Recounting the Past

A Student Journal of Historical Studies

Department of History
At Illinois State University

Number 17 • Spring 2016

Recounting the Past

A Student Journal of Historical Studies

Department of History
At Illinois State University

Number 17 • Spring 2016

Recounting the Past highlights scholarship from graduate and undergraduate students in the core courses for the History program. These courses teach students how to find, access and critically assess primary sources as well as how to integrate the scholarship of experts in the field into their research. The papers in this issue highlight important theoretical insights and thematic streams in the discipline of history.

Recounting the Past

A Student Journal of Historical Studies

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Fighting For Their Reproductive Rights: Latina Women and Forced Sterilization in the 1970s

By Nora Dunne

Dolores Madrigal gave birth on October 12, 1973. While she was in labor, doctors convinced her to consent to a procedure preventing her from becoming pregnant too soon after giving birth. A tubal ligation was performed on Madrigal, with no doctors explaining what the procedure would be or its effects.[1] In 1976, Madrigal, along with nine other Latina women, would face their doctors and stand up for their right to have control over their own reproductive health. Forced, unconsented, and misrepresented sterilization in minority women became an issue for activist groups in the 1970s. The Committee to End Sterilization Abuse (CESA) and the Chicago Women's Liberation Union (CWLU) were two organizations working to highlight the problems involved with sterilization and to improve reproductive rights of all women in the 1970s. This paper will focus on the efforts of CESA and the CWLU as they applied to Latina women during the Women's Health Movement. This paper will look at the cases of *Buck v. Bell* and *Madrigal v. Quilligan* to understand the legalization of forced sterilization. It will also look at CESA's statement of purpose and two documents from the CWLU titled *"The Politics of Sterilization"* and *"Medical Crimes Against Women."* These documents will demonstrate how women worked to bring attention to this issue and how activist strategies resulted in passing legislation.

Forced sterilization was legalized in the United States in the era following World War I due to the U.S. Supreme Court case *Buck v. Bell.* Decided on May 2, 1927, the case involved plaintiff Carrie Buck and J.H. Bell who had sterilized her without her consent after she gave birth to a child. Bell won this case. According to the opinion of Justice Holmes, Carrie Buck was feeble minded. Buck was eighteen at the time of this procedure. The document also states that her daughter was illegitimate and would be feeble minded as well. The decision states that feeble-minded women should be sterilized, because they will be producing more feeble-minded children. Holmes states that sterilizing these women will benefit society. It also states that this procedure will not affect her health. Holmes argues that sterilization will prevent feeble-minded individuals from reproducing. In the end, he argues, this will prevent them from either starving to death or ending up in jail.[2] Holmes argued that taking reproductive rights away from Carrie Buck and other women would lead to a better society, with fewer feeble-minded individuals. Many women lost their reproductive freedom because of this decision.

This case allowed for sterilization without consent to be legalized in the United States in the case of people living in institutions. One issue with this case was that there was no definition given of what was considered "feeble minded." Minorities were often viewed as incapable of taking birth control properly and abusive of welfare. Because of these generalizations, these women were often the victims of unconsented sterilization.

Tubal sterilization, also known as a tubal ligation or having your tubes tied, is one form of sterilization used on women who had not given consent. This procedure entails blocking or cutting the fallopian tubes to prevent pregnancy as a form of birth control. This procedure stops eggs from travelling to the uterus and sperm from travelling to the eggs. This procedure can be done after childbirth or a C-section. Although it is possible to reverse this surgery, it is a major procedure and does not always work. According to the Mayo Clinic, this procedure is often done to prevent pregnancy or to decrease the risk of ovarian cancer. As with any major surgery, there are risks associated with a tubal litigation. Damage could be done to the bowel, bladder, or blood vessels during this procedure. There is a risk of the wound becoming infected or abdominal pain. This surgery is a serious procedure, and it is important that women who were undergoing this procedure fully understand what they were consenting to. Many women became victims of forced sterilization because they were not informed of the procedure that they would be undergoing.

Historians often compare the sterilization that was legalized in the United States after *Buck v. Bell* to similar actions that occurred in Nazi Germany before and during the Holocaust. According to historians, forced sterilization in both the United States and in Germany was seen as a way to prevent the "feeble-minded" from having children. Doctors in both countries believed that preventing these women from having children would help rid society of negative traits.[3] The women who underwent forced sterilization were often poor and minority women. Many doctors viewed these women as incapable of using contraceptives and should not be having children. Historians state that minority women were given false information on sterilization and were encouraged to have this procedure when white women were not. Historians also argue that this issue should be viewed in the broader context of women's struggle to have control of their own fertility and health. Much like the issue of abortion, men had control over women's fertility. Because of this control, many minority women were sterilized without their consent.[4]

Historian Joan Kelly wrote an article titled *"Sterilization: Rights and Abuse of Rights"* in 1977, stating the issue caused people to think about the horrors that occurred in Nazi Germany, however, Kelly argued that minority women also did not have control over their own bodies. Many women were convinced to have this procedure without truly understanding what it entails. Women often would believe that this procedure was reversible, and they could "untie" their tubes at a later date.

Kelly also writes that women often agreed to these procedures because they were threatened with losing welfare.[5] This document was one of the earliest that defined forced sterilization as an issue for poor and minority women. While the decision to be sterilized is one that the author believes is valid, she also believes that many women are not truly being given the option, as they were being sterilized without consent. Kelly's essay brought this issue to light and the article helped women who were not affected directly by this issue understand what was happening and helped women understand that the issue of forced sterilization was a major part of the struggle of women to maintain control over their own reproductive health. The author states that many middle-class women could not imagine this happening, but it was very real and occurring to many women who were in vulnerable positions.

Women were being sterilized without consent, or sterilized due to misinformation. Minority women on welfare were often affected by this procedure. Doctors were making decisions about these patients, and they were not always providing women with all the necessary information to make informed decisions, taking away the right of women to make decisions regarding their bodies and healthcare. This information shows that there were serious problems occurring in Women's Health during the 1970s. Kelly's article was one that defined the issue of forced sterilization, and was a call to action during the era of Second Wave Feminism and the Women's Health Movement.

This period of time was an important era for activist groups. In the 1960s and 1970s, the Civil Rights Movement and Second Wave Feminism were occurring, along with the Women's Health Movement. These issues are important in understanding the movement surrounding forced sterilization. The decision of *Roe v. Wade* in 1973 was a victory for women, but women of color saw their rights disappear with the Hyde Amendment in 1976. This amendment once again took away the right to have control over their own body for some women.[6] The Hyde Amendment took away federal funding for abortions, but federal funding for sterilization remained. Some women were pressured into sterilization because of the trauma surrounding abortion at this time.[7] The Hyde Amendment took away the rights of many women on public assistance to decide to have abortions, and the right to make reproductive decisions. Women in this era were struggling to gain control over their own bodies, as they were unable to make decisions regarding birth control, abortion, or sterilization.[8] These issues are important in understanding the development of the Women's Health Movement. Women played a major part in the Civil Rights Movement, and Second Wave Feminism was also a key movement that was happening during this time. These two movements helped lead women to fight for control over their reproductive help, and lead to the efforts of organizations such as the Committee to End Sterilization Abuse and the Chicago Women's Liberation Union.

Fighting For Their Reproductive Rights:
Latina Women and Forced Sterilization in the 1970s

The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services published "Surgical Sterilization in the United States: Prevalence and Characteristics, 1965-95" in their *Vital Health and Statistics* series. This document looks at issues and factors surrounding sterilization in the United States. It does not specifically look at forced sterilization, but it gives data on who was sterilized during this time. The data suggests that women of Hispanic origin were sterilized more often than women of other races. Women with less education were also more likely to be sterilized.[9] Although this research is not specifically on forced sterilization, this information shows the patterns surrounding it in this era. These statistics show that Latina women were sterilized at higher rates than other women, and that a large percentage of women under thirty who were on Medicaid were sterilized. Women who fit these statistics would often become victims of forced sterilization.

Latina women had been affected greatly by forced sterilization. Research done by Princeton University in 1970 found that twenty percent of Mexican American women had been sterilized, and some other studies show that this number could be as high as sixty-five percent in some areas of the country. Historians state that some people believed that Latinas were not concerned with their reproductive health, partially because they are predominately Catholic, and doctors assumed that these women did not want control over their own reproductive health. It was also difficult for minority women to organize to fight for reproductive rights. These women were often focused on other issues that affected them, such as poverty, homelessness, and welfare. Forced sterilization has also led Latinas to distrust doctors, affecting their overall health. Latinas have much higher rates of cervical cancer and AIDS than non-minority women because they were not receiving proper screening at the earliest stages of their illnesses. Forced sterilization has affected the overall health, especially the reproductive health, of Latina women.[10]

One activist organization that worked to fight forced sterilization was the Committee to End Sterilization Abuse (CESA), which was founded in 1974 by Dr. Helen Rodriguez-Trias, Raymond Rakow, and Maritza Arrastia. Although activists of all races participated in this organization, the participation of Latinas was critical.[11] The participation of these women was important because they were being greatly affected by forced sterilization. This organization allowed for Latina women to become involved in this issue and to fight for their rights to control their health and bodies. CESA lasted until 1979, when it united with several other activist groups that would later become known as the Reproductive Rights National Network.[12] Latina women who were involved in CESA strongly believed that this organization was critical to their participation in activist groups. These women were able to connect with like-minded Latina women for the first time, as many Latina activists had felt very isolated in the past.[13] This organization allowed these women to fight for their

reproductive rights, but also allowed them to work with other activists that they felt personally connected to, which they had not felt previously.

Dr. Helen Rodriguez-Trias was one of the founders of the Committee to End Sterilization Abuse. Dr. Rodriguez-Trias was a Puerto Rican physician who saw the impact of forced sterilization on poor, minority women, especially Latinas. Rodriguez-Trias and the CESA faced some opposition from white women as they fought to end forced sterilization. On the other hand, some white women were having the opposite problem: their doctors were refusing to sterilize them, despite the wishes of the women. Rodriguez-Trias stated that this difference made her realize how diverse the Women's Rights and Women's Health Movements truly were.[14] These women were all fighting for different things, but they all were attempting to gain control over their own bodies and their medical decisions. Dr. Helen Rodriguez-Trias and the Committee to End Sterilization abuse were committed to helping women fight for their rights and fighting to end sterilization without consent from happening during the 1970s.

In 1975, the Committee to End Sterilization Abuse released a statement of purpose.[15] This document discusses the reasons for forced sterilization, and it also defines the goals of CESA. First, this document discusses why forced sterilization was occurring. The document states that many people at this time believed problems with society were caused by overpopulation. Because of this, some suggested the answer to these problems was population control. The document also defines the problems that were occurring with sterilization. The document states that the number of sterilizations that occurred had tripled in the past five years. It says that the women who were sterilized were usually Black, Puerto Rican, Chicana, and working- class women.[16] This document shows that minority women were being sterilized without consent, losing control of their reproductive freedom.

The CESA statement of purpose states that these women did not have correct information given to them, so they were often unaware that this procedure was permanent or the complications involved in it. They were also not always given information about other birth control options. Many women also made the decision because they were threatened with the loss of welfare and access to medical services if they were not sterilized.[17] CESA wanted to bring attention to the issues surrounding forced sterilization and help the women who were being targeted become aware of the issue and provide them with the information needed to make an informed decision about sterilization and their reproductive rights.

This document also discusses the goals of CESA. The first goal is to bring to light the issue of sterilization abuse, and oppression that was occurring in the healthcare system, stating that sexism, racism, and the oppression of working people were major issues. These people were not receiving healthcare that was adequate, and they were being lied to by their doctors. Another goal of CESA was

to provide all women access to different methods of birth control. This would allow women more choice and freedom in decisions regarding reproductive health.[18] This organization helped women understand the impact of forced sterilization on the ability of women to have complete control over their own reproductive health.

The Statement of Purpose also specifically discusses New York City, and the abuses that were happening in their hospitals.[19] The goal of CESA was to create standards in New York City that will set a precedent for all hospitals in the country to follow. CESA wanted guidelines established to ensure that women were truly consenting to sterilization after being properly informed of the consequences of this surgery. The standards would also allow for a much longer, thirty-day waiting period before the procedure, instead of only seventy-two hours. This would allow for women to have time to reflect on their decisions, and gather more information.[20] These guidelines were critical to allowing women to make informed decisions regarding sterilization. Forcing women to make the decision quickly and while under anesthesia would not allow them to thoroughly think through the decision and its consequences. CESA hoped that implementing these standards in New York City would eventually lead to the adoption of these standards across the country. The CESA statement of purpose was one that helped define the issue of forced sterilization. It also clearly illustrates the goals of the organization. This organization was formed to fight sterilization abuse, and this document discusses the key issues and goals. This organization was important to the fight against sterilization for many reasons, and these goals are the starting point for this organization.

Another organization that helped fight forced sterilization was the Chicago Women's Liberation Union, or the CWLU. According to the CWLU's website, the Chicago Women's Liberation Union formed because of the women's movements and the civil rights movement, along with other social movements that were occurring. It was founded in November of 1969. This organization was formed to unite the many women's organizations that were forming in Chicago at this time.[21] This organization was also important to calling attention to the issue of forced sterilization and the Women's Health Movement.

The Chicago Women's Liberation Union Distributed a leaflet in 1971 titled "The Politics of Sterilization." This document is one of the earlier documents that focused on the issue of sterilization abuse. The leaflet describes the procedure of sterilization, and defines it as a minor, outpatient procedure that is safe and has been done for years and states that this is a good way for women who are done having children or do not want children to prevent future pregnancies. However, it also brings up the problems that were happening with this procedure. Women who were not consenting to sterilization were being sterilized as a form of population control. The procedure was being done experimentally in a clinic that treated minority women, and was being done in India to control the population. The author also

describes her concern with this "efficient" procedure. She believes that the ease of this procedure will allow for more doctors to perform it against a patients' will.[22] This document was written soon after the CWLU was founded. This document discusses this procedure as a valid choice for many women who have decided they do not wish to have children or want to stop having children, but it also explains that this procedure was not truly a choice for many women. The author of this leaflet is calling attention to the abuses of this procedure and bringing attention to the issue of forced sterilization.

Another important document was written by the CWLU in 1976. Several women from the Chicago Women's Liberation Union wrote a document titled *"Medical Crimes against Women."* This document discusses forced sterilization, along with other issues regarding the health of women, and discusses a chapter of the Committee to End Sterilization Abuse (CESA) in Chicago and information that this chapter had released.[23] *Medical Crimes Against Women* demonstrates how these two groups came together to fight the issue of forced sterilization. This document states that in Illinois, thirty percent of those sterilized on Medicaid were under thirty years of age.[24] This statistic indicates that these women were sterilized unnecessarily. The reason they were sterilized was the fact that they were on government aid. These activists were calling attention to the fact that many of the women who were losing control over their bodies were women who were low income.

"Medical Crimes against Women" discusses the formation of a Task Force to focus on the issues of abortion and forced sterilization. This task force would work with CESA to research the issue of forced sterilization. The authors also believe that after doing research, they will begin to organize and fight this issue. They state that they will protest hospitals that have sterilization rates that are much higher than they should be. The authors also discuss joining forces with other groups to protest forced sterilizations. They also state there will be different groups involved in the Task Forces. Welfare groups will be important for the task force on forced sterilization and in protesting the hospitals, according to this document.[25] These organizations were bringing attention to the issue and the Women's Health Movement. They were organizing to help the women who were being victimized understand what was happening and what their rights are.

This document shows the importance of organization for activist groups. It also discusses what needed to be done to help fight sterilization abuse. These women understood that they needed to have the correct information in order to protest. They also understood that there was strength in numbers when dealing with this issue. The activists from the CWLU wanted to join forces with CESA in order to research and gather their data on this issue. The CWLU also understands which women are affected by this issue. The authors stated that it is important to include welfare groups in this task force and the protests. Women who had less money were

more likely to be sterilized without their consent. For this reason, it was important to include these women in the activism surrounding forced sterilization.

In 1976, ten Latina women who were sterilized without consent went to court in the case *Madrigal v. Quilligan.* These women were not specifically involved with an organization, but they were standing up for their own rights and for their ability to have control over their bodies. This is an example of activism by the women who were affected by forced sterilization. The doctors lied to these women and gave them false information. These doctors took away their rights to have control over their own body and their ability to decide if and when they wanted to have children. Dolores Madrigal was told while in labor that she would die if she became pregnant too soon after giving birth to her child, and signed a consent form that was written in English, which was not her primary language. She said she was not told what the procedure would be, and what the consequences of this procedure were.[26] This woman was not informed of what was happening to her body. Her rights to maintain control over her body and reproductive system were taken away. The doctors who took away these rights lied to her and did not explain what the procedure was. This is one example of many other Latina women who faced similar situations.

A second plaintiff, Jovita Rivera testified that she was told that she had too many children, and needed to sign a paper that would stop her from having too many children while she was under anesthesia. She was also told that this procedure could be reversed.[27] This is an example of false information being given to the patients. As stated earlier, this procedure is not one that can be easily reversed. Rivera did give consent to be sterilized, but she should not have been asked to consent under these circumstances. Her doctors also gave her wrong information, telling her that this procedure could be reversed. Rivera was not given the information that she should have received about the consequences of this permanent procedure. She did not consent to the procedure she had done. Rivera was not able to make an informed decision, and therefore she did not have control over her own reproductive rights.

Another plaintiff in *Madrigal v. Quilligan* stated that she was threatened and forced to consent to this procedure. Helena Orozco was told that her doctor would not be able to treat her hernia if she did not consent to a tubal ligation. Like the others, she was not told what the consequences of this procedure would be. The doctors of yet another woman, Maria Hurtado, also lied to her, leading her to consent to sterilization. She was told that it was against the law to have more than three caesarean sections in California, and the tubal ligation would be done to prevent this from happening again.[28] These women were both given false information and were not truly informed about what would happen when consenting to this procedure. The doctors took away their right to have children if they chose, and to have control

over their own body and health. They were not able to make informed decisions, and suffered because of this. These women are examples of the many Latina women who were sterilized due to lies and threats from doctors.

Unfortunately, Judge Jesse Curtis ruled in favor of the defense in this case. In his closing comments, Curtis placed the blame on a breakdown in communication between doctors and patients. He blamed this miscommunication on the fact that these women spoke limited English, which in his opinion, meant that misunderstandings were inevitable. He also placed blame on cultural differences. He states that Latinas undergoing sterilization need more explanation on this procedure than a typical patient would, and the judge also states the hospital does not have time to deal with this.[29] This judge believed the doctors were right in performing this procedure, despite the fact that these women had been blatantly lied to about what tubal ligation was and the permanence of this procedure. They were also not informed about other birth control options. The ten women who were the plaintiffs in this case were participating in a form of activism. They were standing up for their reproductive rights, although there were many people who did not believe their rights were being violated. Although these women were not tied to a specific organization, they were clearly activists. They were fighting for their reproductive and health rights and brought attention to this issue.

The goals of organizations like CESA and the CWLU included passing guidelines regarding sterilizations for all hospitals to follow. CESA worked with the Health and Hospitals Corporation (HHC) Committee on Sterilization to establish a sterilization policy that would be put into place in hospitals in New York, followed by other hospitals throughout the country. This committee was established in January 1975, and was racially diverse, much like CESA.[30] These organizations hoped to set a precedent in New York that other hospitals would follow. These guidelines would attempt to prevent forced sterilization from happening, and provide women with enough time to think through and research any procedures before consenting to them.

The committee proposed a thirty-day waiting period between the time of consent and the time of surgery. They saw this waiting period as a way to help prevent doctors from sterilizing women without consent.[31] The committee hoped this would prevent women in labor who were under anesthesia from consenting to this procedure and then having the procedure immediately after giving birth. The guidelines also prevented the sterilization of women under twenty one years of age. There would also be a required session with a counselor, and the session had to occur in the native language of the women undergoing the procedure.[32] Some of the women in the case *Madrigal v. Quilligan* did not speak English as their native language, but they consented to the procedure by signing papers in English. These guidelines were an attempt to prevent doctors from coercing women into this procedure by giving them information in a language they did not understand.

The directors of obstetrics and gynecology departments in the HHC, who were all male, opposed these guidelines. This was followed by three months of negotiations, but the physicians withdrew support at the last minute. To help gain support, CESA activists gathered support by going to the community, making this an issue that focused on poverty and race, rather than focusing on forced sterilization as a feminist issue. These efforts were successful, because the HHC guidelines were passed in September of 1975, and went into effect on November 1.[33] CESA activists helped bring attention to this issue as a form of discrimination. These activists brought attention to the issue and helped the community understand how this issue was affecting all women, especially those of lower economic classes and women of certain races. Several of the physicians filed lawsuits that stated these guidelines violated first amendment rights. However, this never made it to trial as five of the physicians dropped the claims.[34]

In 1976, Intro 1105-A was proposed in New York City. This proposal was an attempt to extend the HHC guidelines to all New York City hospitals. Despite some opposition from organizations like the National Organization of Women (NOW) and Planned Parenthood, this bill, nicknamed the Burden Bill, was passed.[35] This bill was passed because of the support it received from CESA. For example, CESA members went on the radio and encouraged the listeners to attend hearings regarding the Burden Bill. They also filled the hearings with supporters of the bill. The bill was passed on April 28th, 1977, with a vote of thirty-eight to one.[36] The actions of CESA were critical in passing this bill. CESA influenced the people and gained the support of the city council members to pass this bill despite the opposition they faced by major organizations.

Chapters of CESA throughout the country also attempted to fight sterilization abuse. Latina women were very involved with the efforts of CESA in California, as this was an issue that unified them. California chapters of CESA, along with other activists, and the California Department of Health proposed guidelines in the spring of 1976. These guidelines included a fourteen-day waiting period. It also mandated a process for informing the patient of the procedure and receiving consent, and it prevented women under the age of eighteen from being sterilized. The guidelines were passed in April of 1976.[37] These guidelines were attempting to prevent abuses of this procedure from happening.

In response to the passage of these guidelines in California, the California Medical Association filed a lawsuit against Jerome Lackner. This lawsuit accused the California Department of Health of exceeding its authority by establishing guidelines that would help prevent forced sterilization.[38] This lawsuit ruled in favor of the defendant. The ruling states that reasonable legislation to prevent unnecessary operations was legal. It also stated that the California Department of Health was allowed to publicize these regulations to help prevent these surgeries from

happening.[39] This case was important because it further established the guidelines that were proposed in California by CESA. It was a major victory for activists who were working to prevent sterilization abuse in California.

Despite this victory, the debate about sterilization guidelines continued at the national level. Activists from groups that were fighting to prevent sterilization abuse were fighting physicians and organizations like NOW and Planned Parenthood. Some activists argued that waiting periods and minimum age requirements would prevent poor women from having the procedures if they wanted them. They also argued that many physicians ignored the waiting period and extending this period would not make a difference.[40] These arguments did not prevent the guidelines from being passed. On November 8, 1978, federal guidelines were published in the *Federal Register.* The policy prevented women under the age of twenty-one from being sterilized and extended the waiting period to thirty days, along with other standards.[41] These guidelines established in New York, California, and eventually federally, along with the efforts of CESA were very important to helping women gain control of their own reproductive rights. Women were given more time between consenting to the procedure and actually having it. These guidelines would give the women more time to think about the procedure and gather information. It also stopped the sterilization of women under twenty-one. This was an effort to prevent young women on welfare from being sterilized and having their ability to choose to have children taken away. These guidelines were important in the fight against sterilization abuse that was happening during the Women's Health Movement. CESA disbanded soon after achieving this victory, and many of its activists became active in other issues in the Women's Health Movement.

Yet, CESA still found doctors who did not comply. A study that was done by CESA found that although eighty-eight percent of the hospitals complied with the waiting period, only fifty-eight percent followed the age minimum. Only sixty-four percent of the hospitals followed the ban of receiving consent during delivery or abortion. Some doctors were performing these procedures without reporting them.[42] These hospitals were not following the guidelines, continuing the cycle of sterilization abuse despite the regulations. These doctors were continuing to prevent women from having control of their reproductive rights.

Despite the efforts and successes by the Committee to End Sterilization Abuse, forced sterilization is still an issue that needs attention. There are some women today who are being sterilized without consent or not given all the information they should have been given. One place that this is occurring is the California prison system. This procedure seems to be happening more frequently in California prisons. Prisoners are being sterilized without being told what procedures are being done. One Latina woman was told her doctor removed her right ovary instead of the cyst on her left ovary. Her doctor said that having both ovaries

removed would not matter, because this woman was serving a life sentence. Another woman had both ovaries removed in 2001, but was not informed of this until 2004.[43] These women are two examples of the current struggle over sterilization and reproductive freedom. Despite their sentences, these women deserve to make decisions about their own body and reproductive health. Doctors who do permanent procedures that prevent women in the California Prison System from having children are violating the right that these women have to make this decision themselves. One transgendered male stated that he did not want to have children, but he felt violated that the decision was made without his consent.[44] The doctor made the decision to sterilize him without his consent, and his rights to make reproductive decisions were taken away during this procedure. These women are facing the same issue that was a major part of the Women's Health Movement in the 1970s.

CESA, the CWLU and other organizations that focused on preventing forced sterilization during the Women's Health Movement succeeded in their goal of passing federal guidelines to prevent forced sterilization from happening. Women who were affected by forced sterilization were often low income or minority women. Some women consented to the procedure after receiving false information or while under anesthesia during labor or an abortion. Latina women were very important in the activism surrounding this issue, and organizations like CESA and the CWLU helped unite these women in the struggle for control of their own reproductive health. Although there are still violations of reproductive rights occurring today, CESA, helped bring attention to the issue and pass legislation regulating sterilization.

[1]   Jessica Enoch, "Survival Stories: Feminist Historiographic Approaches to Chicana Rhetorics of Sterilization Abuse," *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* no. 3 (2005): 5.

[2]   *Buck v. Bell*, 274 U.S. 200 (1927).

[3]   Angela Franks, *Margaret Sanger's Eugenic Legacy: The Control of Female Fertility* (Jefferson: McFarland, 2005); P. R. Reilly, "Involuntary sterilization in the United States: a surgical solution," *The Quarterly Review Of Biology* 62, no. 2 (June 1987): 153-170; Susan L. Thomas, "Race, Gender, and Welfare Reform: The Antinatalist Response," *Journal of Black Studies* no. 4 (1998): 419.

4   Harry Bruinius, *Better for All the World: The Secret History of Forced Sterilization and America's Quest for Racial Purity* (New York: Vintage Books, 2006); Sarah Earle and Gayle Letherby, *Gender, Identity, & Reproduction: Social Perspectives* (Basingstoke, Hamshire: Palgrave Macmillian, 2003); Gregory W. Rutecki, "Forced Sterilization of Native Americans: Later Twentieth Century Physician Cooperation with National Eugenic Policies," *Ethics & Medicine: An International Journal Of Bioethics* 27, no. 1 (Spring 2011): 33-42; Johanna. Schoen, *Choice & Coercion: Birth Control, Sterilization, and Abortion in Public Health and Welfare.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, (2005); Thomas W. Volscho, "Sterilization Racism and Pan-Ethnic Disparities of the Past Decade: The Continued Encroachment on Reproductive Rights," *Wicazo Sa Review* no. 1 (2010): 17; Susan E. Davis, ed. *Women Under Attack: Victories, Backlash, and the Fight for Reproductive Freedom,* (Boston: South End Press, 1988).

5   Joan Kelly, "Sterilization: Rights and Abuse of Rights," in *Dear Sisters: Dispatches from the Women's Liberation Movement,* ed. Rosalyn Baxandall and Linda Gordon (New York: Basic Books, 2000).

6   Marlene Gerber Fried, "Reproductive Rights Activism in the Post-Roe Era," *American Journal Of Public Health* 103, no. 1 (January 2013): 10-14.

7   Jael Silliman, Marlene Gerber Fried, Loretta Ross, and Elena R. Gutierrez, *Undivided Rights: Women of Color Organize for Reproductive Justice* (Cambridge, MA: South End Press, 2004).

8   Sandra Morgen, *Into Our Own Hands: The Women's Health Movement in the United States, 1969-1990* (New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 2002).

9   *Surgical Sterilization in the United States: Prevalence and Characteristics,* 1965-95. Vital and Health Statistics, Series 23, No. 20, from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and National Center for Health Statistics.

10 Sandra Morgen, *Into Our Own Hands*; Loretta J. Ross Sarah L. Brownlee, Dazon Dixon Diallo, Luz Rodriquez, and SisterSong Women of Color Reproductive Health Project, "Just Choices: Women of Color, Reproductive Rights, and Human Rights," in *Policing the National Body.*; Jael Silliman, Marlene Gerber Fried, Loretta Ross, and Elena R. Gutierrez, *Undivided Rights: Women of Color Organize for Reproductive Justice,* (Cambridge, MA: South End Press, 2004).

11 Silliman et al, *Undivided Rights,* 226.

12 Silliman et al, *Undivided Rights,* 226.

13 Silliman et al, *Undivided Rights,* 228.

14 Joyce Wilcox, "The Face of Women's Health: Helen Rodriguez-Trias," *American Journal Of Public Health* 92, no. 4 (April 2002): 566-569.

15 CESA Statement of Purpose, 1975. http://www.uic.edu/orgs/cwluherstory/CWLUArchive/cesapurpose.html

16 CESA Statement of Purpose.

17 CESA Statement of Purpose.

18 CESA Statement of Purpose.

19 CESA Statement of Purpose.

20 CESA Statement of Purpose.

21 "CWLU Herstory," about CWLU. http://www.cwluherstory.org/About-CWLU/ (accessed April 21, 2014).

22 *The Politics of Sterilization,* accessed 4/21/14. Leaflet written by the CWLU, 1971 http://www.cwluherstory.org/the-politics-of-sterilization.html.

23 *"Medical Crimes against Women",* accessed 2/4/14. Written by Jenny Knauss, Janet M., Kathy M., Lauren C. and Sharon M., 1976: http://www.cwluherstory.org/medical-crimes-against-women.html.

24 *Medical Crimes against Women.*

25 *Medical Crimes against Women.*

26 Jessica Enoch, "Survival Stories: Feminist Historiographic Approaches to Chicana Rhetorics of Sterilization Abuse," *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* no. 3 (2005): 5-24.

27 Enoch, *"Survival Stories."*

28   Enoch, *"Survival Stories."*
29   Enoch, *"Survival Stories."*
30   Rebecca M. Kluchin, *Fit to Be Tied: Sterilization and Reproductive Rights in America, 1950-1980*
     (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 2009), 187.
31   Kluchin, *Fit to Be Tied,* 188.
32   Kluchin, *Fit to Be Tied,* 188.
33   Kluchin, *Fit to Be Tied,* 188-189.
34   Kluchin, *Fit to Be Tied,* 192.
35   Kluchin, *Fit to Be Tied,* 194.
36   Kluchin, *Fit to Be Tied,* 195.
37   Kluchin, *Fit to Be Tied,* 199-200.
38   Kluchin, *Fit to Be Tied,* 201.
39   *California Medical Association v. Lackner,* 124 Cal. App. 3d 28 (1981).
40   Kluchin, *Fit to be Tied,* 204-205.
41   Kluchin, *Fit to be Tied,* 208.
42   Kluchin, *Fit to Be Tied,* 208-209.
43   Now, Human Rights Program at Justice. 2009. *"Prisons as a Tool of Reproductive Oppression,"*
     Stanford Journal Of Civil Rights & Civil Liberties 5, 309.
44   *"Prisons as a Tool of Reproductive Oppression,"*

Conquest, Colonialism and the Creation of the Irish Other

By Meghan Hawkins

In 1166, Diarmait Mac Murchada failed in his bid for the high kingship of Ireland and fled to England. There, Diarmait would swear fealty to King Henry II. Having officially created a feudal bond between his home of Leinster and the kingdom of England, Diarmait appealed for help to win back his kingdom.[1] Historian Donnchadh O'Corrain succinctly summarized what happened next: "The invitation inevitably became an invasion."[2] The Anglo-Normans who arrived in Ireland faced foreign customs and hostile natives. As an agent of the Anglo-Norman colonization, and an ardent supporter of Catholic Church reform, Gerald of Wales made several trips to Ireland in the late 12th century. Gerald's seminal works on Ireland, *The History and Topography of Ireland* and *The Conquest of Ireland* (hereafter, *Topography* and *Conquest*) paint the Irish as barbarians in an attempt to justify the Anglo-Norman conquest. Some 400 years later in 1633, Edmund Spenser would write his own tract on the Irish, *A View on the State of Ireland* (hereafter, *A View*). Highly inflammatory, Spenser's work is also a colonial text. Like Gerald of Wales, Spenser writes as an expert on the Irish, while he himself was part of the conquering group, now called the New English. Although Ireland had been long conquered, in the years between Gerald of Wales and Edmund Spenser the English had lost their cultural hold on the island and Gaelic culture was in a period of revival. The early modern era thus called for a re-colonization of Ireland by the English. Although the eras differ, the aims of both writers were similar: to justify the subjugation of the Irish politically and culturally.

