ibid., 93.

[14] Ibid., 94.

[15] Ibid., 6.

[16] Ibid., 97.

[17] Ibid., 4.

Dust Bowl may incite anger over America's ecological sins and passion about defending wild country from the excesses of capitalist culture. Worster's provocative message of reform reflects the energy behind environmental history's emergence as a field created out of a desire to inform and correct ongoing ecological concerns. *Dust Bowl* ends with a warning for agriculturalists who believe they can ignore the lessons of the past: "new ecological disasters can be created by man on the plains, and on a scale greater than anything experienced before… The Great Plains cannot be pushed and pushed to feed the world's growing appetite for wheat without collapsing at last into a sterile desert."[18]

Worster himself noted that his field was "born out of a strong moral concern."[19] The emphasis on morality gave environmental history its initial shape. Following *Dust Bowl* was another declension narrative: William Cronon's *Changes in the Land: Indians, Colonists, and the Ecology of New England.* In his book, Cronon attempted to show how "European [trade and] agriculture reorganized Indian relationships within both the New England regional economy and the New England ecosystem.[20] In doing so he contrasted Indians' and colonists' differences in agriculture, hunting, forest management, and ideas about property such as land boundaries and livestock control. Like Worster he concluded that the capitalistic culture of the English invaders—including the natives who tried to adopt it—was to blame for the rapid destruction of the native New England landscape and culture.

It makes sense that an academic field founded by environmentalists would rally against anything that threatens ecological balance. Declension narratives, such as *Dust Bowl* and *Changes,* rely on the concept that nature is inherently balanced and that humans destroy that balance when they refuse to adapt to nature's limits. They rest on a few assumptions about ecology, as explained here by Richard White: "complexity is good, simplicity is bad; natural systems seek equilibrium and battle disruption, there is an ideal balance in nature that, once, achieved, will maintain itself."[21]

These ecological assumptions date back to the 1920s, when ecologist Frederic Clements introduced the ideas of succession, and climax communities in nature. This was the accepted theory of ecology when environmental history first began. Historians like Worster and Cronon could confidently write their tales about a human departure

---

[18] Ibid., 239.

[19] Worster, "*Transformations of the Earth,*" 1089.

[20] William Cronon, *Changes in the Land: Indians, Colonists, and the Ecology of New England* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1983), 103.

[21] Richard White, Environmental History, Ecology, and Meaning, *Journal of American History* 76, no. 4 (Mar., 1990): 1115.

from the natural ideal. Indeed, "Historians thought ecology was the rock upon which they could build environmental history," but as White wrote, "it turned out to be a swamp."[22] That is because ecology has drifted away from the idea of climax communities and toward the idea that nature is always undergoing dynamic change.

White pointed out that the ecology that these historians depended on was already changing by the time these works were written. This presented a problem for environmental historians because they no longer had a clear standard of what a stable ecosystem should actually be. They could no longer be sure about using nature as a reference from which to judge human actions. The reformist passion and claim to superior knowledge that fueled the field's beginning works now became a stumbling block.

Another flaw to these works was their propensity to blame everything on capitalism. Cronon reflected years later, "We cannot simply label as capitalist or modern all forces for ecosystemic change, and as traditional or natural all forces for stability… Rather than benign natural stasis and disruptive human change, we need to explore differential *rates* and *types* of change." Colorfully explaining the need for complexity to replace morality, he asked, "Are capitalist pigs intrinsically more destructive than non-capitalist pigs?"[23] As Cronon suggested, universal laws about the destructive tendencies of capitalism should be avoided.

Yet another weakness in early environmental histories such as these was a narrow focus on local or regional history, or what can be referred to as bioregional histories. The narrow focus of these studies enabled their authors to write a declension narrative in which environmental deterioration was clear. Despite ecological uncertainty, the impact of environmental change can clearly be seen in the case of natural disasters like the Dust Bowl or in cross-cultural encounters like those between Indians and English colonists. However, the problem with this narrow scale is one that all local and regional histories share. White points out, "no matter how carefully bounded in place and time local studies are, they involve processes which originated in and involved much larger areas and groups of people. History provides few laboratories."[24] Worster acknowledged that "the historical profession is full of narrow, empirical busyness" and that "the public is obviously and rightly bored by it." What was needed was an emphasis on "the larger issues of our time—the relation of nature and capitalism, the collective myths and

---

[22] Ibid. An excellent summary of Clementsian ecology can be found in Donald Worster *Nature's Economy: A History of Ecological Ideas* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1977), 205-220.

[23] Cronon, "Placing Nature in History," 1128.

[24] White, "American Environmental History," 323.

institutions of nations and civilizations, the workings of imperialism, the fate of the earth."[25]

Environmental histories being written were not limited to a regional focus. One early example of environmental history that was able to broaden the scope of environmental change was Alfred Crosby's *Columbian Exchange: Biological and Cultural Consequences of 1492*, first published in 1972. In it Crosby focused on the environmental impact that occurred in Europe, Africa, and the Americas as a result of the booming interaction between those continents during the Age of Discovery. Crosby improved upon this design in 1986 with *Ecological Imperialism: The Biological Expansion of Europe, 900-1900* in which he showed how the European conquest of many colonies in the temperate zones of the world was due as much to biological co-invaders such as disease, flora and fauna, as it was to military might. It was Crosby who said that what environmental history needed was more "intelligent generalizers."[26] These macrohistories owe something to the Annales School of history in which geographical patterns were emphasized over the accomplishments of political and military leaders. Therefore, mentioning Fernand Braudel in any conversation about the origins of environmental history is necessary.[27]

However, neither scale was able to diminish the most pressing problem facing environmental history. Environmental determinism remained the driving force behind most environmental narratives. Whether it was the overwhelmingly material emphasis of Cronon's New England changes or the superiority of biological factors in Crosby's tale of global conquest, there seemed to be little room for cultural or social influence. In discussing the problem of holism, Cronon admitted to environmental history's tendency to gloss over social divisions:

On the one hand, holistic analysis has the great attraction of encouraging historians to see nature and humanity whole, to trace the manifold connections among people and other organisms until finally an integrated understanding of their relations emerges. On the other hand, holism discourages us from looking as much as we should at conflict and difference *within* groups of people.[28]

Changes in the Land is perhaps the definitive example of holistic history: Cronon spent little time discussing social divisions (with the

[25] Donald Worster, "Seeing Beyond Culture," *Journal of American History* 76, no. 4 (Mar., 1990): 1143.

[26] Crosby, "An Enthusiastic Second," 1109.

[27] Alfred Crosby, *Columbian Exchange: Biological and Cultural Consequences of 1492* (Westport: Greenwood Publishing Company, 1972). Crosby, *Ecological Imperialism: The Biological Expansion of Europe, 900-1900* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1986).

[28] Cronon, "Placing Nature in History," 1128.

exception of different labor roles for men and women) in a tale about two collective actors: Indians and colonists.

Taken together, all of these faults can appropriately be labeled as growing pains. As with many new disciplines, a few years were needed for the field to find its own identity and a promising direction. It was during this process when Richard White offered a few guiding suggestions in 1985 that helped the growing field to mature. Namely, he called for more interdisciplinary research and a fuller exploration of cultural attitudes about nature, encouraging an expansion beyond the narrow focus on influential thinkers such as John Muir and Aldo Leopold. More emphasis needed to be placed on the "political, social, and economic contexts" in which environmental change took place. Furthermore, a definition had to be found for "what healthy ecosystems are and what constitutes their decline." Generally, environmental history needed to get away from environmental determinism and incorporate social history. Yet, historians also had to be careful about losing the environment as their subject in their effort to connect it to larger social issues. White concluded, "It is in the midst of this compromised and complex situation—the reciprocal influences of a changing nature and a changing society—that environmental history must find its home."[29]

Since then, the field has improved in moving beyond narrow stories of environmental change into a broader range of social and cultural issues. A brilliant comparison of environmental history to social history can be found in an article written by Alan Taylor entitled "Unnatural Inequalities." In it Taylor recognizes that "environmental history mute[s] the subdivisions and conflicts that so interest social historians" but also considers it to be "fundamentally compatible and mutually reinforcing" with social history.[30] Both have a "preoccupation with the common and the previously inconspicuous," focus on "the empirical examination of new sources" and have an "engaged political sympathy for the less powerful and most exploited."[31] In some ways, the category of nature may be added to the list of "others" that constitutes social history: women, race, class, and ethnicity. Taylor pointed out the potential of studying the "social inequalities of environmental consumption" and that "inequality has had profound environmental consequences."[32]

This newfound emphasis on social divisions within an environmental framework has been one of the major improvements in

---

[29] Richard White, "American Environmental History," 335.

[30] Taylor, Alan, "Unnatural Inequalities: Social and Environmental Histories," Environmental History 1, no. 4 (Oct., 1996): 7.

[31] Taylor, "Unnatural Inequalities," 8.

[32] Alan Taylor, "Unnatural Inequalities," 11-15.

environmental history. Recent works include: Mark Spence's *Dispossessing the Wilderness: Indian Removal and the Making of the National Parks,* which views the creation of the national park system from the lens of the Native Americans who lived on those marginal lands before they were removed; Karl Jacoby's *Crimes Against Nature: Squatters, Poachers, Thieves, and the Hidden History of American Conservation* which makes a similar argument about how federal conservation pushed working-class people off the land; Carolyn Merchant's "Shades of Darkness," which examines the racial ideas of celebrated environmentalists such as Henry David Thoreau, John Muir, and Aldo Leopold; and Merchant's *Ecological Revolutions* which improved upon *Changes in the Land* in its treatment of class and gender issues.[33] Karl Jacoby, in an argument for reconciling social and environmental history, mentioned that what was needed was " a history that regards humans and nature not as two distinct entities but as interlocking parts of a single, dynamic whole."[34]

For this idea Jacoby owed a lot to his dissertation advisor, William Cronon. The belief that nature or wilderness is something other than civilization began to crumble with the publication of Cronon's controversial article "The Trouble With Wilderness: Or, Getting Back to the Wrong Nature" in 1995. This article met much resistance from environmentalists for its perceived attack on wilderness. Richard White wrote that it "was like offering a scrap of meat to yellow jackets in the fall."[35] In this article Cronon flipped a core concept upside down by arguing that wilderness is "far from being the one place on earth that stands apart from humanity, it is quite profoundly a human creation—indeed, the creation of very particular human cultures at very particular moments in human history."[36] Cronon demonstrated this by tracing human definitions of wilderness from the biblical notion that wilderness was a place "to lose oneself in moral confusion and despair" to the early modern idea that "it might be 'reclaimed' and turned toward human

---

[33] Mark Spence, *Dispossessing the Wilderness: Indian Removal and the Making of the National Parks* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999); Karl Jacoby, *Crimes Against Nature: Squatters, Poachers, Thieves, and the Hidden History of American Conservation* (Berkeley: University of California Press,2001); Carolyn Merchant, "Shades of Darkness: Race and Environmental History," *Environmental History* 8, no. 3 (Jul., 2003): 380-394; Carolyn Merchant, *Ecological Revolutions: Nature, Gender, and Science in New England* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1989).
[34] Jacoby, *Crimes Against Nature,* xvii
[35] Richard White, "Afterword Environmental History: Watching a Historical Field Mature," *Pacific Historical Review* 70, no. 1 (Feb., 2001): 104.
[36] William Cronon, "The Trouble With Wilderness: Or, Getting Back to the Wrong Nature," *Environmental History* 1, no. 1 (Jan., 1996): 7.

ends" to the nineteenth century view of wilderness as a sacred "Eden" to be revered and protected.[37]

It was also during the nineteenth century that wilderness became a source of recreation to be consumed by "well-to-do city folks" and that "Country people generally know far too much about working the land to regard *un*worked land as their ideal."[38] In this comparison of different class-based perceptions about wilderness Cronon shows how wilderness is mainly a cultural invention. This is especially clear when studying Native Americans' experience with the national park system. Cronon wrote that "The removal of Indians to create an 'uninhabited wilderness'—uninhabited as never before in the history of the place—reminds us just how invented, just how constructed, the American wilderness really is."[39] Cronon reminded us that people have been manipulating the environment long before Americans ever considered it sacred. At one particularly abrasive point Cronon wrote:

The dream of an unworked natural landscape is very much the fantasy of people who have never themselves had to work the land to make a living—urban folk for whom food comes from a supermarket or a restaurant, and for whom the wooden houses in which they live and work apparently have no meaningful connection to the forests in which trees grow and die. Only people whose relation to the land was already alienated could hold up wilderness as a model for human life in nature, for the romantic ideology of wilderness leaves precisely nowhere for human beings actually to make their living from the land.[40]

He concluded that the dualism of wilderness versus humans must be abandoned in favor of a view that sees all places and all people as natural. This includes "the celebration…of the wildness in our own backyards" and humble landscapes such as marshes, or agricultural and urban landscapes as well. Indeed, he calls for an end to the perception of wilderness as "pristine" or "wild" or "other." Instead it must be seen as home. Cronon concluded with a moral plea: "If wildness can stop being (just) out there and start being (also) in here, if it can start being as humane as it is natural, then perhaps we can get on with the unending task of struggling to live rightly in the world—not just in the garden, not just in the wilderness, but in the home that encompasses us both."[41]

The Trouble With Wilderness is the keystone of the cultural turn in environmental history. It appeared as the headlining chapter in Cronon's collection of essays from environmental writers all concerned with nature's role in human culture. Though it met with initial controversy it

---

[37] Ibid., 9.
[38] Ibid., 15.
[39] Ibid., 15-16.
[40] Ibid., 17-18.
[41] Ibid., 22-25.

inspired a direction in which environmental history was able to connect to larger cultural patterns in history. Some examples of the new cultural-environmental history are Cronon's own *Nature's Metropolis: Chicago and the Great West*, a great example of how to do an environmental history of an urban landscape; Paul Sutter's *Driven Wild: How the Fight Against Automobiles Launched the Modern Wilderness Movement*, in which Sutter argues that Wilderness Society formed in response to the intrusions of the Civilian Conservation Corps and the increasingly mobile society in which nature became a product to be visited and consumed; and Christopher Seller's "Thoreau's Body: Towards and Embodied Environmental History" which argues that the human body should also be seen as nature.[42]

Environmental history has followed the progress of its general discipline, albeit more quickly, in evolving from Whiggish tales of moral decline to Braudelian patterns of change and universal laws about capitalism, to scientific studies of the "other" in social history, and finally to a postmodern emphasis on culture. Where should it go from here? Paul Sutter offers the suggestion that US environmental historians would gain much by adopting a global perspective. Indeed, he has shown environmental movements have developed elsewhere in places such as India, where there is more of an emphasis on the state vs. marginalized people than there is on conservation vs. preservation. From Africa comes the concept of environmental control in which humans are a stable, rather than unstable, force in the environment. There should also be a greater attempt to reconcile science with environmental history. The "interdisciplinary balancing act" that has both supported and plagued environmental history can be achieved: see Benjamin Cohen's *Notes From the Ground: Science, Soil, and Society in the American Countryside.*[43] The greatest challenge is for historians to find a way to engage other areas in their discipline, to convince others of the environment's value and relevance, and to broaden their focus to capture a bigger public audience. They must remember Richard White's maxim that "Nature does not dictate, but physical nature does, at any given time, set limits on what is humanly possible" without forgetting that the most important thing is to study human relationships to nature. Otherwise,

---

[42] William Cronon, *Nature's Metropolis: Chicago and the Great West (*New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1991); Paul Sutter, *Driven Wild: How the Fight Against Automobiles Launched the Modern Wilderness Movement* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2002); Christopher Sellers, "Thoreau's Body: Towards an Embodied Environmental History," *Environmental History* 4, no. 4 (Oct., 1999): 486-514.
[43] Cronon, "Placing Nature in History," 1122; Benjamin Cohen, *Notes From the Ground: Science, Soil, and Society in the American Countryside* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009).

how would historians be able to contribute to the central goal behind environmental history? The goal has not changed since Worster expressed it in 1990: "to deepen our understanding of how humans have been affected by their environment through time, and conversely and perhaps more importantly in view of the present global predicament, how they have affected the environment and with what results."[44]

[44] Worster, "Transformation of the Earth," 1089.

Origin and Creation: London Guilds of the Twelfth Century

Katherine Payne

Written records concerning guilds did not begin to appear until the late eleventh and early twelfth centuries. The only reference prior had been in the laws of Anglo-Saxon rulers. This paper will focus on the origins of medieval London guilds and the three most popular formations during the twelfth century: merchant, craft, and religious guilds. Each guild represented different influential institutions of medieval society and their economic contributions to the city as a whole. Many historians have debated over the true motivation in the formation of the guilds and two of the leading intellectuals are Lujo Brentano, with his theory of brotherhood, and in response George Unwin, who believes "volunteer associations" and the idea of Western European progress played a significant role in fueling the construction of the London guilds. London, as well as other towns and cities of the twelfth century, acted as the epicenter for guilds to create a regulated authority over members, monopolies, and outside merchants.

Prior to the invasion of 1066, England had been under the rule of the Anglo-Saxons who for over five centuries had established a social and political system, which transitioned "from a tribal to a territorial organization."[1] These institutions echoed some of the feudal system's principles of later centuries with "social unions, lordship and fellowship."[2] In order to keep citizens and members of the guild community informed, social unions and meetings were held once a year to air grievances, collect dues, and set new laws. The notion of fellowship seemed to have the largest impact on the creation of the guilds. By forming groups of "fellows" with like-minded ideas and goals, the men and women would then be able to create their own forms of authority in their "fellowship" or guild.[3] According to Joseph Strayer's *Dictionary of the Middle Ages*, guilds were considered "an association of merchants or artisans primarily intended to promote the interests of its members…The guild usually enjoyed legal recognition and social

---

Katherine Payne grew up in Lake Zurich, Illinois and earned her BA and MA degrees in History from Eastern Illinois University. She wrote "London Guilds of the Twelfth Century" in Fall 2011 for Dr. Bailey Young's HIS 5444 Church and Society in Medieval Europe course.

[1] Unwin, *The Gilds and Companies of London*, 16.

[2] Ibid., 16.

[3] Ibid., 16.

permanence."[4] Some of the earliest guilds became examples of how the formation of power structures within the medieval towns or cities changed both politically and economically in the eleventh and twelfth centuries.

Due to the limited number of records on traditional Anglo-Saxon society, historians have had to "adopt an equally speculative approach toward English gilds."[5] There is no official written evidence of guilds existing in London prior to the ninth century, but by examining the word *gegildan*, or gild brethren, and its use "in the laws of Ina (c. 690) and those of Alfred (c. 890)," historians have been able to theorize who and what were a part of these "fraternal associations" during the seventh and ninth century.[6] Laws written in greater detail are found in the tenth century with the records of the Dooms of the City of London, known as the *Judicia civitatis Londoniae*.[7] This remarkable work created during the reign of Athelstan (924-940) "contains ordinances for the keeping up of social duties in the Gilds, or Gild-ships as they are called."[8] The social duties to which it refers are the by-laws or statutes on how guild members should act, dress, and conduct themselves while members of an established company. Some examples of the statutes are the donations to "a common purse, a monthly feast for members, charity for the poor, ceremonies to be performed upon the death of gild brethren, and a monthly meeting to transact business."[9] Every guild did not act in exact accordance with the *Londonaie*, but each did have specific requirements for its members to follow.

Some of the earliest companies of London are referenced in the *Judicia civitatis Londoniae*, including the Frith guilds, who were established "for the maintenance of peace" during Athelstan's reign (925-40).[10] The Frith guilds represented a group of like-minded individuals who kept law and order within the community instead of relying solely on the support of the local sheriff or alderman(s). By splitting into groups over the city, the Firth guild's main objective was to reduce the amount of thefts taking place within a specific area.[11] A second tenth century guild found in the *Londoniae* was The English Knights (or

---

[4] Joseph Strayer, *Dictionary of the Middle Ages* v. 6 (New York: Collier Macmillan Canada Inc., 1985), 13.

[5] Frank F. Kahl, introduction to *The Gilds and Companies of London*, by George Unwin (London: Frank Cass & Co., 1963), xxiii.

[6] Ibid., xxiii.

[7] Ibid., xxiii.

[8] Lucy Toulmin Smith, introduction to *English Gilds*, xvii.

[9] Kahl, introduction to *The Gilds and Companies of London*, by George Unwin, xxiv.

[10] George Unwin, *The Gilds and Companies of London* (London: Frank & Cass Co., 1963), 16; *Oxford English Dictionary*, s.v. "Firth Guilds."

[11] Ibid., 18.

Cnihten) Gild of London. This is thought to have been established under the reign of King Edgar, but did not receive its first charter until Edward the Confessor.[12] After receiving a number of charters to "prove its continuous existence until its dissolution in 1125," historians have been able to trace the influence of the Knights Guild into the twelfth century.[13] Charters allowed guilds to gain municipality within the cities and towns, influencing the governmental power structure previously established.

Granting of a charter did not always give exclusive power within the city, but in the case of guilds it allowed members to have autonomy within the institution itself. A town in medieval England "produced almost exclusively for itself; it was practically economically independent."[14] There is speculation that due to the turbulent eleventh century, guilds were created in an attempt to secure economic stability in the face of changing political power during the twelfth century. In order to find a balance of power, the guild administration, "its Officers, and its Ordinances or Bye-laws, were based on the same principles as those of the other free institutions of England."[15] Almost every guild had a set of their own elected officers, who enforced the regulations and statutes mentioned earlier, such as the payment of fees, honoring fallen brethren, or meeting once a month to settle administrative inquiries.

Of those voted into office, the Alderman, or the "Graceman," ruled over the body of members.[16] This person was usually of a higher societal status because of his wealth or connection with the nobility. Stewards handled the administrative duties and were considered the wardens of the guilds, collecting funds and fees.[17] The guild members also chose Clerks and Deans and their main duty was to summon the brothers and sisters of the guilds when needed, an example being for the death of a fellow member.[18] Election of the ruling body provided a framework for the ruling courts, which would later be held in a number of guilds, especially those involving trade. Even with having sovereignty of their own court, guilds did not have much power within the whole of the municipality they served. It can be implied that "whatever power the court…possessed, was implicitly, if not explicitly, delegated by the

---

[12] Ibid., 24.
[13] Ibid., 24-25.
[14] Rev. George Clune, *The Medieval Gild System* (Dublin: Browne and Nolan Limited, 1943), 111.
[15] Smith, introduction to *English Gilds*, xxxviii.
[16] Ibid., xxxviii.
[17] Brentano, *English Gilds: The Original Ordinances of more than One Hundred Early English Gilds*), 46.
[18] Ibid., 46.

city."[19] One benefit of holding court was the ability to control and penalize both its own members and those not of the guild who still practiced in trade.

One of the three most influential guilds of the twelfth century is the Guild Merchant. This was "an organization of merchants in the last sense who had been given the trade monopoly of their town."[20] Some historians believe these guilds were created during the Anglo-Saxon era and carried into the rule of the Normans, but the general theory seems to be that they began to flourish primarily after the Norman invasion of 1066. The unique feature about the Guild Merchants was their involvement "in long-distance commerce and local wholesale trade and may also have been retail sellers of commodities in their home cities and distant venues where they possessed rights to set up shop."[21] These guilds, because of their economic and political influence, could not be found in every city, but in the twelfth century "of 160 towns represented in the English Parliament, 92 had the Gild Merchant."[22] Those men and women who became involved in the guild were guaranteed rights and protection from outside traders and even rulers of other countries who would try to seize goods. In response "guilds threatened to boycott realms of rulers who did this, a practice known as *withernam* in medieval England" and this was a serious threat to countries whose lives depended on trade.[23] Merchant guilds also enforced the by-laws of its members as "medieval commerce operated according to the community responsibility system,"[24] making all members responsible for one another, including incidents involving late payments and law breaking. With the capability to enforce codes of conduct on both rulers and members, guild merchants had an incredible ability to monopolize every aspect of trade within a town.

The organization of merchant guilds allowed those dealing in commerce, such as tradesmen, merchants, and craftsmen to feel confident they were getting the best price for their goods and services. With power over the city, merchant guild members usually held higher positions within medieval society and had the ability to influence local governments.[25] The Mercers Guild of 1172 is an example of a guild that withstood the test of time. A journal entry in 1870 *British Periodicals* examines how all the guilds which still existed at the time of the entry

---

[19] Unwin, *The Gilds and Companies of London*, 28.

[20] Clune, *The Medieval Gild System*, 14.

[21] Strayer, *The Oxford Dictionary of the Middle Ages*, 751.

[22] Clune, *The Medieval Gild System*, 16.

[23] Strayer, *The Oxford Dictionary of the Middle Ages*, 751.

[24] Ibid., 751.

[25] Ibid., 751.

could be "traced back to the twelfth century."[26] In one case he studies the Mercers Guild of 1172, mercers being "a person who deals with textile fabrics,"[27] who became known as the "Company of Merchant Adventurers" in 1296, and received a charter from Henry IV in 1406.[28] The success of this gild merchant was in verifying the importance of trade during the twelfth century and possibly, the members of this guild, due to their higher status, were able to maintain their social standings to keep and preserve their guild and crafts.