The prolific writings of Gerald of Wales form the basis of much of what historians know about the medieval era in Ireland. While Gerald of Wales is referenced in a vast number of books on medieval Ireland, it is often in passing reference to his critical views of the Irish. Much like its geographic location, Ireland remained on the periphery of medieval studies in the early 20th century. Today, medieval scholarship is increasingly exploring areas outside of France and England. Historians rightfully interpret Gerald as an agent of colonization, yet recent scholarly studies have focused on Gerald's texts on Wales. Historians who do address Gerald's Irish works, tend to do so in a sweeping attempt to craft a narrative of events,[3] or with a very narrow focus on limited passages that apply to literary technique.[4] Historian Robert Bartlett recently updated his seminal monograph on Gerald's life and influences, arguing that Gerald's academic and religious training were key influences on his later writings. Conversely, the historiography and literary criticism of Spenser's works is voluminous enough to have earned the title of "Spenser

Studies." Within this extensive body of work, *A View* is generally seen as a guide to help de-code Spenser's more famous allegorical work *The Faerie Queene*. Analysis of *A View* as a stand-alone colonial text appears most frequently in the form of short journal articles that address a specific scene in the book.[5]

In the wake of Edward Said's transformative work *Orientalism*, post-colonial studies, and soon thereafter the critique of such studies, gained popularity. The Orientalist lens has been applied to colonial projects that encompass a broad swath of time and geographic space. Given the long and contentious history of British colonialism in Ireland, it is not surprising that Said's framework would be applied there. Said himself applied his lens to Spenser studies: "it is generally true that literary historians who study the great sixteenth-century poet Edmund Spenser . . . do not connect his bloodthirsty plans for Ireland, when he imagined a British army virtually exterminating the native inhabitants, with his poetic achievement or the history of British rule over Ireland, which continues today." [6] For Said, Spenser serves as yet another author in the Orientalist pantheon. And yet what of Spenser himself? To what extent do Spenser's works represent the framework of Orientalism? Even a cursory study of Spenser's *A View* draws the historian back to the work of Gerald of Wales. Is it possible then, to identify a British Orientalist discourse towards the Irish that extends back to the twelfth century?

While scholars and literary critics label both Gerald of Wales and Spenser agents of imperialism, there is very limited scholarship that directly compares the works of both authors. In this paper I address this gap in scholarship by comparing the form and purpose of Gerald of Wales's *The History and Topography of Ireland* with Edmund Spenser's *A View on the State of Ireland*. Both works purport to be a non-fiction description of the Irish from the point of view of a knowledgeable expert with the credentials necessary to establish the work's authenticity. Through my analysis of these two works, I will apply the framework of Orientalism as described by Said. I will argue that in terms of methodology, *Topography* and *A View* uphold many of the tenets of Orientalism. In doing so, I will identify a commonly established narrative in defense of the subjugation of the Irish and a similar framework in Gerald and Spenser's interpretations of the Irish "other." However, I contend that each author's background and motivations do not represent the foundation of an Orientalist school of thought regarding Ireland. When viewed through this lens alone, the framework of postcolonial Orientalism distorts the complexity and context of both *Topography* and *A View.*

Gerald of Wales and the Discourse of Colonial Conquest

To say the works of Gerald of Wales are polemical is obvious. His pernicious accounts of the Irish in the twelfth century quickly became "the authoritative historical source for the study of Ireland and the Irish people" for the next several centuries.[7] By the sixteenth century, disgust for Gerald's works spurred a new school of Irish authors who set about dismantling the representation of the barbaric Irish they attributed to Gerald.[8] Speaking for this counter-colonial school, Irish historian John Lynch wrote in 1662 that, "The excesses of a foreign soldiery in Ireland, the devastation of her provinces, the plunder and conflagration of her houses, and the massacre of her sons, must be all laid at Giraldus's [Gerald of Wales's] door." [9] Modern historians have adopted a similar postcolonial model to interpret the works of Gerald of Wales. Historian John Brannigan succinctly explains that "Giraldus anticipates (and, indeed, shapes) the structure of English colonialism in the Tudor and Renaissance periods in the creation of a myth of unworldly others who populate the outer margins of a small island's imagination." [10] However, not all historians agree with this analytical lens. Medievalist historians have objected to applying postcolonial theory to the scholarship of the Middle Ages, arguing that the era is much more complex than a simple "us versus them" narrative of racially inspired stereotypes.[11] Interpretations aside, later authors, such as Edmund Spenser, used Gerald's body of work to justify British imperialist claims over Ireland.[12] Did Gerald of Wales's *Topography* exercise a constitutive function for the British colonial reality in Ireland? In other words, does Gerald create a bipolar understanding of Anglo-Normans (later the British) vis-à-vis the Irish that reflects the mentality of Said's Orientalism? In terms of methodology, there are numerous parallels between *Topography* and the precepts of Orientalism.

Methodologically, there are clear similarities between the works of Orientalists and Gerald of Wales. An inherent power of Said's Orientalist is his ability to control the discourse of "the other." Knowledge, for Said, is power. Orientalists justified 20th century British imperialism through Britain's supremacy in knowledge, "and not principally with military or economic power." [13] Gerald of Wales framed his expertise on Ireland in such a manner. Although he traveled to Ireland as part of an invading force, Gerald repeatedly stresses that it is his first-hand testimony that legitimizes his work. Fantastical accounts are introduced with phrases like "I have seen many times and with my own eyes" [14] and "I have witnessed it for myself." [15] Conversely, Gerald is highly skeptical of conclusions about Ireland drawn from native sources, warning the reader: "Neither would it be strange if these authors sometimes strayed from the path of truth, since they knew nothing by the evidence of their eyes, and what knowledge they possessed came to them through one who was reporting and was far away. For it is only when he who reports a thing is also one that witnessed it that anything is

established on the sound basis of truth." [16] This slight aside by Gerald serves a two-fold purpose. First, it authenticates his own conclusions; he is asserting truths based upon evidence he claims to have directly observed. Secondly, he quite casually discredits the conclusions of Irish bards and clerics who simply repeat stories about the history of their native land. Gerald's knowledge, what Said would label the discourse of the Orientalist, determines what is truth.

Another important feature of Orientalism is that "knowledge of the Orient, because generated out of strength, in a sense *creates* the Orient, the Oriental and his world." [17] As Said explains, knowledge "means surveying a civilization from its origins to its prime to its decline –and of course, it means *being able to do that.*" [18] Dividing *Topography* into three parts, Gerald documents the natural and geographic origins of Ireland in Part I, all as part of a larger justification of conquest. In Part III, Gerald records the history of the people of Ireland, from the first inhabitants to the present.[19] What follows is a saga that includes a biblical flood, a race of giants, pestilence, corruption, and waves of invasions.[20] Through these tales, Gerald establishes a historic link between the Irish and the ancient Persian race of Scythians, which Edmund Spenser would later build upon. Gerald's historic genealogy ends, not coincidentally, with the story of the Basclenses, a people who ask the king of the Britons for land to inhabit. As Gerald explains, "Eventually the king, on the advice of his counselors, gave them that island that is now called Ireland, and which was then either entirely uninhabited or had been settled by" the Basclenses. Although this story and its actors are admittedly culled from "British history," Gerald determines that, "From this it is clear that Ireland can with some right be claimed by the Kings of Britain, even though the claim be from olden times." [22] In this instance, Gerald's knowledge of history is used to explicitly reinforce political supremacy. For Said, this is the logical extension of knowledge by the dominant power. The purpose of crafting knowledge of a perceived lesser civilization "is to dominate it, to have authority over it. And authority here means for 'us' to deny autonomy to 'it' – the Oriental country – since we know it and it exists, in a sense, as we know it." [23]

Gerald also provides modern justification for British control over Ireland, asserting, "The kings of Britain have also a newly established double claim. On the one hand the spontaneous surrender and protestation of fealty of the Irish chiefs – for everyone is allowed to renounce his right; and on the other, the favour of the confirmation of the claim by the Pope." [24] Here, the Irish are presented as a unified, unitary state that acted collectively in subjugating themselves to the British monarchy. [25] Legitimacy for the conquest is also provided by the Catholic Church. Seemingly innocuous, as the Church was well established in Ireland at the time, Gerald's later critique of the Irish Church makes this justification yet another outside force acting on behalf of the Irish.

Said contends that the Oriental is rendered voiceless and stripped of his agency by the Orientalist.[26] This brief episode recounted above of Irish self-subjugation reinforces the power inherent in crafting discourse. Irish action and intention are delineated by Gerald, who speaks for the Irish. In fact, at no point in *Topography* do we hear directly from an Irish native. The reader hears *of them* and *about them*, but never *from them*. While at times sympathetic to the plight of those he writes about, and genuinely complimentary towards Irish musicians, the Irish are collectively stripped of any voice.[27] Said's postcolonial interpretation of events claims that knowledge of the other, "places things Oriental in class, court, prison, or manual for scrutiny, study, judgment, discipline, or governing." [28] Gerald of Wales clearly takes this approach in *Topography*, although I will argue later that his reasons for doing so do not align with the theory of Orientalism. *Topography* is full of detailed descriptions of the natural world, followed by Gerald's unique interpretations.[29] For example, in typical fashion, Gerald explains that a fish found with three gold teeth in an Irish lake "seemed to prefigure the imminent conquest of the country." [30] It is not the Irish people, but Gerald's interpretation of the natural world, through entirely unnatural events, that determine the course of Ireland's history.

Most obviously, Gerald's depiction of the Irish as a barbaric, uncivilized "other" coincides with the manner in which Orientalists described "Orientals" as noted by Said. Gerald's denunciation and vilification of the Irish is commonly cited. Gerald minces no words: "[The Irish are] a filthy people, wallowing in vice." [31] Quick to point out that the natural state of the Irish is noble, Gerald's descriptions of Irish customs flow with invective: "But although they are fully endowed with natural gifts, their external characteristics of beard and dress, and internal cultivation of the mind are so barbarous that they cannot be said to have any culture." [32] The Irish lack all the trappings of civilization. They are too lazy to trade, [33] "neither strong in war, nor reliable in peace," [34] have no use for castles, [35] and their kings have no achievements worthy of Gerald's pen. [36] It is through this contrast to the uncivilized Irish that the Norman conquerors, represented by Gerald, achieve superiority. Such comparisons are a fundamental feature of Orientalism, which Said calls, "*positional* superiority, which puts the Westerner in a whole series of possible relationships with the Orient without ever losing him the relative upper hand." [37] The Anglo-Normans believed themselves to be "the champions of modernity" according to historian Peter Sposato. What matters is not whether the Anglo-Normans (or Gerald) were more civilized than the Irish, but that they believed themselves to be so. [38] Sposato states, "The conquerors saw themselves as the vanguard of a political and cultural mainstream which flowed from the continent to the cosmopolitan court of Henry II." [39] Sposato's research is based on a later work by Gerald of Wales, entitled *The Conquest of Ireland.* In the context of this work, the Anglo-Norman attitude of superiority is a logical extension of a victorious people documenting their conquest.

This same self-perception is echoed in Gerald's self-described historical works. Gerald's definitions of the civilized Anglo-Normans vis-à-vis the barbaric Irish is indicative of the elements of Orientalism.

The issue of civilization extended beyond degrees of economic and political development. Not only were the Irish uncivilized, but they perpetuated an antiquated agrarian system that was extinct in Europe. For Gerald, "They are a wild and inhospitable people. They live on beasts only, and live like beasts. They have not progressed at all from the primitive habits of pastoral living." [40] The pastoralism practiced by Europe's periphery, became a "cultural yardstick" that represented the cultural dichotomy between England and Ireland according to historian Robert Bartlett.[41] It is easy to draw parallels between Gerald's medieval critique and the Orientalist's critique of Arabs. As Said explains, "Orientals or Arabs are thereafter shown to be gullible, 'devoid of energy and initiative,' much given to 'fulsome flattery,' intrigue, cunning and unkindness to animals; Orientals cannot walk on either a road or a pavement…; Orientals are inveterate liars, they are 'lethargic and suspicious,' and in everything oppose the clarity, directness, and nobility of the Anglo-Saxon race." [42] The cultural deficiencies highlighted by Said and Gerald directly limit the achievements and growth of the perceived lesser culture. Gerald's vitriolic commentary polarizes the distinction between the Irish and their conquerors, another facet of Orientalism.[43] Lest the reader be left with any uncertainty, Gerald is explicitly clear: "This people is, then, a barbarous people, literally barbarous…All their habits are the habits of barbarians…Their natural qualities are excellent. But almost everything acquired is deplorable." [44]

Gerald of Wales's *Topography* is an unambiguous engagement with the Irish "other." The fact that both sides of the dialogue are produced by Gerald of Wales supports Said's Orientalist thesis. In part because of his complete command of the discourse, Gerald of Wales can be seen as an agent of the colonizing Anglo-Normans. By characterizing the Irish as barbaric, stripping them of their voice and agency, and claiming a monopoly on knowledge, Gerald embodies many of the traits of Orientalism as described by Said, only in an Anglo-Norman/Irish context. As there are very limited written Irish works from the era, it is likely that Gerald's works dominate the surviving discourse.

Gerald of Wales: Limitations of the Orientalist Framework

Given these similarities, it is easy to conclude that Orientalism is applicable to the works of Gerald of Wales. However, such a conclusion is misguided as it disregards the context of twelfth century Ireland. While his methodology may reflect the work of an Orientalist, Gerald's perspective is far more opaque given the complicated context in which he wrote. The boundaries he describes and identities he

attempts to categorize can only be understood through the historic context in which Gerald wrote. Furthermore, Gerald's motivations reflect the many dimensions of his own identity. Gerald was born into a family of mixed Cambro-Norman heritage, in a region in Wales where Norman customs were both assimilated and actively opposed.[45] Desperate to gain favor with the King, Gerald's Welsh ancestry would prevent his inclusion in the inner circle of power. Trained in a cathedral school in Paris, Gerald was an ardent advocate of continental church reform, but would never attain the position as Archbishop of St. David's cathedral that he sought for much of his career. While the Orientalist model is generally indifferent to the background of the author, it is impossible to understand Gerald's works without taking into account his multifaceted identity.

The twelfth century conception of borders does not align with the Orientalist model. For Said, borders are artificial constructs. Created by those in power, borders delineate and allot a geographic space to the lesser culture. Said details the symbolic nature of boundaries, "A group of people living on a few acres of land will set up boundaries between their land and its immediate surroundings and the territory beyond, which they call 'the land of the barbarians.' In other words, this universal practice of designating in one's mind a familiar space with is 'ours' and an unfamiliar space beyond 'ours' which is 'theirs' is a way of making geographical distinctions that can be entirely arbitrary. I use the word 'arbitrary' here because imaginative geography of the 'our land—barbarian land' variety does not require that the barbarians acknowledge the distinction." [46] While such notions of borders may adequately describe the creation of boundaries by imperial powers, they do not reflect the reality of the expanding Anglo-Norman world in the twelfth century. For Gerald, borders were a real part of life. Ireland was not defined by an artificial border; it was literally a distinctive island separated not just by customs but by a real geographic barrier. Within territories that were considered conquered, cultural boundaries remained both fluid and ambiguous in the Middle Ages. In focusing narrowly on discourse, Said fails to connect literary works and their authors to their complicated historical realities. At the time of Gerald's visits, Ireland remained culturally and geographically distinct. Conversely, Wales, although conquered by the Normans politically, was never fully culturally vanquished. Gerald himself was a product of such a checkerboard ethnic and cultural zone called the Welsh March.

Said argues that a major element of Orientalism is the "impulse to classify nature and man into type." [47] Behind these classifications, lies power, as Said explains, "we readily observe the way cultural generalization has begun to acquire the armor of scientific statement and the ambience of corrective study." [48] One must omit the context of the twelfth century in order to force *Topography* into this piece of the Orientalist framework. Traditionally, the Middle Ages was understood as a period of fragmentation between clearly distinguishable groups. Today, even

postcolonial historians such as Jeffrey Jerome Cohen admit to the paradox of identity during the era. Cohen argues that medial spaces abounded in the Middle Ages. Hybrid geographies, cultures, languages, and identities were "difficult to articulate, and difficult to inhabit." [49] Gerald inhabited a world devoid of surnames, where race was yet to be socially constructed, and the concept of national identity did not exist, for there was as yet no state.[50] Notions of identity were further complicated by the lack of vocabulary available to Gerald to describe the ethnic and cultural assimilation he was a part of. Cohen explains that "composite names have no counterpart in medieval terminology…however handy such shorthand might be for us, medieval people did not conceptualize group identities in terms that allows transitional, hybrid, or hyphenated phases." [51] Terms Gerald may have found useful such as Cambro-Norman, Anglo-Norman and Anglo-Saxon were not established by historians until the twentieth century.[52] Cohen's analysis concludes that lacking the needed vocabulary, Gerald and his contemporaries built on a tradition of attaching allegorical meanings to the natural world and using bestiaries as analogies for human interaction.[53] When describing the conquest of Ireland, both Gaelic writers and the conquerors themselves make few distinctions. As historian John Gillingham explains, the term "Norman" emerged in the eighteenth century as part of a larger movement by Irish authors who attempted to re-write the British narrative of their own history.[54] For Gerald of Wales and his contemporaries, Gillingham argues, "the question of the identity of the twelfth-century invaders was both less controversial and very much duller." [55] Quite simply, conquerors were referred to as either "English" or directly by name.[56] Such context suggests that rather than the intentional establishment of Orientalism, Gerald's descriptions may reflect the constraints of language and the literary models available to him.

Significantly, as mentioned above, there was no modern state for Gerald to represent. Historian John Brannigan interprets Gerald in the context of Orientalism, building his case upon the fact that Gerald is an agent of the Norman state. Brannigan writes, "When Cambrensis wrote his *Topographia Hibernica* in 1185, he did so not as an isolated cleric and intellectual but with the authority of the Norman state behind him." [57] The historical context, however, fails to corroborate such a claim. Significantly, the conquest of Ireland in the twelfth century was not undertaken by the monarchy. As Robert Bartlett explains, "The conquest and exploitation of Wales and Ireland by the Anglo Normans was not, initially a royal project. The first incursions into both countries were organized as private aristocratic enterprises, and it was not until the thirteenth century that an English king seriously undertook a policy of conquest." [58] King Henry II would actually impose an edict against subsequent settlers moving to Ireland.[59] If not an agent of the state, what then is Gerald's relationship with the Norman king? Gerald's dedication to *Topography* provides an obvious answer – Gerald is desperately trying to win the king's favor. [60]

Unlike the Orientalist, Gerald does not write from a position of power. As noted above, Gerald describes the invading force, of which he was a part, as superior to the native Irish. In this sense, Gerald writes from a position of power over the Irish. Within his own society, however, Gerald was a political and cultural outsider to the Norman court. Who was Gerald, asks Robert Bartlett as the title of his opening chapter, "'Gerald of Wales' or 'Gerald the Welshman'?" [61] The answer to this seemingly simple question divides medieval scholars. For some, notably Welsh historians, Gerald self-identified with his Welsh roots and was so defined by his contemporaries. [62] For other historians, Gerald is definitely defined by his Norman connections. His geographic and cultural origins mean far less than his continental education and Norman sympathies. Even twentieth century scholars acknowledged the complexity of Gerald's identify. Historian F.M. Powick writes of Gerald, "Here… is a man of Welsh extraction, but not of Welsh race, who does not know Welsh, and is at the same time supposed to be infected by Welsh national sympathies." [63] Gerald understood that he was not a part of the ruling class. In expanding on the work of Cohen on hybridity, historian Asa Simon Mittman uses Gerald's own words on leaving the Angevin court: "'Whatever esteem my gravity of manner, literary ability and hard work could bring me was taken away by that suspect, dangerous, hateful name –Wales.' Conversely, when in Wales, he met with anti-Norman prejudices: 'Both peoples regard me as a stranger and one not their own… one nation suspects me, the other hates me.'" [64] What all these interpretations of Gerald have in common is that he was on the outside of existing Norman culture.

A close reading of the text of *Topography* proves that the work is as much a treatise on church reform as it is a justification for colonization. While the work unquestionably paints the Irish as barbaric, I contend that Gerald's main critique is of the Irish church. Gerald's critique of the Irish church is notably absent from most of the historiography. While historians highlight Gerald's disparaging depiction of the Irish, they fail to address Gerald's distinction between the natural and present condition of the Irish. At the time Gerald was writing, the continental church had undergone a series of reforms codified in the Lateran Councils, which were not implemented in Ireland.[65] Historian Seán Duffy summarizes Pope Alexander's main grievances with the Irish: lax marriage practices, failure to observe Lenten rituals, failure to pay tithes and disrespect for church officials and property.[66] These deficiencies are addressed throughout Gerald's work, emphasizing the need for reform. The hybrid nature of ethnicity and identity also manifested itself in religious practices in Ireland. In his research on Gaelic-Irish religion, historian Barry O'Dwyer explains, "Gaelic-Irish religion did represent an amalgamation of Latin Christianity and the very old Gaelic culture; conversion had resulted not in the extermination

of the pre-Christian rites and customs but in the acceptance of many of them along with the new religion." [67] Gerald was well aware of this reality. In contrast to the Orientalist, Gerald directly addressed this internal diversity.

Unlike the Orientalist, Gerald does not view the Irish as a static, homogenous people. Instead, Gerald makes clear distinctions between the Irish clergy and the lay population. The natural state of the Irish is not to blame; it is the failure of the Irish clergy to properly instruct them. Towards the end of his work Gerald tells the story of two lost sailors who found themselves on the shore of a small island whose inhabitants "had as yet heard nothing of Christ and knew nothing about him." [69] While Gerald's mythical creatures and absurd portents are bizarre to the modern reader, historian Asa Simon Mittman traces the use of such marvels in medieval literature. So prevalent were such stories, that Mittman concludes that the fact that those on the island knew nothing of Christ "may have struck many [contemporary] readers and listeners as more horrifying than the monsters and marvels." The responsibility for such ignorance, according to Gerald, rested solely on the Irish clergy. While they have many positive traits, the clergy have failed in their pastoral mission. Gerald openly criticizes the clergy, declaring "that they are too slack and negligent in the correction of a people that is guilty of such enormities," [70] and that "They care for and are mindful of themselves only, but they omit or put off with great negligence the care of the flock committed to them." [71] Gerald censures generations of Irish clergy saying," If the prelates from the time of Patrick through all those years had done a man's job, as they should have done, in preaching and instructing, chastising and correcting, they would have extirpated at any rate to a certain extent those abominations of the people already mentioned, and would have impressed upon them some semblance of honour and religious felling." [72] Gerald's depictions of the Irish thus serve a dual purpose. While justifying the invasion, they are an open endorsement for church reform in Ireland. Gerald also distinguishes between faith and practice. In the case of the former, Gerald commends the Irish. The faith "has almost continuously thrived," Gerald observes, "it is, nevertheless, remarkable that this people even still remains so uninstructed in its rudiments." [73] Later, Gerald again points out that, "all this time the Faith has grown up" throughout the country among many who "are not baptized, and who, because of the negligence of the pastors, have not yet heard the teaching of the Faith." [74] This continuous distinction allows the continental church to retain its reputation and power. Unlike the Orientalist, Gerald's work is a blatant and insistent demand for specific religious reforms. While it is possible to interpret these demands as a type of religious imperialism, continental church reforms had been initiated by the Irish church prior to the arrival of Gerald.[75]

Edmund Spenser and the Discourse of Colonial Conquest

Though over 400 years had passed since Gerald wrote *Topography*, Edmund Spenser's Ireland shared many of the same challenges for the English. Despite the implementation of various strategies of compulsion and persuasion, the English never fully conquered all of Ireland.[76] Norman, and later English law, applied only to the Norman settlers and Gaelic cultural redoubts existed throughout the fragmented island. The Middle Ages was a period of costly attempts at colonization and plantation in Ireland. While historians debate the causes of failed colonization, by the time of Spenser the English conquerors were in retreat, Gaelic culture was in revival, and Protestantism had failed to take hold. Since the time of Gerald, three distinct groups had emerged in Ireland. Outside the areas of English control, traditional Gaelic Irish culture coexisted with the Old English, descendants of the original Norman conquerors who had assimilated with Gaelic culture. The English crown controlled a small region known as the Pale, where the New English remained politically and culturally loyal to England. Part of the latter group, Spenser worked for the monarchy first in the Pale, and then in Munster as part of the Crown's colonial project to subdue the region.[77] The complexity of Spenser's position is clearly contextualized by historian Kenneth Gross: "An English Protestant writing in war-ravaged Catholic Ireland, Spenser became the unofficial, un-patronized, and often disapproved of prophet of Elizabeth's *imperium* while helping to administer one of her government's most unstable and often ill-conceived colonial polities." [78]

Interpretations of Spenser's works span a wide range of genres. As mentioned above, Spenser's accomplishments as an English poet are the focus of historic and literary works that see *A View* primarily as an aberration to be mentioned in passing. Among historians, Spenser's critique of the Irish and his cruel recommendations for their annihilation are viewed primarily as a colonial tract. Even the works of historians like Joan Fitzpatrick, Kenneth Gross and Clare Carrol read as literary analysis more than historic pieces. Nevertheless, the aforementioned authors concur that Spenser's discourse in *A View* is that of a conqueror, who is at times desperate to justify immediate and brutal suppression of a lesser people. Spenser biographer Andrew Hadfield agrees with this conclusion, yet Hadfield maintains that Spenser's critique of the Irish was a rational response to his personal experiences in Ireland, rather than a product of an existing Orientalist dialogue.[79] Hadfield repeatedly returns to Spenser's time under the employ of Lord Grey, who used brutal tactics to suppress the Irish in Munster.[80] According to Hadfield, these were formative experiences for Spenser, and directly shaped his conception of the Irish.

Like Gerald, Spenser's *A View* is nothing if not provocative. *A View* is an unabashed attempt to convince the English in England to pay for reform in Ireland. Spenser needed to be convincing, as his plan for reform called for the destruction of

Gaelic society by breaking the power of the Gaelic elites, exterminating both Irish military players and bards, destroying homes, burning fields, and starving portions of Irish society into submission.[81] To what extent does the framework of Orientalism apply to *A View*? Can Spenser's work be seen as a direct legacy of Gerald's critique of the Irish? In order to answer these questions, I will begin by applying the elements of Orientalism directly to the text of *A View*.[82] By using the same elements of Orientalism applied to *Topography* above, I will create a parallel analysis of the two works. Like *Topography, A View* embodies many aspects of postcolonial discourse, which should come as no surprise given the book's intended objective. A closer examination of the context of *A View* will prove that Spenser's approach diverges from Orientalism.

The structure of *A View* allows Spenser to fully control the discourse of "the other." *A View* is a dialogue between Irenius (whose name is from the Greek for "peaceable" and also a play on "Ireland") and Eudoxus (meaning "well-taught").[83] Although he is not Irish, Irenius comes from Ireland and is familiar with the situation there. Like Gerald's testimony, the reader is supposed to trust the conclusions of Irenius, for they are based on scholarly learning and on his first-hand knowledge in Ireland.[84] Eudoxus, who represents the English in England, is the one who must be convinced of Irenius's plan for reform. Through this dialogue, Spenser manages to represent two sides of a dialogue about Ireland, without allowing the Irish to ever speak for themselves. While Irenius speaks as an expert on the Irish, he distances himself from them. By always using the third person, the Irish become a distant "they" to whom the reader never has to relate.

In the manner of both Gerald and Orientalism, Spenser creates a history of Ireland for the Irish. Through Irenius, Spenser documents a series of invasions in order to deny the Irish any natural or historical claim to the land. Like Gerald, Spenser establishes both a historic and a modern claim for English control over Ireland. It is irrelevant that the Irish refuse to acknowledge their submission to England, for it is a fact that they officially recognized King Henry VIII as monarch of Ireland in 1541, when Irenius explains, "all the Irish Lords and principall men came in, and being by faire meanes wrought thereunto, acknowledged King Henry for their Soveraigne Lord." [85] Furthermore, Spenser argues that in this acknowledgment, "nothing was given to King Henry which he had not before from his auncestors, but onely the bare name of a King; for all other absolute power of principality he had in himselfe before derived from many former Kings…" through their conquests of Ireland.[86] The history of brutal invasions of Ireland further legitimizes Spenser's own plan. Here, Spenser strategically places the example of the Scot Edward le Bruce, who invaded and attempted to destroy the Pale. When the English counterattacked, the Scots retreated, ravaging everything in their wake. This example not only provides a historical basis for brutal repression, but it is followed by a passage on the present natural beauty of Ireland.[87] This juxtaposition suggests that purging Ireland has a restorative effect.

Irenius goes on to tell only a few of the countless times that Ireland "hath thus wretchedly beene wracked." [88] Notably missing from this narrative are Irish victories against invaders.[89] Through these techniques, Spenser strips the Irish of their own voice, while creating a historical precedent of both invasion and brutality against the Irish, which he claims they deserve.

In the spirit of Orientalism, Spenser's work seeks to justify the conquest of Ireland. Spenser juxtaposes historical examples of English civilization with the current state of the Irish to show the benefits of his program. For Said, this is a critical feature of Orientalism: "Such strength and such weakness are as intrinsic to Orientalism as they are to any view that divides the world into large general divisions, entities that coexist in a state of tension produced by what is believed to be radical difference." [90] For example, Spenser compares the English acceptance of Common Law with the failure of the Irish to do so.[91] There are two key differences in the English and Irish acquisition of Common Law. First, Common Law was implemented across all of England, whereas "there be many wide countries in Ireland, which lawes of England were never established in, nor any acknowledgment of subjection made…" [92] Second, and most importantly, when the Normans successfully imposed their legal system on England, William the Conqueror was "present in person to overlooke the Magistrates, and to overawe these subjects with the terrour of his sword, and countenance of his Majesty." [93] In Ireland, however, English attempts to impose Common Law failed precisely because they were not accompanied by the necessary force. In the time of Spenser, erratic governance and inconsistent policies served to destabilize Ireland and granted the Gaelic Irish more power than they deserved. Under these conditions Irenius informs Eudoxus,"it is all in vaine that they now strive and endeavour by fair meanes and peaceable plots to redresse the same, without first removing all those inconveniences, and new framing (as it were) in the forge, all that is worne out of fashion: For all other meanes will be but as lost labour, by patching up one hole to make many; for the Irish doe strongly hate and abhorre all reformation and subjection to the English, by reason that having beene once subdued by them, they were thrust out of all their possessions…. Therefore the reformation must now bee the strength of a greater power." [94] Spenser goes on to document the success of scorched earth tactics in Munster in an earlier war to provide legitimacy for his own ruthless designs.[95] Contemporary rebellions and treasonous behavior by Irish lords further justifies conquest. As Irenius pronounces, "to subdue or expel an usurper, should bee no unjust enterprise or wrongfull warre, but a restitution of auncient right unto the crowne of England, from whence they were most unjustly expelled and long kept out." [96] As Irish lords abused their power under past colonial schemes, the only way to successfully rid the country of the threat of the Gaelic Irish are the drastic measures called for by Spenser.