Craft guilds were similar to merchant guilds in their need to ensure financial security for their members. One of the main theories on the origins of the crafts is their split away from the merchant guilds and reorganizing into more specific skill sets. This move weakened the merchant guilds, but did not cause them to totally disband, as seen in the case of the mercers. Another theory is proposed by Lujo Brentano, suggesting that the craftsmen were kicked out of the guild merchant's halls. After attempting to survive on their own, they realized the necessity of having a fellowship of members to ensure that the needs were met for each craftsman.[29] This supports his overall theory of guild formation and the importance of bonds in a familial sense. In almost every town there were those who practiced a craft, and while not all belonged to the association of the guilds, many who did enter memberships received benefits such as the guarantee of business and limited competition.

Divided into three categories, craft guilds came to represent the economic structure of the towns and the importance in the division of labor. The "Guilds of victuallers brought agricultural commodities… Guilds of manufacturers made durable goods…[and] Guilds of a third type sold skills and services."[30] Brewers, bakers and butchers were considered part of the victualler's guild; blacksmiths and goldsmiths became members of the manufacturer's guild; the guild of skills and services could include, but was not limited to, clerks and entertainers.[31] There are no known reports on any disputes which occurred during the transition from merchant to craft guilds and gradually over time the craft guilds were able to acclimate and establish themselves in a city or town. The statutes and regulations introduced by the craft guilds were

---

[26] William Chambers, "The Livery Companies of the City of London," *Chamber's Journal* 317 (1870), 57.

[27] *Oxford English Dictionary*, s.v. "mercer."

[28] Chambers, "The Livery Companies of the City of London," 57.

[29] Lujo Brentano, "On the History and Development of Gilds and the Origin of Trade Unions," in *English Gilds: The Original Ordinances of more than One Hundred Early English Gilds* (London: N. Trubner & Co., 1870), cxv - cxvi.

[30] Strayer, *The Oxford Dictionary of the Middle Ages*, 751.

[31] Ibid., 751.

similar in many ways to the merchant guilds, upholding the same standards of honor and respect shown to the other and acts of charity, all while following the by-laws to avoid being fined.

Evidence of fines found in the discrepancies on payments to the Royal Exchequer of 1155, reveal that the bakers of London guild found themselves close to seventeen pounds in debt. The Pipe Roll "gives us the dues originally payable by the London bakers as the customs of the hallmoot."[32] The hallmoot was an extremely important aspect to the guilds political system. When "the legal and administrative business of the city increased and became specialized, it passed largely into the hands of smaller assemblies held more frequently," such as the house-meetings, or hallmoots.[33] One of the administrative duties performed included handling "tolls," similar to taxes, but paid by the bakers in respect to the amount of goods sold.[34] It is thought that the bakers must have charged their members a small amount per week to avoid paying their tolls and in the end made a small profit for themselves and ended up owing money to the crown.[35]

Power and money are not the only reasons guilds formed during the twelfth century. The third most popular guilds of the age were the religious guilds. Religious guilds, considered also a social guild, seemed to be more concerned with the moral well being of the towns, versus the growth of personal economic endeavors. Because they did not deal directly with trade, unlike the merchant and craft guilds, religiously affiliated societies "did not carry the legal powers of a court."[36] The religious guilds had an extensive and clearly defined set of goals, and its appeal to so many caused a rapid development of similar societies in the wider world. The object of these guilds was to "unite in every exercise of religion" and pay homage "under the patronage of the Holy Trinity, or of certain Saints, or of the Holy Cross, or of the Holy Sacrament, or of some other religious mystery."[37] Craft and merchant guilds also required some religious action, but nothing compared to the devotion shown by the members of the religious societies.

Nearly every religious guild during the medieval age identified their name with a patron of the church. Some examples include Guild of St. Thomas of Canterbury, Guild of St. Katherine, or the Fraternitas Sancte

---

[32] Unwin, *The Gilds and Companies of London*, 35.
[33] Ibid., 30.
[34] Ibid., 30.
[35] Ibid., 36.
[36] Unwin, *The Gilds and Companies of London*, 29.
[37] Lujo Brentano, "On the History and Development of Gilds and the Origin of Trade Unions," lxxxiii.

Trinitatis, which translates to "Fraternity of the Holy Trinity."[38] As a sign of respect, religious guilds closely followed religious practices; their most important was the lighting of the candles, thought to represent the origins of their society. More common acts of devotion included "masses, orisons, and other good deeds."[39] Religious guilds during the twelfth century are numerous and many were licensed and practicing legally. The "Pipe Roll of 1179-80" focused on what are to be known as the "unlicensed or 'adulterine' guilds."[40] Within this account there are eighteen adulterine guilds, and only one is religiously affiliated: owing money to the king because of its illegitimate existence. The Guild of St. Lazarus had a recognized alderman by the name of "Ralph le Barre," and because of his affiliation the guild can be assumed to have an established ruler, but not enough power to have a court. [41] The monetary amount of twenty-five marks owed to the king also signifies a prestigious existence for the guild, as only three other companies were fined higher than twenty marks.[42] The "adulterine" guilds listed did not represent the majority of guilds during the twelfth century, but it is important to see how devoted the aldermen and members were to their society.

Historians have studied the effects of the formation of the guilds and through their writings have recognized competing theories on the origin of guild formation. Lujo Brentano's *English Gilds: The Original Ordinances of more than one hundred Early English Gilds* is an interesting and thorough look into the origins of the guilds and their regulations. Within his body of work there are quite a few return ordinances of English guilds, each explaining their origins, properties, and usages, or daily procedures, of everyday activities.[43] What is useful from the study are the two introductions: one by his daughter, Lucy Toulmin Smith, and the second by him, an essay "On the History and Development of Gilds and the Origin of Trade Unions," written prior to the book being published. Due to an untimely death, his daughter wrote an introduction examining her father's ideas, and I pull from both works, Brentano's main argument on the origins of the medieval guilds.

Lujo Brentano studied the bonds of brotherhood and the associations of fraternity. He believed "it is an essential characteristic of

---

[38] Lujo Brentano, *English Gilds: The Original Ordinances of more than One Hundred Early English Gilds* (London: N. Trubner & Co., 1870), 25; Google Translate "Fraternitas Sancte Trinitatis."

[39] Brentano, "On the History and Development of Gilds and the Origin of Trade Unions," lxxxiv.

[40] Unwin, *The Gilds and Companies of London*, 47.

[41] Ibid., 48.

[42] Ibid., 48.

[43] Lujo Brentano, *English Gilds: The Original Ordinances of more than One Hundred Early English Gilds* (London: N. Trubner & Co., 1870), 1.

the system of local self-government, that its constant tendency is, to bring men together continually, with feelings of brotherhood."[44] In the introductory essay, he also noted familial bonds that created the strongest "natural union."[45] His theory then expanded into the formation of licensed guilds and eventually trade unions, believing if a bond is strong enough between brothers, neighbors, or friends; it will survive the creation of "restricted association[s]."[46] His romanticized view of history, at times, makes it difficult to find historical accuracy with psychological insight into the formation of natural bonds.

George Unwin's methodology was similar to Brentano, as both studied primary documents of the time. However, Unwin's argument is in contention with Brentano's idea of brotherhood and fraternity. Unwin wanted to take it one step further into an idea of the "voluntary association," instead of an obligatory familial bond. He believed this aspect of the natural bonds came "into relationship with political power."[47] To Unwin, willing participants of an association, much like the guild system, would lead to the progress of Western Europe as a whole, not just England. This approach seemed to be a stretch when trying to relate it to the whole of Europe, but it does fit the historical aspect of the medieval twelfth century.

The debates and questions surrounding historical origins of medieval guilds may never be fully answered. In this brief essay I have tried to explain the two main arguments of Lujo Brentano and George Unwin and how their interpretation on the earliest history of the guilds is similar. Yet, through their understanding of the subject and methodological approaches to guilds, they have concluded different outcomes as to why and how the guilds were created. By giving some historical background, one gains a better understanding of how the guilds came into being and the differences and similarities between the economic institutions.

---

[44] Lucy Toulmin Smith, introduction to *English Gilds: The Original Ordinances of more than One Hundred Early English Gilds*, by Lujo Brentano (London: N. Trubner & Co., 1870), xxvi.

[45] Brentano, *English Gilds*, lxxx.

[46] Ibid., lxxi.

[47] George Unwin, *The Gilds and Companies of London* (London: Frank Cass & Co., 1963), 14.

An Agreement of the People: Self-empowerment and the Downfall of the Great Chain of Being in Early Modern England

Tim Aberle

In a manifesto published in 1647, a small but significant band of English parliamentarian soldiers and politicians declared a series of imperatives to honor in the post-Civil War reformation period. Published as *An Agreement of the People*, the document boldly expressed the revolutionary notion that the people of England were sovereign, stating that the power of Parliament was "inferior only to theirs that choose them," or "the people of England."[1] Such a truly revolutionary concept markedly differed from the norms of paternalism and deference that sustained a hierarchical social and political system in England during the late Tudor and early Stuart periods.[2] As articulated by the authors of the document, the adoption of personal independence and collective sovereignty by the people was a major change in early modern England, and it affected political, social, and religious issues alike.

Although the exact sentiments in *An Agreement of the People* were not fully established as the new English order due to powerful conservative elements within the Parliamentarian victors, the ideas expressed in the document did reflect drastic changes in the psyches of English people before, during, and after the Civil War. In fact, evidence suggests that a major portion of the parliamentarian forces ultimately fought for sovereignty of the people as much or more than out of loyalty to their local gentry.[3] Their common purpose of dethroning an oppressive and autocratic ruler in favor of self-determination regarding religious and political issues sustained the parliamentarian effort, making reformation possible. Therefore, the English Civil War and its outcome resulted from a massive paradigm shift concerning English identity. The empowerment of individuals as equal, sovereign beings

Tim Aberle is a senior majoring in history with teacher certification from Fairbury, Illinois. He will graduate in December of 2012 with additional endorsements in language arts and the middle grades. He wrote this paper for Dr. Key in "HIS3100: The History of England," during the Fall semester of 2011. He plans to teach and eventually continue his education in graduate school.

[1] *An Agreement of the People* (ca. late October 1647), in *Sources and Debates in English History, 1485-1714*, 2nd ed., ed. Newton Key and Robert Bucholz (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009), 186-7.

[2] Robert Bucholz and Newton Key, *Early Modern England 1485-1714: A Narrative History*, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009), 182.

[3] Ibid., 259.

ultimately brought destruction of the Great Chain of Being, which was the fundamental cultural framework for a hierarchical socio-political order, but a revolutionary change had to occur to influence such individual empowerment. Primarily, religious independence stimulated the empowerment of individuals as equal and discerning citizens, leading to a dramatically new English identity by the end of the Civil War period.

Prior to the immediate events that culminated in the Civil War, religion was the backbone of the social and political order in early modern England. Through the state church, its episcopal structure, and its intellectual monopoly over English culture, religious doctrine and sermons in the late Tudor and early Stuart period promoted paternalism and deference, reinforcing those values as proper and divinely sanctioned.[4] Also, in the highly censured literary environment of the period, writers who were granted publication used scripture to reinforce those values even further. For example, Sir Robert Filmer justified the absolutist political structure of England in *Patriarcha* by referring to the Book of Genesis and the story of Adam.[5] In the 1630 work, Filmer compares the king of a people to Adam, reasoning that subjection to a monarch as a supreme, fatherly being is as natural and proper as the subjection of children to their parents. Through such scripture-based arguments, a literate minority used their intellectual influence over illiterate commoners to promote and maintain a value system of social submission to superiors in the Great Chain of Being in early modern England. However, the increase of literacy during the Stuart period enabled common people to read and evaluate scripture for themselves.[6] In turn, increased literacy led to more independent congregations, less dependence on state-sponsored dogma, and ultimately a stronger sense of self-determination instead of deference.

Religious independence first manifested itself in English culture through a significant diversification of religious sects during and after the Civil War. According to Bucholz and Key, parliamentary authorities implemented a time of free press during the Civil War in order to encourage popular questioning and an ultimate overthrow of the government.[7] The ensuing flood of literature facilitated the expression of divergent opinions on a variety of social topics, including religion. Unrestricted expression not only served to promote and share different opinions among the populace and stimulate intellectual development, but it also demonstrated the extent to which literacy and the ability to self-administer scripture had undermined the homogeneous religious

---

[4] Ibid., 182.

[5] "Robert Filmer, *Patriarcha*" (ca. 1630, pub. 1680), in *Sources and Debates*, 140.

[6] Bucholz and Key, *Early Modern England*, 209.

[7] Ibid., 263.

environment that the Tudors' and Stuarts' state-sponsored church strived to create in the previous decades.