Like Gerald of Wales, Spenser styles the Irish as a regressive civilization. After establishing the legal background for his program, Spenser creates an ethical justification for his colonial scheme by portraying Gaelic culture as barbarous. Spenser begins his critique on Irish customs by linking the Irish to the ancient mythical race of the Scythians, in the same fashion as Gerald of Wales.[97] In doing so, Spenser creates a mythical history in which the Irish are explicitly related to Europe's barbarian race, setting the tone for the rest of the work. Taking after their Scythian ancestry, as established by Spenser, the Irish spend most of their time pasturing in the hills, or boolying. By this practice, according to Irenius, "the people that live thus in those boolies, grow thereby the more barbarous, and live more licentiously than they could in townes,…For there they thinke themselves halfe exempted from law and obedience, and having once tasted freedome, doe like a steere, that hath beene long out of his yoke, grudge and repyne ever after, to come under rule again." [98] Historian Kenneth Gross's work dissects Spenser's descriptions of the Irish through an analysis of literary techniques. Gross maintains that Spenser is particularly disturbed by "the kind of corrupting poetry or literalizing metamorphosis, a metonymic infection of herders by the herded…" [99] which reflects the desire of the Orientalist to dehumanize the uncivilized "other." The very dress of the Gaelic Irish is another custom inherited from the Scythians. As maintained by Irenius, the mantles which the Gaelic Irish wear are "a fit house for an out-law, a meet bed for a rebel, and an apt cloke for a theife." [100] The Gaelic Irish tradition of wearing their hair over their face is another example of their savage nature. Both their mantles and glibbes promote vice in all forms. As Gross contends, glibs "are in the end the very embodiment of a furtive, energetic evil that continues to resist the reforming work of English governors…" [101] Much as the Scythian lifestyle has survived in everyday practices, Scythian military practices are also kept alive by the Gaelic Irish. Spenser uses these customs to argue that the inherent flaw of the Gaelic Irish is that they are in fact barbarians by nature.

Since the problems of Gaelic society reside in their customs, Spenser contends that laws are not the answer. Irenius clearly summarizes this concept when he tells Eudoxus: "…for when a people be inclined to any vice, or have no touch of conscience, nor sense of their evill doings; it is bootelesse to thinke to restraine them by any penalties or feare of punishment, but either the occasion is to be taken away, or a more understanding of the right, and shame of the fault to be imprinted." [102] By portraying the Gaelic Irish as a thoroughly uncivilized people, Spenser creates a sense of legitimacy for his proposal on two levels. First, the Irish are so barbaric, traditional reform methods would prove ineffective. Also, he gives the English a moral authority to destroy such a barbarous way of life and replace it with their own civilized culture.

While it is unclear if Spenser read Gerald's works, his criticism of the Irish follows a similar narrative.[103] Both writers use literary structure to craft a discourse that places the Irish in an inferior position. Following the framework of Orientalism, Spenser denies the Irish a voice in their own history. To justify the right of conquest, Spenser provides historic and modern claims of political subjugation. However fictitious these claims may be, Spenser and Gerald both go to great lengths to establish a double claim for colonization. Writing from the perspective of an expert, Spenser crafts a narrative wherein the Irish are presented as having barbaric customs and practices. Notably, both Gerald and Spenser focus their critique on Irish links to the mythical Scythians, agricultural practices, dress, and lawlessness.

Postcolonial Shortcomings: Spenser in Context

As Andrew Hadfield explains in his introduction to *A View*, Gerald of Wales's works on the Irish "were generally copied by all subsequent English observers until they were supplanted by *A View* in the seventeenth century." [104] More so than Gerald of Wales, Spenser embodies many of the tenets of Orientalism. Furthermore, the brutality of Spenser's policy proposals makes it easy to dismiss A *View* as merely the wrathful ranting of an aspiring poet. Yet, viewing Spenser solely through a postcolonial lens obscures both the complexity of the era and the purpose of *A View.* I argue that a closer look at contemporary Ireland and the thorough use of logic in *A View* align with M.L. Donnelly's thesis that Spenser is a realist humanist as opposed to an Orientalist. Literary analysis consistently labels Spenser a humanist poet, yet Donnelly is unique in applying this label to *A View*. As Donnelly explains, *A View* "is a chillingly modern design in what it proposes, but the cool assurance of righteousness of purpose that justifies it can be traced directly to the exaltation of an absolute moral hierarchy of rational and useful values that drove humanist idealism." [105] Donnelly's work makes the case for a realist humanist interpretation of *A View* without directly engaging with the Orientalist model. I contend that this paper's dissection of the flaws of the Orientalist model when applied to *A View*, supplements Donnelly's alternative understanding of Spenser.

Said argues that the boundaries between Occident and Orient were artificially constructed and clearly defined. And yet, the process of assimilation made the issue of boundaries a real part of Spenser's world. Like Gerald, Spenser is a product of multiple borderlands. Not only did he believe that the English were failing to maintain territorial control in Ireland, Spenser feared the loss of cultural superiority as well. In his time in Ireland, Spenser lived at the literal intersection of New English and Gaelic culture, in a region where assimilation (which Spenser would call degeneration) could not be stopped. Spenser's main critique is not of the Irish generally, but on the cultural assimilation which was destroying English customs.

Spenser's shocking policy prescription for the Irish hides subtler distinctions that do not align with the "us versus them" framework of Orientalism. Much like Gerald distinguished between the Irish and the Irish clergy, Spenser differentiates between types of Irish. Interestingly, Spenser's vitriol is directed squarely at the Old English, who were the descendants of Gerald of Wales's Anglo-Norman conquerors, rather than the native Irish. New English contemporaries "often accused by the New English of 'going native', of being seduced and contaminated by Native Irish culture," argues historian Joan Fitzpatrick in her study of cultural assimilation in the sixteenth century.[106] To Spenser, the threat was not the Irish themselves, but the degeneration of the English, which makes his plan of drastic repression the only possible solution. Again, unlike the Orientalist, Spenser's analysis of cultural differences is blunt and uncompromising, as evidenced in the following exchange, "Eudoxus : …are not they that were once English, English still? Irenius: No for some of them are degenerated and growne almost mere Irish, yea, and more malitious to the English then the Irish themselves." [107] The seriousness of English degeneration is such a threat that Irenius repeatedly returns to the subject, later stating, "…for the cheifest abuses which are now in that realme, are growne from the English, and some of them are now much more lawless and licentious then the very wilde Irish: so that as much care as was by them had to reforme the Irish, so and much more must now bee used to reforme them; so much time doth alter the manners of men." [108] The Old English acceptance of Gaelic customs, laws and language is a very visible sign that English ways of life were not necessarily preferable, and certainly not superior. Assimilation therefore posed one of the greatest dangers for English colonial plans. Language is indicative of the cultural assimilation of the Gaelic Irish and the Old English. According to Irenius, speaking Gaelic is particularly dangerous for "the speech being Irish, the heart must needes be Irish: for out of the abundance of the heart, the tongue speaketh." Considering the aforementioned New English view of Gaelic culture, Spenser deems it crucial to stop these practices that directly contribute to the degeneration of the English. Interestingly, in tracing the use of Gaelic words in *A View*, Fitzpatrick's research concludes that Spenser himself must have become quite familiar with the language.[110]

Spenser's work is a political tract whose political designs are explicit. Unlike the Orientalist, Spenser does not disguise his assessment of the native culture under the guise of literature. The aforementioned critique of Irish cultural customs serves as an introduction to Spenser's open attack of Irish political customs. Resembling Gerald's documentation of the failure of the Irish clergy in a bid for church reform, Spenser documents Irish legal traditions which did not subscribe to English norms. For example, Spenser condemns the Irish system of Brehon law, that as portrayed by Spenser is in direct contrast to Common Law, and by extension civility. Unlike Common Law, Brehon Law is an oral tradition, and as such is biased and easily

manipulated by the judges.[111] Irenius goes to great lengths to assert that English law is not in and of itself the problem. The problem is rather that the Irish are too uncivilized to take to English law. As Irenius tells Eudoxus, "So the lawes were at first intended for the reformation of abuses, and peaceable continuance of the subject; but are sithence either disannulled, or quite prevaricated thorough change and alteration of times, yet are they good still in themselves; but, in that commonwealth which is ruled by them, they worke not that good which they should, and sometimes also that evill which they would not." [112] As attempts to impose English law on the Irish have actually brought about injustice, the Irish are clearly not suitable for the good English laws. They are incapable of jury duty for they always favor themselves against the English and have no qualms of perjuring themselves.[113] Irenius goes on to warn the reader about the evils of tanistry, the Irish system of inheritance, which directly prevented the implementation of primogeniture.[114] With the Irish leading such a hostile lifestyle, Irenius warns, "…it is vaine to speake of planting lawes, and plotting pollicie, till they be altogether subdued." [115] Spenser calls these practices into question, according to Gross because "there is no question of accommodating colonial rule to the separate legal traditions that have grown up in Ireland." [116] While Spenser's conclusions and evidence may be unconvincing to the modern reader, they represent the thorough use of humanist logic.

Given the nature of his audacious response to Irish political customs, it is easy to conclude that Spenser is an agent of the colonial state. What postcolonial discourse fails to mention is that Spenser's work was censored by the Crown. Before publication, works at the time had to be entered into the Stationer's Register and then approved by the government. *A View* was submitted in 1598, but was immediately censored and not published until 1633.[117] In his biography of Spenser, Hadfield maintains that such censorship was part of a general policy towards works on Ireland, but also due to the severity of Spenser's policy prescription.[118] In Hadfield's introduction to his translation of *A View* he explains various suppositions regarding the work's censorship: "Some have suggested that this [censorship] was because *A View* was simply too offensive in its anti-Irish prejudice and recommendation of draconian measures for the reform of Ireland; others, because it exposed government policy in Ireland." [119] Regardless of which explanation is true, the censorship in and of itself is conclusive evidence that *A View* was not a state supported work. Like Gerald, Spenser's work was not employed to support a contemporary imperial project.

Spenser goes to great lengths justifying his solution of drastic repression in *A View.* Spenser's work is essentially a desperate warning calling for even more desperate measures. While the work reflects many of the tenets of Orientalism, it is more than simply a postcolonial assault on the Irish. Following the logic of Donnelly, *A View* is "like so many humanist texts, an intervention in an actual policy debate, a practical application of the wisdom of history and experience, informed by classical

precedents, to deliberations concerning affairs of state." [120] By portraying the Gaelic Irish as the barbaric people responsible for the degeneration of the Old English and by providing the historical validation for repression, Spenser makes the case for his own solution. As his work was written for government officials and policy makers, it was essential that Spenser create both the legal and ethical basis for his costly plan to overcome Gaelic culture. In the years between the writing of *A View* and its publication, full scale war would break out between the Irish and the English. Thus, by the time of its publication, both the context and prescriptions were outdated and served no purpose for imperial policy makers.[121]

1   Seán Duffy, *Ireland in the Middle Ages* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1997), 59-61.
2   Roy Foster, *The Oxford Illustrated History of Ireland* (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 1989), 52.
3   For example, Duffy, *Ireland in the Middle Ages*.
4   For example, James Cain, "Unnatural History: Gender and Genealogy in Gerald of Wales's *Topographia Hibernica*," *Essays In Medieval Studies* no. 19 (2002): 29-43; Shirin A. Khanmohamadi, *In Light of Another's Word* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2014); Monika Otter, *Inventiones: Fiction and Referentiality in Twelfth-Century English Historical Writing* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1996); and P. W. Sposato, "The Perception of Anglo-Norman Modernity and the Conquest of Ireland," *Comitatus- A Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 40, (2009), 25-44.
5   For example, Bruce Avery, "Mapping the Irish Other: Spenser's *A View of the Present State of Ireland*," *English Literary History* 57, no.2 (Summer, 1990), 263-279; and M.L. Donnelly, "Humanist Imperialism of Moral and Cultural Superiority in Spenser's *A View of the Present State of Ireland*," *Litteraria Pragensia: Studies in Literature and Culture* 18, no. 35 (July 2008), 5-27.
6   Edward W. Said, *Culture and Imperialism* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1993), 7.
7   John Brannigan, " 'A Particular Vice of that People': Giraldus Cambrensis and the Discourse of English Colonialism," *Irish Studies Review* 6, no. 2 (August 1998), 121.
8   Authors include Geoffrey Keating, Philip O'Sullivan Beare and John Lynch according to Brannigan, "Particular Vice," 121.
9   Brannigan, "Particular Vice," 121.
10 Brannigan, "Particular Vice,"129.
11 For examples, see Duffy, *Ireland in the Middle Ages*); Robert Bartlett, *Gerald of Wales: A Voice of the Middle Ages* (London: History Press Limited, 2006); Brenda Deen Schildgen, "Middle Eastern Apocalyptic Traditions in Dante's *La Divina Commedia* and Mohammed's Miraj or Night Journey," *Studies in Medieval and Renaissance History*, edited by Roger Dahood and Peter E. Medine, vol. 4, (2007): 171-193; and Shirin A. Khanmohamadi, *In Light of Another's Word*.

12 Brannigan gives an extensive list of such authors, "Particular Vice," 121.

13 Edward W. Said, *Orientalism* (New York: Random House, LLC, 1979), 31.

14 Gerald of Wales, *The History and Topography of Ireland*, trans. John J. O'Meara (New York: Penguin Books, 1982), 41.

15 Gerald, *Topography*, 43. Additional examples appear on 35, 52, 57-58, 62, 72, and 117.

16 Gerald, *Topography*, 35.

17 Said, *Orientalism*, 40.

18 Said, *Orientalism*, 31.

19 Gerald, *Topography*, 92-100.

20 Gerald, *Topography*, 93-97.

21 Gerald, *Topography*, 99.

22 Gerald, *Topography*, 99.

23 Said, *Orientalism*, 31.

24 Gerald, *Topography*, 100.

25 This account is based on the feudal bond established by Diarmait Mac Murchada to British King Henry II in 1166. Diarmait was exiled from Ireland after failing to win a bid for the high kingship of Ireland. Diarmait used this feudal bond to gain England help in winning back his kingdom. Duffy, *Ireland*, 59-61.

26 Said, *Orientalism*, 34.

27 Gerald recounts a story of a half ox half man who was killed by Irish natives, "a fate which he did not deserve." Gerald, *Topography*, 74. Later, Gerald praises Irish musicians. The section begins: "It is only in the case of musical instruments that I find any commendable diligence in the people. They seem to me to be incomparably more skilled in these than any other people that I have seen." Gerald, *Topography*, 103-4.

28 Said, *Orientalism*, 41.

29 Bartlett explains that this was common practice in the Middle Ages: "many occurrences in the natural world were read as signs. They were not seen simply as the automatic consequences of autonomous natural processes; they had significance." Bartlett, *Voice*, 92.

30 Gerald, *Topography*, 65.

31 Gerald, *Topography*, 106.

32 Gerald, *Topography*, 101.

33 Gerald, *Topography*, 122.

34 Gerald, *Topography*, 107.

35 Gerald, *Topography*, 119.

36 Gerald, *Topography*, 123.

37 Said, *Orientalism*, 7.

38 Sposato, "Perception," 25.

39 Sposato, "Perception," 28.

40 Gerald, *Topography*, 101.

41 Bartlett, *Voice*, 132-3.

42 Said, *Orientalism*, 38-39.

43 Said, *Orientalism*, 46.

44 Gerald, *Topography*, 102-103.

45 Bartlett, *Voice*, 20.

46 Said, *Orientalism*, 54.

47 Said, *Orientalism*, 119.

48 Said, *Orientalism*, 149.

49 Jeffrey Jerome Cohen, *Hybridity, Identity, and Monstrosity in Medieval Britain: On Difficult Middles* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006), 2.

50   Identifying the origins of the modern state is a much debated field of study. While iconic medieval scholars like R.I. Moore, R.W. Southern and Joseph R. Strayer disagree on the location, impetus and chronology of the making of the modern state, all agree that the modern state did not exist at the time of Gerald. In *On the Medieval Origins of the Modern State,* Strayer argues that the process of state building began to emerge in the late eleventh century. By 1300, there is evidence of very weak states that would take another 200 years to develop into effective institutions with real power. Joseph R. Strayer, *On the Medieval Origins of the Modern State* (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1970).

51   Cohen, *Hybridity*, 79.

52   Huw Pryce and John Watts, eds., *Power and Identity in the Middle Ages: Essays in Memory of Rees Davies* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), 85.

53   Cohen, *Hybridity*, 86-7.

54   Pryce, *Power*, 85.

55   Pryce, *Power*, 89.

56   Gillingham traces this convention across medieval authors in Pryce, *Power*, chapter 7.

57   Brannigan, "Particular Vice," 121.

58   Bartlett, *Voice*, 11.

59   Bartlett, *Voice*, 26-27.

60   Partly in an attempt to win favor, Gerald dedicates *Topography* to King Henry II. His dedication states, "I could, as others have done, have sent your Highness some small pieces of gold, falcons, or hawks with which the island abounds. But since I thought that a high-minded prince would place little value on things that easily come to be – and just as easily perish – I decided to send to your Highness those things rather which cannot be lost. By them I shall, through you, instruct posterity. For no age can destroy them." Gerald, *Topography*, 32.

61   Bartlett, *Voice*, 16.

62   See Henry Owen, *Gerald the Welshman* (London, 1889, revised edn. 1904); and Thomas Jones, *Gerallt Gymro/Gerald the Welshman* (Cardiff, 1947).

63   Quoted in Bartlett, *Voice*, 16.

64   Bettina Bildhauer and Robert Mills, eds., *The Monstrous Middle Ages* (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 2003), 105.

65   R.I. Moore, among others, documents the impact of these changes on the church and society in *The First European Revolution c. 970-1215*, (Oxford, United Kingdom: Blackwell Publishers, 2000).

66   Duffy, *Middle Ages*, 73.

67   Barry W. O'Dwyer, "Early English perspectives on Gaelic-Irish Religion," *Parergon* 10, no. 2 (December 1992), 129.

68   Gerald, *Topography*, 111.

69   Bildhauer, *Monstrous*, 107.

70   Gerald, *Topography*, 112.

71   Gerald, *Topography*, 113.

72   Gerald, *Topography*, 113.

73   Gerald, *Topography*, 106.

74   Gerald, *Topography*, 110.

75   The earliest surviving record of Irish church reform is the Synod of Cashel in 1101. At Cashel, the Irish church initiated its own reform project that addressed the issues of continental church reform Gerald supported. Later synods would continue this work. *Duffy, Middle Ages*, 25.

76   See Foster, *Illustrated History*, Chapter 3 for a more detailed description of the period.

77   Edmund Spenser, *A View of the Present State of Ireland from the first printed edition (1633)*, eds. Andrew Hadfield and Willy Maley (Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishers Ltd., 1997), xiv-xv.

78   Kenneth Gross, *Spenserian Poetics: Idolatry, Iconoclasm, and Magic* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1985), 79.

79   Andrew Hadfield, *Edmund Spenser: A Life* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012).

80 It is estimated that Irish casualties in Munster between 1579-1583 were "as high as 50,000, about a third of the Munster population and a tenth of the whole population of Ireland." Hadfield, *A Life*, 167.

81 One of the most infamous and often cited passages of *A View* is Spenser's description of the success of mass starvation tactics used against the Irish in Munster as support for his own genocidal plans: "out of every corner of the woods and glynnes they came creepign forth upon their hands, for their legges could not bear them, they looked like anatomies of death, they spake like Ghosts crying out of their graves, they did eate the dead Carrions, happy were they could finde them, yea, and one another soone after, insomuch as the very carcasses they spared not to scrape out of their graves, and if they found a plot of water-cresses or Shamrocks, there they flocked as to a feast for the time, yet not able long to continue therewithal, that in short space there were none almost left, and a most populous and plentifull countrey suddainely left voyde of man and beast, yet sure in all that warre, there perished not many by the Sword, but all by the extremitie of amine, which they themselves had wrought." Spenser, *A View*, 101-102.

82 To avoid excessive repetition, it will be assumed that the reader has an understanding of these elements from the analysis above.

83 Gross, *Spenserian Poetics*, 80.

84 Like Gerald, Irenius repeatedly stresses his firsthand knowledge, using phrases like "as I observed." Spenser, *A View*, 12.

85 Spenser, *A View*, 15.

86 Spenser, *A View*, 18.

87 Spenser, *A View*, 26-27.

88 Spenser, *A View*, 28.

89 Spenser's use of Edward le Bruce is ironic in that le Bruce fought with the several important Irish lords against the English in Ireland. Duffy, *Middle Ages*, 134.

90 Said, *Orientalism*, 45.

91 Spenser, *A View*, 13-14

92 Spenser, *A View*, 15.

93 Spenser, *A View*, 20.

94 Spenser, *A View*, 91-92.

95 See footnote 80 for the full text of Spenser's description.

96 Spenser, *A View*, 111-12.

97 Spenser, *A View*, 44.

98 Spenser, *A View*, 55-56.

99 Gross, *Spenserian Poetics*, 90.

100 Spenser, *A View*, 57.

101 Gross, *Spenserian Poetics*, 91

102 Spenser, *A View*, 32.

103 Spenser expert Roland Smith concluded that Spenser had access to a wide array of Irish sources and likely drew from a wide selection. While *Topography* was definitely an available source, Smith argues that the stories that appear in both *Topography* and *A View* also appear in numerous other texts. Thus, it cannot be argued with certainty that Spenser directly used *Topography* as a source. Furthermore, Spenser repeated altered traditional material, which Smith documents but does not seek to explain the author's motivations for doing so. Clare Carroll, *Circe's Cup: Cultural transformations in early modern writing about Ireland* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press in association with Field Day, 2001), 65.

104 Spenser, *A View*, xxviii.

105 Donnelly, "Humanist," 5.

106 Joan Fitzpatrick, *Irish Demons: English writing on Ireland, the Irish, and gender by Spenser and his contemporaries* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 2000), 34.

107 Spenser, *A View*, 54.

108 Spenser, *A View*, 67.

109 Spenser, *A View*, 71.

110 Fitzpatrick notes that the lack of English equivalents resulted in the inclusion of a great many Gaelic words, among them bawne (fortified enclosure), rath (round trench), galloglass (young warrior), and tanist (elected leader of the sept). This suggests the failure of English colonization to penetrate Ireland, the Irish language, and Irish customs. Fitzpatrick, *Irish Demons*, 63-64.

111 In describing the system's prejudices, Spenser states, "Lords Brehon, adjudgeth for the most part, a better share unto his Lord, that is…the head of that sept [political [territory under a judge's juristiction], and also unto himselfe for his judgement a greater portion, then unto the plaintiffs or parties grieved." Spenser, *A View*, 14.

112 Spenser, *A View*, 13.

113 Spenser, *A View*, 30-31.

114 Spenser, *A View*, 16-17

115 Spenser, *A View*, 21.

116 Gross, Spenserian Poetics, 85.

117 Spenser, *A View*, xi.

118 Hadfield, *A Life*, 366.

119 Spenser, *A View*, xxii.

120 Donnelly, "Humanist," 9.

121 Foster, *Illustrated History*, 116.

"Colonization of the Mind" in Knowledge, Race, and Nationalism

By Kayla Iammarino

In telling the history of the British Empire in India, the youth of Britain was an important instrument in the continuation and consolidation of British colonial power. In order to transform the youth of Britain into future rulers of the empire, children needed to undergo "colonization of the mind." Central to this process is the importance of knowledge production, which shaped children's ideas of race and nationalism, which further cemented the wedge between the "colonizers" and the "colonized." For years, historians have interpreted their view on the "colonization of the mind." There is one prevalent question at the heart of every historian's research: how was the process achieved? I propose that "colonization of the mind" was achieved through the construction of knowledge production, race, and nationalism. Through these processes, children developed a "habit of mind" that they were the "superior" race and therefore could rule over other "inferior" races, thus allowing them to become the future agents of the British Empire.

My historiographical analysis of the process of the "colonization of the mind" draws on photographs and secondary sources. I examined the scholarship of Kathryn Castle, Patrick Brantlinger, and Bernard Cohn to illustrate the integral role schooling and literature played through the use of school textbooks and other literary sources in developing the "colonization of the mind". To demonstrate the construction of the idea of race, I relied on Castle, Frederick Cooper and Ann L. Stoler, Tony Ballantyne and Antoinette Burton, Thomas Trautmann, and Elizabeth Buettner's scholarship. These scholars demonstrate the use of science and Social Darwinism and how it justified the idea of "superior" and "inferior" races through colonial scientific knowledge production. Buettner focuses on the interactions between the child and their servant, which further illustrated the idea of "superior" vs. "inferior" races. E.M. Collingham and Allen Warren's scholarship demonstrates how nationalism led to the construction of British identity and ways to maintain that "Britishness." I also use John Rosselli's, scholarship on Bengali nationalism to examine the contestation of dominant colonial knowledge and stereotypes imposed on Bengali males. In order for British imperialism to survive and thrive in India, they needed to mold the youth of Britain into the future rulers of their empire. For that reason, through "colonization of the mind," historians argue that knowledge production, race, and

nationalism play an integral role in achieving this. Each author listed above defends valid and thought-provoking points behind their own interpretation of the success and implementation of the "colonization of the mind."

"Colonization of the mind" was a very intimate way of colonizing a person. Through "colonization of the mind," British children developed a distorted portrait of the "colonized" and thus found justification for their role in "civilizing" their subjects. This idea was fostered through knowledge production. Knowledge production can be transmitted through education, which illustrates the important role schools played in achieving "colonization of the mind". Cohn's articles further demonstrate how education and schooling were essential in developing this "habit of mind" in the British youth. "Colonial rule is based on forms of knowledge as much as it is based on institutions of direct control." [1] Through education, the British were able to acquire "a steady development in the accumulation of knowledge about the history of India, its systems of thoughts, its religious beliefs and practices and its society and institutions." [2] Through this acquisition of knowledge, the British were able to interpret and create their own idea of India's history. "It was the British who set the agenda and who had the authoritative voice in determining what was useful knowledge to be processed for the European projects." [3] This further illustrates how education allowed the British to control what was taught in British schools. It also reinforced a European frame of mind onto British students regarding law, religion, commerce, and culture. By doing this, the British could create a group of people who supported its policies and regulations. This would eventually lead to the development of a certain class of people that would willingly work and serve the empire.

As stated earlier, the colonial school was the site of "colonization of the mind" through the use of school textbooks. Kathryn Castle lays the groundwork for her essay by noting that "textbooks gave the information they imparted to young minds the legitimacy of historical fact and analysis." Whatever was included in these textbooks was taken at face value and should not be questioned. Castle's essay also illustrates how school textbooks fostered the development of stereotypes through the use of science, and hinted at British nationalism. Through these textbooks "the image of India which emerged was both ethnocentric, enhancing the cultural superiority of Great Britain, and racist." Castle's focus on knowledge production demonstrates the success of "colonization of the mind" within the British youth. Through these textbooks, the British Empire was able to "present India in a state of anarchy and confusion." [4] The British Empire had the power to rewrite history by omitting and adding information useful for justifying their empire. By arguing that the "colonized" were chaotic, disorganized, and unruly, unable to govern themselves, they needed the help of the British. It is no surprise that after reading these textbooks, British children developed a frame of mind that all Indians were helpless.

Bratlinger's article further illustrates this argument by examining how knowledge production of key historical events shaped colonial history-writing and led to the creation of racial stereotypes. Through literary sources, the Indian Mutiny of 1857 was used to villainize the Indians. Many of the novels, plays, poems, and books at this time can be seen as "melodramas that reduce social and moral complexities to simplistic opposition between good and evil, victims and villains." [5] In these sources there was no room for interpretation or justification for the Indian Mutiny of 1857. In black and white, it clearly states, that the Indians were villains because they murdered innocent women and children. When children were exposed to these literary sources, they too developed the idea that all Indians were bad and the British were good. Learning about the Mutiny of 1857 also illustrates the growing need to control the "colonized." By constantly driving home the idea that the "colonized" are dangerous and untrustworthy, it then leads to the hardening of beliefs towards their subjects. These children were supposed to continue the "civilizing" mission of their forefathers, and in order to do this they must believe in the task being carried out.

In contrast, John Rosselli takes a different approach. Rather than conceiving the "colonization of the mind" as a complete success, he suggests that it was not always a successful project. As stated earlier, "colonization of the mind" was a very intimate way of colonizing a person. It led the "colonized" to believe that the "colonizer's" reality was the norm. If successful, the oppressed begin to believe what their oppressors say about them. For example Rosselli argues that, "Bengali physical culture from the 1870s onwards was marked at least as much by the influence of British officials or of supporters of British rule." [6] This demonstrates how Indians took the whole idiom of being "effeminate" to heart. Out of their contestation of dominant colonial knowledge and typecasts, Bengali nationalism emerged and acted as a type of resistance to the British stereotype of them.[7] In this case, "colonization of the mind" was a success. Bengali men went to great lengths to discredit their "effeteness" and prove their masculinity. Bengali nationalism and masculine reclamation was achieved through "bending iron bars with one's teeth, having oneself buried alive for a time, supporting enormous weights, body-building, or acrobatics." [8] However, it is also important to mention that even though the Bengali believed in the stereotyping of their masculinity, they went to extreme lengths to discount Bengali "effeteness." These lengths led to nationalist projects, which disproves that "colonization of the mind" is always a successful project.

Another important theme that illustrates the process of the "colonization of the mind" on the British youth is race. The issue of race has been around for centuries, but with the advancements in science, Europeans found further justification for their racism. Cooper and Stoler further illustrate this argument by stating that: "Nineteenth century discussions of African and Asians were replete

with biological metaphors; but biological and medical science provided more than metaphors for colonial domination. They provided the proof and rationalization for European supremacy as it was played out in racial terms."[9]

This is evidence of how the country being taken over was weaker and therefore needed help. Thus allowing the more "superior" countries to come in and impose themselves economically, politically, and socially. The British used this idea to justify their actions in India by arguing that they were "there for the good of the Indians, to prepare them for self-rule in some distant future, through a policy of gradual social and political reform toward a European model of civilization."[10] Ballantyne and Burton's essay further illustrates this argument of the "superior" race imposing themselves on the "inferiors" by arguing that "the web's intricate strands helped to create hierarchies of race, class, religion, and gender, among others, thereby casting the conquerors as superior and the conquered as subordinate."[11] This type of thinking did not remain confined. As stated earlier, through colonial scientific knowledge production, British children were exposed to this type of thinking. Having stereotypes depicting Indians as unruly, unorganized, and childlike led British children to develop the same mindset. Colonial scientific knowledge production "did little to encourage sympathy, tolerance, or understanding of India and its people. They were not only a strange and disordered state, but clearly inferior to the progressive, Anglo-Saxon community of the reader."[12] Thus through Social Darwinism, which promoted the idea that the white race was "superior" to others and destined to rule over them, children found further justification for their racism and future roles in the British Empire. They believed that their Indian "subjects" needed the help and guidance of the British, and it was their job to accomplish this.

Buettner's article further illustrates this argument by examining the relationship between the child and their servant. By looking at the interaction between British children and their servants, one can see the clear distinction between the "colonized" and the "colonizer." As mentioned before, one of the stereotypes that British children believed in was the idea of the "childish native." The metaphor of the "childish native" allowed the British to compare their Indian "subjects" to children. When Indians were perceived as children, they were seen as helpless, undisciplined, vulnerable, and naïve. This idea was further reinforced when Indian servants treated British children like adults. When children were treated like adults, they came to realize their own importance.[13] This illustrates how in India, age did not matter, whereas race did. It was the color of one's skin that decided their place in the social hierarchy. When an Indian man gave the same amount of respect to a child as they did to an adult, that man was seen as being below the child. In this case, there is a role reversal. The Indian adult is now seen as a child, while British children

were seen as adults. It is no surprise that when British children were exposed to this behavior they began to feel "superior." This newfound feeling of superiority further reinforced the idea of their future role as rulers in the British Empire.

Along with race and knowledge production, British nationalism plays an important part in the progression of the "colonization of the mind." Nationalism is a powerful force. Many people kill and die for the preservation of their national identity. With nationalism, people are united by a common language, culture, religious belief, history, and tradition. Essentially, a nation, in a fictive sense, is a community of people. These people serve their country by being active and responsible citizens. From an early age, British children learn what it meant to be a good citizen. They were taught what their future role would be, and how that role would ensure the continuation and consolidation of the British Empire.

In order to create a class of people willing to support and serve the empire, they needed to develop a sense of what it meant to be British. Once a concrete definition of British identity was established, then one could implement these ideas onto the British youth. Through education, children were exposed to the traits and values the future ruling class should have. Collingham lays the groundwork for her essay by calling attention to some of the traits British men must have. "The indianized body of the nabob was discredited in the favour of that of the burra sahib, who was characterized by the British qualities of energy, probity and manliness." [14] These traits were the desired qualities the colonial ruling class should possess. As mentioned before, the best way to teach and implement these traits on the British youth was through schooling. Through the education system, boys learned about being athletic, brave, fair, strict, and orderly. Once a child possessed all of these desired qualities, they could be considered British.

Despite the colonial school being an important place for colonial knowledge, Baden-Powell would argue that there were better means to promoting ideal British citizenship. With the development of Scouts and Guides, Baden-Powell relied on "more familiar mid-Victorian ideals of self-help and personal independence." [15] Through self-help, children would undergo character building. Self-help promoted independence, which was an important trait to have. When one has independence they are able to take care of themselves and others. Those who were independent were far more superior compared to those who were dependent. It is also important to note that by teaching the ideals of self-help and independence, it required students to take an active role in their learning. Baden-Powell argued, "That true patriotic teaching could only come through conduct and action rather than through formal instruction or a reformed syllabus." [16] In order for children to learn, they needed to go out in nature. Only by going out, and actively participating in something, did one understand what it truly meant to be a good British citizen.

One photo that helps support this argument, which was drawn by Baden-Powell himself, includes a young scout looking at his overweight troop leader.[17] Another photo shows a group of scouts hiking outside.[18] The second photo reinforces the idea that children needed to be active by going out in nature. In the photo, scouts are shown gathering around their leader as he points to something. From this picture it is clear that while they are hiking, they are learning as well. The hike they are on is teaching them how to find their way around the forest, which in turn teaches them independence and allows them to be active. It is also important to note that in both pictures the scouts are in uniform. The uniform represents the community or "brotherhood" these boys share with one another. The older gentlemen in both photos are also wearing the same uniform as the boys. This shows that the there is no separation; despite the age difference they are seen as equals. In the other picture, it shows an overweight scout leader. Being overweight is something Baden-Powell considered an effect from urban life, and therefore ridiculed.[19] If one was overweight like the gentleman depicted in the photo, they were seen as lazy, unhealthy, inactive, and gluttonous. These were not considered traits of the ideal British citizen. On the contrary, the boys depicted in each photo represent the ideal British citizen because they are active and healthy individuals.

Moreover, constructing one's British identity was only half the battle. After children began to identify as British, it was important to ensure that they maintained their "Britishness." This proved to be problematic for children who were brought up in India. "Outside Britain, children thus could fail to acquire the character attributes that would qualify them as legitimate representatives of the 'ruling race,' adopting habits and desires that British adults condemned in their places." [20] Children were and still are seen as impressionable. One could even compare them to a sponge. Like a sponge, children absorbed everything around them. When British children were constantly around their servants, they began to absorb and develop undesirable traits. "White children's intertwined physical and mental health, morality, and cultural development as Britons were widely deemed jeopardized even within what was often a highly self-contained and protecting setting." [21] If the children's minds were corrupted, then they would be deemed unsuited to be the future rulers of the empire. Being morally dubious, immoral and unstable was not acceptable behavior of colonial rulers.

Another problem with being around Indian servants was that some children would grow too attached to them. It became very problematic when "children's early exposure to Indians and the delight they seemed to take in these relationships was feared to undermine the divide." [22] As mentioned early, Collingham made a similar argument in her essay when she discusses the change from the Nabob to the Burra Sahib. What prompted the change was Britain's growing desire to separate themselves from their Indian subjects.[23] The empire would no longer mix cultures; mixing cultures would give their "subjects" a false sense of equality. The same went

for British children in India. If children began to develop affection and admiration for their servants, then they would muddle the divide between the "superior" and "inferior" by adopting non-British traits. It would also become problematic for children to have to rule over them as well.

Key to preserving European attributes at risk of deteriorating over time was by sending children back to England at an early age.[24] By sending children back to England, they could be placed into British schools. Through schooling, children would undergo "colonization of the mind" to prepare themselves to be the future agents of the empire. Other ways children could maintain their "Britishness" was by the clothes they wore. When British men wore black suits, their outfits signified the "colour of sobriety, decency, and uprightness as it was in Britain as a symbol of the civilian's commitment to utilitarian principles…and his political legitimacy as a neutral administrator of law.[25] This type of clothing represented Victorian values that embodied British identity. Food consumption was also another way children were able to maintain their British identity. British people went through great lengths to grow crops found in England in India.[26] People were very conscious of what they put into their bodies, and feared that using Indian cuisine would taint their British identity.

As historians, it is our responsibility to recall and understand the important role British children had in the empire. Despite their age, British children would prove invaluable when it came to the continuation of the empire. The role of British children is crucial in understanding their importance in the strengthening and prolongation of British imperial authority in India. The British Empire would not have lasted as long as it did had it not been for the children who would assume the leadership position. However, in order to create a group of people that would serve the empire, they needed to believe in its mission. "Colonization of the mind" allowed this. "Colonization of the mind" led to the belief that the British were the "superior" race, and everyone else was "inferior." The only way this "habit of mind" could be successfully created was through knowledge production, race, and nationalism. Once these ideals were established, British children developed the same mindset of their forefathers. This would eventually allow them to take on the role as the future agents of the British Empire.

1   Bernard Cohn, "Representing Authority in Victorian India" in E. Hobsbawm & T. Ranger eds., *The Invention of Tradition* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 182.
2   Cohn, "Representing Authority in Victorian India", 182.
3   Bernard Cohn, "Command of Language and Language," in B. Cohn ed., *Colonialism and its Form of Knowledge* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), 41.
4   Kathryn Castle, "The Imperial Indian: India in British History Textbooks for Schools 1890-1914," in J. A. Mangan ed., *The Imperial Curriculum: Racial Images and Education in the British Colonial Experience* (New York: Routledge, 1993), 23-26.
5   Patrick Brantlinger, *Rule of Darkness: British Literature and Imperialism, 1830-1914* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1990), 206.
6   John Rosselli, "The Self-Image of Effeteness: Physical Education and Nationalism in Nineteenth-Century Bengal," *Past and Present* 86 (1980): 137.
7   John Rosselli, "The Self-Image of Effeteness," 141.
8   John Rosselli, "The Self-Image of Effeteness,"137.
9   Frederick Cooper and Ann L. Stoler, "Introduction Tensions of Empire: Colonial Control and Visions of Ruler," *American Ethnologist* 16:4 (1989): 612.
10 Thomas Trautmann, *India: Brief History of a Civilization* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 180.
11 Tony Ballantyne and Antoinette Burton, "Introduction: Bodies, Empires, and World Histories," in Tony Ballantyne and Antoinette Burton eds., *Bodies in Contact: Rethinking Colonial Encounters in World History* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2005), 3.
12 Castle, "The Imperial Indian," 27.
13 Elizabeth Buettner, *Empire Families: Britons and Late Imperial India* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 65.
14 E. M. Collingham, *Imperial Bodies: The Physical Experience of the Raj*, c. 1800-1947, Polity (2001): 53.
15 Allen Warren, "Citizens of Empire: Baden-Powell, Scouts, and Guides and an Imperial Ideal, 1900-1940," in John M. Mackenzie ed., *Imperialism and Popular Culture*, (Manchester and Dover, N. H.: Manchester University Press, 1986), 240.
16 Warren, "Citizens of Empire," 241.
17 Robert Baden-Powell (Artist). *Scouting is Developing Steadily* [Drawing], available from http://media.scoutwiki.org/File:Scouting_is_developing_steadily.gif; accessed 1 December 2014.
18 Norman Rockwell (Artist). *Pointing the Way* [Painting], available from http://www.troop476.org/patrol-leader-s-council-plc; accessed 1 December 2014.
19 Warren, "Citizens of the Empire," 240.
20 Buettner, "British Children in India," 39.
21 Buettner, "British Children in India," 28.
22 Buettner, "British Children in India," 40.
23 Collingham, "Anglicization of the Body," 52.
24 Buettner, "British Children in India," 28.
25 Collingham, "Anglicization of the Body," 62.
26 Collingham, "Anglicization of the Body," 71.

What Killed Greenwich Village?
The Dilemma That Comes From Pronouncing Any Creative Center "Dead"

By Taylor Long

Few places in America can brag about having played host to the same likes of men and women, arts and sciences, and unbridled creativity than Greenwich Village did over the past 200-odd years. However, the Greenwich Village of today is not at all like the Village of centuries past. Today, the cobblestone sidewalks of the neighborhood do not welcome artists off the street and up the stairs into affordable apartments, dimly lit saloons, time honored "mom and pop" pizza joints or bookstores. Instead, only the wealthy can afford to live in the same apartment buildings that, if not already razed and rebuilt, once housed near destitute playwrights and musicians. In the Village of 2015, locals and nostalgic observers both pine for some semblance of a return to the way things were in the neighborhood in the decades, generations, and centuries past. On the face of it all, it would seem that those dreams of a countercultural Mecca are gone, but history offers a different, more hopeful outlook.

So what characteristics were lost? What changes over the past few decades in the neighborhood have most scholars and modern day bohemians commented on to indicate that the Village's creative spark has been snuffed out? Moreover, why should folks even concern themselves with the current happenings and past significances of a small section of Manhattan whilst all of New York City still bustles and boasts all sorts of cultural attractions? The answers to these questions depend upon the weight and/or value one ascribes to the past and the historical preservation of an ever evolving—some would say devolving—urban landscape. Whatever your preconceived notions of the Village, though, it is clear that a total lack of inexpensive housing, over commercialization of former locally owned businesses and buildings, and the growth of New York University into a land grabbing giant have made it impossible for young intellectuals, society's outcasts, and the artistically minded to take up residence in one of the few places that once championed their causes and existence. The current state of this fabled neighborhood is so unlike what it used to be that perhaps the only way to truly understand what has been lost in the Village is to discuss and track the progression of the exceptionally creative and forward thinking history of the people, groups, and structures that chose to root themselves

in such a small neighborhood cradled along the banks of the Hudson River on over to Broadway and from Canal on up to West 14th Street. In tracking that progression, one learns very quickly that the Village has died and been reborn time and time again, and that the debate amongst historians over when, why, and if the neighborhood ever truly died creatively has been ongoing since the early 1900s.

The historiography of Greenwich Village – the way historians have conceptualized this neighborhood's beginnings, years of prominence, and perhaps final death as a countercultural haven – is almost as storied and certainly as interesting as the lives of the people and groups that put the Village on the map. What is so difficult about researching and putting into a concise conclusion the historiography of the Village is the fact that the neighborhood has gone through so many periods of great influence and subsequent years of lull and insignificance. Famed authors of the late 19th and early 20th centuries like Floyd Dell, Malcolm Cowley, George Du Maurier, Mary Kingsbury Simkhovitch, and countless others all wrote of their experiences living in the Village and all professed of the neighborhood having lost its spark of creativity and misfit welcoming by the end of the 1910s or early 1920s.Yet, just as many primary sources of the Village in the 1950s and 1960s like Bob Dylan's autobiography or the "beat" writings and commentary of Allen Ginsberg all profess of the Village's vitality in their time and its end being marked by the beginning of the 1970s. As New York historian and essayist Jan Seidler Ramirez astutely stated in her essay, "The Tourist Trade Takes Hold" that "A cyclical pattern of invasion and corruption…has characterized the historical interpretation of Greenwich Village as the hotbed of American bohemianism." [1] The great dilemma is attempting to understand just when, exactly, Greenwich Village truly stopped being the Village that Cowley, Dylan, and residents of the neighborhood in more recent decades once made famous and now so fondly reminisce about. With that dilemma in mind, the best way to break down the historiography and discuss the chronology of the Villages' creative ebb and flow is by starting with the neighborhood's first undisputed "Golden Age" spanning from roughly 1890 to 1920.

It is very difficult to prove that one generation of bohemian greatness in the Village was wholly better than any other, but a convincing argument can certainly be made that the Golden Age was superior because of the cast of infamous writers that it staged. Malcolm Cowley, one of the most renowned writers in the Village at that time, wrote that in the 1920s "most of the serious American writers felt like strangers in their own land." [2] Novelists, poets, playwrights, and newspapermen felt "rejected," according to Cowley, and believed that the country was being led by "middle-aged bankers and corporation executives" that showed "little interest in books or ideas." [3] However, for writers like Cowley and Walt Whitman before him Greenwich Village was what Cowley called, "an island." The Village of the 1920s was an island in the same respect that Cowley believed the West Indies,

Paris, Mexico, Corsica, Capri, or the Greek isles were places where "Americans could feel that they had escaped from everything that oppressed them in a business civilization." [4] Before the Golden Age's supposed end in the 1930s, writers, artists, and any other bohemians at heart could come to Greenwich Village to "build themselves private islands of art or philosophy" and "live without moral scruples or modern conveniences, live in the pure moment, live gaily on gin and love." [5] Malcolm Cowley believed that the neighborhood's island aesthetic was at the core of "the Greenwich Village idea," but he was not the only writer of the period that knew his surroundings were exceptional.

Prior to arriving in Manhattan and migrating southward to work as Max Eastman's editorial assistant for the Village's new *The Masses* magazine, Floyd Dell already had a pretty impressive resume as the *Chicago Evening Post*'s editor and bohemian commentator.[6] Yet, when he came to Greenwich Village and fully immersed himself in the bohemian club scene, Dell became an observer, participant, and satirist of his new avant-garde friends and colleagues. What's more, Dell would write not the first, but certainly one of the most thought-provoking and comprehensive histories of the Village up to his day and age in 1926's *Love in Greenwich Village*. In his prose, Dell wrote of his new home's bohemian highpoint as such: "a refuge for tormented men whose heads were full of dreams, whose hands were weak to do the world's commands: builders of palaces on sands – these, needful of a place to sleep, came here, because the rents were cheap." [7] This quotation of Dell's introduces a number of factors that made the Golden Age of the Village a gathering point and exporter of creativity the world over. First, the Village was seen as a place far more accepting of outsiders and characters with inklings and traits not held by many people or at least not openly condoned by a majority of people in the country at the time.

A leading historian of Greenwich Village, University of Massachusetts Amherst's Gerald McFarland, emphasizes the fact that the period of American history that provided the backdrop to the Village's first phase of bohemian greatness was the Progressive Era. McFarland writes that progressivism – "the reformist spirit of the time" – and its supporters sought to curb or eliminate the evils caused by prostitution, the consumption of alcohol, "new and more sensual" forms of dancing, and new forms of media such as film that portrayed "sexually explicit or unpatriotic content." [8] As anyone who merely skimmed the briefest of Greenwich Village historical texts could tell you, the Village was a place that welcomed wondering radicals, free-lovers, and starving artists of all kinds to its clubs and boarding homes to take part in all – and more – of the entertainment that many progressives were working to put a stop to. What's more, these new age morality policing groups often found themselves imposing their social controls on recently arrived immigrants of working-class Italian and Jewish backgrounds – two of the three most predominant

resident groups of Greenwich Village from the 1860s onward. According to Christine Stansell, one of the most famous and knowledgeable historians of the Village in the Progressive Era, the neighborhood's brand of bohemia was "uniquely equipped to launch idealistic young people" out of their college dorms and affluent family homes and into the "grand labor" of bridging what Jane Addams called "The Social Gulf." [9]

While it is true that many progressives pushed puritanical, moral reforms with "Victorian condescension," Stansell emphasizes the fact that restless artists and writers also adopted the activist spirit of the era to enact social changes.[10] Part of what made 1890 through 1930 in the Village so "gilded" was the amount of political and social involvement that was undertaken by Villagers with all sorts of convictions. In *American Moderns,* Stansell writes that the neighborhood's authors and artists embraced a "fondness for working-class characters…sense of affinity with fellow wage earners and urban travelers, and…fascination with women of independent lives" created political movements and Progressive Era reforms unlike any other in the country.[11] Political and social movements centered on radical ideas like feminism, socialism, and trade unionisms had, according to Stansell, "never before been tightly tied to bohemia," but were soon flourishing throughout the neighborhood and would become "a distinguishing feature of the Village esprit." [12] What is perhaps most interesting about the Golden Age's blending of Progressive Era conventions and early American bohemia's unconventionality is the fact that it led to what historians of the Age and today agree was one of the greatest attributes of Greenwich Village at that time, a sense of duty to benefit one another. The sense of shared community or need to work for the betterment of each other was a trait that made the Village flourish as a community and a self-supporting reservoir for creativity. From the 1890s to 1920, the Village flurried with activist protests in favor of Women's suffrage marching up Fifth Avenue from Washington Square and to large numbers of protestors both in favor and opposed to WWI.[13] The Village had a spirit of neighborly cooperation that was altogether unique in such a city as New York or on an island like Manhattan and many primary and secondary sources point to this spirit's dissolution as a key reason why the Village's first – and perhaps only – great creative highpoint ended.

According to McFarland, "American Settlement House Reformers" in Manhattan modeled themselves after contemporary 19th century students in Oxford and Cambridge and went into their respective slums – or places perceived to be slums because of their predominant working-class European immigrant and Great Migration-era black populations – to "make their settlement in the slums outposts of education and culture." [14] What is particularly interesting about these settlement reformers is that their makeup or membership was not wholly that of progressives pushing change or self-righteous bohemian or radical thinkers trying to inculcate a greater following in the Village. No, based upon the research of McFarland, these

groups rather were concerned with combating the "enormous social problems spawned by the growth of modern industrial cities, by the increasing gulf between rich and poor, and by the increasing ignorance of and…hostility toward workers on the part of the middle and upper classes." [15] Moreover, these young and nearby New York University educated folks went to neighborhoods like Greenwich Village with its well known slums – chiefly the largely black populated expanses of Minetta Lane and Minetta Street ("the Minettas" for short) – and worked to show that "cross-class communication" was a viable means of solving economically shared problems and (as one New York settlement's constitution put it) bring "men and women of education into closer relations with the laboring classes to their mutual benefit." [16] Once in the community, settlement reformers would set up residence and offer classes on subjects ranging from "English, civics, and debate to sewing, carpentry, and basket weaving" and had organized activities for young and old, boy and girl. [17] These groups, also, often worked alongside already established ethnic or religiously driven groups to curb political corruption and lobby for improved public sanitation, schooling, public works and much more. Stansell asserts that, although there was usually "condescension at the heart of the effort," the settlement movement's "desire to socialize democracy" did bring about physical and abstract benefits to the neighborhood. [18] As a whole, the intermingling of Greenwich Village residents of different class, creed, and ethnic background allowed for the neighborhood to grow stronger because of the fostering of a shared responsibility for the environment in which all lived and worked. Additionally, the introduction of American settlement house reformers can be seen as an example and certainly a promoter of another aspect of the Village between 1890 and 1920 that many hold to be one of its defining creative catalysts – diversity.

By the 1860s, the Village had a very healthy population of Italian, Irish, formerly Southern blacks, and Anglo-Americans; and by the time the 19th century was waning to a close, all had a very sizeable and recognizable foothold in various sections of the neighborhood. For McFarland, these pre-bohemian settlements are a facet of the Village's history that are largely ignored or only summarized by contemporary historians. McFarland holds that the ethnic, pre-bohemian character of the Village is understated as existing in "a shabby, mixed ethnic district whose quaint old houses, irregular street patterns, and cheap rental properties attracted artists and writers to the neighborhood." [19] Although this abbreviated history of longstanding ethnic sections of the Village may offer little debate or expanded support, it does flesh out the basics of the diversity available to a new Villager. One of the finest examples of interracial mingling in the Golden Age could be found in the bars and hangouts coined collectively as "black and tan saloons." Such large populations of blacks, immigrant Europeans, and even mulattos in one place, coupled with the close proximity of lodging and leisure in the Village made it inevitable that folks of

different class and color would meet, strike up conversations, and form relationships that in other parts of the country and New York would have been taboo or legally squashed. The Slide, a notorious black and tan bar on Bleecker Street, scared the vast majority of whites in Manhattan because of the threat that "amalgamation of the races through sexual union" was believed to pose, but to the average Villager these so-called "low-class bars and clubs" were a venue for shared fun, drinking, dancing, and casual dating amongst people of similar laboring plight and social class.[20] What's more, the visible diversity and ethnic blending of the Village was said to attract visitors and new residents because of the neighborhood's possession of "European charm, replete with crooked streets, human scaled buildings, and a foreign flavor that [was] derived from the Italians." [21] Innumerable accounts of life in the early 20th century Greenwich Village cite the layout of the small Southern Manhattan neighborhood as a key reason for settlement and an almost natural stimulant for a great creative culture. Alfred Kazin, the famed literary critic of the 1950s and 60s, wrote that the Village was so special and unlike any other part of Manhattan because of its lack of "long, straight, numbered avenues and sharply regulated streets" that made up the rest of the island's stifling "gridiron plan." [22] Writers like O. Henry, Thomas Paine, Henry James, and Mark Twain all enjoyed and wrote about their experiences on the irregular streets and in the famed Squares of Greenwich Village. As one will also notice, the abbreviated ethnic history alluded to by McFarland also includes a key detail about the Village already introduced by Floyd Dell in his description of Golden Age bohemia, "cheap rental properties." [23]

Enough cannot be said about the necessity of affordable rents in regards to the housing of young, aspiring writers and artists in a city like New York City even back in the early decades of the last century. Greenwich Village was able to draw in the wealth of creative minds that it did in the Golden Age not just because of its longstanding bohemian roots and mythology, but more often because it had the least expensive lodgings in Manhattan. According to Kazin, young writers, political radicals and rebels, and a full spectrum of artists took advantage of the falling real estate values in the Village at that time and managed to attain cheap housing just South of Washington Square – an impossibility for even today's upper-middle class.[24] He noted "many of the old brick houses [of the neighborhood] lost their value because of the tenements around them, and were converted into rooming houses." [25] The realities of just how cheap housing was in this period is never more clear or emphasized than in Malcolm Cowley's heavily-cited memoir, "Exile's Return." Arriving back in the Village after college and WWI, Cowley writes that he and his "kind" ventured south of Fourteenth Street where they could rent a "furnished hall-bedroom for two or three dollars a week" in the only city in the world "where a young writer could be published." [26] The innovative advantages that such low

rents and largely unrestricted and/or rarely policed zoning laws provided Greenwich Village are beyond counting, but it's particularly clear that a burgeoning newspaper and magazine business was able to be established and spread at this time.

Eastman and Dell's *The Masses* was just one instance of bohemian journalistic success, but it represented a louder and more combative vain of writing that pushed the Village and men like John Reed into the national spotlight. *The Masses* classified itself as "a magazine with a sense of humor and no respect for the respectable; frank, arrogant, impertinent, searching for the true causes." [27] Kazin writes that the Village made for a time and place of popular and political dissent when "old magazines were being remodeled, and even the old conservative magazines were finding new uses for themselves." [28] John Reed and his brazen political writings and commentary were said to embody the "recklessness of the true Greenwich Villager" in the period of optimism before WWI and *The Dial* adopted an editorial policy characterized by the "era's experimentalism, skepticism of inherited values, and critical spirit." [29] The Village of the Golden Age boasted such creativity that John Reed once wrote that within a block of his house was "all the adventure in the world; within a mile was every foreign country." [30] So what events caused the same people who lauded the Village's haphazard streets, affordable housing, and experimental ways of thinking and acting to then turn around and say that the neighborhood's creative spark had been snuffed out by the mid/late 1920s?

Historians frequently used Caroline F. Ware's 1935 book, *Greenwich Village, 1920 – 1930: A Comment on American Civilization in the Post-War Years* to understand the mindset of the era. Ware proclaimed that Greenwich Village, by 1930, "ceased to be a neighborhood in anything but name." [31] Just like the settlement reformers who fretted over urbanization's decaying effects on immigrants and formerly Southern blacks, Ware focused her research in urban slums and collected statements from some of the Village's oldest residents who talked of "earlier times when a spirit of easygoing neighborliness had existed." [32] The loss of a sense of community is an idea shared by many researchers and historians, but most primary and secondary sources on this topic cite an increase of vice and debauchery, commercialization of the Village and its avant-garde character (chiefly tourism), and the first great wave of gentrification in the Village as the leading causes for the neighborhood's first and perhaps final end.

Those who cite vice and increased debauchery as a leading cause for the Golden Age of the Village's demise do so with the Volstead Act and Prohibition in mind. Jan Seidler Ramirez is of the opinion that the 18th amendment, ratified in 1919, strengthened the Village's "rowdy profile" and almost overnight turned the neighborhood into the "easiest place in New York to buy bootleg." [33] According to Lewis Erenberg, Prohibition coupled with the air of free-love and "bohemian atmosphere" that Village tourists were so enamored with and helped to remove that

much more the "personal impulses from social regulation." [34] Furthermore, drinking illegally in the Village's clubs, cabarets, and speakeasies became an easy way of defying authority and this, many hold, corrupted the youth of the Village and its visitors who were all too ready to throw caution and money to the wind. Aside from the loss of "neighborliness" and the new reputation as a speakeasy haven, historians and firsthand accounts point to gentrification of the Village as another or the true cause of the Golden Age's dimming.

Gentrification of a region of New York in the 1920s meant an increase in living costs and the exclusion of lower income individuals and families. By 1919, committees of local businesses, property owners, social workers, and realtors pooled their efforts to champion a "local re-colonization movement" in the Village, thus undermining the efforts toward class cooperation championed by settlement reformers.[35] Using such titles for their groups as the "Greenwich Village Improvement Society" and the "Greenwich Village Rebuilding Corporation" and working to "arrest the district's physical deterioration," shrewd realtors amassed dilapidated properties on behalf of their employers and proceeded to remodel the run-down residences into "stylish apartments and studios, an objective accomplished with little else than the addition of modern plumbing and several coats of fresh paint." [36] According to Ramirez, by the start of the 1920s, newspapers were filled with editorials protesting the gentrification of the Village and one such observer to the neighborhood's displacement of bohemians by luxury high-rises north of Washington Square quipped that "artistically inclined shirt merchants, and atmosphere crazy shoe manufacturers are the welcome lessees" to the local real estate "shark." [37] Additionally, public works projects in the Village were aimed at "modernizing the district," much to the dismay of an already financially pinched and increasingly marginalized avant-garde population.[38] For Floyd Dell, the original arrangement of the neighborhood's streets was the first, almost natural reason why the Village was able to be an alcove for his "tormented men" and "dreamers." Dell wrote that "the little twisted streets that crossed and recrossed each other" were what kept the "tide of traffic beats…the noisy waves of enterprise" at a creatively encouraging distance from the Village.[39] In his early chapter of *Love in Greenwich Village* entitled, "The Rise of Greenwich Village," Dell states that original, crooked streets like Greenwich Avenue made a "barrier" for the Village that "protected it from the roaring town all about." [40] Central to the theories of those who mark the 1920s as the Village's creative expiration date are statements like Dell's that point to the "ruthless and efficient" placement of the West Side Subway and the extension of Seventh Avenue into the Village as the main reasons why rents prices were on the rise.[41] Villagers hated plans to install of subway extensions and widen local streets to allow for more through traffic in the Village. According to Ramirez, by the late 1920s the Village's former "isolation was just a memory" as a result of the more accessible

flow of "day-trippers and other outsiders into the Village." [42] These day-trippers and the young masses of bootleg liquor chasers were just two small facets of a much larger and perhaps the most identifiable cause of the Golden Age's death – tourism.

Erenberg convincingly writes in his essay, "Village Nightlife," that from WWI onward, "the Village's bohemian associations turned the area into a metropolitan nightlife amusement zone that merchandised the 'atmosphere' of rebellion and the Village itself." [43] Countless sources from the past and today agree that if the Village did cease to exist as a hangout for the creative vanguard in the 1920s, it was a direct result of the over commercialization of what once made the Village separate and unlike any other place in Manhattan. The operation of tearooms and cabarets, once bohemian staples in the neighborhood in the 1890s and prior to WWI, switched hands from Villagers who identified and patronized the bohemian way of life to tourist-minded owners seeking to attract sight-seers and those wanting to experience free-love for a day or two. Erenberg perhaps summarizes the effect such business ventures had on the neighborhood's character the best: "The commercialization of the 'different' had succeeded in undermining much of what was truly unique about the Village." [44]

Even if the avant-garde ranks of the Village were willing or somehow able to stomach the rising costs of living and working in the neighborhood, the encroachment of bourgeois thrill seekers and self-invented, outlandishly clothed "poseurs" was the deciding factor of whether or not to leave. According to Ramirez, artists and the like were "dismayed by the 'vulgarians and Rotarians' encamped in their midst" and chose to settle somewhere else in the city or abroad that had reasonable costs of living and did not force them to "conform to distasteful changes." [45] Ramirez also noted that bohemia in the Village was driven, "if not into exile, then at least into hibernation." [46] What's more, Alfred Kazin, in his essay "Greenwich Village Writers," states that a creative "cycle" was completed beginning in the 1920s and ending in the 1950s. For Kazin, the East side of the Village came to the rescue of the dying West Village by the late 1940s and "real bohemia" then had to go "where Allen Ginsburg, Gregory Corso, William Burroughs, and Jack Kerouac typified an abandon and a literary style that spoke not so much for a neighborhood as it did for a family of friends." [47] So perhaps the loss of neighborliness Ware concerned her research with was just part of a creative transformation that took place in the Village over a few decades, and maybe this stylistic change in literature speaks to a greater wealth of innovation that was to come in the second period of Greenwich Village prominence in the 1950s and 60s. Historians who mark the 1920s as the Village's last hurrah often cite the loss of brazen voices and writers like John Reed and those found in The Masses by the decade's halfway point as proof of a great change. In contrast, Kazin offers the 1920s and 30s work of Willa Cather, Edmund Wilson, and E. E. Cummings as evidence of a change in political commentating from Reed's "flaming" and blunt tone to a more delicate

and fine point form of published activism.[48] Additionally, Malcolm Cowley is also frequently used as a primary source for the Golden Age's end marking the death of the Village as a rebel haven, but his writing and collected works only became noteworthy and acclaimed after the 1920s – perhaps he, himself, represented the Village's new or continued vitality. Tourism, the great mechanism for commercialized death cited by many researchers, can also be said to partially represent a new, continued, or hibernating form of Village innovation.

  The Village's tourism, while also seen as a push factor for the avant-garde, drew in many new ranks of misfits and world-weary radical thinkers and sparked the interest and desire of a whole new generation of folks around the country through the dispersal of tour guides and pamphlets like Anna Alice Chapin's highlighting the Village's cabarets, tearooms, and restaurants as "symbols for free love and exotic experience in an area removed from Midtown conventions." [49] In the late 1920s and 30s the Village established itself as a refuge for America's gay men and women and that in itself can be said to have sustained the neighborhood through and after its next great period in the 1960s. Additionally, this period saw Village "joints" catering to what a 1925 edition of *Variety* magazine called the "temperamental" elements of the area – homosexuals, and wandering black and white folksingers of the 1930s and 40s.[50] Night clubs and music venues like Café Society and the Village Vanguard hosted some of the greatest musical acts and "most socially conscious entertainment" of the 20th century – Woody Guthrie, Pete Seeger, Burl Ives, Charlie Parker, Millard Lampel, the Almanac Singers to name a few – and they did so in a period when the Village was supposedly tapped dry of its creative juices and innovative wealth.[51] The creative cycle that Alfred Kazin wrote of may or may not have truly run its course by the end of the 1920s or start of the 1950s, but what is clear is that most historians who do not denote the death of the Village after 1920 usually do so by the year 1970 when the neighborhood's second "Golden Age" is thought to have come to a close.

  The 1950s and 60s brought on the most recent period of prominence and creative influence in Greenwich Village and conjure up some of the most iconic images of that time and place in the minds of most Americans today. The Greenwich Village Society for Historic Preservation (GVSHP) published the *Greenwich Village Stories: A Collection of Memoirs* in 2014.[52] Edited by Judith Stonehill the book includes quotations, interviews, poetry, and excerpts of memoirs from the famous and common ranks of Villagers either still living and/or working in the neighborhood or those who now reflect upon their pasts from afar. Stonehill's selected "stories" represent a larger wealth of primary sources available to historians of this period of Greenwich Village's creative past and they speak to the diversity of class, ethnicity, and professions that existed in the neighborhood then and perhaps still today. Moreover, what made the 1950s and 60s a creative

highpoint – and possibly its last – for the Village is abundantly clear to anyone willing to take the time to sift through the tonnage of accounts of life in that place in those few decades.