One specific broadside that was published in London in 1647 particularly emphasizes how the Anglican Church came to be splintered by different opinions.[8] Illustrating and profiling 12 different religious sects such as Anabaptists, Adamites, Arminians, and Libertins, a conservative author refers to their perceived "false and dangerous" intentions and exaggerates their features in order to emphasize their radical nature. In effect, the illustration is an attempt to stigmatize the sects in question and therefore make the Church of England seem like the most normal and sensible choice in a pool of different religious disciplines. Such an effort does not only reveal that English religious culture was becoming more diverse, but it also suggests that the rate at which new sects emerged and proliferated was so great as to alarm conservatives like the author and the Rump Parliament, who only wished to remove the king rather than alter the nation's religious and social structure altogether. By the middle of the 1640s, it was becoming clear that the religious fabric of early modern England had frayed.

When religious diversification permeated the ranks of the parliamentarian army, the Civil War became a vehicle for major changes in religion at an institutional level. In effect, revolt and overthrow of the monarchy set the changes in English religious identity in motion. While different religious sects were tolerated but still alienated in England's religious structure before the war, their participation in the parliamentarian effort enabled them to agitate for broader social recognition. In other words, English religious character had begun to change under the Stuarts, but the Civil War provided the opportunity to manifest that change in institutional reform. Similar to the author of the 1647 broadside, Thomas Edwards, a Presbyterian writer, noted the diverse religious population particularly among the parliamentary ranks in 1646's *Gangraena*.[9] Warning against Anabaptists, Arminians, and other independent sects that were present in the army, Edwards refers to the subjects as "strange monsters" as he emphasizes their erroneous beliefs. More importantly though, Edwards attributes the sects' proliferation to "libertinism as the great vein going through the whole of the army." Implying that different sects spread like blood-borne pathogens among the army, Edwards suggests that libertinism, or the general condition of having liberty "of conscience" and "of preaching," encouraged the growth of different religious interpretations. Therefore, the document illustrates how adherents of diverse religious sects served in the parliamentarian forces as opportunists; they flourished in the

---

[8] [Anon.], *A catalogue of the several sects and opinions in England and other nations* [London, 1647], broadside.
[9] Thomas Edwards, *Gangraena* (1646), in *Sources and Debates*, 193-4.

tolerant environment that parliamentarian authorities created, taking advantage of the opportunity to seize freedom of worship from the bonds of the state-sponsored church.

Such empowerment invoked fear in the more conservative parliamentarians who wished to reform government while maintaining the rest of England's social order, which again was an aristocratic hierarchy dependent upon tight control of a religion that endorsed submission and deference. According to Bucholz and Key, Parliament actually implemented a government censure as early as 1643 to curtail the increasing diversification of opinions.[10] However, such an effort was in vain. Having granted initial tolerance in exchange for the assistance and loyalty of England's masses, Parliament had enabled a population thirsting for liberty to challenge the existing order, and they could not prevent them from pressing even further. As a result, the diverse religious community survived into the aftermath of the Civil War.

In the post-War reformation period, two groups, the Quakers and the Levellers, exemplified the threat to the order that Parliament had tried to maintain. Their dangers are particularly evident in two contemporary documents illustrating the changes in English psyche that the groups represented. In one document from 1649, a group of women protested the imprisonment of some Leveller leaders who had published literature calling for popular sovereignty.[11] Claiming assurance of their "creation in the image of God, and of an interest in Christ, equal unto men," the women draw from a scriptural reference to justify themselves as having an appropriately equal right to petition authorities and therefore have a voice in government. Such behavior drastically contradicted the Great Chain of Being, which relegated women to a silent role, but the writers' boldly asserted their perceived rights as equal beings nevertheless. Essentially, their religious beliefs emboldened them to present themselves as sovereign participants in England's society, leading them to defy the established order in the process.

Similarly, the Quaker James Nayler challenged conservative order and directly protested the influence of bishops in English religious life in a 1656 hearing of Parliament.[12] Reacting to his impersonation of Jesus Christ in Bristol earlier that year, Parliament reprimanded Nayler and summoned him to account for his actions, and the hearing was published in a report of the proceedings. According to the reporter, Nayler addressed Parliament as being "a long time under dark forms, neglecting the power of godliness, as bishops." Claiming that he was obeying God's will, Nayler effectively expressed his independence, suggesting that he had dominion in his spiritual life over the dictations of the bishops and

---

[10] Bucholz and Key, *Early Modern England*, 263-4.
[11] "Leveller Women" (May 1649), in *Sources and Debates*, 196.
[12] "Parliament on James Nayler" (December 5-8, 1656), Ibid., 201-3.

subsequently demanding that Parliament eliminate their role in society. Convinced that he alone was capable of discerning God's input, Nayler impersonated Christ in order to express to his neighbors that Christ was present in every individual, therefore encouraging them to assert themselves and break free from the instructional constraints of traditional religious doctrine. In other words, he challenged traditional deference. In doing so, he effectively acted out of a desire to pursue social change in favor of personal religious independence in the reformation environment. Along with the Leveller women, Nayler assumed personal sovereignty; their religious convictions empowered them to challenge authority and actively pursue change.

As religious independence empowered sects of the English population to assume sovereignty over their religious lives, it stimulated an ultimate movement toward popular sovereignty in England's political structure as well. As Gerrard Winstanley expressed in a letter to Oliver Cromwell, the parliamentarian victors and their armies of commoners recovered their "land and liberties again . . . out of that Norman hand."[13] Referring to the long-standing system of property ownership that had entitled aristocratic privilege since the Norman conquest, Winstanley appeals to an ancient English society that saw land equally possessed by all as a "common treasury." In an attempt to persuade Cromwell to eliminate private property, Winstanley effectively articulated the new, post-Civil War English psyche. That is, England was to be had by the people as a whole and not as a select few. To be English was no longer to be subject to the Crown, the bishops, or the land-holding elite; it was to be united as a sovereign body of citizens capable of self-determination. Although many of his ideas and those of his fellow Diggers were shunned as too radical by most of English society, his fundamental idea that individuals should be in control of their lives reflected that of the general population. Abiezer Coppe expands this view even further stating that "pure libertinism" would overturn even the victorious Rump Parliament, riding the surge of individual empowerment that had propelled the English to overturning the "bishops, Charles, and the Lords" in favor of complete self-determination.[14]

With the religious backbone of the Great Chain of Being gone, the political hierarchy and system of exclusive aristocratic privilege stood at risk for collapse. Essentially, if the religious instructions that had propped up an elite order of people collapsed, then the rights that had been previously allocated to them were no longer considered exclusive. Instead, the bonds that kept English commoners in an inferior state of

---

[13] "Gerrard Winstanley, 'To His Excellency Oliver Cromwell, General of the Commonwealth's Army'" (1652), in *Sources and Debates*, 197-98.

[14] "*Abiezer Coppe*, A Fiery Flying Roll: a Word from the Lord to All the Great Ones of the Earth" (January 1650), in *Sources and Debates*, 199.

deference were released. As a result, a powerful sense of entitlement swept through the psyches of Englishmen and women, and such a movement created a drastically different English identity from that of the late Tudor and early Stuart periods. Essentially, the forging of a new English identity in which "the people of England" held the supreme power had come to fruition after the Civil War.[15] As the drafters of *An Agreement of the People* had expressed, the power of English authorities was thereafter to be inferior only to those that chose them.

---

[15] "An Agreement of the People" (ca. late October 1647), in *Sources and Debates*, 186-7.

Disciple of St Paul: Jonathan Boucher and the American Revolution

Paul Shakeshaft

American Loyalists have been cast – when they have received enough attention to be cast – as reactionaries, well-meaning though misguided Tories, and "Benedict Arnolds." *Damnant quodnon intelligent.* Many students of the American Revolution have not quite fully appreciated, nor understood, the motivation of men such as Jonathan Boucher to remain loyal to King and Country. To Boucher and fellow Loyalists, Country meant America – not England – a fact sometimes overlooked. A number of arguments used to explain the Loyalist mindset are familiar: conservatism, English identity, aristocracy, Anglicanism, to name a few. While these are not wrong explanations, they fail to portray the most holistic interpretation of Loyalism possible. By using Rev. Boucher's autobiography *Reminiscences of an American Loyalist* this paper will analyze his understanding of Loyalism through post-modern textual methodology[1]. In consequence, Rev. Boucher's religious impetus for refusing to partake in revolutionary flite will be considered with an empathy sometimes wanting amidst American historiography of the Revolution.

To begin with the historiography of Boucher and his politics: even his more generous commentators write of him with only varying degrees of pathetic patronization. One of his most sympathetic champions, Robert G. Walker, writing in the William and Mary Quarterly of 1945, admits: "Jonathan Boucher, when he has not been completely ignored, has received undeservedly severe treatment at the hands of American literary historians."[2] His best attempt to assuage that undeservedly severe treatment: "That Boucher saw only half of this [the benefit of emerging republican democracy] makes him worthy of respect. He was not merely a Tory divine who preached quaint, confused, naïve political doctrines; he was a man who had more in common with the impious rebels against whom he preached than either he or they were at the time able to recognize."[3] Significantly, the only

---

Paul Shakeshaft is a graduate student studying European History. He wrote this paper for Dr. Charles Foy's Early American History Seminar in Fall 2011.

[1] Let it be noted that the useful tool of linguistic analysis sharpened by the post-modernists of the 20th century is not an endorsement of the logical conclusions of the theory.

[2] Robert G. Walker, "Jonathan Boucher: The Champion of the Minority," *The William and Mary Quarterly*, Third Series, Vol. 2, No. 1 (Jan., 1945): 3-14. Omohundro Institute of Early American History and Culture.

[3] Ibid.,14.

way Walker can attempt to rehabilitate Boucher's reputation among his fellow Americans is to suggest that, in the end, he was really *almost* "one of us." Dr. Walker is acting *almost* the good historian here. The inability to recommend Boucher on his own merits points to the fact that American historians are often unwilling to take seriously Loyalist proclivities. They are not seen as anything beyond "quaint, confused, naïve." Given the importance of the Revolution in American history, modern historians of the Revolutionary period owe a debt to these colonists, and to themselves, to better understand the Loyalism men like Boucher fled, bled, and sometimes died, for.

In an article published seven years before Walker's, Director of Proviso Junior College in Maywood, Illinois, R.W. Marshall,[4] wrote in the Virginia Magazine of History and Biography: "The unescapable [sic] conclusion of all of Boucher's arguments was, if anyone had believed him, that, in his own words, 'Liberty consists in subserviency to law' and 'where there is no law there is no liberty.' But he convinced no one. Nevertheless, what he believed, he preached."[5] Again, we find in Marshall a belittling of Boucher afforded by an anti-Loyalist perspective emerging from overriding nationalistic sensibilities. Marshall, at least, comes closer to Boucher's fundamental reason for opposing the bloody revolution: his theology. He cites Boucher's faith-informed position toward Indians, for example: "We found not these wretched tenants of the woods a whit more savage than our progenitors appeared to Julius Caesar…what else is the early history of nations now the most polished, but the history of Indians?"[6] He points out that on one Easter Monday Boucher "baptized three hundred thirteen negro adults and lectured extempore to upwards of one thousand!"[7] Going further, he highlights a 1763 sermon by Boucher: "If ever these colonies, now filled with slaves, be improved to their utmost capacity, an essential part of the improvement must be the abolition of slavery."[8] Perhaps Boucher had in mind John Wesley's reminder to the colonists who cried enslavement by Britain that the true slaves in the colonies were Negroes. For, Wesley was well aware of said blindness as is evidenced in his letter to abolitionist William Wilberforce in 1791: "Dear Sir: Unless the divine power has raised you us to be as *Athanasius contra mundum*, I see not how

---

[4] Now Proviso Township High school. A sign, perhaps, of the less-than-significant treatment Boucher was receiving that Walker alludes to.
[5] R.W. Marshall, "What Jonathan Boucher Preached," *The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography*, Vol. 46, No. 1 (Jan., 1938): 1-12. Virginia Historical Society. Accessed 28/10/2011. 11.
[6] Ibid., 4.
[7] Ibid., 4-5.
[8] Ibid., 5.

you can go through your glorious enterprise in opposing that execrable villainy… you will be worn out by the opposition of men and devils …"[9]

Lastly, Marshall does well to draw attention to Boucher's influence. Boucher was Rector of St Anne's Parish in Annapolis, and so *ex officio* the Chaplain of the Lower House of the Assembly at Maryland. As Boucher tells us in his autobiography: "The management of the Assembly was left very much to me; and hardly a bill was brought in which I did not either draw or at least revise… All the Governor's[10] speeches, messages, etc., and also some pretty important and lengthy papers from the Council were of my drawing up."[11] In addition, he mentions the fact that the Governors of King's College in New York[12] conferred upon him the honorary degree of Master of Arts for "his services to Church and State."[13] Given this influence, Marshall's conclusion that "he influenced no one" is left in considerable doubt.