Playwright and local biographer of Greenwich Village, Penny Arcade wrote that when she was growing up in the 1960s, the neighborhood was "a different place, of small, dark, barely lit bookstores and cafés where people went religiously each night to talk politics, read poems, play chess and music." [53] Author and "creative ambassador" for Barneys New York, Simon Doonan, described a friend as "epitomizing everything that was great about the Village in the pre-hedge fund era;" furthermore, his friend's "affectionate and welcoming, wildly unpredictable, and naughty and irreverent" personality summed up everything that the Village "was." [54] The descriptions of people, places, and activities offered by these two 1960s residents of the Village sound quite similar to the environment and character of the Golden Age and Progressive Era Greenwich Village – a fact that many point to as proof of a second or continued creative spark in the neighborhood. Thomas Meehan remembers coming to the Village in 1955 and living in an old, rundown boardinghouse on Horatio Street that only cost him twenty-five dollars a week – cheap housing: an artist's necessity for survival, as Ramirez put it, both in the early 20th century and in the 1950s.[55] Where else but Greenwich Village in those days could a visionary like Andy Warhol put his imprint on music and art history simultaneously by importing paintings from his Factory in Midtown, quarreling over women with Bob Dylan, and essentially sponsoring The Velvet Underground? Even more convincing of this period's significance is the fact that people once again, or appeared to still have, a strong feeling of cooperation and of looking after each other.

The poet Anne Waldman remembers a "sense of civic pride" in the neighborhood that was embodied in local Arbor Day poetry readings and parades; and of the Village's atmosphere of "intimate, friendly" people "putting their lives together…inter-generationally." [56] Historians point to the reemergence of a sense of community in the Village as proof of a creative resurgence, but usually they cite neighborliness as only a contributing factor or the byproduct of the great musical, literary, and avant-garde movements that flourished in this period. The Wilentz family-owned Eighth Street Bookshop became a meeting ground for beatniks and men like Ginsberg and Kerouac while clubs and bars like the Café Wha?, The Gaslight Tavern, and the Night Owl became the stomping grounds for acts like Leonard Cohen, The Velvet Underground, The Mamas & The Papas, Dave Van Ronk, Pete Seeger and Bob Dylan.[57] In his 2004 autobiography, Dylan quotes the great folk "archivist," Alan Lomax, who once said that "if you want to get out of America, go to Greenwich Village." [58] In the same vein of a return or metamorphosis of Village bohemia, the great poet Harold Norse wrote in his autobiography, *Memoirs of a Bastard Angel*, that: "For Allen [Ginsberg], as for the

rest of us, the Village was an oasis in the puritan desert, a watering place for the soul." [59] Those historians who feel that the 1950s and 60s saw Greenwich Village reborn cite masses of primary sources, just like Norse and Dylan's autobiographies, that showcase most of the same reasons the Golden Age was what it was – a sense of community, cheap housing, and a bohemian mythos – from the 1890s to the 1920s. Interestingly enough, the cited causes for the Village's creative decay in the 1920s – over commercialization, gentrification, and moral slippage – are the same elements that historians of the second "Golden Age" point to as proof of the Village's creative end coming by the early 1970s.

One example of changes in the Village after the 1960s was the closing of the Wilentz family's Eighth Street Bookshop in 1979. The Bookshop had a long and storied run of operation and managed to keep its doors open far longer than many of its contemporary cafés and beatnik hangouts, but even it was not immune to what Sean Wilentz called the "gigantic and technological forces that were already looming in 1979." [60] The son of the last Wilentz to own the bookshop, Sean writes that even thirty-five years after the shop's closing, perfect strangers come up to him "bemoaning the bookshop's demise" and he believes that what they are really saying is that "there will never be anyplace quite like it…again, and they're right." [61] Although some aspects of the Village certainly did die off by the 1970s, the arguments that the Village still lives on – if only in the hibernating state Ramirez spoke of or as a microcosm of its former glory – are just as convincing as those arguing against the 1920s as the neighborhood's creative stopping point. Stonehill's *Greenwich Village Stories* is littered with past and present day Villagers' opinions about the neighborhood's state of affairs today, and the overwhelming majority believes that the spirit of its second heyday is still very much alive.

Longtime Villager, Linda Ellerbee does lament the loss of "cheap but good restaurants and street musicians" among other things, but writes that the Village refuses to stay in one "orbit" for too long and that the neighborhood still has what it did in the 1960s, "a big, loud, beating heart." [62] Penny Arcade goes even further to say that the Village's "energy" can never be lost and that the "energy of the unique and eccentric beings of the past resonate in our streets, and people visiting and living here today can experience it, too." [63] It is sources and quotations like these that flesh out the great passion that people in the Village have for their neighborhood and its truly amazing history; moreover, one way the Village lives on creatively today is through the cultural and historic preservation of local landmarks. The GVSHP, for example, is just one organization devoted to lobbying for the Village's preservation and the protection of iconic locales "celebrating the bold ideas and stubborn individuality" inherent to the neighborhood. [64] Remembering what Jan Seidler Ramirez had to say about the dilemma and paradox

associated with tourism in an area of bohemian refuge, it's fair to say that after the 1960s, and still today, tourism has had both positive and negative impacts on the Village's new life.

Robert Kaufelt, the owner of the old Village's cheese shop, Murray's, came to the neighborhood in 1989 with the dream of "inhabiting the same neighborhood where Dylan and others had tread [sic], as if some of their vibe might rub off." [65] Given, Kaufelt might not speak for the greater masses of day-trippers who visit the Village for its quaint, yet worldly flavor, but its men and women like him who hear or read about some bygone great from the neighborhood and decide to make a life there and add to the next chapter in Greenwich Village's history. Tourism in the 1980s also saw a resurgence of the comedy and theatre scene in the Village. For actor and comedian John Leguizamo the Village still had a supportive and creative environment in the 1980s stand-up and acting scene. What's more, Leguizamo writes that the Village was one of the few "inspired" places that made you feel "safe to fail" which allowed all artists the ability to think "outside the box." [66] Aside from arguments that tourism and entertainment saved the Village from death after 1970, is the belief held by many historians that the free-loving Village managed to live on as the epicenter of the Gay Liberation Movement.

Just as *Variety* asserted the Village's new life as a caterer to the nation's "temperamental" gay and black populations in 1925, the neighborhood became a vanguard for oppressed, alienated, and fed up gay men and women especially after the June 1969 Stonewall Riots. Artist and author of several books about sexual history, Jonathan Ned Katz, remembers living in the Village at the time of the riots and recalls the walls of his apartment muffling "the sounds of change coming from the world outside." [67] Thousands of men and women like Katz, a "repressed" gay man himself, flocked to the Village and protested in the streets, parks, and historical squares of the neighborhood and in many ways set the nation on the course toward gay and lesbian tolerance and equality that we find ourselves still following today. These are just a few instances and samples of the arguments that many use to argue that the Village's radical thinking and avant-garde character never truly died out after Dylan left or The Mamas & The Papas began California Dreamin' and departed the Village altogether.

Greenwich Village has gone through several periods of creative prominence and influence and has experienced lulls in its notoriety as a place of artistic and countercultural expression. As this discussion has sought to show, the Village's two most widely conceived "Golden Ages" – the 1890s to 1920s and the 1950s to 1970 – shared many of the same qualities and elements that both established and perhaps closed the neighborhood's avant-garde and creative wellspring. Village institutions like the Whitney Museum of American Art and hundreds of other galleries, studios, and social clubs that have stood the test of time are the types of features that

challenge any assumption of a creative expiration date for the neighborhood. As Ramirez wrote, "the bohemian colony of Greenwich Village has bloomed, withered, and mutated in direct proportion to its encroachment by outsiders;" thus, this paradox of sorts may be the driving force behind the neighborhood's great cycle. [68] In closing one has to wonder, can anyone ever truly say that Greenwich Village has or will ever die? Or is the answer as simple as Robert Kaufelt put it, "Things change, and only Bob Dylan [Malcolm Cowley, Floyd Dell, and all the Village greats are] forever?" [69] Only time will tell.

[1]   Jan Seidler Ramirez, "The Tourist Trade Takes Hold," in *Greenwich Village: Culture and Counterculture*, ed. Rick Beard and Leslie Cohen Berlowitz (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1993), 372.

[2]   Malcolm Cowley, *Exile's Return*, ed. Donald W. Faulkner (New York: Penguin Books, 1994), 215.

[3]   Cowley, *Exile's Return*, 215.

[4]   Cowley, *Exile's Return*, 235.

[5]   Cowley, *Exile's Return*, 235.

[6]   John Strausbaugh, *The Village: 400 Years of Beats and Bohemians, Radicals and Rogues, a History of Greenwich Village* (New York: Harper-Collins Publishers, 2013), 98-99.

[7]   Floyd Dell, *Love in Greenwich Village* (New York: George H. Doran Company, 1926), 15.

[8]   Gerald W. McFarland, *Inside Greenwich Village: Inside A New York City Neighborhood, 1898-1918* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2001), 6

[9]   Christine Stansell, *American Moderns: Bohemian New York and the Creation of a New Generation* (New York: Metropolitan Books, 2000), 15.

[10] Stansell, *American Moderns*, 16.

[11] Stansell, *American Moderns*, 39.

[12] Stansell, *American Moderns*, 60.

[13] For a more detailed and analytical discussion of female activism in the Village's Golden Age and after see: Leigh Ann Wheeler, "Where Else but Greenwich Village? Love, Lust, and the Emergence of the American Civil Liberties Union's Sexual Rights Agenda, 1920-1931," *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 21 (2012): 60-92.

[14] McFarland, *Inside Greenwich Village*, 49.

[15] McFarland, *Inside Greenwich Village*, 49.

[16] McFarland, *Inside Greenwich Village*, 49.

[17] McFarland, *Inside Greenwich Village*, 50.

[18] Stansell, *American Moderns*, 61.

[19] McFarland, *Inside Greenwich Village*, 4.

[20] Strausbaugh, *The Village*, 69.

[21] Lewis Erenberg, "Village Nightlife," in *Greenwich Village*, 358.

[22] Alfred Kazin, "Greenwich Village Writers," in *Greenwich Village*, 290.

[23] McFarland, *Inside Greenwich Village*, 4.

[24] Kazin, "Greenwich Village Writers," 295.

[25] Kazin, "Greenwich Village Writers," 295.

[26] Kazin, "Greenwich Village Writers," 299.

27 Kazin, "Greenwich Village Writers," 295.
28 Kazin, "Greenwich Village Writers," 296.
29 Kazin, "Greenwich Village Writers," 296-297.
30 Kazin, "Greenwich Village Writers," 296.
31 Caroline F. Ware, *Greenwich Village, 1920 – 1930: A Comment on American Civilization in the Post-War Years* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1935), 93.
32 McFarland, *Inside Greenwich Village*, 5.
33 Ramirez, "The Tourist Trade Takes Hold," 385.
34 Erenberg, "Village Nightlife," 360.
35 Ramirez, "The Tourist Trade Takes Hold," 388.
36 Ramirez, "The Tourist Trade Takes Hold," 388.
37 Ramirez, "The Tourist Trade Takes Hold," 389.
38 Ramirez, "The Tourist Trade Takes Hold," 389.
39 Dell, *Love in Greenwich Village*, 15.
40 Dell, *Love in Greenwich Village*, 15.
41 Dell, *Love in Greenwich Village*, 15.
42 Ramirez, "The Tourist Trade Takes Hold," 389-390.
43 Erenberg, "Village Nightlife," 358.
44 Erenberg, "Village Nightlife," 364.
45 Ramirez, "The Tourist Trade Takes Hold," 389.
46 Ramirez, "The Tourist Trade Takes Hold," 390.
47 Kazin, "Greenwich Village Writers," 301.
48 Kazin, "Greenwich Village Writers," 298.
49 Erenberg, "Village Nightlife," 357-258.
50 Erenberg, "Village Nightlife," 364.
51 Erenberg, "Village Nightlife," 368.
52 The Greenwich Village Society for Historic Preservation also has a fantastic website detailing a geographic history of Village landmarks and past and present spots of great interest. See: Greenwich Village Society for Historic Preservation, "Village History," Accessed March 29, 2015, http://www.gvshp.org/_gvshp/resources/history.htm#bohem.
53 Greenwich Village Society for Historic Preservation, *Greenwich Village Stories: A Collection of Memoirs*, ed. Judith Stonehill. (New York: Universe Publishing, 2014), 16.
54 Greenwich Village Society for Historic Preservation, 40.
55 Greenwich Village Society for Historic Preservation, 117-118.
56 Greenwich Village Society for Historic Preservation, 165-167.
57 Greenwich Village Society for Historic Preservation, 89, 168-171.
58 Bob Dylan, *Chronicles: Volume One* (New York: Simon and Schuster Paperbacks, 2004), 55.
59 Barry Miles, "The Beat Generation in the Village," in *Greenwich Village*, 168-169.
60 Greenwich Village Society for Historic Preservation, 171.
61 Greenwich Village Society for Historic Preservation, 171.
62 Greenwich Village Society for Historic Preservation, 41-42.
63 Greenwich Village Society for Historic Preservation, 16.
64 Greenwich Village Society for Historic Preservation, 5.
65 Greenwich Village Society for Historic Preservation, 86.
66 Greenwich Village Society for Historic Preservation, 98.
67 Greenwich Village Society for Historic Preservation, 84.
68 Ramirez, "The Tourist Trade Takes Hold," 372.
69 Greenwich Village Society for Historic Preservation, 86.

The Delaware Whipping Post:
Ancient Punishments in an Enlightened Age

By Lucas Mays

It is fairly unanimously accepted within the modern Western world that whippings, beatings, and other forms of physical punishment are extremely barbaric. Most, if asked when such practices ended, would likely guess the early to mid-nineteenth century. In fact, the practice of whipping criminals was practiced well into the twentieth century. This sentencing of criminals to physical punishment, such as whipping, is commonly referred to as "judicial corporal punishment." Delaware practiced judicial corporal punishment longer than any other state, maintaining it well into the early 1950s.[1] The intentional infliction of pain is seen as something alien to modern America and current readings of the Eighth Amendment to the United States Constitution. Yet, the United States, and especially Delaware, have not so distant histories of judicial corporal punishment.

The expansive history of judicial corporal punishments is substantial. Historians have written about the Puritans and their use of the whipping post.[2] Others have tackled the entire history of the practice, focusing on its origins within Puritan communities through its practice in the twentieth century. Few historians, however, have addressed the specifics of judicial corporal punishment within more recent United States history. Also, little or no research has been done regarding which states held on to the practice of judicial corporal punishment longer than others. In this area, as stated before, Delaware is of particular note. It was the last state to do away with judicial corporal punishment.[3] This leads to the question of why Delaware held on to its tradition of corporal punishment so much longer than the rest of the nation. Further, what were the roles of gender and race in its application, duration, and eventual downfall? What groups supported its use and what groups opposed it and why? Which methods of judicial corporal punishment were endorsed and which were frowned upon, even within the state of Delaware? This paper will address these questions and argue that Delaware maintained a seemingly archaic punishment by adjusting it to modern concepts of criminal justice brought on by Enlightenment and Progressive schools of thought.

With the amount of historical research done on criminal justice within the United States, one would think that there are already countless works concerning judicial corporal punishment. Most scholarly work on the corporal punishment of

criminals has focused on its use within prisons. Specifically, David Rothman and Michel Foucault have examined the role of corporal punishment as a means of control in the development of the prison system in the nineteenth century.

In his 1971 book, *The Discovery of the Asylum*, Rothman noted that, at the time, the birth of prisons had either been explained as the result of new Jacksonian ideals encouraging benevolence or as the result of attempts to control the growing labor force that was necessary to the growth of capitalism.[4] Rothman found both these theories to be less than satisfactory and thus set out to cast the era of prison reform in his own light. The resulting argument is one that chronologically addresses the development of prisons through a lens of cause and effect, beginning with the mid-eighteenth century and ending with an analysis of prisons in the late nineteenth century.[5] Rothman argues that with the dawn of the Jacksonian era, criminal justice reformers became more and more interested in the idea that criminals were a result of negative influences within their environment. In order to combat this, these reformers advocated more humanitarian methods of punishments that focused on rehabilitating criminals rather than exacting vengeance. From these sentiments emerged the concept of the modern penitentiary. Reformers believed that by providing criminals with a regimented environment, separate from the negative influences of society, they could be reformed and eventually reintegrated into society. However, Rothman notes that even with the new focus on humanitarian punishment, early prisons like the Ossining Institution in New York still readily used physical means to maintain order and obedience.[6] During the early years of the penitentiary, it was not uncommon for prison guards or wardens to use whippings or beatings to keep unruly prisoners in line. While no longer a legal form of punishment in most states, Rothman demonstrates that corporal punishment continued to play a role in the developing institution of prisons.

Michel Foucault presents a similar argument about the role of physical punishment in prisons in *Discipline and Punish*. Foucault focuses on the development of the modern prison system to show how punishment transitioned from the public sphere to the more private one of the prison. His main argument is that the driving force behind these changes was the desire by the state to develop more efficient methods of social control.[7] As the United States progressed further into the modern age, Foucault argues that the state began to seek to further assert itself over the individual. This was largely facilitated by the creation of the modern prison. Unlike previous forms of punishment, the prison allowed the state to conceal its power from the eye of the public, which in turn allowed the state to become even more controlling. However, despite moving away from public punishment, Foucault still asserts that an element of corporal punishment was still necessary. Like Rothman, Foucault reasoned that for contemporaries, a certain element of physical pain was required for the sake of order within the prison.[8] For both scholars,

corporal punishment was an inescapable part of early prison regimes. However, more importantly, they highlight the gap in historical research. Their works make it seem as though corporal punishment within the criminal justice system was confined to the realm of the prison. Yet Delaware stands as proof that this was not the case. Just as Foucault's state worked to conceal its use of power within the prison, so too did Delaware work to mask their use of the whipping post in modern language of deterrence and formalized practices.

In order to better understand the practice of judicial corporal punishment in Delaware, the majority of the primary sources used for this paper will be pulled from *The New York Times*, and to a lesser extent, the *Chicago Tribune*. While not local to Delaware, both these papers still published articles that commented on the proceedings within Delaware concerning the application of judicial corporal punishment. Along with providing detailed information regarding the practice, this coverage demonstrates that there was a continuous national interest in Delaware's use of the whipping post. Both newspapers regularly reported the age and gender of those who were being punished. While many articles did not explicitly state the race of those being punished, it was typically implied that the individual being discussed was white. Through the analysis of these sources, it will become clear that it was only through the quick adaptation of judicial corporal punishment within Delaware that the state was able to maintain its whipping post while the rest of the nation moved forward.

Dating back to the Puritans, pain has played an important role in how wrongdoers have been punished in American traditions rooted in retributive justice. In other words, pain and punishment were traditionally used as a way for the victim of the crime to exact an indirect form of revenge, or retribution, on the criminal. This practice of vengeance through the law within the United States is the main topic of Anne-Marie Cusac's book, *Cruel and Unusual: The Culture of Punishment in America*. According to Cusac, religion has been deeply ingrained within American criminal justice practices.[9] Puritans were an extremely strict religious group that was ready and all too willing to use pain to make sure their disciples adhered to their strict code of morality. Corporal punishment, unlike other methods, allowed the Puritans to incorporate public shaming into punishment of the offender. According to Cusac "the physical marking of faces and forcing of bodies into uncomfortable postures both causes hurt and set the suffering body apart from others, so that onlookers will notice and disapprove." [10] Many times, the punishment also corresponded in some way with the crime committed. For example, a heretic might have an H seared into their forehead or a loud woman would be forced to wear a gag.[11] In this way, there was never a doubt as to what exactly the consequences of sin entailed. Along with that, the values of the community were made "painfully" clear.

By the time of the American Revolution, shame oriented methods of punishment had begun to fall out of favor. Reformers such as Benjamin Rush argued the immorality of painful punishment. Rush's version of God was benevolent, not destructive.[12] Rush was not alone in his beliefs either. Other noteworthy thinkers of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, such as Cesare Beccaria and Jeremy Bentham, shared Rush's dislike of corporal punishment and saw it as ineffective.[13] These beliefs were representative of the American Enlightenment as a whole. Rothman argues that Enlightenment reformers viewed the British pain-oriented methods of punishment as responsible for the criminality in their country.[14] A more civilized, less violent method of punishment was needed if criminality was to be decreased. Reformers, such as Jeremy Bentham, advocated systems, not driven by pain, but rather by social control. Bentham argued that good and evil were created by pleasure and pain, respectively. As such, if a society wished to eliminate evil, or crime, legislators should focus on the removal of pain from their systems of punishment.[15] Prisons became the ideal method of removing pain from the system, and as such, in 1819 the Auburn state prison of New York was created. Pennsylvania was quick to follow suit, establishing its own take on the ideal penitentiary.[16] These prisons worked to reform criminals through regimented lifestyles of manual labor and obedience.[17] In this way, prison sentences were ideally meant to deter future criminal activity instead of exacting impersonal revenge through the state.

Yet, rather than eliminating the inflicting of pain from criminal punishment, modern criminal justice simply moved corporal punishment from the public sphere to the private sphere of prisons.[18] Criminals were still physically punished, but now it was done so unofficially. Moving into the Progressive Era, this would develop into the concept that Cusac aptly refers to as "punishment creep." [19] The old time, religiously driven methods of physical punishment were far from gone. The implementation had simply evolved to fit the philosophical language of the time. In the modern era, retributive justice had become stigmatized as an archaic leftover from British rule. Criminal justice now had to be presented through the more humane lens of "deterrence." While for the majority of the United States, this meant moving the physical aspects of punishment into the prisons with their lofty goals of reformation and deterrence, Delaware simply redefined judicial corporal punishment appropriately.

At first glance, the Delaware method of judicial corporal punishment seems inherently retributive. After all, reformers since the eighteenth century had condemned such practices as cruel and unusual. Punishments such as whipping have all the trappings of revenge. One party is placed in a submissive position while the other stands above, with the power to inflict as much pain as they possibly can within a set number of lashes. The relationship between the crime and the punishment also communicates a sense of retribution. For example, Delaware's laws stipulated that one of the crimes punishable by whipping was wife beating.[20]

This fact was even used to justify attempts to enact similar laws in other states. In 1903, two Chicago police justices declared themselves in favor of the whipping post for wife beaters as the only appropriate method of punishment for such a crime, citing Delaware as proof of its effectiveness.[21] Two years later, a Pennsylvania state legislator by the name of Robert Adams also called for wife beaters to receive the lash. In a fifteen minute speech on the matter, he praised Delaware as the only state "that had the courage to take wife beaters to the post."[22] With other states applauding the retributive nature of Delaware's whipping laws, it was very clear that there were those who still supported the "eye for an eye" style of punishment. Yet, despite receiving the most attention, the whipping of wife beaters was an uncommon occurrence. In fact, Delaware's whipping laws were far more deterrence-oriented than the Illinois justices or Pennsylvania representative realized.

While Delaware did punish wife beaters for their actions with the whip, they also used the post to punish a variety of other crimes, including larceny and numerous other forms of theft.[23] Indeed, the number of criminals sentenced to the post for theft- oriented crimes vastly outnumbered those sentenced for wife beating. In a 1925 interview with the *The New York Times*, a warden by the name of Elmer J. Leach was asked how many criminals he had whipped in one year and for what offense. Warden Leach stated he had given the lash to nine men, all convicted of robbery, larceny, or some other form of theft. Not one of the men had been sentenced for wife beating. In fact, according to the warden, there had not been a convicted wife beater for the previous two years.[24] In other words, Delaware was using the post, not primarily to avenge victims of domestic abuse, but rather to motivate thieves and robbers to give up their habits or to practice their trade elsewhere.

As Cusac and Rothman discussed, the mentality of the nineteenth century was that steps should be taken to deter criminals rather than seek vengeance. Reformers of the time argued that this could not be accomplished through the whip because it was excessively cruel and only served to humiliate the subject. Yet Delaware used this idea of humiliation to justify its continued use of the whip, except they saw humiliation as related to deterrence rather than vengeance. Delaware politicians argued that the humiliation was not enacted in order to make the convict repay some debt to society, but rather to motivate him to give up his thieving ways. As one 1921 *Chicago Daily Tribune* article explains, "the theory of the 'cat' is that the humiliation of being beaten is worse medicine to a criminal than a prison sentence."[25] It is also worth noting that race played no noticeable role in who received whipping sentences. There were only a select few news articles that mentioned blacks receiving the whip as punishment, and in most they were punished alongside whites. In fact, out of all the men punished in Delaware's largest group whipping, not a single one of them was black.[26] In this way, at least in the minds of the good people of Delaware, they were keeping with the mentality of the time. After all, as Rothman

readily reminds us, deterrence was a key aspect of Enlightenment theory.[27] As such, by the end of the period, every state within the nation except Delaware had abandoned the use of judicial corporal punishment. Instead, they had transitioned to the use of penitentiaries in which corporal punishment was allocated a more informal, disciplinary role. However, in order to maintain their preferred method of punishment, Delaware simply cast the whipping post in a more modern light.

Nevertheless, Delaware's use of judicial corporal punishment within the twentieth century was not entirely in line with the progressively more humanitarian ideals of the time. Within the Progressive Era, there was a continued emphasis on removing the ritual from punishments. During its early use, such as in pre-revolutionary times, public punishment had been a grand spectacle. Whether it was executions, the stockades, or public whippings, the entire community would come out for the event. But attitudes toward judicial corporal punishment shifted over time much as they did for capital punishment. Specifically, the whipping post and its public nature underwent the same critiques as public hangings.

In *Rites of Execution*, Louis P. Masur explains that initially the public execution was seen as a "spectacle of civil and religious order." [28] Similar to the old versions of judicial corporal punishment, the public aspect of hangings had served to reinforce the values of the society. However, during the early nineteenth century, the elites of the United States began to realize that public executions were in practice, having the opposite of the intended effect. Public executions had become characterized by the upper and middle classes of society as unruly and disgusting. [29] With public executions beginning to be seen as a threat to public order, elites began searching for reasons to end the practice altogether. It is at this point that Masur discusses the influence of phrenology. Phrenology was a new science at the time that focused on analyzing the brain as an organ.[30] Popularized within the United States by George Combe, phrenology provided a rational, scientific explanation as to how public hangings were damaging to society. Popular phrenologists of the time such as Charles Caldwell argued that public executions ran the risk of awakening "the instinct to destroy human life," in those who were not of the appropriate temperament.[31] Armed with science and a desire to maintain decency and order, elites throughout the nation set about beginning the transition to private executions. By the nineteenth century, every state had abandoned public hangings, with the exception of Kentucky. Much like Delaware, Kentucky stood as a pariah, maintaining the practice well into the twentieth century. However, in 1936 one particular event doomed public hangings within Kentucky.

In August of that year, convicted rapist Rainey Bethea was publicly hanged in Owensboro, Kentucky.[32] The hanging itself was an extraordinary event. Already a matter of large discussion locally, the case drew national interest when it came to the public's attention that the sheriff of the county, Florence Shoemaker Thompson,

was a woman.[33] From there, the media only further sensationalized the event. By the day of the execution, Bethe had received so much attention that an estimated 10,000 individuals showed up to witness his hanging. Newspapers described the large crowd as unruly, even stating that some members attempted to gather souvenirs from the gallows.[34] By the end of the entire experience, the Kentucky government had been thoroughly embarrassed and immediately set about planning to end public executions for good. The entire event serves as a testament to the volatile state of punishments considered excessive by the mid-twentieth century. Through their actions at Bethea's execution, the crowd had confirmed the fears that had been expressed almost a hundred years prior. While the science of phrenology may have become obsolete, the United States still accepted that public executions were immoral and created disorder. They had long since ceased to serve as deterrence to those who witnessed them. All it took was one poorly managed hanging and some newspapers looking for a good story to make the entire experience seem like a grisly holiday. As a result, the practice of public execution died with Rainey Bethea.

Although judicial corporal punishment was not a method of execution, it still ran similar risks of becoming sensationalized. Were a whipping in Delaware to receive the same bad press as the Bethea execution, the practice would have surely received an equally swift demise. However, unlike hangings in Kentucky, Delaware's use of the whipping post was an extremely formal event. While the whippings themselves were open to the public, crowd sizes throughout the early to mid-nineteenth century remained noticeably smaller than the one at Bethea's hanging. On average, crowd sizes ranged from ten to one hundred.[35] It should also be noted that these smaller sizes were not due to an inconsistent schedule or lack of public awareness. The whippings in Delaware were a monthly event, carried out exclusively at the New Castle Workhouse in Wilmington. Once a month, all individuals who had been sentenced to public whipping were taken to Wilmington where they then received their lashes from the current warden. Had large portions of the general population wished to view the whippings, all they needed to do was travel to New Castle. Yet, despite the consistent schedule and easy to locate facility, the overall attendance was extremely low. By creating a formalized schedule from which little deviation was made, Delaware removed the sense of excitement from the event. For the citizens of Delaware, it was just another month, just another set of criminals.

Moreover, the conduct and composition of the audiences was strictly regulated. While attendance was allowed, there were certain rules that were put in place to avoid the chaos that had characterized public executions. To begin with, anyone who was considered faint of heart was strictly prohibited from viewing the event. As such, no women were allowed to witness the whippings.[36] The press was allowed to be present at the whippings, but unlike in Kentucky absolutely no photography was permitted. Not only that, but the guards present at the whippings

actively worked to enforce these regulations. So diligent were the guards, that in one instance they caught a man who had concealed a camera within his derby hat, taking pictures from a hole in the top. The warden then confiscated the camera and destroyed the film. The changes in criminal justice theory over the past century clearly had not gone unnoticed by Delaware. The restrictions put in place are evidence of an understanding that the whipping post was viewed as archaic. The fall of public executions demonstrated that a certain degree of caution and restraint would be required moving forward. Therefore, in order to avoid criticism, Delaware went to great lengths to avoid the carnival-like merriment and sensationalism associated with other public punishments of the time.

The rulings of the court when it issued judicial corporal punishment within Delaware also helped a great deal to create a sense of formality. In the time of the Puritans, whippings or other forms of physical punishment were special events all in themselves, as were public executions up through the nineteenth century. In Delaware, however, the use of judicial corporal punishment was anything but noteworthy. The whippings themselves were rarely even the primary form of punishment. In most instances, they were simply a supplemental punishment. Criminals convicted of larceny or highway robbery would receive their lashes and then still be expected to serve time within the prison system, often with long sentences. Individuals who received the lash could also be liable to serve anywhere from one to ten years of jail time.[37] In this way, the whipping post's significance was greatly lessened. In Delaware, the whip was not the major event of the month. It was simply a minor part of the criminal justice system, similar to a fine. By removing any spectacle from the whip, Delaware avoided suffering similarly embarrassing displays of cruelty like that of the Bethea hanging. The low key nature of the whipping allowed it to go unnoticed by the opponents of corporal punishment.

While changes in the language of punishment and formality helped protect the whipping post from criticism, there were nonetheless attempts to reform the practice. At the very beginning of the Progressive Era, much like every other state at the time, certain Delaware officials were working diligently to transform how they viewed crime and punishment. In some areas, significant change was even achieved. As the older generation of prison wardens began to rotate out, newer, more open-minded schools of thought began to take root. Throughout the early twentieth century a variety of alternatives to incarceration rose in popularity. In *Conscience and Convenience*, Rothman examines the rise of further humanitarian forms of rehabilitation during this period. Rothman explains that the Progressives strongly emphasized the uniqueness of each criminal. For Progressives, intense evaluation of the individual was required if any attempt at rehabilitation was to be met with success.[38] Another tenet of Progressive criminology was the state as a guiding force. Progressives believed the state should work with the criminal to help them

become fit for reentry into society. Key to this were the concepts of the probation officer, the settlement house, and indeterminate sentences.[39] By leaving a prisoner's sentence open for interpretation, it allowed the state to reevaluate prisoners on a case by case level, and thus better help the individual achieve rehabilitation. Indeterminate sentences were particularly popular with wardens and Delaware's were no exception.[40] In 1920, a man by the name of Mordecai S. Plummer took the position of warden at the Newcastle workhouse. Plummer brought a variety of Progressive reforms including a new honor system in which guards were replaced with long-term prisoners in places of responsibility. He also allowed prisoners time for recreation, created a night school, and even worked to provide decent food.[41] Warden Plummer's system epitomized the new views on prison systems put forth at the turn of the century. He even opposed the whipping post and actively worked to put an end to its use.

Along with the newer wardens, political figures opposed the whipping post off and on for the entirety of the Progressive Era. In 1897, a Republican member of the Delaware Senate put forth a bill to abolish the whipping post, but it was quickly defeated.[42] Again in 1901, state senator S.M. Knox put forth a bill to end the post. This time it was accompanied by a petition with 100 signatures and the support of various church associations.[43] As before, the bill was summarily defeated. Finally, in 1925 the Senate tried for a third time to stop the whippings. However, as with the two times before, the bill was rejected, with 31 members of the Senate voting nay, and only one, yea. Clearly, there were those within the state of Delaware who did not buy into the talk of "deterrence" and saw through the formality of the whippings. In the words of Governor Caleb J. Boggs, the post was "barbaric and cruel." [45]

Opposition was not restricted to just within the state either. Individuals throughout the nation took note of Delaware and its continued use of the whip. In the mid-1890s an opponent of judicial corporal punishment named Robert G. Ingersoll attempted to speak out against Delaware's practices. In his essay *Is Corporal Punishment Degrading?* Ingersoll asserts that corporal punishment was an outdated and degrading practice. He supported this argument by noting that the recent accomplishments within the United States, such as the abolition of slavery, were the result of kindness. Ingersoll ultimately states that "fear is the father of lies," and that affection can only be gained through kindness.[46] Ingersoll was scheduled to speak in Dover on the whipping post, however before he had even entered the state Delaware's Chief Justice threatened him with arrest. Not surprisingly, Ingersoll chose to avoid the state.[47]

U.S. Congressional Representative, John M. Evans of Montana, also viciously attacked Delaware's practices of judicial corporal punishment, drawing attention to the issue in September and again in November of 1913. In a particularly vehement speech, he stated that "I have but little patience with any man who permits his

sympathy to run with a felon so far as to forget the rights of law abiding citizens of the state." For Evans, even a criminal was still entitled to fair and just treatment. He then proceeded to call for the President and Attorney General of the United States to bring injunctions against the state of Delaware until they ended their outdated practices of punishment.[48] These continued attacks on the use of the whipping post defined the Progressive Era for Delaware. By the 1920s, change was most certainly in high demand. Despite their best efforts, Delaware was finally receiving the attention it had worked so hard to avoid. The state's willingness to imprison Ingersoll also suggests that they were losing local support. Yet the resolve of Delaware would continue to endure, and not simply because lashing criminals was long standing tradition or because their opinions of it changed with the times.

The largest reason that Delaware continued to whip their criminals all the way up until the 1960s was because certain parts of the government, and more importantly, the population as a whole, truly believed that the system worked. For the good people of Delaware, ending judicial corporal punishment would leave them defenseless to the criminals of the nation. In particular, they had a unique obsession with keeping the dastardly "professional criminal" out of their borders. Interestingly, while this was the battle cry of whipping post supporters across Delaware, their fear of the professional criminal dated back to before the likes of Al Capone and the Italian mafia gained notoriety. Historically speaking, 1920 to 1933, the period of prohibition, is considered the era of the professional criminal. It was during this time period that criminal gangs began to gain power and notoriety. However, records show that Delaware had an overwhelming fear of the professional criminal dating all the way back to the 1800s. Like the monster under the bed, Delaware saw the professional criminal as an ever looming threat to be kept at bay. The common crook could be dissuaded with a simple prison sentence, but they believed that the hardened criminal was not so easily driven off. Prison was nothing more than a minor setback for the higher class of criminal. But, according to the people of Delaware, this special brand of criminal had his own particular set of universal fears. Much like how the vampire fears the cross, Delaware's "professional criminal" was particularly frightened by the threat of public whipping. According to an 1891 *New York Times* article, "to them, an experience at the whipping post is considered a deep disgrace that degrades them beyond redemption in the eyes of their fellows." [49] It appears that Delaware was cracking down on the criminal class long before the rest of the nation would find it necessary.

While such reasoning may initially seem like desperate justification for an outdated system, interviews showed that Delaware was not entirely wrong in its analysis. In 1913, a visiting criminal from Maryland by the name of James Plater was arrested for the theft of a dozen shirts and a stove. As punishment, he was assigned ten lashes and a six month prison sentence. At the time, whipping criminals

was illegal in Maryland and as such it was a new experience for Plater. When asked about his lashing after the fact, Plater stated that at the end of his prison sentence he would return to Maryland and keep away from Delaware.[50] Similar accounts can be found dating throughout the Progressive Era. In 1898, a noteworthy out of state crook by the name of "Big Frank" McCoy and his compatriot were caught robbing a bank. Both men were given the traditional lashing. After receiving his punishment, "Big Frank" swore to stay away from Delaware. For him, nothing was more unbearable than the whip. He said he would instead stick to the states where the most painful experience he could receive would be an extra-long prison sentence.[51] While it may not have been as effective against all full-time criminals in Delaware as it was against "Big Frank" or Plater, it was clearly something that was taken into consideration. After all, unlike the local or common crook, the master thief, like a traditional businessman, had the option to set up shop somewhere more appealing. With these testaments and arguments, Delaware staunchly defended its position against the select few who were not dissuaded by the initially unassuming appearance of its judicial corporal punishment.

In conclusion, it was only through careful adaptation of practice and language associated with the whipping post that Delaware was able to maintain the practice well into the twentieth century. Beginning with the Enlightenment era, reformers like Jeremy Bentham and Cesare Beccaria worked diligently to do away with the violent punishments that had characterized British rule.[52] Both public capital and corporal punishment came under heavy attack, being condemned as archaic and rooted in outdated systems of retribution. While most states adopted the penitentiary as the ideal means of deterring future crimes, Delaware instead chose to present their whipping post as their own form of deterrence. Delaware argued that with the ever looming threat of the lash, no criminal would have the courage to steal within their state's borders. When states began to attack public hangings as unruly, Delaware was quick to react, enacting systems to maintain order within their own form of public punishment. However, despite their best efforts, Delaware was eventually driven to the edge. With the dawn of the twentieth century and criticism mounting both within and without the state, Delaware used their fear of the professional criminal as their final justification. While the testimonies of convicted criminals were enough to sustain Delaware for a further few decades, eventually, even that became an ineffective argument. In July of 1972, Governor Russell W. Peterson finally signed Delaware's whipping post out of existence.[53] After over a century's worth of maneuvering, Delaware was finally forced to move forward into the modern age of criminal punishment.

1   Robert Graham Caldwell, *Red Hannah: Delaware's Whipping Post* (Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia Press, 1947).
2   William Andrews, *Old Time Punishments* (Dorset: The Tabard Press, 1992).
3   Caldwell, *Red Hannah.*
4   David Rothman, *The Discovery of the Asylum: Social Order and Disorder in the New Republic* (New Brunswick: Aldine Transaction, 1971; revised 2001), xi-xii.
5   Rothman, *The Discovery of the Asylum.*
6   Rothman, *The Discovery of the Asylum*, 79-109.
7   Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* (New York: Vintage Books, 1979).
8   Foucault, Discipline and Punish, 104-135.
9   Anne-Marie Cusac, *Cruel and Unusual: The Culture of Punishment in America* (New Haven: Yale University, 2009).
10 Cusac, *Cruel and Unusual*, 21.
11 Cusac, *Cruel and Unusual*, 21.
12 Cusac, *Cruel and Unusual*, 40.
13 Cesare Beccaria, *An Essay on Crimes and Punishment* (Dublin: John Exshaw, 1776). Jeremy Bentham, *An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1876).
14 Rothman, *The Discovery of the Asylum*, 59.
15 Bentham, *An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation.*
16 Rothman, *The Discovery of the Asylum*, 79.
17 Foucault, *Discipline and Punish.*
18 Cusac, *Cruel and Unusual*, 50-60; Foucault, *Discipline and Punish*, 231-237;Rothman, *The Discovery of the Asylum*, 83.
19 Cusac, *Cruel and Unusual*, 72.
20 "Want the Whipping Post," *Chicago Daily Tribune*, September 12, 1903.
21 "Want the Whipping Post," *Chicago Daily Tribune*, September 12, 1903.
22 "House Plea for Whipping Post," *Chicago Daily Tribune*, January 7, 1905.
23 "All Robbers must be Whipped Under Bill Passed in Delaware," *New York Times*, May 1, 1959.
24 Rose C., "Delaware Still Uses Ancient Whipping Post," *New York Times*, April 19, 1925.
25 "Delaware Uses Whip to Check Crime," *Chicago Daily Tribune*, March 26, 1921.
26 "Delaware's Whipping Day," *New York Times*, March 7, 1909; "Eight Delaware Robbers Given Mass Whipping," *Chicago Daily Tribune*, March 17, 1940; "Four Negroes Punished by 140 Lashes at the Delaware Whipping Post," *New York Times*, March 27, 1921; "7 Delaware Thieves Given 40 Lashes Each at Whipping Post," *Chicago Daily Tribune*, March 20, 1932.
27 Rothman, *The Discovery of the Asylum*, 79-109
28 Louis P. Masur, *Rites of Execution: Capital Punishment and the Transformation of American Culture, 1776-1865* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989), 96.
29 Masur, *Rites of Execution*, 95-99.
30 Masur, *Rites of Execution*, 98.
31 Masur, *Rites of Execution*, 99.
32 "Word for Word," *New York Times*, May 6, 2001.
33 "Word for Word", *New York Times*, May 6, 2001.
34 "10,000 See Hanging of Kentucky Negro," *New York Times*, August 15, 1936.
35 "Firebug Receives 20 Lashes at Whipping Post in Delaware," *New York Times*, April 15, 1928; "Four Negroes Punished by 140 Lashes at the Delaware Whipping Post," *New York Times*, March 27, 1921.
36 "Wife-Beater Gets the Lash in Delaware; Ten Strokes Applied Under Law of 1717," *New York Times*, October 10, 1937.
37 "Firebug Receives 20 Lashes at Whipping Post in Delaware," *New York Times*, April 15, 1928; "Four Negroes Punished by 140 Lashes at the Delaware Whipping Post," *New York Times*, March 27, 1921.

38 David J. Rothman, *Conscience and Convenience: The Asylum and its Alternatives in Progressive America* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1980), 54-60.

39 Rothman, *Conscience and Convenience*, 68-71.

40 Rothman, *Conscience and Convenience*, 73.

41 Rose, C., "Delaware Still Uses Ancient Whipping Post".

42 "Delaware Crooks Have Wholesome Fear of the Whipping Post," *Chicago Daily Tribune*, December 3, 1898, Accessed November 12, 2014, http://search.proquest.com/docview/172898124?accountid=11578.

43 Special to The New York Times, "To Abolish Whipping Post," *New York Times*, Jan 9, 1901.

44 Special to The New York Times, "Bill to Ban Whipping Post is Voted Down in Delaware," *New York Times*, March 26, 1925.

45 "Veto Measure on Whipping in Delaware," *Chicago Daily Tribune*, May 12, 1959.

46 Robert Ingersoll, *The Works of Robert G. Ingersoll* (New York: The Dresden Publishing Company, 1900), http://www.gutenberg.org/files/38806/38806-h/38806-h.htm#link0017.

47 "Delaware Crooks Have Wholesome Fear of Whipping Post," *Chicago Daily Tribune*, December 3, 1898.

48 "Whip for Felons Plea in Congress," *Chicago Daily Tribune*, November 15, 1913.

49 "The Delaware Whipping Post," *New York Times*, November 24, 1891.

50 Special to The New York Times. "More Delaware Whippings," *New York Times*, December 7, 1913.

51 "Delaware Crooks Have Wholesome Fear of Whipping Post," *Chicago Daily Tribune*, December 3, 1898.

52 Beccaria, *An Essay on Crimes and Punishment*
Bentham, *An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation*

53 "Whipping Post Banned by New Delaware Law," *New York Times*, Jul 09, 1972.

A Vision of Peace: The International Congress of Women at The Hague

By Chris Moberg

In the spring of 1915, in the midst of the deadliest war that the world had ever known, over a thousand women from twelve nations met together to find a way to end the apocalypse. To get there they would cross submarine infested waters and the battlelines of the western front. These peace activists, while despised and harassed in their own time, have had the benefit of being on the right side of history. Their proposals, developed over the course of three days at the International Congress of Women at The Hague, would clearly influence the end of the war. At the time, however, the attendees were strongly criticized by the dominant pro-war societies of their respective nations. As scholar Joshua S. Goldstein comments, "Theodore Roosevelt called the meeting 'silly and base.' Winston Churchill closed the North Sea to shipping, preventing most British delegates from attending. The British Admiralty also detained the US delegation's ship – which the British press called a 'shipload of hysterical women' and 'feminine busybodies' – until the last minute."[1] While this sort of criticism was common, the delegates were not the sort to be easily intimidated. These determined women would not be stopped by blustering politicians, travel bans, or the Great War itself. From April 28th to May 1st of 1915, women from both sides of the conflict came together in Holland to address the initial causes of war and determine how to prevent such a catastrophe from occurring again in the future. They discussed the specific effects of war on women and children, how to bring the war to an end, developing principles for a permanent peace, creating a stronger sense of international cooperation, and the importance of universal education for children. The Congress would also send a delegation to the governments of Europe to spread their proposals for peace and lead to the creation of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom (WILPF) which continues to the present day.

The International Congress of Women (ICW) of 1915 was not a meeting of politicians or diplomats. The attendees, led by women like Jane Addams, Rosika Schwimmer, and Chrystal Macmillan were often middle aged, middle class reformers who had little real power to influence diplomacy and military policy. Yet the reforms that the ICW promoted would go on to make up six of President Wilson's lauded Fourteen Points.[2] The ICW gave its attendees an opportunity to demonstrate that women from warring countries could work together to create both a dynamic plan to end the war and proposals for a lasting peace. Their proposals would also lead to the development of organizations which continue to impact the present like WILPF, the United Nations, and The Hague International Criminal Court.

There are countless texts on the First World War, but few mention the ICW. Most scholarly writing on the ICW[3] has occurred around the time of other more recent conflicts when peace movements tend to grow in popularity. The initial coverage of the ICW was from journalists writing from the time and was resoundingly negative.[4] Often times journalists simply made up facts about the ICW as they were disappointed that it did not degenerate into fights between women from opposing sides of the war. Several months later Jane Addams, Emily G. Balch, and Alice Hamilton coauthored a short recounting of the event entitled *Women at the Hague,* which along with the official *Report* of the ICW is a primary source for much of the information in this essay.[5] There were also many references to the ICW early on in the publications of the WILPF in the 1920's.[6] After that there is little mention of the ICW until the 1960s where it is rated only in relation to peace activism and peace movements.[7] There is again a gap where little scholarship seems on the ICW appears until the 1980s were several books are written related to peace activism. Specifically, Anne Wiltsher's *Most Dangerous Women: Feminist Peace Campaigners of the Great War* which thoroughly explores the events surrounding ICW, the women who attended, and their continued efforts to end the war.[8] Since then, a significant amount of scholarship relating to the ICW has been written in the last decade.[9] The ICW is also mentioned in the biographies and monographs related to many important women who were involved, although it usually gets little more attention than the fact that the individual or group the text focuses on had attended.[10] All in all, save for a few thin volumes, little attention has been paid to this important event.

To properly explore the ICW and its impact, this essay will be divided into three parts. Part one provides some context for the Great War, how suffrage groups reacted to the onset of war, and why the peace activists split from their old organizations. Part two primarily follows Rosika Schwimmer, as she develops her prescient ideas while watching the war begin from enemy territory. She in many ways acts as a catalyst for the ICW and its agenda as she joins a growing coalition led by suffrage leaders Jane Addams, Chrystal Macmillan, and other international suffragists. I briefly cover how they react to the outbreak of war and develop the first strategies to promote peace. Part three covers the ICW itself: the organization of the ICW, difficulties attendees had in reaching the ICW, and resolutions they adopted.

To aid in the task of understanding this little known, yet important event, I have utilized the personal papers and published writings of the attendees, the organizational records of the ICW, the Woman's Peace Party (WPP), the WILPF, among other contemporary sources. Due to limitations in both time and space most of the primary sources used in this work are limited to those that are available digitally and in English. To build a solid foundation of context in which the ICW was held, I utilize a wide variety of monographs and articles related to the ICW, and peace movements in general, to provide a framework for understanding

the importance of the events that led to the formation of the ICW. While I have attempted to build a basic framework for understanding how the ICW came to be and its effects, this is a very complex topic with hundreds of women involved from a dozen different nations.

Part 1: A Victorian World

When the Great War began in August 1914, it marked the end of an era. Great empires had ruled Europe for centuries, and were used to handling arbitration between the envoys of Kings, Emperors, and other men of power and status. The concept of nations coming together as equals on the basis of international peace and diplomacy was yet an unrealized dream. There had been two previous attempts at creating a body for international arbitration for peace at The Hague. The first, convened by Czar Nicholas II of Russia, was in 1899. The goals of the Hague Convention of 1899 were to slow down the international arms race between European powers, place a ban on the further development of "scientific weapons," develop a system of rules governing behavior during war, and to develop a system to settle international disputes as an alternative to war.[11] While they attained moderate success in creating a group to arbitrate conflicts, the arms race continued and the deadly RussoJapanese War of the next decade made it clear that another peace convention was required. The second Hague Convention occurred in 1907 on the suggestion of President Theodore Roosevelt. Again the focus of the convention was to establish a system to settle international disputes but like before, it would fail to accomplish anything significant. Already by 1907 the major powers of Europe were forming themselves into opposing alliances in preparation for a potential war.

In spite of their preparations, few politicians and military leaders understood the kinds of changes made to warfare during the forty years of peace prior to the Great War. The men leading the governments and militaries of the belligerent nations were Victorians, many of whom saw war as a glorious adventure. Participating in such a conflict served the highest ideals of duty toward "King and Country." The Great War would not only devastate a generation of young Europeans, but through the use of poison gas, terror bombings, and sustained artillery bombardments, destroy the old ideology of human progress through science being an unequivocal good.[12]

The women who would lead the peace movement during the First World War were also Victorian people, having lived during one of the most peaceful times in European history. For women of this time life was highly stratified and separate in most cases from men by strict societal norms. This was particularly true in relation to women's ability to participate in government. The organizers of the International Congress of Women at The Hague all had their roots in the international women's suffrage movement.[13] In 1914, woman's suffrage organizations were active

throughout the industrialized world. Though much progress had been made towards the goal of granting women the vote, by 1914 only Finland, Norway, and Australia had done so.[14] Groups like the International Women's Suffrage Alliance (IWSA) represented women from around the world and had been holding regular international meetings since 1902.[15] This umbrella organization facilitated the transfer of suffrage literature, letters, and other information through its publication "Jus Suffragii" and regular meetings held in cities like Budapest in 1913 and London in 1914. When the war began the next scheduled international meeting for the IWSA was to be April 28, 1915 in Berlin, Germany.[16]

When the news of inevitable war began to spread, women suffrage activists throughout the industrialized world grew concerned. In many countries, suffrage groups felt they were close to achieving their goals, but many years of hard work was going to be sidelined if not forgotten as preparation for the war consumed more of the public and the government's attention. As WILPF member and scholar Helen Kay has recounted, the IWSA denounced the impending war in a manifesto on the 13th of September 1914, stating, "We, the women of the world, view with apprehension and dismay the present situation in Europe, which threatens to involve one continent, if not the whole world, in the disasters and the horrors of war. We women of twentysix countries, having banded ourselves together in the International Women's Suffrage Alliance with the object of obtaining political means of sharing with men the power which shapes the fate of nations, appeal to you to leave untried no method of conciliation or arbitration for arranging international differences which may help to avert deluging half the civilised world in blood." [17]

Prior to the formal declarations of war, many women among the suffrage organizations felt that they could best meet the needs of the world by encouraging their nations towards peace. At an IWSA meeting on August 4 1914 in London, attendees were already in favor of a negotiated settlement.[18] Unfortunately, the support for such ideas would quickly fade as the war escalated and previously inconceivable numbers of casualties began to come in. The terrible carnage of the early days of the war would drive the resentment between the populations of the warring nations. More and more women turned toward war relief work over international suffrage and peace as the call to country and duty proved to be stronger than that of international cooperation. They would take up war relief work consisting of food drives, volunteering as nurses, filling the vacant jobs of the men who were off fighting, and supporting women who had lost their husbands to the war.[19] Whether it be England, France, Holland, or Germany, the prevalent attitude was much the same as the bonds that connected women through their international suffrage network began to weaken. It was as a reaction to the overwhelming support of the war, that suffragists opposed to anything that fueled the murder of another woman's father, husband, brother, or son began to form a

peace movement. Ideological divisions between nationalist suffragists who wanted to support their nation against its aggressors and internationalist-minded suffragists who sought cooperation and peace, divided many women's organizations in the autumn and winter of 1914.

The United States was initially the exception. Suffragists in America, due to its distance from the war and a cultural norm of neutrality, found it easier to focus on peace in the early years of the war and anti war demonstrations were often held by women involved in the suffrage movement. Regardless, the divisions grew as public opinion toward the war grew more polarized and calcified. Peace was not a popular message and its promotion would only become increasingly risky.

Leaders in the suffrage movement like Millicent Fawcett of England's National Union of Women's Suffrage Societies (NUWSS) and other likeminded suffragists of her generation could see that working against the government could only jeopardize their position. A century of hard work toward getting the vote could easily be lost if they were to fully embrace the peace movement. While she had supported peace before England had joined the war, Fawcett soon changed her stance and supported war relief work over peace. Particularly during the early stages of the war, the Victorian mindset was still intact and public opinion was looking at the conflict as a noble and heroic endeavor, making the side of peace unpopular. Fawcett's goal like many other suffragists of her day, was to bring as many people in as possible from a broad swath of the population to support getting the vote, suddenly taking unpopular stances could alienate many of their members and risk the organizations they had built over the years. Additionally, she and others knew the government was not likely to grant women the vote if they were standing in direct opposition to its own primary goals of not just ending, but winning the war.[20]

So while the nationalist suffragists of their respective countries turned to support the war out of patriotism or to simply help ensure that they achieve their primary goal of achieving womens suffrage, pacifists began to break away and form their own organizations to address the new reality of the world at war. While there are many reasons the international suffragists and pacifists were in league together, it was their ability to communicate during the war that facilitates the organizing of a women's peace movement. The women of the international suffrage movement would have a unique view on the war as letters would arrive from all nations and be printed in publications like "Jus Suffragii," allowing international suffragists to experience the true costs and realities of the war free from government censorship and journalistic bias. It was this raw emotional outpouring that drove many of the women toward finding some way to stop the war. Women like Rosika Schwimmer, who would arguably be one of the most powerful voices in this burgeoning movement.

Part 2: A Need for Peace

On June 28, 1914, Archduke Franz Ferdinand of Austria was assassinated in the Bosnian capital of Sarajevo. Few would have guessed at the time that this singular event would cause the entirety of Europe to convulse with war, and even fewer could predict its devastation. Unlike most Europeans, by July of 1914, Rosika Schwimmer already knew something must be done to avoid international catastrophe. Schwimmer was an Austro Hungarian feminist, pacifist, and scholar, who had just recently moved to London to be the press secretary for the International Women's Suffrage Alliance (IWSA). She was a powerful orator, uncompromising, and a self described very radical feminist.[21] She knew the history of her homeland and how people there would be reacting to the assassination of the Archduke. A speaker of nine languages, well traveled, and well educated, Schwimmer understood how the fragile alliance system of Europe doomed it to a terrible war should those alliances be triggered. Her foresight into the scale and devastation of the war will in many ways be the catalyst for the formation of the ICW and the actions its delegates take.[22]

On July 9, 1914, weeks before the war began, Schwimmer met with British Chancellor of the Exchequer, Lloyd George, to explain how dire the situation was. As he recalled later in his autobiography, "[Schwimmer] told me that we were taking the assassination of the Grand Duke much too quietly; that it had provoked such a storm throughout the Austrian Empire as she had never witnessed, and that unless something were done immediately to satisfy and appease resentment, it would certainly result in war with Serbia, with the incalculable consequences which such an operation might precipitate in Europe." However, such official reports as came to hand did not seem to justify the alarmist view she took of the situation.[23]

He would not be the last to realize much too late that Schwimmer was right. The apparent lack of vision by the leaders of England drove Schwimmer to action. By the end of July 1914, Schwimmer began organizing for peace as an extension of womens' suffrage. She wanted the suffrage societies of England to jointly oppose the war. Her plan was to bring all women to the table, regardless of ideology or nationality, to form an alliance for peace. She argued that by linking womens suffrage and peace, it made it more apparent to those women opposed to suffrage that a world run solely by men, made war more likely. This proposal, however, proved too radical for British suffrage leader Millicent Fawcett, who was also the head of the IWSA in England, and it was voted down.[24]

Late on August 4th, the day war was declared in Great Britain, Schwimmer wrote an open letter calling upon "All men, women and organizations who want to stop the international massacre at the earliest possible moment." In this open letter, Schwimmer called upon President Wilson to immediately call together an

organization of neutral powers that would continuously mediate peace terms and develop peace proposals. This would allow nations to back out of the war before a total victory or defeat on either side and still preserve their sense of national pride.[25] She argued that there is no time to wait, "what is going on today is not merely a war, but the breakdown of a world the earthquake of civilization." [26]

When Britain declared war against Germany, and then soon after her home country of Austria Hungary, Rosika Schwimmer found herself to suddenly be in what was technically enemy territory. Knowing that she would no longer be effective working for peace in London with the growing war fever and xenophobia all around her, Schwimmer traveled to the United States to see if she could motivate the Americans to step in and bring a settlement to the war before it got out of hand.[27] Upon her arrival in late August she met up with Carrie Chapman Catt, a friend to Schwimmer and current head of the IWSA.[28] Catt would give Schwimmer a place to live, arrange speaking engagements, and connect her with government contacts. Together they were to meet with President Wilson in September, but Catt decided shortly before the meeting to return home. Catt, like many other public figures Schwimmer encountered, was not willing to tie her organization fully to Schwimmer's radical plans. Schwimmer's proposal to President Wilson was essentially the same as in her earlier open letter. She urged Wilson to travel to Europe where he could demand an armistice and help set up an "International Watching Committee" of scholars and intellectuals. This group would meet in a neutral nation and draft continuous proposals for peace until the warring parties found the terms to be acceptable.[29]

While Wilson was interested in the possibility of mediating a peace between the warring nations of Europe, he did not give Schwimmer any kind of definitive response.[30] He was waiting for the warring parties to ask for help, as he did not want to risk playing his hand too soon and risk his opportunity at negotiating. Wilson also felt that peace would be more achievable if Germany had been weakened first and the war fever on both sides cooled off some.[31] Regardless of the reasons, this kind of response would be a common occurrence for most of the peace activists whenever they have opportunities to meet with heads of state. Ironically, it would be many of Schwimmer's ideas that Wilson would later adopt to negotiate the armistice only after four long years of bloodshed.

Continuing her mission, now under the umbrella of Catt's American organization, the National American Woman Suffrage Alliance (NAWSA), Schwimmer began to tour the United States throughout the fall and winter of 1914-15. She used her skills as an orator to speak on behalf of women's suffrage and strongly encourage Americans to pressure their government to take action towards building a peace settlement. At each speaking engagement she provided copies of her petition to President Wilson on the seats of the audience. Schwimmer would

often appear with the British suffragist Emmeline Pethick Lawrence who would promote a similar message of peace and women's suffrage as related goals. [32] They spoke in twenty-two states on behalf of mediation by neutral nations before suffrage meetings, women's clubs, business associations, and even the Nebraska state legislature.[33] As the United States had not yet joined the war, Schwimmer and her allies thought that as a neutral party President Wilson could arbiter peace negotiations before the war got out of hand. Ultimately Schwimmer and many others in the growing peace movement wanted an international body to be set up to mediate between the belligerents and the sooner, the better.

It was at this time that Jane Addams, famous social reformer and arguably one of the most respected women in America, became involved in the growing peace movement. Addams was not new to peace movements and had been involved since at least 1904 where she spoke at a convention of National Peace Societies in Boston. She had also written a book entitled *Newer Ideals of Peace* which highlighted the growing need for international cooperation and social reform.[34] In spite of these prior activities Addams was not immediately won over by the burgeoning peace movement. Both Rosika Schwimmer and Emmeline Pethick Lawrence would meet with her to urge her to take the lead on creating a women's peace organization. Like everyone else in the early days of the war, she had many other plans at the time and was reluctant to begin something new. However, as 1914 wore on and the letters in favor of holding a meeting relating to peace piled up, thanks to the hard work of Schwimmer and Pethick Lawrence, Adams was swayed to begin organizing a women's peace conference.[35]

On the 10th of January 1915, nearly 3,000 women met at the New Willard Hotel in Washington D.C. for the Women's Peace Congress (WPC). This Congress would be led by suffragists Carrie Chapman Catt and Jane Addams. Over a dozen womens' groups were represented from social work, educational, genealogical, temperance, trade union, and peace organizations and would unite as the Woman's Peace Party (WPP). [36] Schwimmer would hold a key role in the development of the organization and became its international secretary. Jane Addams would be elected its chairman. During the Congress, the WPP drew up a plan called the 'Program for Constructive Peace' which was largely derived from Julia Grace Wales's Wisconsin Plan.[37] This program would be the first formal step toward the resolutions put forth at the ICW. [38] It consisted of eleven points:

1. The immediate calling of a convention of mutual nations in the interest of early peace.
2. Limitation of armaments and the nationalization of their manufacture.
3. Organized opposition to militarism in our own country.
4. Education of youth in the ideals of peace.

5. Democratic control of foreign policies.
6. The further humanizing of governments by the extension of the franchise to women.
7. "Concert of Nations" to supersede "Balance of Power."
8. Action toward the gradual organization of the world to substitute Law for War.
9. The substitution of an international police for rival armies and navies.
10. Removal of the economic cause of war.
11. The appointment by our Government to commission of men and women, with an adequate appropriation, to promote international peace.[39]

While these proposals were not as thorough as the ones later developed at the ICW, they provide the foundation for those ideas. Furthermore, many of these points would go on to be little changed after nearly four more years of war when they make the grounds for German surrender as many of President Wilson's Fourteen Points.

Meanwhile, back in London, antiwar suffragists continued to find conflict within their longstanding suffrage organizations. The leading womens suffrage union, the NUWSS, took a decidedly prowar stance. Its leader, Millicent Fawcett, wrote in August of 1914: "Women, your country needs you. As long as there was any hope for peace, most members of the National Union probably sought for peace, and endeavoured to support those who were trying to maintain it. But we have another duty now...Let us show ourselves worthy of citizenship, whether our claim to it be recognized or not." [40] While she was not alone in this sentiment, many other suffragists were looking to alternatives to organize a group that did not support the war.

By February 1915 some of the more ardent pacifists of the NUWSS were ready to take action on their own. Catherine Marshall, Chrystal MacMillan and Kathleen Courtney traveled to the Netherlands where they met up with Dutch members of the IWSA and began the preliminary organizing for the Hague Congress. Originally there had been an IWSA convention scheduled to meet in Berlin, but with the war that became an impossibility. So the peace activists used the original planning as the framework for what they would call the International Congress of Women.

At a council meeting of the NUWSS held later that month, Fawcett argued that until the German armies had been driven out of France and Belgium "I believe it is akin to treason to talk of peace." This meeting would be the final straw for the pacifists of the NUWSS. After the meeting, many of the officers of the NUWSS and ten members of its National Executive board resigned over the decision not to support the ICW. This included Chrystal Macmillan, Kathleen Courtney, Margaret Ashton, and Catherine Marshall, among others.[41] As the leader of the NUWSS, Fawcett's words were taken as policy. The nationalist faction of the suffrage movement had made itself clear how they felt about organizing a peace movement.