To this author's knowledge, the modern, American historian most willing to proscribe to Boucher kinder motives is Mark Noll, now the Francis A. McAnaney Professor of History at Notre Dame. Perhaps tellingly, Noll is interested in exploring religious motivation for American causations. In an article published two days before the United States bicentennial, Noll wrote:

Jonathan Boucher of Maryland was another Anglican who discovered a foundation for Loyalism in the Bible. In a sermon "On Civil Liberty, Passive Obedience, and Nonresistance" preached in 1775, Boucher argued that… the New Testament did, however, speak clearly of political obligations in demanding "obedience to the laws of every country, in every kind or form of government." "Obedience to Government is every man's duty," Boucher went on, "because it is every man's interest; but it is particularly incumbent on Christians, because it is enjoined by the positive commands of God."[14]

Even so, Noll twice reminds his readers that the political commitments of Christian Loyalists may have to be rejected on moral grounds, leaving room for his readers to distance themselves from this disconcerting political rebel. However, he acknowledges that only very recently has serious study of American Loyalists begun.[15]

---

[9] Charles Yrigoyen, Jr., *John Wesley: Holiness of Heart and Life.* A Letter to William Wilberforce, Balam, 24 February, 1791. 1996. http://gbgm-umc.org/umw/wesley/wilber.stm. Accessed 29/10/2011.

[10] Maryland's Governor Eden, with whom Boucher was on intimate social terms.

[11] Marshall, "What Jonathan Boucher Preached," 2.

[12] Now Columbia University, New York.

[13] Marshall, "What Jonathan Boucher Preached," 3.

[14] Mark Noll, "Tory Believers: Which Higher Loyalty?" *Christianity Today* (2 July 1976): 4.

[15] Ibid., 1.

And so the serious study of colonial loyalists continues. Robin D.G. Kelley, in his *Race Rebels: Culture, Politics, and the Black Working Class* argues that individuals' lives must be seen as a "totality of lived experiences."[16] In other words, the historian must take into account the life and environment of an individual in order to understand his actions. In Kelley's case, he examines the life of Malcolm X in such a way, attempting to explain the "riddle of the Zoot suit." Boucher and Malcolm X lived centuries and worldviews apart; nevertheless, both were men to stand out of a crowd. It remains to be fully explained what deep convictions a man of comfortable means possessed to stand-out for a political cause amid turbulent times. In keeping with Kelley's method of textual criticism we may turn to *Reminiscences of an American Loyalist* itself.

Published by Boucher's grandson, Jonathan Bouchier[17], *Reminiscences* allows us not an insignificant glimpse into the mind of Jonathan Boucher. Only thirty-eight pages are directly related to the conflict in the Americas; the rest being a fairly detailed summary, in flowing narrative, of his early life in England, move to the American colonies, eventual flight back to the Isles, and his ensuing elder years. It thus provides the primary opportunity to assess the totality of Boucher's lived experiences: the very method by which we may better understand his Loyalist convictions, and those of his peers. Lawrence H. Leder comments in *The Colonial Legacy: Loyalist Historians*: "historical literature has a refractive quality: it mirrors both the time *about* which it was written and the time *in* which it was written."[18] Indeed, regarding his autobiography Boucher himself implores in the introduction: "read it with the same spirit with which it is written."[19] Thus it shall be taken.

The historian may be tempted to ascribe to Boucher, an Anglican priest, purely esoteric sentiment towards the Church of England as an explanation for his Loyalism. This, as his autobiography reveals, is not the case. Writing about a time near 1761: "I was now…as much at a loss as ever as to a profession for life. My thoughts had long been withdrawn from the Church; nor could my late course of life in any sense have qualified me for it. Yet happily…a train of unforeseen circumstances…at last made me an ecclesiastic."[20] It seems that Boucher landed, as it were,

---

16 Robin D.G. Kelley, *Race Rebels : Culture, Politics, and the Black Working Class* (New York: Free Press. 1996), 181.

[17] Apparently a change to the surname, which Jonathan Boucher says occurred several times throughout the family's long history.

[18] Leder, Lawrence H. *The Colonial Legacy: Loyalist Historians*, Ed. Leder. Harper & Row. New York, 1971. 1.

[19] Jonathan Boucher, *Reminiscences of an American Loyalist*, ed. John Bouchier. (Port Washington, New York: Kennikat Press, Inc. 1925).

[20] Ibid., 2-3.

upon the Orders in the Church of England by mistake. In any event, it was not the consummation of a life-long career ambition.

Boucher's first real encounter with the Church of England occurred in 1755 when he was 17 years of age. His then schoolmaster, Mr. Ritson, was an Anglican parson, and took especial concern for the young Boucher; a kindness he never forgot. Still, Boucher shares with us no experiences of angel visitants or divine calls; not even an attraction to the bells and smells of Anglican liturgy. Nor was he particularly pious: "I was often in mischief, and still oftener suspected of mischief."[21] In fact, when already ordained a priest, Boucher confesses to nearly losing his Christian faith altogether.

His readings of popular Enlightenment deists and agnostics of the time were apparently a cause of great anxiety to him.[22] In the end, he retained his orthodox faith. How he did so speaks volumes of his political Loyalism. "In this manner did I *search the Scriptures*, [italics original] with the single view of ascertaining whether they do or do not teach the doctrine of a co-essential Trinity in the one essence of the Deity…the result of this laborious examination was a full conviction both of the truth and importance of the doctrine of the Trinity."[23] A little further on Boucher states: "My ruling passion was, if possible, to see to the bottom of things…"[24] Here we discover two important aspects of Boucher's mind: first, an evangelical approach to the Bible; second, a determination to see arguments through to the bitter end. This straightforward interpretation of Scripture and analytical stubbornness formed during this pivotal moment in his life would come to determine his reaction to the political crisis of 1775.

Other than assumptions of inordinate affection toward the Church of England, American historians too often equate Loyalism with aristocracy – or at the very least – snobbery. Boucher possessed little of either. While it is true that he cites Vanity as his chief sin, he rightly recognizes it as a general fault of humanity in general (and if Vanity be the cause of Loyalism, surely several of the chief revolutionaries wound-up on the wrong side). Of his upbringing Boucher tell us: "I remember only that we lived in such a state of penury and hardship as I have never since seen equaled, no, not even in parish almshouses."[25] His situation would steadily improve; however, he retained significant debts as a result of living a lifestyle slightly above what his normal salary could afford – partly due to his forced return trans-Atlantic voyage – for the rest of his life.

---

[21] Ibid., 15-16.
[22] Ibid., 44.
[23] Ibid., 45.
[24] Ibid., 45.
[25] Ibid., 9.

Neither maudlin affection for the Church of England nor highbrow sentiments for England proper kept Jonathan Boucher from endorsing the American Revolution. His faith did. A Faith built, as we have seen, on an unshakable conviction in the truthfulness of Scripture. In his last sermons to his congregation in Annapolis, Boucher readily admits the carelessness, and sometimes inconsideration, of the Crown. Nevertheless, he decries the revolutionaries as those who are detached from divine law, much in the way Edmund Burke would decry the Revolution in France a decade later. Yet Burke endorsed the American Revolution; what kept Boucher from doing the same? In short, the words of St. Paul.

Citing St. Paul's epistle to the church in Galatia, Boucher decreed in his last sermons that "liberty" carries no political connotation, as patriotic preachers assumed, but rather spoke of release from the dominion of sin.[26] As the Authorized Version has it: "Stand fast therefore in the liberty by which Christ has made us free, and do not be entangled again with a yoke of bondage."[27] Also too, in the back of Boucher's trained mind, would exist St. Paul's words to the 1st century church in Rome: "Let every soul be subject to the governing authorities. For there is no authority except from God, and the authorities that exist are appointed by God. Therefore whoever resists the authority resists the ordinance of God, and those who resist will bring judgment on themselves."[28] Boucher's congregation did not appreciate his interpretation. Indeed, dissension came to such a head that on the Sundays he was allowed to preach "like Nehemiah," ascending the pulpit steps "with my sermon in one hand and a loaded pistol in the other."[29] Nevertheless, Boucher was unable to change his mind. "All the answer I gave to these threats was in my sermons, in which I uniformly and resolutely declared that I never could suffer any merely human authority to intimidate me from performing what in my conscience I believed and know to be my duty to God and His Church."[30] Amazingly, it was not until several escapes from enraged mobs – one which took place in his church – that he "began to have serious thoughts of making my retreat to England."[31]

Boucher was no starry-eyed Romantic for England, its Church, or conservative politics. He was not quaint, confused, or naïve. The totality of his lived experiences shows he was a serious thinker with a deep concern for the truth. He was a disciple of St. Paul. When finally forced to "retreat," as he says, from his country of America to England, the

---

[26] Noll, "Tory Believers: Which Higher Loyalty?," 4.
[27] King James Bible.
[28] King James Bible.
[29] Boucher, *Reminiscences of an American Loyalist.*, 122.
[30] Ibid., 113.
[31] Ibid., 124.

former felt foreign to him.[32] There is a profound sadness in his account, which betrays his strong feelings for his flock, friends, and estate, in Maryland. In a parting letter to George Washington, whose son-in-law he once tutored, he writes: "there cannot be anything named of which I am more strongly convinced, than I am that all those who with you are promoting the present apparently popular measures are the true enemies of their country…with your Cause I renounce you; and now, for the last time, subscribe myself, Sir, Your humble servant J.B."[33] Daniel Richter has recently invited us to view American history *Facing East from Indian Country*; so we might begin to see American history facing Loyally. We may, after all, not agree with Jonathan Boucher's convictions. At the least may we respect them as the emanations of an imminently respectable man?

---

[32] Ibid., 127.
[33] Ibid. 136-141.

"Jungle Rhythm and Juvenile Delinquency": London *Times* Coverage of Youth Subcultures and Rock and Roll , 1955-1960

Patrick Vonesh

_____

During the mid 1950s, post-war England went from rationing to a new, more material lifestyle. From the laboring poor to the aristocracy, the British became conspicuous consumers. Included were the young people of England, who after schooling, went into the work force and began to create a new class of Englishmen, known as teenagers. Teenagers consumed fashion, music, and cinema, at times passively, but more often shaping these cultural influences to create their own subculture(s) within Britain. These subcultures have been analyzed by cultural critics such as Dick Hebdige, Stuart Hall, and Colin MacInnes, but the definition of these subcultures was not only created by the young people but also by the public, or at least the media. Young people shocked their elders, at least according to the newspapers, radio, and television. Before the sixties, youth were revolting: rioting, racism, and raucous music seemed to excite them.

A view has developed that young people had previously been quiescent, much like the golden age of the fifties is often contrasted with the wild, violent sixties. This paper seeks to discover, first, how did British media view young people, focusing on the London *Times*, 1955-60. Particularly, how did journalists and editors frame discussion of violence, disturbances, and riots in which teenagers took part? Who or what was the villain? Second, how is the consumer culture of the fifties—music, cinema, fashion, clothing styles—related to this youth revolt? Finally, this paper looks tentatively at the relationship between the media and the young people themselves. Did the journalists (the elders) shape the young people's view of themselves (at least those young people who were seen as part of the disturbances)? With stiff opposition by the government and the public through the newspaper, the teenagers were constantly challenged to become the respectful and loyal citizens of their counterparts. The music began to let them imagine a world that they wanted to live in; where the older British leaders could not touch them. Teenagers sought to break away from what was "square" and forge their own world for the future. They did commit crimes and riots during the years stretching from 1950-1960, but the paper argues that the connection between the popular culture and the rioting were rooted into their everyday lives that many believed were very tame. The formation of the various subcultures also helped to paint the picture that the children saw themselves as completely different from their parents, teachers, and bosses, and they did not want to follow the

same existence as their rivals. These various subcultures also sprung up from the working-class neighborhoods, and the children would become the new voice of these people all across England.

If there was a British teenage culture in the 1950s, it centered on musc, and yet, that music was not uni- but was rather multi-dimensional. Indeed, the media had difficulty reporting on teenagers because they tended to divide themselves into different subcultures, identify with different fashions, movies, and music, but also they made the issues worse among the teens by reporting strongly against them. With the emergence of Rock and Roll, jazz (modern and also trad jazz movements), and popular music, teenagers embraced many more forms of expression through song, and although many of them did enjoy the classical music of their parents age, there were some who connected deeply with the lyrics and beat of more contemporary compositions. Figures like Bill Haley, Elvis Presley, Buddy Holly, and Lonnie Donegan (who came out of the home grown Skiffle scene based on folk/blues of the United States) had solidified themselves as the main attractions.

Not only Rock and Roll, but jazz musicians such as Louis Armstrong, Count Basie, Joe "King" Oliver, Jelly Roll Morton, and England's own Humphrey Littleton emerged in the trad jazz Scene. This new resurgence of Jazz was greatly admired by Colin MacInnes in his novel Absolute Beginners. The novel tells the story about teens growing up in the Soho area of London[1]. Spawning directly from the same scene were modern jazz musicians such as Miles Davis, John Coltrane and others, who challenged the old ideas that jazz (trad or mod) could be as popular as the innovation of electric music. The most conservative of all music in the 1950s was traditional pop. Artists such as Perry Como, Frankie Lane, Vera Lynn, Doris Day, and Frank Sinatra were very popular in the UK and would chart in the Top 20 for oncoming years. For the purpose of this paper, the focus will remain on Rock and Roll because the most aggression and public outcry came from its inception into British culture. Not only were the Teddy Boys and Rockers[2] becoming disobedient to the norms of society, but the emergence of

---

Patrick Vonesh, from Franklin Park, Illinois earned his BA at Eastern Illinois University in 2011. He is currently enrolled in the Graduate history program, and plans to major in European history, with a minor in American. His main historical focus is on the 20th century, with an emphasis on music and the cultural ramifications that come from it (subcultures, violence, group mindedness, globalization). Besides his work on Teddy Boys/Jazzers/Rockers/ Mods, he is currently looking at the influence of reggae music in English culture and the formation of a West Indian identity in post-war Britain.

[1] His characters mirrored the typical Jazzers, Teddy Boys, and later Mods of the era.

[2] Name adopted by youths during the 1950s, often associated with rock music.

female rioters also shocked the country. Although some argue Rock and Roll was a subculture based around poor, working-class, male youths, females were also getting involved in the disturbances. As one Article in the London Times stressed, "If decadence be taken to represent a physical state as well as an attitude of mind, then it can confidently be asserted that 'Rock and Roll' is not decadent-the exercises its devotees go in for are violent and acrobatic in the extreme."[3] Notably, this came out before any of the major violence in Notting Hill the following September. Though this early news reported that the dancing and singing of teenagers was "violent," they had yet to see their worst fears realized until that warm August day at the Notting Hill festival of 1958.

The idea that the teens had forged their own subculture(s) has been debated for years by scholars and newspapers alike. Was it out of rational fear that the teens beat blacks in Notting Hill, or was it the emergence of a new attitude of "group mindedness?"[4] Also, were these newly formed subcultures responsible for the teens that acted out during the first showing of "Rock Around the Clock?" Scholars like Dick Hebdige support the idea of many different subcultures amongst teens, while writers like Hoggart do not believe that young people did anything to progress the teenage culture and newly found independence being celebrated with money. These two cultural critics (and others) help us analyze the *Times* and other publications that represented the various groups and whether or not music influenced rioting and disturbances.

In *Subculture: The Meaning of Style*, Dick Hebdige argues style and material culture helped to forge a new type of teenager and create a new type of subculture in England. He has also written on the emergence of punk rock and other well-known teenage crazes of the 20th century, which follow similar guidelines. Written in the first pages of the introduction, Hebdige uses the phrase "the idea of style as a form of refusal" to argue that the newly found styles and material culture helped create a group of teenagers who tried to first rebel with their clothing.[5] Teenagers used these styles as an ideal form of refusal for the "square" culture around them. This can be seen heavily in the Teddy Boy lifestyle and the choice to wear Edwardian coats. Hebdige goes on to defend his ideas about subculture and style as a form of rebellion. The Teddy Boys are also lumped into this group because they had become fashion minded in the 1950s. The Edwardian suit became their most prized possession

[3] *Times* [London], Tuesday, January 15th, 1957. "More Rock and Roll On The Screen."
[4] Stuart Hall and Tony Jefferson, eds., *Resistance Through Rituals: Youth Subcultures in Post-War Britain* (London: Routledge, 1990), pg. 82.
[5] Dick Hebdige, Subculture: *The Meaning of Style (New Accents)*, New Ed ed. (London: Routledge, 1981), 2.

and Teddys wanted to dress as nicely as possible. Some argue that this may be attributed to the fact they had come from poor areas and wanted to use the streets as a workingman's catwalk. This is reinforced by, the "Lambeth Boy's" (1958) film stated that having a suit for six months is acceptable, but then they need to buy another to keep up with the style of Teddy Boy life.[6] Hebdige says the "nature of cultural phenomena, to uncover the latent meaning of an everyday life which, to all intents and purposes, was perfectly natural" to teenagers.[7] For teenagers, it had become very natural within their various subcultures that the working class attitudes and ideology became the normal day-to-day activity. Although Hebdige does not directly attribute this to the teenagers of the time, clearly he believes that in order for cultural phenomena to occur, the groups must believe their ideals and act on them in everyday fashion. The Teddy Boys became very territorial and were willing to defend their communities from influence that they did not see fit. The "culture extends beyond the library, the opera-house and the theatre to encompass the whole of everyday life," and was very much believed by the teenagers that they were using rational choices to defend their claims to be a new force in British culture.[8]

The Jazzers of the 1950s also formed their own subculture during the period and support the Hebdige argument for a multiple subculture structure amongst the English teens. When the jazz scene remerged in England, there were many who became fearful of black men influencing the culture. Because there had been blacks in England since the early 1600s, they must have imparted culture in one way or another to the British.[9] The influence on teenagers was very striking to the media and mostly to the older leaders of the nation, who did not understand why their children were celebrating solidarity with the blacks and jazz music.

The *Times* commented on a situation[10] where black males were asked to bring their own partners to dance halls because "friction is caused where there are large numbers of colored men asking white girls for dances, many of them refuse" and this led to fights between the white males trying to get the blacks to leave.[11] The reaction when young white girls had said yes to the black males remains unknown, but due to the outcry from refusals, it can be safe to assume that violence would have been possible. These black men found a home with the new Jazzers, as

---

[6]"We Are The Lambeth Boys," taken from vocal track.

[7]Hebdige, *Subculture: The Meaning of Style*, 8.

[8]Ibid., 9.

[9] After the Second World War with full employment, West Indians began to arrive in England seeking jobs from their mother country.

[10] This was written just a few weeks before the Notting Hill Race Riots and may have influenced the white males at the fair to strike out against blacks males.

[11]*Times* [London,] July, 1st, 1958. Coloured Men Told Of Dance Rule.

they were more willing to accept anyone at their dance halls. For the most part, these were the teenagers who refrained from participating in the Notting Hill race riots after being exposed to heavy black influence in their neighborhoods. Most of the teens that were associating with the blacks were art school and college students.

The divide between the Teddy Boys and Jazzers is noted in Colin MacInnes' book *Absolute Beginners*, as the unnamed narrator finds himself in conflict with Ed the Ted in several scenes and comments later that it was most likely Ed's group of friends who started the fights at the Notting Hill festival. The tolerant community who formed around jazz is the exception to the Teds' racist behavior during the Notting Hill race riots. Notably, not all the youth were engaged in rioting and disturbances during the 1950s. Although the Jazzers were responsible for several incidents of riotous behavior after shows, they were mostly harmless fights due to intoxication. Hebdige points out that the majority of teenagers did not involve themselves into subculture groups and were happy to continue life as their parents had before them. Also included in Hebdige's work is a paragraph that supports the claim that the Jazzers were a different group from the Teds completely. "Despite the Giles cartoons which regularly depicted Beats and Teds joining ranks against legions of perpetually flustered bowler-hatted 'gents', there is no evidence of any conspicuous fraternization between the two younger groups."[12]

This split shows that more than one active subculture had emerged during the 1950s amongst the teenage population. As later evidence from the *Times* demonstrates, the teenagers were lumped into one group who were seen as defiant against the whole nation and black community.

There are scholars who believe there was no significant teenage movement in the 1950s, and it did not contribute to a new way of life for the youth in England. Richard Hoggart who is well known for his studies of youth consumer culture and movements believed that the youth movements of the 1950s were not as important as they were made up to be. Unlike Hebdige, Hoggart does not believe that British teenagers were creating a new subculture, but instead believed that the youth had simply been shaped by American cultural influences (rightfully so considering Hollywood and a capitalist consumer culture). They were in essence "zombies" of this outside material culture.[13] Hoggart did not believe, for example, that the Teddy Boys of northern England were creating their own culture, but rather using the United

---

[12] Hebdige, *Subculture: The Meaning of Style*, 51.

[13] David Fowler, *Youth Culture in Modern Britain, c.1920-c.1970: From Ivory Tower to Global Movement - A New History* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008), 117.

States model as a form of culture that they adopted as their own.[14] This goes along with Hoggart's ideas of an "Americanized Europe", and the fact that consumerism becomes a subculture within itself in Italy along with England. This type of rejection is exactly what the *Times* would have liked to hear, because they also felt that the teenagers had not been forming new subcultures under the direction of music and consumer culture, but were rather just rebellious due to American influences. Hoggart wrote on the youth consumer class, and appears to believe that the children were just acting out against their elders because of the American influence and did not forge their own structured society. If Hoggart would have read Hebdige later in his life, then he may have gotten a better appreciation for what a subculture actually was. This does not condemn him for all the work on working-class lifestyles, as later in the 1960s he must have realized that youth subcultures were significant. The formation of musical understanding and consumer culture frightened the older generations because they thought the teenagers had gone mad, but the teens were rebelling against the societal norms that did not fit the working-class lifestyle the youth had grown to idolized.

Historians can use the ideas of Hoggart and Hebdige to help make sense of contemporary discussions about teenagers and the music scene. From 1956 to 1960 there were a series of disturbances surrounding Rock and Roll films and the Notting Hill riots. These were all well covered by the *Times* and other media outlets. Teenagers began to challenge the norms of British society that they believed were set in place by the ruling class. Novelists of the time also explained the various forms of teenage entertainment and the lifestyles they led during the period of disturbances and rioting. *Absolute Beginners* (1959) written by Colin MacInnes, was a fictional account of various individuals living in London during the same age this paper addresses. The film *We Are the Lambeth Boys* also provides a great look into what the boys had been spending their money on, and what type of issues actually captivated the youth in Britain during the 1950s.

The narrator in Colin MacInnes' *Absolute Beginners* is one of the "new" youths that had enjoyed the benefits of a working-class lifestyle, and MacInnes noted that the youth was drastically changing in Britain through out the 1950s. In the novel, various aspects of teenage life are addressed. Rejection of the older generation is evident throughout the pages and expressed over and over by the narrator. When he meets with his mother, the narrator thinks she does not understand why he has chosen to live on his own at such a young age. She does not believe that he is old enough to be out on his own and should think about returning home. The neighborhood in which he lives is seen as lower income

---

[14] Ibid.

housing and he chooses to live there because he believes it is the only place where he can express himself freely without repercussions from his parents (the older generation). Along the way, he meets a series of shady and interesting characters. From the callboy who lives in his apartment complex to his friend he calls the Wizard, various groups are represented. Jazzers, Teds, colored people, and "newer" Mods are represented throughout the pages. By the end of the novel he is so disgusted with the racial violence in Notting Hill that he decides he must flee the country to gain true independence and enjoy his youth (he is turning twenty, and sees that as the cut off between youth and adulthood in England). Following his decision to leave, before getting on the plane he sees a group of immigrants and welcomes them to England, despite the fact that stiff regulations would soon be placed on immigration of West Indians into England.

This is very relevant to the argument presented in this paper, and it proves that not all the violence affected the youth the same way. The narrator is sympathetic of the events in Notting Hill and invites the new immigrants into England with open arms. This was not celebrated the same way by the press, as they began to talk about regulations on the immigrant population. Earlier in the novel, the narrator even goes on to say that "no one in the world under [twenty] is interested in that [nuclear] bomb of yours one little bit", providing a great example of the time in which the youth grew up.[15] As mentioned earlier in the paper, teenagers were well aware that they live in a time of growing anxiety about the Soviet Union and nuclear arms. With the Cold War well under way, the youth had developed distaste for anything associated with the elder generation and their political agendas. This makes taking the accounts of the *Times* focusing on youth violence as absolute truth unsafe; some teens rejected violence and promoted pacifism as a way to cope with the political climate.