This offended many longstanding members of the NUWSS who could not believe that their decades long friendships and associations were disintegrating over pro-peace and prowar ideologies.[42]

Part 3: The Congress

The organization for the ICW occurred over two months. Considering the difficulties of travel and communication brought about by the war in 1915 this is a remarkable achievement. At the February meeting between British, German, Belgian and Dutch members of the IWSA there was drafted a preliminary program for the ICW. A committee of Dutch women, headed by Dr. Aletta Jacobs, were placed in charge of making arrangements and issuing invitations. To pay for the event the British Dutch and German members all agreed to raise one third of the total cost each. Though a minor detail, the fact that women from opposing nations in war were willing to split the cost for their peace ICW speaks volumes toward their character. The invitations were sent out to women's organizations, mixed organizations, and individual women all around the world. Each organization was to appoint two delegates to send. Though all were welcome to attend and visit the ICW, only women were allowed to become members. In addition, members had to agree to two resolutions. First, "That international disputes should be settled by pacific means." Moreover, "that the parliamentary franchise should be extended to women." [43] These two simple resolutions would be the underlying foundation of the ICW. As these were women still devoted to the idea of international suffrage, it was logical for them to use that aspect of their identity to reach out to others across the barrier of nationality.

In addition to the membership requirements there were also rules established in regards to the conditions of debate. This was vital to the cohesion of the ICW as these conditions would mitigate many opportunities for conflict. It was those opportunities that the press was hungrily waiting for, and due to the wise foresight of the ICW organizers, would be left sorely disappointed. A vigorous debate would occur, but due to the previously established rules, civility was maintained by the attendees.

The location chosen for the ICW was also important. The Hague, which is located in the Netherlands, was chosen for several reasons. As mentioned previously, The Hague had been the location of the previous 1899 and 1907 peace conferences. Holding the ICW there allowed it to take part in that tradition. Furthermore, it was in neutral territory where women from opposing sides could meet without fear of military interference. This is not to say that attendees would have an easy time reaching the ICW. Occupied Belgium and war torn France were to the South, and Germany was to the East. Arriving by land would be difficult. Though the Netherlands is reachable by sea, the waters surrounding the Netherlands and adjacent coastline of Germany were heavily mined with underwater explosives and patrolled

by German Uboats. The Uboats were a particular danger as Germany had just recently declared unrestricted submarine warfare. Any merchant ships travelling to or from allied nations could now be sunk without warning. [44]

The American delegation embarked across the Atlantic on the Dutch steamship Noordam in late April of 1915. They undertook this journey shortly before the sinking of the Lusitania and all aboard were well aware that German Uboats were on patrol throughout the Atlantic. [45] In spite of this, the women undertook their journey with little reservation. As Emily G. Balch recounts in *Women at The Hague,* "I felt, however, that even a shadow of chance to serve the cause of peace could not today be refused." [46] They would be a diverse group, as one of the delegates, journalist, suffragist and labor activist Mary Heaton Vorse, later recalled, "Besides many of the most forwardlooking women of America, the group also included cranks, women with nostrums for ending war, and women who had come for the ride. New Thought cranks with Christian Science smiles and blue ribbons in their hair, hardworking Hull House women, little halfbaked enthusiasts, elderly war horses of peace, riding furious hobbies." [47]

They would spend the voyage discussing how to approach creating an effective permanent peace. Along the way they decided to again use Wales's "Wisconsin Plan" as a basis for their platform at the ICW. When they neared the end of their voyage numerous problems arose with the naval authorities of the British, French, and Dutch. After being held up in port at the Hague for several days, the American delegation was given permission to disembark and made it to the opening of the ICW with only minutes to spare. [48]

Other delegates had similar troubles. The delegation from German occupied Belgium was stopped repeatedly by German guards. Ann Wilsher recounts their journey, writing, "The difficult journey had involved driving by car to Esschen, when they were searched, and then walking for two hours to Rosendahl across the Dutch border, from where they got into a train to The Hague." [49] The delegation from England would have a far less perilous journey because most of them never left the island. Out of a total delegation of one hundred and eighty members, only 20 were able to get passports issued by the British government. Of those 20, only three were able to make it to the Congress. The British admiralty, namely Winston Churchill, had the entirety of the English Channel and North Sea closed to nonmilitary traffic. The 20 women aboard the ferry at the port of Tilbury would never set sail. The only British delegates to attend would be Catherine Marshall, Chrystal MacMillan, and Kathleen Courtney who had already been to and from the Netherlands working to get the Congress set up.[50]

Looking back it is easy to ask why hundreds of middle aged, middle class women would risk life and limb, not to mention their reputations, to meet at the IWC. Their determination to travel to the IWC was born out of necessity, grief, and fear. By the spring of 1915 the war had become all consuming for the nations of Europe with millions of casualties on both sides of the conflict. [51] As Mary Heaton Vorse recounts: "There was not one woman from the belligerent nations near whom death had not walked. There was no man left at home in all Hungary. The Boy Scouts who had so joyfully posted our letters two years before at the suffrage convention in Budapest were all in the trenches. Two years ago they had been longlegged little boys. All the women of Germany and Austria and Hungary had seen men, who had gone out singing, return wounded and wrecked. The women of Belgium had seen worse. Four of them had seen Antwerp fall and its miserable, hopeless and homeless population stream forth. They had seen little girls, too young to know their own names, wandering around strayed from their families. They had found old women who had dropped from exhaustion. The wide and fertile plains of Belgium had been trampled into a bloody battlefield." [52]

This was the horror that drove these women to risk death and imprisonment. They were determined to halt Europe's march to the apocalypse. These women were not holding a peace rally with banners and fanfare, or a protest march with signs and slogans. The IWC was serious business and the women there intended to not waste the opportunity. Vorse describes the mood adding, "...there was a spirit of terrible endurance such as is bred by grief and fear and suspense. A spirit with which I was familiar, for I had lived in a fishing village and I knew the granite calm of women during a storm when their men were at sea." [53] These were mothers, sisters, and daughters of the war dead, regular people who had no say in what was happening to the world around them and had enough. They were not permitted to vote or serve in office, nor were they permitted fight in battle. Instead used the best tools at their disposal to create change in their hearts and minds.

Unlike the men in the halls of power, the women at the IWC were able to discuss the realities of the war across the otherwise unbreachable wall of nationality. Unlike the majority of people in Europe in the spring of 1915, who could not get much news from outside their own borders and were subject to constant propaganda from their respective governments and press, the women at the IWC could see that the war was being fought for the same reasons and with the same effects on society regardless of nationality. During the three days of the Congress, attendees would give testimony to the horrors of the war that they witnessed. it was made clear that whether one fell under the alliance of the Central Powers or the Triple Entente, civilian populations, particularly women and children, were suffering to a degree previously unimagined in warfare.[54] Much of Belgium was a battlefield and millions were homeless and starving. Likewise in France, Poland, and Bulgaria where

starvation, disease, and homelessness were running rampant. Mary Heaton Vorse recalls the sorrow of another delegate, Frau Hofrath von Lecher of Austria: "I am not a strong and militant woman accustomed to speaking as most of these who have spoken before me. I have never before stood on a platform. All my life, like most of the women whom I know, I have been dependent on my men. But I have seen our men dependent on us weak ones. I have seen their strength wrecked. What are we women of Europe to do? We cannot live without our men, so we dependent women for whom I speak must join ourselves to you strong women and protest against a civilization that under pretension of protecting us, takes our men from us, and so I have come here to cry out: 'Give us back our men!' I ask as they lie there wounded, 'What are you fighting for?' and they all answer, 'We do not know, we were told to fight.' When I told them of this Congress, they begged me to come and, in the name of their wives and children, implore the nations of the earth to make peace." [55]

So they did, and on May 1, 1915 the members of the congress voted on a number of resolutions that they felt would bring the war to an end and promote a lasting peace. Voting members of the IWC to attend stood at 47 American delegates, a dozen from Sweden and Norway, a thousand from the Netherlands, nine from Hungary, 28 from Germany, six from Denmark and Austria, five from Belgium, two from Canada, three from Great Britain, and one from Italy. [56] None would attend from France, as all those invited refused to negotiate peace while parts of their country were still occupied by the Germans. There would also be none attending from Russia and Serbia as the war made it impossible for them to travel to the Netherlands.

The Congress would adopt twenty resolutions over its three days in The Hague. The resolutions would fall under seven categories; Women and War, Action towards Peace, Principles of a Permanent Peace, International Cooperation, The Education of Children, Women and the Peace Settlement Conference, and Action to be Taken. They would be printed in English, French, and German and be distributed to leaders of Europe and the United States. The resolutions were revolutionary in their time, their consideration of women during wartime and in political discourse, while logical for a meeting of suffragists, was a radical policy for most governments of the early 20th century. This is also true of their effort to establish rights regarding self determination and democratic control of national foreign policy, which are problematic and controversial topics in our own time.

The initial two sections of the resolutions developed ideas about women, war, and actions toward peace. The first two resolutions spoke of their opposition to war and its devastating effect on civilization, as well as the atrocities committed specifically against women during wartime. Women were being affected particularly harshly in this war due to its massive scale. Many women and children were refugees and violence against them was a regular occurrence. [58] The third resolution, pointed out that all nations had claimed to be fighting a war of self defense and that

commonalities between nations that could be the basis for a peace agreement that emphasizes fairness to all. The fourth resolution incorporates Schwimmer and Wales' original idea of continuous mediation by neutral powers so that proposals could be generated until they find an acceptable solution.[59]

The third set of resolutions, 'Principles of a Permanent Peace,' looked forward to ensuring peace was maintained once it was achieved. In resolution five, they affirm that citizens of every country should be allowed selfdetermination and the opportunity to form democratic governments without risk of outside control or interference. Furthermore, territory could not be transferred from one nation to another without the consent of the people who lived there.[60] The sixth and seventh resolutions stated that to avoid war in the future, all governments should agree to use arbitration for future conflicts and to use sanctions on any country that does not. [61] The eighth resolution seeks to place foreign policies under democratic control, as it is rarely the will of the people that causes war, but the designs of a small group in powerful positions. The ninth resolution declared that women should have political enfranchisement and only countries that allow women the same rights as men should be recognized as democratic.[62]

Section four of the resolutions establishes principles for international cooperation. The tenth resolution urged a third Hague Peace Conference to take place after the war to continue the work attempted at the conferences of 1899 and 1907. The eleventh resolution described the creation of a 'Society of Nations' that should be developed to ensure future peace; this organization would provide a permanent International Court of Justice at The Hague, conferences in which to discuss and enforce the principles of a permanent peace, and a council that would investigate and settle international differences over economic and social issues.[63] The twelfth resolution urged international disarmament, as it was well established already by 1915 that one of the major causes of the war was arms race between Britain and Germany.[64] The thirteenth resolution proposes free trade and freedom of the seas for all nations.[65] The fourteenth resolution demanded that previous secret treaties be voided and all future treaties include the participation of legislature, international conferences, and women.[66] The fifteenth resolution reaffirms the importance of involving women in national and international politics. The fifth section speaks only of children, and the need to educate them in a manner that will lead towards ideals of peace.. The sixth section outlines the role of women in the peace settlement conference; women should be included as representatives of the people in the conference and the settlement should pass a resolution affirming the need for all countries to give women political rights. [67]

The final section outlines action to be taken. The nineteenth resolution called for a meeting of women to be held concurrently with the peace settlement conference. While the twentieth and final resolution asserted that envoys would

carry these resolutions to the rulers of nations of Europe and the US and report back to the women's conference afterward. The final resolution was the most contentious. Championed by Rosika Schwimmer, this resolution was initially voted down. However, Schwimmer was able to convince the leadership to give her a minute to speak on the matter and gave an impassioned speech as quoted in Ann Wilsher's *Most Dangerous Women:* "Brains they say have ruled the world till today. If brains have brought us to what we are in now, I think it is time to allow in our hearts to speak. When our sons are killed by millions, let us, mothers, only try to do good by going to kings and emperors, without any other danger than a refusal! (Hear,Hear, Hear!)" [68]

Her powerful rhetoric would turn the tide in favor of voting to send delegates abroad as envoys of peace. These visionary resolutions would be brought forth by a group of five elected delegates to the heads of state in Europe and the United States. The three delegates from neutral nations Jane Addams, Dr. Aletta Jacobs, and Frau Wollften Palthe, would visit the capitals of the belligerents.[69] While Emily G. Balch, Rosika Schwimmer, Chrystal Macmillan, and Madam Ramondt Hirschman, with Julia Grace Wales as their secretary, would visit neutral and allied leaders.[70] When they had completed their tour they would meet together with President Wilson to propose their resolutions and the data gathered during their trip, urging him to action. While their tour of the capitols gathered much important data on the thoughts of leaders and common people in the nations affected by the war, it would accomplish little in the way of actual results. Wilson was still not willing to commit to the ICW's proposals and the leaders of the nations at war were unwilling to give in now that they have already spent so much blood and treasure.

One of the major successes to come of the ICW was the formation of the WILPF. It began as the International Committee of Women for Permanent Peace (ICWPP), which would be founded at the ICW. Later in 1919, the ICWPP sought to reconvene at Versailles to be a part of the treaty development, but they were refused permission to attend. The members would meet instead in Zurich, Switzerland where they would hold another conference similar to the ICW, reiterating their platform and making changes to fit the developments at the end of the war. At the end of the conference the ICWPP formally changed its name to the WILPF, which has become the longest lived women's peace organization in history.[71]

After the Congress, most of the women returned to their previous occupations. Addams was called back to tend to Hull House while others like Julia Wales and Emily G. Balch returned to their universities. The war continued and only a few of the peace activists that pushed for the congress would continue to try and create dramatic changes. Later in 1915, Rosika Schwimmer would team up with Henry Ford in another unsuccessful peace mission, only to be further ridiculed by the press and heads of state when it failed.[72]

While the members of the International Congress of Women were not successful in meeting their goals of 1915, their concern with not only ending the Great War but creating a permanent peace laid out a plan for creating a more just world. Their visionary ideas had likely been the basis for the armistice in 1918. Had they been followed, their proposals would have arguably led to not only a lasting peace but a better civilization. The WILPF is still a robust and active organization which held its 99th anniversary conference in April of 2014. While other proposed developments like the UN and its related bodies are seriously flawed, their ability to provide a framework for international cooperation has helped keep nations communicating when conflicts threaten to engulf the world in another Great War. While there is a seemingly infinite amount of work to be done to bring about the International Congress of Women's vision of peace, their example of tireless dedication can provide a path through the wilderness for future generations of peace activists to follow.

[1]   Joshua S. Goldstein, *War and Gender: How Gender Shapes the War System and Vice Versa,* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001), accessed March 24, 2014, http://www.warandgender.com/wgwomwwi.htm#FN05_181.

[2]   Kathryn Kish Sklar and Kari Amidon, "How Did Women Activists Promote Peace in Their 1915 Tour of Warring European Capitals?" *Women and Social Movements in the United States, 1600–2000* http://womhist.alexanderstreet.com/hague/intro.htm., (accessed March 22, 2014).

[3]   On World War I see: Niall Ferguson, *The Pity of War* (New York, NY: Basic Books, 1999); John Keegan, *The First World War.* (New York: A. Knopf 1999); Ross A. Kennedy, *The Will to Believe: Woodrow Wilson, World War I, and America's Strategy for Peace and Security.* (Kent, Ohio: Kent State University Press, 2009).

[4]   Jane Addams, Emily Greene Balch, and Alice Hamilton, *Women at the Hague; The International Peace Congress of 1915* (New York: Macmillan Co., 1915), 45.

[5]   These records can be found at: Jane Addams, Emily Greene Balch, and Alice Hamilton, *Women at the Hague; The International Peace Congress of 1915* (New York: Macmillan Co., 1915); *Bericht-Rapport-Report* (Amsterdam: International Women's Committee of Permanent Peace, 1915), accessed on May 4, 2014, https://archive.org/details/berichtrapportre45wome; *Report of the International Congress of Women the Hague--The Netherlands, April 28th to May 1st, 1915: President's Address: Resolutions Adopted: Report of the Committee Visiting European Capitals.* (Chicago: Woman's Peace Party, 1915), https://archive.org/details/internatcongrewom00interich. Accessed on May 4, 2014.

[6]   For WILPF documents see, *The Women and Social Movements in the United States, 1600-2000* at http://asp6new.alexanderstreet.com.libproxy.lib.ilstu.edu/was2/was2.movement.details.aspx?name=Women%27s+International+League+for+Peace+and+Freedom%2c+1915 and the UK WILPF site http://www.ukwilpf.org/resources2/documents.

[7]   See, Vera Brittain, *The Rebel Passion: A Short History of Some Pioneer Peacemakers* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1964) and Mercedes M. Randall, *Improper Bostonian: Emily Greene Balch, Nobel Peace Laureate, 1946* (New York: Twayne Publisher, 1964).

8 Gertrude Bussey and Margaret Tims, *Pioneers for Peace: Women's International League for Peace and Freedom 1915-1965* (London: WILPF, 1980); 2008); L.B. Costin, "Feminism, Pacifism, Internationalism and the 1915 International Congress of Women" *Women's Studies International Forum,* 5 (1982), 301–15; and Sybil Oldfield, *Women Against the Iron Fist: Alternatives to Militarism, 1900-1989* (Cambridge: Oxford University Press,1989).

9 See also: David Cortright, *Peace: A History of Movements and Ideas* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2008); Joshua S. Goldstein, *War and Gender: How Gender Shapes the War System and Vice Versa* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001), Accessed March 24, 2014. http://www.warandgender.com/wgwomwwi.htm#FN05_181; Helen Kay, *"Chrystal Macmillan: From Edinburgh Woman to Global Citizen"* Deporte, esuli, profughe: Rivista Telematica Di Studi Sulla Memoria Femminile, n.1819 (2012): 125152, Accessed May 2, 2014, http://www.unive.it/media/allegato/dep/n182012/Ricerche/Monografica/08 Kay.pdf; David S. Patterson, *The Search for Negotiated Peace: Women's Activism and Citizen Diplomacy in World War I* (New York: Routledge, 2008).

10 Biographical information for many of the activists involved in the ICW can be found in *Notable American Women, 1607-1950*, ed. by Edward T. James, Janet Wilson James, and Paul S. Boyer. (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1971).

11 The term "scientific weapons" refers to the recent development of airships and poison gas. James Brown Scott, *Texts of the Peace Conferences at the Hague, 1899 and 1907, with English Translation and Appendix of Related Documents* (Boston: Pub. for the International School of Peace, Ginn & Company, 1908).

12 Anne Wiltsher, *Most Dangerous Women: Feminist Peace Campaigners Of The Great War* (London: Pandora Press, 1985),153.

13 For more on the international suffrage movement see, Jill Liddington, *The Road to Greenham Common: Feminism and Antimilitarism in Britain since 1820* (Syracuse University Press, 1991) and Leila J. Rupp, *Worlds of Women, The Making of an International Women's Movement* (Princeton University Press: Princeton, NJ, 1997).

14 Laura Turquet, *Progress of the Worlds Women: In Pursuit of Justice* (UN Women 2011), 122-125.

15 Helen Kay, "Chrystal Macmillan: From Edinburgh Woman to Global Citizen," *Deporte, esuli, profughe: Rivista Telematica Di Studi Sulla Memoria Femminile,* (2012), 134, n.1819.

16 The Berlin meeting would be canceled and the International Women's Congress at the Hague would take its place.

17 Chrystal Macmillan, Millicent Garrett Fawcett, Rosika Schwimmer, *Jus Suffragii,* Vol 8 No.13 (September 1914), 1, quoted in Kay, "Chrystal Macmillan."

18 Kay, "Chrystal Macmillan."

19 For more information on the lives of women during World War I see, Margaret R.Higonnet, *Behind the Lines: Gender and the Two World Wars* (New Haven [Conn.]: Yale University Press, 1987).

20 Wiltsher, *Most Dangerous Women*, 7981.

21 Wiltsher, *Most Dangerous Women*, 10.

22 "Schwimmer, Rosika," *Notable American Women*.

23 David Lloyd George, *War Memoirs of David Lloyd George* (Boston: Little, Brown, and Co. 1933-37), PDF ebook, 33.

24 Wiltsher, M*ost Dangerous Women*,17.

25 Mercedes M. Randall, *Improper Bostonian: Emily Greene Balch, Nobel Peace Laureate, 1946* (New York: Twayne Publisher, 1964), 162.

26 Wiltsher, *Most Dangerous Women*, 25.

27 Wiltsher, *Most Dangerous Women*, 31.

28 Suffrage activist and Founder of the League of Women Voters, Carrie Chapman Catt was an important figure in both the international women's suffrage and peace movements. For more about her life see, Jacqueline Van Voris, *Carrie Chapman Catt: A Public Life* (New York: Feminist Press at the City University, 1987) and Kristin Thoennes Keller, *Carrie Chapman Catt: A Voice for Women* (Minneapolis, Mn: Compass Point Books, 2006).

29 Patterson, *The Search for Negotiated Peace,* 38.

30 Patterson, *The Search for Negotiated Peace,* 38.

31 Kennedy, *The Will to Believe*, 6568.

32 Emmeline Pethick Lawrence was a well know suffrage activist in England and ran a mission similar to Addams Hull House. She would attend the ICW. Little has been written on her life but she did write an autobiography: Emmeline Lawrence, *My Part in a Changing World* (Westport, Conn.: Hyperion Press, 1938).

33 "Schwimmer, Rosika," *Notable American Women*, 247.

34 Works that contain references of Jane Addams peace activism include: Allen F. Davis. *American Heroine: The Life and Legend of Jane Addams* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1973); Jean Bethke Elshtain, *Jane Addams and the Dream of American Democracy: A Life* (New York: Basic Books, 2002); Louise W. Knight: Jane Addams: Spirit in Action (New York: Norton, 2010); and James Weber Linn, *Jane Addams: A Biography* (New York: D. AppletonCentury Company, 1935). Also see Kathyrn Kish Sklar's "Some of us who deal with the Social Fabric: Jane Addams Blends Peace and Social Justice, 19071919," *Journal of the Gilded Age and Progressive Era* 2:1 (2003), 8096.

35 Wiltsher, *Most Dangerous Women*, 53.

36 Eleanor Barr, "Part 1: Woman's Peace Party, 19151920," Women's International League for Peace and Freedom Collection, Accessed on 4/22/2014, http://www.swarthmore.edu/library/peace/ DG026050/dg043wilpf/Part%20IWPPhistory.htm

37 Julia Grace Wales was a 24-year-old, Canadian-born, pacifist and English professor at the University of Wisconsin during the war. Her plan, entitled *Continuous Mediation Without Armistice,* was based around the idea of a group of intellectuals from neutral nations meeting together and providing a mediating body for the warring nations. These "mediators" would then devise a plan for resolving the conflict with two essential conditions. 1. That the conflict end without humiliation to any nation. 2. That it must not lead to compromises that restart the war later. Her plan was remarkably similar to Schwimmer's, though they were developed independently. Interestingly, these ideas developed in the first days of the war are the very things that are not adopted at the Paris Peace Congress of 1919 that most scholars consider primary causes of World War II. For more on Wales see Mary Jean Woodard Bean, *Julia Grace Wales: Canada's Hidden Heroine and the Quest for Peace, 1914-1918* (Borealis Press, 2005).

38 Eleanor Barr, "Woman's Peace Party," accessed on 4/22/2014, http://www.swarthmore.edu/library/ peace/DG026050/dg043wilpf/Part%20IWPPhistory.htm

39 John Whiteclay Chambers II, ed., *The Eagle and the Dove: The American Peace Movement and United States Foreign Policy 1900-1922* (New York: Syracuse University Press, 1991), 4956.

40 Wiltsher, *Most Dangerous Women*, 27

41 Patterson, *The Search for Negotiated Peace*, 71.

42 Wiltsher, *Most Dangerous Women,* 75.

43 Jane Addams, Emily Greene Balch, and Alice Hamilton, *Women at the Hague; The International Peace Congress of 1915* (New York: Macmillan Co., 1915), 120

44 George, *War Memoirs of David Lloyd George*, PDF ebook, 670.

45 The Lusitania was torpedoed by a German U Boat on May 7, 1915, a week after the International Women's Congress.

46 More about Emily Greene Balch can be found in: Kristen E. Gwinn, *Emily Greene Balch: The Long Road to Internationalism* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2010) and Mercedes M. Randall, *Improper Bostonian: Emily Greene Balch, Nobel Peace Laureate, 1946* (New York: Twayne Publisher, 1964).

47 Mary Heaton Vorse, "Women's Peace Conference," in *A Footnote to Folly: Reminiscences of Mary Heaton Vorse* (New York: Farrar & Rinehart, 1935), pp. 7989.

48 Addams, Balch, and Hamilton, *Women at the Hague*, 38-41.

49 Wiltsher, *Most Dangerous Women,* 95.

50 Kay, "Chrystal Macmillan."

51 Niall Ferguson, *The Pity of War* (New York, NY: Basic Books, 1999), 297-298.

52 Vorse, *A Footnote to Folly*, 79-89.

53 Vorse, *A Footnote to Folly*, 79-89.

54 Unlike most previous wars, with the advent of powerful longrange artillery and aerial bombing, civilian populations were no longer safe away from the front line. Furthermore, the front lines in this war were hundreds of miles long swaths of devastation that left many areas uninhabitable.

55 Vorse, *A Footnote to Folly*, 79-89.

56 Addams, Balch, and Hamilton, *Women at The Hague*, 121.

58 While it is not immediately clear in the language of the resolutions, going over the ICW report makes clear that "women's sufferings in war" refers to mass rape. Women in territory occupied by other nationalities were particularly targeted and rape was a common occurrence in the First World War as well as most others. It would not be formally recognized as a war crime until the 1990's. Danise Aydelott, "Mass Rape During War: Prosecuting Bosnian Rapists Under International Law," *Emory International Law Review*, 7, (1993), 585-631.

59 See Wale's "Mediation Without Armistice: The Wisconsin Plan," Wisconsin Peace Society, *Mediation Without Armistice: The Wisconsin Plan* (Madison, Wis.: The Wisconsin Peace Society, 1915) and Schwimmer's 'Open Letter' from August 4, 1914 in Wiltsher, *Most Dangerous Women*, 24.

60 This principle was rejected in the formation of the 1919 Treaty of Versailles and led to it being denounced by the WILPF and other peace organizations. In addition, transfer of territory from one nation to another after the war was one of the many causes of subsequent wars in Europe, Asia, and the Middle East. It is also point 5 of Wilson's Fourteen Points.

61 The enforcement power of the League of Nations and later United Nations is largely dependent on the idea of sanctions and it is the preferred method to apply nonmilitary pressure on aggressive nations today. This was one of the first instances where its current use has been suggested.

62 This principle, while a logical conclusion for a meeting of suffragists, was a radical idea for the time. Only a few nations had allowed women to vote by 1915 and even less allowed for full participation in government.

63 The 'Society of Nations' proposed in resolution 11 is very similar to the current U.N. General assembly and World Trade Organization. Also is Point 14 of Wilson's 14 Points.

64 This resolution is nearly identical to Point 4 of Wilson's Fourteen Points.

65 This resolution coincides with Points 2 and 3 of Wilson's Fourteen Points.

66 This is the first of Wilson's Fourteen Points and was ignored in both cases by the Treaty of Versailles. The secret SykesPicot agreement of 1915 would divide up the Middle East between France and Britain at the expense of their Arab allies and the borders drawn by Sykes and Picot have persistently led to conflict in the region since. For more on this see Reeva Spector Simon and Eleanor H. Tejirian, *The Creation of Iraq: 1914-1921*, (New York: Columbia University Press, 2004).

67 My research cannot find any women who attended the drafting or signing of the 1919 Treaty of Versailles

68 Wiltsher, *Most Dangerous Women,* 102.

69 Addams was accompanied by her personal physician and friend Dr. Alice Hamilton. Jacobs and Palthe were both from Holland.

70 Balch was an American, Schwimmer Austrian, RamondtHirschman was Dutch, MacMillan British, and Wales originally from Canada

71 Harriet Hyman Alonso, "The Longest Living Women's Peace Organization in World History: The Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, 1915 to the Present" (City College and CUNY Graduate Center, 2014), http://wasi.alexanderstreet.com/help/view/the_longest_living_ womens_peace_organization_in_world_history_the_womens_international_league_for_peace_ and_freedom_1915_to_the_present, accessed on May 4, 2014.

72 Wiltsher, *Most Dangerous Women*,157.

Real Victims and Bad Memories: The Sabra & Shatila Massacre and Modern Israeli Memory

By Chris Roberts

During the Lebanon War in 1982 a true tragedy occurred for the world to see. Christian Lebanese militia fighters known as Phalangists took it upon themselves to avenge the assassination of their leader and new President Elect Gemayel Bashir, targeting the local Palestinian population as the scapegoat for their anger and sadness. Their endeavors were quietly backed and monitored by their allies, the Israeli forces that had invaded Lebanon during the war. From September 16 to September 19, the Phalangists entered the Palestinian neighborhoods Sabra and Shatila in the Israeli occupied city of Beirut. Over that three day period they raped, tortured and murdered the civilian population, under the watchful eye of the Israeli Defense Force, who had equipped, guided and locked down the city for the Phalangists to commit the atrocities against the civilians of the two refugee camps. While there was international outrage, Israel faced minimal embarrassment and over the ensuing months and years spun a national narrative that they too were innocent bystanders to the massacre and painted themselves as victims of the Phalangist's as well. Recently the film *Waltz with Bashir* has brought this tragedy back into the mainstream discourse and has made a new generation aware of the occurrence as well as questioning how Israel deals with its memory lapses. Utilizing primary sources, a selection of articles, and the film itself, this paper will attempt to analyze just how does a modern nation justify their role in this massacre in the face of outrage and what memories of this time period do they choose to focus on?

In the post 1948 War, a large number of displaced Palestinian refugees relocated to the neighboring state of Lebanon, particularly in the cities of Tyre, Sidon and most importantly, Beirut.[1] Census data conducted in the 1950's showed over 106,800 Palestinians were registered as living within Lebanon's borders, although it is estimated that in counting the unregistered residents the more accurate number would be around 120,000.[2] Over the next several decades the Palestinian refugees were restricted by the government, denied employment and forcibly contained by the Lebanese government.[3]

When the PLO was founded in 1964, Lebanon became the first country in which they opened a recognized office of operation.[4] Over the late 1970's through the early 1980's the Maronite Christian forces under the leadership of Bashir

Gemayel began to coordinate efforts to restrict Palestinian freedoms and fought against the PLO directly.[5] A full shooting war between the PLO and the Maronite Phalangist forces had resumed again in 1981, and was being eyed by Israel as an opportunity to join the fray and strike a blow against the PLO.[6] Israel utilized the June 3rd, 1982 attack on the Israeli ambassador to London to scramble air strikes against PLO targets in Beirut, and then used the subsequent return fire from Palestinian forces to justify their invasion of Lebanon.[7]

Israel's involvement in what was its second invasion of Lebanon was officially launched on June 6, 1982 under the military name of "Operation Peace in Galilee, and was spun as being a preventative measure to help the Lebanese Militia defeat the PLO fighters within their borders. This narrative was soon expanded, with Ariel Sharon's forces pushing into the country in an effort to "rid the world of the center of international terrorism," namely the PLO headquarters in West Beirut.[8] Secondary to their "helpfulness" the Israeli government was looking to install Bashir Gemayel into office to create a Christian Lebanese government that would be friendly to their ally to the south and serve as a buffer to Syria.[9]

By mid-summer the PLO could not hold their position against the Israeli forces that had besieged Beirut, and began utilizing the United States Government to engage in negotiations to withdraw from Lebanon. One of the great concerns left for the departing PLO forces was the fate of the thousands of Palestinian civilians who would be left behind as they exited the country, and it was agreed upon that starting on August 23rd, a multinational force would oversee the evacuation of more than 11,000 PLO members over a twelve day period. By September 1 the PLO forces had been evacuated and by September 10th the multinational coalition had left as well.