Another great representation of youth can be found in the documentary *We Are The Lambeth Boys*. The film is about a group of young Teddy Boys in England, coping with their new lifestyles as consumers and teenagers. Conversation during the group meetings often focused around the youth clubs, present an accurate portrayal of the new youth culture. The documentary, which dives into various aspects of teenage life during the 1950s, was commissioned by the Ford of Britain group, and shown across England. The boys from the youth club describe their clothing and other important aspects of their daily lives. They go to work during the week and on the weekends they want to go to the youth club to socialize and have a bit of fun with the girls on the dance floors. Interestingly, the club is open to boys and girls, and though they are both represented in the film, it focuses heavily on the

---

[15]Colin MacInnes, *Absolute Beginners* (New York: Macmillan, 1959), 35.

boys. Many of them bring up issues like female roles in relationships and how to spend their earnings while living paycheck to paycheck. The various jobs are basic labor for the boys and secretarial jobs for the girls. Most who lived in flats had jobs being postal workers, butchers, and print shop workers, and earned a good living by these trades, while others chose to become apprentice workers and found careers for life. A rejection of the older generation throughout the film is common, and they disliked forfeiting their youth. The film enlightens the viewer about the greater aspects of teenage consumerism and culture, and is an important view for historians attempting to make sense of this era. Although, the film shows that there was not universal rejection from the press, it does not paint the boys in the best way - they are constantly seen howling at girls and poking fun at boys dressed in "square" clothing. Nonetheless, it does show that interest in the youth phenomena had made a clear impact on many in the English media, and a documentary was commissioned.

The last great indicator that people were finally paying attention to Rock and Roll and the youth response was a television show created in 1957 to rival "American Bandstand," "Oh Boy!" It is similar to the future program "Top of the Pops" which would feature many up and coming artists. In the early days of the show, the ratings were not very high but by the sixth week it grew to considerable figures. This meant that the youth and older generations began to watch the show "Oh Boy!" because it was one of the only places outside the youth club dances that they could hear music.[16] The show launched the careers of many notable English musicians, and helped to establish Rock and Roll in the British media. Along with "Oh Boy" the BBC also introduced the "Six-Five" special, and was their pop show that had been created to incorporate a teenage audience. This too was very successful in establishing a teenage following – they wanted to see their idols perform live. Both of these shows had come out before the Notting Hill riots, and the *Times* later reported that Rock and Roll was poison for the children who were involved in the disturbances of the 1950s. Had rock music made the youth violent?

These three examples showcased the way the general public was first being exposed to the Rock and Roll phenomena along with the growing youth culture that had sprung up from the working-class neighborhoods all over Britain. But as there was a positive reaction to the new culture, there was also a negative one. In the early 1950s, newspapers were constantly reporting on disturbances and actions taken by teens. The *Times* helped shape the popular opinion created across England. It was also useful in creating a catalyst and making Rock and

---

[16] Unless they had purchased the music at a record shop or tuned into the BBC radiobroadcasts.

Roll out to be a very disturbing brand of musical expression. There are two different riotous acts that must be taken into account before the analysis of the *Times* begins: the disturbances of 1956 and the 1958 Notting Hill riots. The disturbances of 1956 are heavily rooted in the hysteria surrounding the emergence of *Rock Around the Clock*, while the 1958 rioting in Notting Hill is shaped around the Teddy Boy tendency to gravitate towards group-mindedness and racism. It must be separated this way because the media links them in the *Times* as having direct connection. Instead, they are separate incidents created by the working-class youth, and have no ties to one another in terms of the grand scale of youth culture. The appreciation for black rhythm and blues gave early hope to a peaceful existence with the blacks in England, but the Notting Hill riots were carried out as aggressive violence adopted by the working-class Teddy Boys. The shift from Rock and Roll hysteria to the Notting Hill riots will be analyzed through the *Times,* as well as secondary research, and will suggest that the media portrayed teenagers as racist, disobedient children. While the media thought this about the youth, many stories would arise in the paper about the role of immigrants in England, and reporting on the incidents may have escalated violence by exploiting immigration issues in the newspaper.

The first disturbances surrounding the film *Rock Around The Clock* happened in 1956. During these showings across England, the youth wanted to get up and dance to express their interest in the music. Not surprisingly, the elderly population saw this as a disruption during the viewing of the film, and they did not want the teenagers to jump and jive to the music. It was not until youths were ejected from the film that many had taken action in the streets. Many accounts say that the youth were dancing outside the film halls, blocking traffic, and shouting loud lyrics to the popular songs from the film. This was not a violent protest, but it certainly was seen as an unnecessary display of affection for the music. As was previously mentioned, the youth had accepted the music as a rejection of the older generation who they saw as "square" for not wanting to accept Rock and Roll.

On September 5th, 1956 the *Times* reported the rioting happening during screenings of the film *Rock Around The Clock*. It went on to discuss various youths that had been fined by the court for indecent behavior in a public area.[17] Fear that the riots would spread made the paper assure that the rioting had been contained in the London area, and that it had not spread out to the other provinces. Subsequent stories proved this assumption false, but it does not explain why the papers were willing to make such a bold statement. It needs to be stressed that the paper did not want the discourse to spread throughout Britain, but were helpful regardless. By September 12, 1956 the *Times* had given a

---

[17] *Times* [London], September 5, 1956. "Rock and Roll Disturbances."

more accurate and in depth reporting on the incidents involving the teens. In response, the movie had been taken out of various cinemas because it presented "matter likely to lead to public disorder."[18]

The following day, news that the Rock and Roll "disorders" had spread to the north was reported, and the film was being banned all over England. The containment that the *Times* hoped for was not successful. Rock was treated more as a plague than anything, and the youth were responsible for the spread. The only issues that the media were reporting on were stories of teens getting arrested for merely dancing to the music, and may have spread across the country as a sign of solidarity between the youths. Not until September 21st 1956, when six hundred youths had organized in Oslo, Norway and some were taken in for questioning, did the issue reach continental scale.[19] For a group that large to organize there must have been some communication between the youths participating in dancing and shouting of loud Rock and Roll lyrics; or was the *Times* responsible again for the story reaching other countries? From the small groups who had reacted just two weeks prior, to the very large organization of youth in Oslo, there were clear decisions made by the youths to stick together, and the hysteria was spreading across the continent. The youth seemingly adopted the "you-can't-take-us-all" mindset in order to combat the police. More importantly the newspaper was depicting the youths action as the worst case of disorder in the modern era. This may have moved the youths to participate in more and more discourse, and the newspapers may have been pushing the youth to rebel. With a concert that was held at Prince of Wales Theatre on September 25th 1956, the older generations found a way to make fun of the youths and their music, driving a deeper wedge between the generations.

Terry Thomas, a comedian during the 1950s, was hosting a comedy show that was attended by upper-class adults and elderly population. Because of the older audience, Thomas used the opportunity to poke fun at the clashes between the business owners and the youths who had attended the showing of *Rock Around The Clock*. When Thomas' "outrageously square" performance of *Rock Around The Clock* was underway, the audience laughed with him in support of his rendition of the popular song.[20] Then out of nowhere, an elderly couple began to dance in the aisle and was asked to leave by the manager. Of course, this was preplanned but it sent the audience into a frenzy of laughter. Whether or not he meant it as a joke against the "square" elderly people in the audience or the youth, the *Times* interpreted it as a joke about the teenagers' actions. Thomas was well known for performing characters

[18]*Times* [London], September 12, 1956.
[19]*Times* [London], September 21, 1956. Rock and Roll Clash In Oslo.
[20]*Times* [London], September 25, 1956. Prince Of Wales Theatre.

that made fun of upper-class people who thought they were above others, so quite possibly he was looking to satirize the beliefs about youths, but the media took it as an attack against the youth for being disruptive.

Throughout the remaining coverage of the trials and court fines for the youths, the *Times* attempted to explain why the Rock and Roll riots occured. By September 15th "Birmingham, Belfast, Bristol, Liverpool, Carlisle, Bradford, Blackburn, Preston, Blackpool, Bootle, Brighton, Gateshead, and South Shields" banned the film that was becoming the main issue with teenage "rioting" across the nation.[21] The *Times* once again takes on the same belief of Hoggart that the youth were just being sidetracked on their morals by the American perversion of music, and they sought the same kind of "fulfillment" as the American youths.[22] They also described a maddening effect that seemed to take hold of the youth; despite the fact there was more dancing in other films of the era. This general panic made them fear the youth had gone morally wrong somewhere. If Rock ' and Roll could make their children do this, then there was no telling what the youth could do in future rioting. No one at the time could have predicted the Notting Hill riots, but if the public thought that the Rock ' and Roll riots were bad, then they were in for a rude awakening come August 1958. Either way, the media used Rock and Roll as the scapegoat for rioting and disorders, and failed to realize that they had played a significant role in creating a wedge between the young and old.

Two years later, rioting broke out during the Notting Hill festival in London. This was nothing like the early riots (even though the same word is used) based around music hysteria; the reason for this disorder was racism. As the West Indian population began to increase in the London working-class neighborhoods, the fear by the inhabitants that they would lose jobs had reached the boiling point. This was not reported on until after the rioting, as the *Times* were looking to explain the disturbances. They were quick to blame the youth for the revolts as if it was somehow a conspiracy against the overall population of England. It was not just confined to the London area, and many other fights over territory were under way by the more extreme youth groups. The Teddy Boys, as discussed early in the paper, were very hostile over their neighborhoods and the presence of the immigrants (especially blacks) sent them into frenzy that would result in the Notting Hill riots of 1958.[23]

---

[21] *Times* [London], September 15th, 1956. U.S Scenes Recall " Jungle Bird House At The Zoo".

[22] *Times* [London], September 15th, 1956.U.S Scenes Recall " Jungle Bird House At The Zoo".

[23] Stuart Hall and Tony Jefferson, eds., *Resistance Through Rituals: Youth Subcultures in Post-War Britain* (London: Routledge, 1990), pg. 82.

The Teddy Boys were well known in the newspapers by the time the Notting Hill riots broke out. During the early 1950s, the government and police had issued warnings to try and monitor their behavior in various cities. One disgruntled head master of a boy's school even suggested that there be a lower wage for those who are under 21, as they had been causing trouble with their newfound wealth. In Oxford it was motioned, and dismissed with a vote that all boys wearing Edwardian dress would not be allowed into dance halls for fear that they might cause disruption. Blaming the entire riot on the Teddy Boys seems unfair, regardless they became the focus of many aggressive actions against the blacks, and were the ones associated with the working class pro-white mentality. The paper was looking to make an example out of them just as the courts were. It is not clear whether it is a general attack on the youth, or just the Teds, but either way for the purpose of this paper it must be assume that the *Times* was rejecting youth movements as a whole. This proved to be very hypocritical by the newspapers, as many articles following the riots were in support of new immigration laws that limited the West Indian population.

On Saturday, September 20th 1956, the court cases of thirteen youths who were accused of starting fights in the Notting Hill area were called to the stand. Eight of the thirteen were found not guilty by the judge, and the remaining five faced up to two years imprisonment.[24] Notably, of the eight men who were not accused of any crime, four of them were over the age of thirty. This may have happened due to the fact that the government was trying to make examples of the youths involved in the violent riots, rather than adult males. Prior to this incident in the courts, there were twenty-six youths charged in the early court cases of the riot. Fifteen of the men were white, and the remainder were black, and "all except one were in or just out of their teens".[25] There seemed to be an ongoing trend that the youth were being sentenced for crimes during the riots, but the older men who had become involved were getting off. Furthermore, the paper did not seem to cover older men's cases, while the media chose to exploit the teen's cases.

Just ten days after the court cases, nine youths were on trial for attacks on colored men. The "Nine youths, aged of 17 and 20, from the Shepherds Bush area of West London set out in the early hours of the morning on what one of them was alleged to have described as a 'nigger hunting'" expedition and wanted to inflict pain directly on the black community.[26] Five men were attacked, and three of them were

[24]*Times* [London], September 20th 1958. "Prison Sentences For Making Affray."
[25]*Times* [London], September 3rd, 1958. "Magistrate Asks For Voluntary Curfew."
[26]*Times* [London], September 13, 1958. "Nine Youths On Trial: Alleged

considered greatly injured due to the beatings[27]. The youths who were involved seemed to show no regret for their actions, and said they had been provoked by the colored people in the neighborhood as they "spat" on the street while the boys walked past, and even had pulled weapons on them during previous occasions. Although this could not be proven, the youths seemed to come up with any excuse to give justification. Surprisingly, the paper does not show contempt for the youths going out and beating the black immigrants. When it was a larger event like the Notting Hill race riots, the paper took it out on the youth, but the isolated incident did not follow up with any responses by the correspondent. The youths acted out this way because they felt threatened after the race riots and said aggression had been going on for a long time before Notting Hill. The Teddy Boys had been at the fair in preparation for a fight (if they needed to defend themselves), and other youth involved adopted the same mentality as the Teddy Boys. Although it does not say if they were indeed Teddy Boys, clearly they shared the same racist values as their Teddy counterparts. Actions by the Teddy Boys are further proof that there were separate subcultures within the working-class community of youths because they had become the main aggressors instead of the youth as a whole during the Rock ' and Roll hysteria of 1956.

After the stories were printed in the *Times*, there were still acts of aggression being taken out on the blacks and new political agendas were formed around it. Clearly the youth was instrumental in this new way of life, and they forced their own names into the history books by participating in the Rock and Roll riots, and the more blantly racist Notting Hill riots. The government issued several warnings to the immigrant community following the riots and many hateful articles littered the paper. This then led to the newspapers covering many of the race issues that were happening between political candidates during the following months. One candidate believed that after the race riots, harsh immigration laws should be set in motion and the idea of a mixed culture amongst blacks and whites was "biological sacrilege."[28]

Due to the *Times* involvement and coverage of the teenage subcultures, a set back in racial acceptance reverberated through out England and the British Commonwealth. Many were deported due to their involvement in Notting Hill but for the most part, the deportees were only defending themselves from the masses that attacked them. The music, style, and attitudes shared by the working-class youth of Britain did not ensure that they agreed on every subject, especially racial

---

Attacks On Coloured Men."
[27]*Times* [London], September 13, 1958. "Nine Youths On Trial: Alleged Attacks On Coloured Men."
[28]*Times* [London], September 18, 1958. "Colour Bar As Election Issue."

issues. The Jazzers who were close to many black musicians and lived in the same neighborhoods did not agree with the Teddy Boy policy of "Nigger Hunting." The divide between the youth subcultures does not seem to be recognized in the *Times* and often they are seen as the same groups throughout the coverage of the Notting Hill race riots and the *Rock Around The Clock* disturbances. The suggested divides between the youth subcultures are supported by scholars such as Dick Hebdige, and rejected by Richard Hoggart. The *Times* clearly and irrationally rejected the youth, as demonstrated through the daily coverage of the distubrances. In years to come, changes in youth culture throughout England would become even more shocking, especially to the conservative generation who had first rejected Rock ' and Roll. The emergence of Mods, Skin Heads, Punks, and other subcultures among the youth in the years that followed, led the *Times* to continue covering the pressing issues it faced daily with the newly found teenage youth subcultures; ones which were formed during the not so quaint 1950s.

Viva Los Incas: Myths of Survival and Heritage in Incan Religion

Emily Scarbrough

Religion has taken on many forms throughout history, each revealing much about those who believed in them. In the Incan empire, religion was embraced as an explanation for natural phenomena and the formation of society. Religion served an important purpose as it developed into a complex set of myths that governed the empire. Their polytheistic religion had several deities who controlled how the world functioned, with most important of these gods controlling the sun. Looking at the mythology that developed in the Incan empire reveals unrelenting dedication to surviving as individuals and as a united society. Incan mythology seems to enshrine, above all else, a belief in preservation; the mythology suggests a belief in preserving the societal hierarchy, livelihood, and the lineage of the Inca leader.

Standing as the cornerstone of Incan religion was Inti, the sun god. As the expression of the sun and light, Inti was responsible for the success of the harvest season. The sun gave life to maize, potatoes, and quinoa, which in turn ensured a steady food supply. While he did not create the Incas, he ensured their livelihood. To thank Inti, temples of the sun were built, prayers spoke, and tribute paid through the sacrifice of crops, llamas, and, in extreme cases, young children.[1] Inti was also the subject of the most important of the many Incan festivals, Inti Raymi. Despite centuries of Spanish influence, the festival is still celebrated in modern day Peru, as a reminder of their Incan heritage. To add to the significance of the sun god, Inti also fathered Manco Capac, the founder of the Incan state. Though Inti was the most important of Incan deities, several others joined to make up the pantheon.

Viracocha was the creator deity. To a predominantly Christian society Viracocha's secondary importance may seem strange, but this particular dynamic of this Incan religion helps to clarify what priorities existed within society. Viracocha had little to do with the Earth after creating it, while Inti was responsible for the prosperity of the Incan state. Inti was more important because of his role in the day-to-day lives of ordinary Incans, and while Viracocha was not the most important god, he still had a huge presence in Incan mythology. Today, Viracocha is generally considered to be the second-most important of the deities.

Emily Scarbrough, of Fairfield, Illinois, wrote this essay for Dr. José Deustua's Colonial Latin America class in the Fall of 2011. A history major, she expects to graduate in 2014.
[1] Paul R. Steele, *Handbook of Incan Mythology*, (Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO, 2004), 248.

Viracochas method of creating the world reflects traditional Incan values; in particular the process of creating humans in the Incan origin myth helps to reinforce a belief in the power of lineage. To begin with, Viracocha created a race of giants, but replaced them with men of stone, before finally creating humans as they are today. This myth suggests that ancestors are somehow superior to their living descendants.

The third of the Incan's most worshipped gods was Illapa, who controlled lightning and rain from his place in the stars by "giving off flashes of lightning when he whirled his sling," pulling "water from the celestial river that was perceived as the Milky Way."[2] Like Inti, Illapa was essential to growing crops since he controlled rainfall, but quite uniquely, he was thought to give credibility to priests. Potential religious leaders would expose themselves to storms in hopes of becoming enlightened, a result of being struck by lightning. He is considered the third most important deity, and helps to form the trio of the most worshipped gods.

Inti, Viracocha, and Illapa were the most important gods of the Incan empire, but even so, many lesser deities existed. The gods were embraced as an explanation for natural phenomena. As an example, a god named Cuichu represented rainbows. Goddesses represented bodies of nature. Inti's wife, Mama Kilya, served as the goddess of the moon, Mama Qoca as the goddess of the sea, and Capa Mama as the Earth Mother. The Incans embraced many gods to explain ever day occurrences of their lives. Religion also shaped the calendar; religious festivals allowed the laboring Incans to take a break from the strenuous tasks of terracing, planting, tending, and harvesting.

The Apus are another example of lesser deities that affected both natural phenomena and the Incan calendar. The Incans believed that the Apus were gods of the mountains and served as protectors of nearby villages. Animal sacrifices were made as tributes to Incan protector gods. In addition, the sacrifices were believed to increase the fertility of the type of livestock that were offered.[3] The sacred rite provides an example of behavior at religious ceremonies. The Apu sacrifices involved burning offerings, drinking corn beer and cane alcohol, shortly before saying incantations and finally slaughtering one llama or other herd animal.[4] Incas offered crops and livestock in hopes that the gods would reward them with better yields and fertility so the villages could prosper and grow.

---

[2] Steele, *Handbook of Incan Mythology*, 198.

[3] Sacrifices to the Apus are still made today by ancestors of the Incan people.

[4] Peter Gose, "Sacrifice and the Commodity Form in the Andes," *Man*, New Series, Vol. 21, No. 2 (Jun., 1986): 296 310.

Earthquakes were another natural phenomena for which Incans sought mythological explanation. Earthquakes are fairly common in the Incan homeland because of the tectonic activity of the Andes mountain range. To account for the seismic activity the Incan turned to myth; specifically they looked to Pachacamac, the god of major changes in the world. They decided that Pachacamac was shaking the earth, causing the ground to tremble. This serves as a great example of how the Incans used myth to account for seemingly inexplicable natural phenomena, since there was no science to explain how the earth moved, the gods must have been responsible.

Religion reveals a lot about the values of Incas. Clearly survival was the most important aspect of Incan religion. Inti, the sun god, represented not only the sun, but also indirectly food, since the sun is needed to grow crops. Illapa, the god of thunder, elevated the value of a good harvest by controlling the rain, which was also invaluable to the growth of crops. They grew potatoes, maize, cacoa, and quinoa as well as raised livestock like llamas and alpacas. The Inca people worshipped their gods for giving them the necessities to live. However, Incan religion extended beyond an explanation of nature and a way to show thanks; Incan religion enshrined values of the society as a whole by explaining why society worked as it did, and by establishing credibility of the leader.

In everyday life, religion played a major role. Society functioned communally; all men, women, and children had important roles. Religion was a great motivation for the peasant class because it provided an outlet for entertainment. The calendar was scattered with festivals like the Kapac Raymi where people gathered to ask Illapa for rain on the winter solstice.[5] This festival celebrated Illapa by sacrificing llamas and children who were associated with lightning for one reason or another. Same-sex twins, thought to have been split by lightning in the womb, were often sacrificed on the holiday. Though sacrifice may not seem worthy of celebration, the festivals also included music, dancing, and alcohol, all of which the Incan laboring class enjoyed. These festivals helped to establish and promote the sense of community that was necessary for a functioning Incan society.

Another crucial piece to the success of the Incan empire lay in the authority of the emperor. The myth of the Incan Empire's origin helped solidify the power of the emperor by linking the ruler's heritage to the most powerful of Incan Gods, Inti.[6] This religious heritage legitimized the immense power that one man was to yield. The myth is that Manco

[5] Daniel W. G. Ade, "Lightning in the Folklife and Religion of the Central Andes," *Anthropos*, Vol. 78, No. 5/6 (1983): 770-788.

[6] Brian S. Bauer, "Pacariqtambo and the Mythical Origins of the Inca," *Latin American Antiquity*, Vol. 2, No. 1 (Mar., 1991): 7-26.

Capac, son of Inti, was the ruler who united the Incan empire and founded the city of Cusco. He came out of a cave in a region directly south of Cusco and made his way north to the city teaching the Incas along the way, how to dress and farm. Because he established the empire, he was crowned ruler, and his future descendants would follow. Each new Incan emperor could trace his lineage to Manco Capac, and even further to Inti. This heritage vested in the emperor absolute authority because he was the representation of Inti on Earth.

As exhibited by the myths of Manco Capac and Viracocha's creation of the Incan state, lineage had to be legitimized. These myths demonstrate that society adhered strictly to the significance of heritage. In one specific myth this belief was enshrined by creating a pseudo-caste system. In the myth, one the very first human beings asked Inti to make more humans, to which Inti reciprocated by sending three eggs. Each color corresponded to a class of people: "the golden egg was the origin of the cuaracas and nobles; the silver egg gave rise to women; and from the copper egg came the commoners and their families."[7]

Myths are a particularly effective way to secure beliefs across classes. To expand on the role of social hierarchy even further in Incan society, the wealthiest citizens were mummified after death. These *Mallqui*, or mummified ancestors, were significant to their respective *ayllus*, or clans, who revered the ancestors greatly and believed that they would help the crops grow.[8] Mallquis were usually preserved in caves near a town so the descendants could dress them and offer food and drink to honor them. Many have been discovered since the Spanish conquest when the practice was eradicated because its association with idolatry. From the area surrounding the settlement of San Pedro de Hacas, one count of mummies reached 1,825 bodies.[9]

The Incan people spoke Quechua and had no written languages. The only written record of myths is attributed to the Spanish conquistadors, who took interest in writing them down. Later criollos, mestizos, and educated natives began recording mythology, but probably not without the influence of Spanish conquistadors. The Incan myths have undoubtedly been changed by many people who have transcribed them over the centuries including: Cieza de León, who as a Spanish soldier recorded notes on his years of travel throughout Peru; Juan de Betanzos, whose marriage to an Incan noble woman gave him an intimate look at the Incan perspective in the years immediately after the conquest; Garcialaso De La Vega, the son of a Spanish conquistador and

---

[7] Gary Urton, *Inca Myths*, (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1999), 69.

[8] Steele, *Handbook of Incan Mythology*, 200.

[9] Urton, *Inca Myths*, 69.

an Incan princess, who in 1609 wrote *Comentarios Reales de los Incas*.[10] Perhaps the most significant of the chroniclers was Guaman Poma whose unique position between Spaniards and Quechua allowed him to produce a 1200 page manuscript that detailed religion through written accounts and when his Spanish failed him, drawings. He has since become a person of interest for Latin American historians, as very little is known about him, but his account of Incan culture is one of the most detailed.[11]

Through all these chroniclers, one would assume that the mythology of the Incas would be well preserved; however, the writers learned the mythology from different regions of the former empire, which each had varying versions of myths. The myths have most likely lost some of the meaning in translation. As twenty-first century historians and anthropologists try to sort through the mythology of the Incan empire, one single set of myths cannot be readily identified. There are several versions of each myth, more than one name for gods, and other complications that make a universal Incan mythology impossible to identify. From what pieces historians can gather, they can learn a lot about Incan society especially when coupled with archeology and the records from the Spanish following the conquest.

The Incan religion was polytheistic, rich, varied, and because of the range of chroniclers, fairly well preserved. Despite the inconsistencies from chronicler to chronicler, the overall themes of Incan religion present themselves. Survival and heritage are the key aspects that the myths promoted, but the stories also worked to explain natural phenomenon, like the weather and earthquakes. Looking at Incan religion demonstrates some of the core values of Incan society, while explaining that through communality, their society was able to thrive. Religion united people through festivals, sacrifice, and universal devotion to their deities and their emperor. The myths of the Incan empire provide clear insight into the inner workings of a vast empire that has largely been lost to the centuries.

---

[10] Urton, *Inca Myths*, 29-33.

[11] Valerie Fraser, "The Artistry of Guaman Poma," *RES: Anthropology and Aesthetics*, No. 29/30, The Pre-Columbian (Spring - Autumn, 1996): 269-289.