On Tuesday, September 14, 1982 Gemayel was killed by an explosion at the Phalange party headquarters in East Beirut, which was later found to be the work of a Syrian agent. Defense Minister Ariel Sharon, aware that the PLO had already been evacuated from the city, took to the airwaves to denounce Gemayel's murder stating that "[the killing] symbolizes the terrorist murderousness threatening all people of peace from the hands of the PLO terrorist organizations and their supports." [10] Israeli military forces would go on to claim that despite the evacuation the PLO had left behind an estimated 2,500 fighters in the refugee neighborhoods of Sabra and Shatila in Beirut, interestingly before the full evacuation had even been completed.[11] It was later noted by the survivors that weapons were indeed left behind by the PLO, not heavy ordinance, but small arms that had been bathed in grease, placed in rubber tires and then buried under concrete outside of Beirut.[12] Any chances of such weapons being easily or quickly accessed and used against invading forces were slim at best. Personal weapons would later be found discarded under dung piles

or wrapped in newspapers, abandoned by the refugees during the frequent Israeli megaphone calls demanding refugees "throw down their weapons and assemble at the Sports City were they could surrender and not be harmed." [13]

On Wednesday, September 15th Israel Defense Forces (IDF) chief of Staff General Rafael Eitan arrived in Beirut and met with Major General Amir Drori, head of the IDF Northern Command, and with the Phalangist military leadership, where they discussed how Israeli forces would seize the city, but it would be up to the Phalangist militia forces to enter the two camps of Sabra and Shatila. The IDF moved in their forces at dawn and by noon of that same day had locked down West Beirut. After establishing a forward command post at the Kuwait embassy traffic circle, the IDF had an unobstructed "panoramic view" of the Shatila and Sabra camps. The IDF controlled the checkpoints in and out of the city, and made statements that they had been obliged to intervene in West Beirut "in order to forestall the danger of violence, bloodshed, and chaos." On Thursday, September 16, 1,500 Phalangist militia men began to move towards the camps in IDF supplied jeeps, with supposed the first unit of 150 to enter the city being a specially trained force with a talent for "discovering terrorists." Armed with knives, hatchets and small arms they entered Shatila camp at sunset, triggering a wave of violence that would last for the next 40 hours.[14]

The Phalangist militia entered the Shatila camp from both the West check point and the South check point to comb the camps in their search for "terrorists." [15] Radio broadcasts caught messages and cross traffic talk of the Phalangist forces requesting for instructions on what to do with 45 or so captured Palestinians, with the liaison officer replying "Do the will of God." Further cross radio talk was heard later by IDF Lieutenant Elul, who was serving at the forward command near the Phalangist transmitter. A Phalangist officer and asked what should be done with the 50 women and children they had captured? The response was a curt reply that "This is the last time you're going to ask me a question like that, you know exactly what to do." The IDF from their rooftop command post followed the fighting on the ground and after 8:00 in the evening began firing illumination mortars for the Phalangists on the ground to "work" by. At this time the initial trickle of reports from inside the camp were being received by the IDF and at his point of the first day the Phalangists had already claimed that they have successfully killed 300 people- both "terrorists and civilians." [16]

Eye-witness reports of survivors describe the terror of hiding in their homes on the first night, watching groups of armed Phalangist walk down the middle of the street, flanking bulldozers that they brought with them, calling people out of their homes and executing them with axes or shooting them on the spot. The bulldozer would then either dump the bodies off into an alley or would dig a shallow trench and cover the dead with sand.[17] Those who initially hid were still not guaranteed

safety; such as the case of Umm Ahmad Farhat, a mother of ten who was staying in her home when Phalangists burst in at 5:00AM on the first night of the Massacre.[18] She was shot twice herself and had to witness her husband and several of her children executed in front of her before she lost consciousness.

Those Palestinians who took refuge in the emergency shelters were the first to be seized by the invading Phalangists. Some were pulled out and taken away for questioning, but others were immediately fired upon, killed en masse in what they thought would be their last chance at protection.[19] In some cases the bulldozers the Phalangists brought were utilized to bury those who fled in to the shelters alive.[20] Stories of families having knocks on their doors, only to have a bomb get thrown in after they open it began to circulate amongst the people in the hospitals who were taking shelter from the mass killings, those who had to drag themselves through the streets and see the corpses of their neighbors axed and dead on the ground around them.[21]

By Friday, September 17 more reports began to surface to the IDF command, starting Major General Drori to worry that the situation was spinning out of control for the IDF to handle. He had heard stories of women being beaten and mistreated, the entire neighborhood of San Simon being violently assaulted, and of the Phalangists conducting "unclean mopping-up" techniques.[22] He made a report to Chief of Staff Eitan stating that "something was amiss in the Phalangist's actions." The Chief of Staff responded that he would be there himself in the afternoon to assess the situation, but the free reign of the Phalangist continued. It was also on Friday that the eyewitnesses on the ground were the IDF soldier's who where holding the checkpoints, who witnessed Phalangist soldiers rounding up men, women and children away to the Soccer Stadium, only to hear shots ring out a short time later. By the end of the day when the Chief of Staff did tour the scene, he met with the Phalangist commanders and heard their own reports that "everything was alright and that while the operation was ending, they were formally requesting another bulldozer from the Israeli's to use to "demolish illegal structures" of the Palestinians, which Eitan granted.

By the close of the second day, Chief of Staff Eitan called the Defense Minister to official inform him of the Beirut visit, freely admitting that the Phalangist's actions had harmed the civilian populations more that they had initially expected, and particularly had selected the phrase "gone too far." International pressure was beginning to mount, as certain survivors who had made it out of Beirut were speaking to the press, with the Americans in particular starting to lean heavily on Israel to pull their forces out immediately. The Israelis had formally agreed to have the Phalangists leave the Sabra & Shatila camps by 5:00AM, yet this would not end up being enforced. Around 6:30 Saturday, September 18, the Phalangist militia entered Gaza hospital in the Sabra camp and began to round up the doctors and

nurses and forcibly move them under armed escort back to the forward command post where they were interrogated and then released. It was at this time that Brigadier General Yaron who had arrived to oversee operations realized that the Phalangists had not withdrawn from the city as they had been ordered, and again formally demanded they withdraw – which was actually followed, the last of the forces leaving by 8:00AM. Initial Red Cross surveys of the camp were estimated to count 328 bodies at first, but the IDF themselves thought that the death toll was closer to being between 700-800 dead.[23] The Lebanese Red Cross would later unbury the hastily covered dead and retrieve bodies from the mass graves, offer a death toll that was estimated to be 3,000 dead, excluding those who could not extract from being under the rubble. When all was said and done, it can be estimated that the true count was somewhere between 4,000 and 5,000.

Initial reports of the Israeli occupation as well as the Phalangist activities were initially vague, with reporters noting that the Israeli army were guarding entry points around Beirut while automatic weapon fire could be heard and even later the appearance of weeping women claiming that their husbands and sons were being taken away by the Phalangists started on the second day of the massacre. Initial reports noted that the Israeli's seemed to be indifferent to the situation inside the camp, noting they would periodically request through bullhorns that people of the camps should just come out and give up their weapons. In contrast the Phalangists were angrily demanding that on site reporters take no pictures and were confiscating rolls of film from those on the scene.[25]

By the end of the second day, witnesses had finally been able to get the story out of Beirut and the International community reacted. On Saturday, full access to the camps was granted to foreign journalists and diplomats, and by noon the news of the massacre was officially being broadcast to the world. Israeli spokesmen initially denied the "alleged massacres," focusing on the "intense resistance" from terrorists that had led to such casualties, and later the story changed to involve the IDF bravely exchanging fire with the Phalangist extremists to "halt the violence." President Ronald Reagan, who firmly backed Israel in the past proclaimed his own outrage and revulsion at the situation, blamed the IDF for allowing the killings and demanded that Israel withdraw from Beirut.[26]

No time wasted in making inquiries into the event itself, six days after the story broke the United Nations General Assembly formally voted to condemn the massacre and called for a complete investigation by the Security Council. It is notable that the United States and Israel were the only two nations to vote "no" compared to the other 147 votes in favor of investigating the matter; with United States representative Charles Lichenstein arguing that the resolution would "only worsen conflict in the Middle East." The Soviet Union repeatedly accused Israel of genocide, and insinuated that the United States was also implicated, whereas other

Western Europeans implied only Israel was to blame. Zehdi Labib Terzi, the PLO observer at the UN was understandably the most passionate orator, commenting that Israel could not atone for the crimes and noting that "now the Palestinians were victims of a "holocaust" and "genocide," alluding that this was the goal of the Jewish state all along to wipe out Arabs.

Yehuda Z. Blum, the delegate from Israel painted Israel as a victim of hatred, calling the exercise as "an excuse to shift blame for the massacre from those who did perpetrate it to those who did not," while at the same time accusing the United Nations of ignoring massacres in Cambodia, Afghanistan, Syria and Uganda. The Council deliberated and concluded that they were going to wait and see what action Israel would take in launching its' own inquiry, but made sure to vote on resolutions of making photographs of the massacre available for display at the United Nations visitors entrance.[27] On September 25, more than 400,000 people began demonstrating in Tel Aviv, demanding the Sharon and Begin be removed from office, which forced the Israeli government to announce on September 28th that they would indeed make an official inquiry.[28]

By December of 1982 the United Nations General Assembly formally condemned Israel's actions in Beirut, noting the Geneva Convention was not enforced to protect the occupied civilians during the Massacre, and further noting that Israel's record speaks to the fact it is not a peace-loving Member State since it violates the various obligations under the United Nation's charter. The United Nations took the opportunity to condemn the various other violations Israel was guilty of at the time, including its' occupation of the Golan Heights, the Annexation of the West Bank, its violations of both the Hague and Geneva Conventions, its overall aggressive militarism, and finally encouraged other Members States to boycott Israel and sever diplomatic ties with them until they would comply. The General Assembly agreed that the large-scale massacre that occurred at the Sabra and Shatila refugee camps was indeed considered Genocide, and Israel is responsible for not following the appropriate measure laid out by the Geneva convention to protect the inhabitants of the territory that the militarily occupied.[29]

While Israel felt it was being persecuted by the findings of the United Nations, note that there were no binding resolutions that outright punished Israel in any way. They were essentially formally denounced, but would not feel any economic sting that did not already exist, nor would they cease having support from their staunch ally, the United States. In short, there was not much done in the post massacre period, other than international outrage for sake of display, rather than actually trying to hold Israel truly accountable.

The Israeli response was to have a government inquiry look into the massacre and ascertain what, if any, responsibility was to be placed on Israel for the tragedy, as well as the judgment of conduct to the leading Israeli officials who were in office

at the time. Led by Yizhak Kahan, the President of the Israeli Supreme Court and chairmen of the Commission, the ultimate goal was to make final recommendations as to what to do with those in power.[30] To the report's credit, it gives a very detailed account of all of the interviews done with Prime Minister Begin, Defense Minister Sharon, other cabinet members, Military Leaders and troops on the ground, and does address the atrocities and reports of witnesses. That being said, the Kahan report is very selective in how it interprets the accountability of the both the IDF and the political leadership, based very much on the repeated statements that they had poor visibility of what was going on in the camp from the forward command post.

Defense Minister Sharon knew exactly what to expect from allowing the Phalangists to enter the camp, as should all of the upper cabinet members. Major General Drori was uneasy about the operation before it even began, and made several requests to both persuade the actual Lebanese Army to oversee the camps rather than the Phalangists for fear of violence. Brigadier General Yaron spoke with the Phalangist leadership and gave them direct orders that they were not to harm the civilian population, and therefore order that the IDF should have enforced as soon as the reports came back that civilians were being killed. The report makes the aforementioned notation of what was heard over the Phalangist radio transmissions, which would make one think that the IDF stationed at the forward command post would have enough of a grasp on the situation reported by Lieutenant Elul to General Yaron over the killing of civilians, but the matter was just stated and then seemingly dropped.

As the conditions on the ground that first day were first reported by General Yaron, the casualty counts were amended from 300 to 120 when reported to the administration. Yaron would later claim that he had doubts about the veracity of the numbers he was getting, but he also claimed that he believed the Phalangist leadership, noting that he had given explicit orders not to do harm to civilians. The Kahan Commission also seems to shift throughout as to how much control the IDF had on the ground- the Administration uses the control of the perimeter to show how they thought everything was being taken care of, as in the case of the Chief of Staff Eitan's explanation. Later that same logic is used by the military to point out that the Phalangists were "using their own methods" on the ground and thus, the IDF had no control over them. The Prime Minister, who claimed not to understand the situation after the fact, did have a cabinet meeting about the Massacre on the second day, where he expressed that with the situation becoming chaotic on the ground, he did not was Israel to lose its' credibility in the international community, especially since "no one will believe that they came to create order and they will bear the blame for the outcome, whether they are responsible or not…" [31]

Testimony from the various cabinet ministers is conveniently forgetful on a variety of issues during the three day timeline. For example the Journalist Ze've

Schiff who was reporting on the massacre at the camp contacted Minister Zipori, who later contacted Foreign Minister Yizhak Shamir about rumors of killings in the camps. In later testimony, Minister Shamir could not recall any conversation with Zipori over killings of Palestinians, but he did seem to remember a conversation about the loss of four IDF soldiers. Defense Minister Sharon, ostensibly in change of this whole operation, claims that he was first told of the atrocities by the Chief of staff the evening of the second day, but did not seem to worry about it, as they were under pressure to have the Phalangists out of the camps by 5:00AM the next morning. When the news broke officially the next day on September 18, the Prime Minister went on record to say that he had not heard anything about the Massacre until the BBC began reporting on it.

The Kahan commission closes with Israel bearing indirect responsibility for the Massacre, as they should have known or had some foreknowledge of the motives of the Phalangist militia before the decision was made to let them into the camps. These concerns were known to those who were leading the military and despite the Phalangist leadership "appearing to be civilized," the anger over Bashir Gemayel's death should have been taken into account as well as the reports that the military witnessed from the ground.[32] The Commission would go on to ascribe various levels of blame (all were at least "indirectly" responsible) appropriate punishment to be meted out to the Government and Military Staff. Prime Minister, Foreign Minister and the Head of the Mossad were all determined to hold no real responsibility, and thus there was no need for any action to be taken. Defense Minister Ariel Sharon was taken to task for what was deemed to be gross negligence of someone in his office, noting that he who was so involved in the planning of this military excursion should have know the consequences as well as made the Prime Minister aware of the various changes on the ground. Sharon was found to bear personal responsibility in this matter, and it was recommended that he be discharged from the duties of the office, forced to be a Minister without portfolio.

Major General Drori was found to be "somewhat" responsible, but his actions to try to alert higher commanders were taken into consideration by the Commission so he received not real punishment at the time. Chief of Staff Eitan was deemed as being to blame as well, but he was retiring from service so it was deemed that there was no need for further action. General Amos Yaron was found to be lacking in what was expected from a field commander, thus it was determined that he would be suspended from field duty for a period of at least three years before reconsideration would be given.[33] In short, Sharon was made to be the main fall guy for the Israel's mishandling of the Massacre, but in the end it did not really affect his status or placement within the government. The whole proceeding could be considered a slap on the wrist for most of the parties involved.

While never forgotten by the victims, the memory of what happened at Sabra and Shatila faded overtime for the rest of the world, particularly in the collective memory of Israel. Then in 2008, an Israeli film maker named Ari Folman released his film *Waltz with Bashir*, an animated documentary about Folman's own attempts to come to grips with the repressed memories he has from the Lebanon war.[34] Folman attempts to deal with his repressed memories of what he witnessed at his time with the IDF during the Sabra and Shatila Massacre by interviewing friends, reporters and psychologists to reconstruct what happened to him during the war.[35] The film itself is masterfully done, since the subjects were filmed and then the filmed pieces were animated, giving it a very stylized and distinct look, allowing some of the nightmares and thoughts that are shared by the various people interviewed to take on both an artistic and frightening representation.[36]

Reoccurring themes that keep coming up throughout the interviews are focused on feelings of being alone, helpless and fearful; while each person interviewed is invariably asked "What exactly do you remember about the war?" Gradually as the film progresses Folman begins to remember more and more about his time and service in Lebanon through his interviews, and eventually accepts what he has witnessed at the Sabra and Shatila camps. When the film closes with Folman's acceptance of his witnessing the tragedy, the film stylistically cuts from being animated and ends on a montage of "reality," which in the films case is a series of photos of the dead victims of the massacre.[37]

One would hope that Folman's work would spark new conversations about Israel's involvement in the Massacre and expose the incident to a new generation who were unaware that it had ever occurred. In a way, this is what happened, although one would argue that it did not spark the outrage that one would assume would come from learning about a horrific crime that took place and was subsequently covered up. Rather, *Waltz With Bashir* is just one of several films dealing with the Lebanon war from the Israeli perspective to come out over the last thirty years, an like its predecessors it selectively chooses what it wants to remember about the war, making it all the more ironic in the case of *Waltz*, since it is an exercise on memory itself.[38]

In his article "War Fantasies: Memory, Trauma and Ethics in Ari Folman's Waltz With Bashir," Raz Yosef, a Professor of Cinema Studies at Tel Aviv University makes the argument that Folman's film marks another example of an Israeli film highlighting the traumatic rupture between history and memory, pointing to the decline of national collective memory in Israel.[39] Yosef notes that these films generally are critical of the Zionist national narrative and the Israeli government's "belligerent polices," and all seem to portray the war as being a painful occurrence for both the Israeli's and the Palestinians. Israeli's portrayed as enlightened occupiers who "shoot and weep," capable of identifying with the suffering of the Palestinians,

but also feeling persecuted themselves. Yosef notes that in the film Ricochets, the message that is delivered is not matter what the conditions are in Lebanon, at that end of the day Israel is the victim of the Arab world's irrational hatred.

Waltz is actually pointed out as being one of three recent documentaries made about the Lebanon War, including *Wasted* (2006), *Beaufort* (2007) and *Lebanon* (2009), with Yosef pointing out that all of these films mark an interesting turn in contemporary Israeli cinema: they explore the repressed traumatic events from the Lebanon war. *Wasted* talks of the traumatized minds of the soldiers fighting in the conflict, seeing friends die; whereas *Beaufort* focuses on Israeli soldiers desperate to leave the battlefield at the close of the war and the terror and hopelessness that they feel each day. All of these films are less focused on the history of the war and more on the private, subjective experiences and memories of the Israeli soldiers who fought. Yoself cites the French historian Pierre Nora, and his work "Between History and Memory," noting that in modern secular multicultural society, historical memory has lost its national role, thus history became a social science and memory became a purely private phenomenon- which is now replacing collective national memory. Groups become now dependent on these private memories in order to make sense of identity, resulting in a "shift from the historical to the psychological." Yoself argues that out of all the films mentioned, *Waltz* with Bashir fits this description of modern memory, since it is purposely highlighting the rupture of memory itself: the film is not interested in revealing true details of the war; rather it was to work through remembering and asking ethical questions of the protagonists.

Yosef notes that Folman spends the movie trying to remember "those three specific days" which is when the massacres took place, and to do this he enlists the help of his friends and acquaintances who had taken part in the war. Folman's memories as well as other traumatic memories are uncovered for the soldiers to experience again: death's of officers, loss of comrades, abandonment on the battlefield, fighting children and the murder of civilians. Yosef chalks this up to delayed trauma, which can be belated or dormant, but can still be triggered by deferred action of consciousness, which he goes onto explain is a Freudian concept. A figure or an experience or even a scene that reenacts something that has already taken place, serves to construct it now as something that is emotionally important or meaningful. Yoself explains that trauma occurs between two events: the first event occurs and doesn't seem traumatic at the time, but will overtime gain significance, thus when the second event occurs it triggers the memory of the earlier event, which has now achieved full traumatic significance.

Folman and his friends experience memories that are part real, part fantasy, haunting the men that they inhibit, which Yosef attributes to disremembering, a survival strategy in which fragmented memories are constructed through both forgetting and inserting traces of fantasy. It allows all of the men to remember

horrible events that are too traumatic to experience directly, and this is where Yoself thinks that the film describes the Israeli national memory, exposing a rupture between the past and the present- showing the decline in Israel's memory of the war.[40] Folman was one of the soldiers on the rooftop of the forward command post during the massacre, and was instructed to launch flares during the night to provide light for the Phalangists in the camp. The day after, he was able to see the atrocities that had taken place in front of him, which horrified him and as a result caused him to repress his memory.

Yoself points out that during the film, Folman visits a friend of his who has become a psychologist who tells Folman that he repressed the memory of the massacre for so long because he identified himself with the murders. Folman was the son of Auschwitz survivors, and views himself as a victimizer, which gives him feeling of guilt, and putting him on a different level than the Israeli political and military leadership (Sharon is the main example in the film) who knew of the massacre and take no responsibility for any of it. Folman understands that he did not take an active part in the massacre, but is questioning the ethics of his own behavior, as well as posing the question "then what is the meaning of not wanting to remember?" Yoself argues that the iconic animation used is just another way of putting distance between the actual event, noting that "using photographic documentary footage would have been too shocking and threatening," thus photographs are reality, which is why the film ends as it does with the archival photo appearing only after Folman has recognized his deferred memory of the massacre.[41]

Yosef also points out that *Waltz with Bashir* deals not with the trauma of the massacre from the point of view of the Palestinians, but rather from the traumatized Israeli, who is after all just and innocent, since he was drafted into the army. With the changing views of collective memory, Yosef cites the historian Dominic LaCapra, noting that "it is very important to understand the distinction between victims, perpetrators and bystanders. Victims are not a psychologicalcategory, but can at times be social, political, and ethical category." Trauma may also be extended to the perpetrators, but it does not equal the same trauma that allows identification between perpetrator and victim.

Yosef accuses Folman of equating victimize and victim by his linking of the Massacre at Sabra and Shatila to the Holocaust, claiming that the intergenerational trauma of the Holocaust itself prevented him from working through his own trauma of the massacre. He states that "the only way Folman can show any interest in the Palestinian victim is by creating a linkage with the Jewish victim and Folman's position as a victim does not allow for the possibility that Israeli Jews are themselves responsible for creating non-Jewish victims." The whole exercise of coming to term

with his own memories apparently absolves Folman, allowing him to move on with his life, which also collectively serves to redeem others who may feel they too have a sense of responsibility from being near the massacre.

While I do not particularly agree with everything Yosef said about Waltz with Bashir as a film, he does make a good point that Folman is bringing the topic of the Sabra and Shatila Massacre up and only speaking about it from the Israeli point of view. While this does make for a very interesting, and I would absolutely argue a worthwhile film, the Palestinians are treated as props. The Palestinians are just stand ins, both in the memories of the interviewed soldiers and later at the film's close, where their corpses displayed to shock the viewer in the horror of what these surviving men must have seen; rather than the focus being on all of the people who were brutally murdered. It speaks to the larger problem with acknowledging what had happened in those West Beirut camps in 1982.

How in modern times can a State such as Israel justify complete inaction and allow atrocities to be inflicted upon innocent people. In the case of the Sabra and Shatila Massacre I would argue that it comes down to three factors, the first being that Ariel Sharon who had planned from the start to involve the State of Israel in the Lebanon war utilized his time honored practice of making "facts on the ground" occur to justify his own actions, or in the case of the Massacre, inactions.[42] It was Sharon who banged the drum of war claiming "2,000 armed terrorists" remained in the camps without any evidence, and later still no weaponry was found to be produced after the massacre by the IDF. Even a week after the Massacre had occurred, Sharon was speaking to the media and reporting that it was up to the IDF to indeed enter Beirut "because the terrorists had left behind thousands of men and had very large quantities of arms." [43] All actions were spun from the standpoint of ensuring security for the State, preemptively stopping those who Sharon perceived to be a threat, whether or not they actually existed. Sharon was a man who would tell whatever story suited his needs at the time and he would then attempt to make it true through his own actions.

The concept that Sharon was held accountable for his gross inaction as well as being blamed for "not adequately assessing the situation that any knowledgeable person who was close to the subject could," is an interesting one, as when one reads it the Commission seems to be politely pointing out that either Mr. Sharon was incompetent or he is not sharing all of his knowledge about the situation, with a subtle emphasis on the latter. Yet it is odd that the Commission does not blame him for not responding after the Massacre began; all of the accountability takes place in the set up of conditions for the Massacre as the Commission holds to the notion that the Sharon himself was not aware of the killings until Friday night. Sharon should have known better, but once the violence starts the situation is miraculously beyond his control as far as the commission is concerned.

His punishment being removed from his position of Defense Minister, but not being removed from office is essentially a non-starter; it was window dressing to look like he was receiving a rebuke, but since he remained in office as a Minister no real harm to his political career or power occurred. The State had to protect Sharon, they had been following his plan by involving themselves in the Lebanon War in the first place and direct punishment or ousting of Sharon would be an admission that they had done something wrong as a nation. The State and Sharon were tied together, so his accountability *had* to be minimal, as Israel viewed its' own responsibility in this situation. They would not have been bystanders if Sharon was completely aware of the scenario, and thus would be culpable for the violence they allowed to happen under their charge.

The next factor in justifying Israel's inaction, while there was indeed international outcry and involvement from the United Nations, none of the General Assembly resolutions bound Israel to do anything, and they did not impose any real political or economic punishment that did not already exist. The United States took the pose of outrage and demanded Israel with draw from Beirut after the fact, but never withheld financial support. What message could be taken by Israel over this? With no real punishment or repercussions, all that was needed was to look like they were taking care of the situation themselves, thus the using the Kahan Commission to quell protests and later shuffle the cabinet, allow members to change posts or retire, and look like fundamental change had indeed occurred. The international community allowed this to be swept under the rug, and reinforced the Israeli narrative of events, rather than addressing the true problem of Israel's aggressive interference in neighboring States.

Lastly, in looking at modern research, there is not a lot of written material from the Israeli point of view that comments on the State's own accountability regarding the massacre. All of the blame is deferred to the Phalangist, but as we have seen this event did not happen in a vacuum. The IDF provided uniforms, weapons, bulldozers to the Phalangist groups and did nothing to stop their actions, even when those actions went against direct orders that the Israeli military gave to not harm the civilian population. We have seen from the Kahan report that the Cabinet had discussed the situation at the camps both prior to the start of the Massacre; and later after reports of the killing began to surface, how to minimize Israel's involvement and/or blame in this instance without directly intervening.[44] It is here that I think Yosef's analysis of memory and psychology is most applicable and accurate. Over the year's Israel has turned itself into a helpless victim- recasting its own involvement as being unaware and then later "powerless" to stop something that had already started. They are just as shocked as the rest of the world that such horrors could be committed by the Phalangists; dismembering the role they played in empowering the Militia to enact the killings.

I do not believe Israel has ever in its' own history been victimized, yet it has made the accusation time and time again where it accuses the rest of the Middle East of hating them, as if they are a passive player on the international scene. By repeating it over and over again, it has lodged into the collective memory, thus it has taken on a life of its' own, replacing examples of their own aggression with explanations of triumphant survival. The standard view can be summed up in a quote that Yosef provided from the film *Ricochets*: "The Christians hate the Druze and the Shiites-so do the Sunni and the Palestinians. The Druze hate the Christians, the Shiites and the Syrians…The Sunni hate whoever their bosses tell them to hate, and not only do the Palestinians hate everyone else, they hate each other as well…And they've all got one thing in common: they all hate- and you have no idea how much-us Israelis." [45]

Taking responsibility for being able to have controlled what happened at Sabra and Shatila would shatter the "new" Israeli narrative of being a victim and would cast them as perpetrators. Toward the close of the 20th century one would think that the systematic killing of a selected group of people would garner not only world outrage, but an appropriate level of response to both punish and prevent such a tragedy from happening ever again. But what does the modern world do when there is an indirect party to such an example of mass death; a party that is controlling the means of violence, providing the tools of terror, and giving the aegis to murder, all the while maintaining that there is no blood on their own hands? How can a modern State justify this behavior?

In the case of the Sabra and Shatila Massacre the answer is simple: Israel chose how to interpret their own actions through the prism of being bystanders and innocents to the atrocity, and collectively the international community let them. Yes, there was initial international outrage, and Israel did face embarrassment and over the ensuing months and years; but as time moved forward the memory of the event was altered by the participants to frame themselves as victims of the Phalangists along with the Palestinians who were killed. Films such as *Waltz with Bashir* have indeed brought this tragedy back into the mainstream discourse and have made a new generation aware of the occurrence, but it has also supported the lapses and alteration of national memory when it comes to Sabra and Shatila. How do they justify it? The do not have to, for they have experienced the pain of being a part of something horrific just like the victims…or at least that is how they are now remembering it.

1   Bayan Buwayhed al-Hout, *Sabra and Shatila: September 1982* (London: Pluto Press, 2004), 21.
2   Buwayhed al-Hout, *Sabra and Shatila*, 1.
3   Buwayhed al-Hout, *Sabra and Shatila*, 22.
4   Buwayhed al-Hout, *Sabra and Shatila*, 27.
5   Charles D. Smith, *Palestine and the Arab-Israeli Conflict: A History with Documents* (Boston: Bedford and St. Martin's, 2013), 366.
6   Smith, *Palestine and the Arab-Israeli Conflict*, 70.
7   Smith, *Palestine and the Arab-Israeli Conflict*, 371.
8   Leila Shahid, "The Sabra and Shatila Massacres: Eye-Witness Reports," *Journal of Palestine Studies* Vol 32, (Autumn 2002): 36.
9   Shahid, "The Sabra and Shatila Massacres," 37.
10   Shahid, "The Sabra and Shatila Massacres," 36-37.
11   Al-Hout, *Sabra and Shatila*, 35.
12   Al-Hout, *Sabra and Shatila*, 40.
13   Al-Hout, *Sabra and Shatila*, 41.
14   Shahid, "The Sabra and Shatila Massacres," 38-40.
15   Kahan Commission, "Final Report of the Israeli Commission of Inquiry into the Events as the Refugee Camps in Beirut," in *Journal of Palestine Studies* Vol. 12, No. 3 (Spring, 1983):94.
16   Kahan Commission, "Final Report of the Israeli Commission of Inquiry into the Events as the Refugee Camps in Beirut," 94-95.
17   Al-Hout, *Sabra and Shatila*, 82.
18   Shahid, "The Sabra and Shatila Massacres," 50-51.
19   Al-Hout, *Sabra and Shatila: September 1982*, 89.
20   Shahid, "The Sabra and Shatila Massacres," 52.
21   Al-Hout, *Sabra and Shatila*, 104-105.
22   Kahan Commission, "Final Report of the Israeli Commission of Inquiry into the Events as the Refugee Camps in Beirut," 100.
23   Kahan Commission, "Final Report of the Israeli Commission of Inquiry into the Events as the Refugee Camps in Beirut," 100-105.
24   Al-Hout, *Sabra and Shatila*, 277.
25   Colin Campbell, "Israel Increases its Grip on Beirut," *New York Times*, September 17, 1982.
26   Shahid, "The Sabra and Shatila Massacres," 42.
27   Bernard D. Nossister, "General Assembly Condemns Massacre and Calls for a Security Council Investigation," *New York Times*, September 24, 1982.
28   Shahid, "The Sabra and Shatila Massacres: Eye-Witness Reports," 42-43.
29   UN 37/123 General Assembly Record: December 16th, 1982 "The Situation in the Middle East, 37-39.
30   Kahan Commission, "Final Report of the Israeli Commission of Inquiry into the Events as the Refugee Camps in Beirut," 89.
31   Kahan Commission, "Final Report of the Israeli Commission of Inquiry into the Events as the Refugee Camps in Beirut," 93-98.
32   Kahan Commission, "Final Report of the Israeli Commission of Inquiry into the Events as the Refugee Camps in Beirut," 101-108.
33   Kahan Commission, "Final Report of the Israeli Commission of Inquiry into the Events as the Refugee Camps in Beirut," 110-116.
34   Ari Folman, *Waltz With Bashir*, DVD, directed by (Los Angeles: Sony Pictures Classics, 2009).
35   Folman, *Waltz With Bashir*, 2009.
36   Folman, *Waltz With Bashir*, 2009.
37   Folman, *Waltz With Bashir*, 2009.
38   Raz Yosef, "War Fantasies: Memory, Trauma and Ethics in Ari Folman's Waltz With Bashir," *Journal of Modern Jewish Studies*, Vol 9.¸No.3 (November 2010):311.
39   Yosef, "War Fantasies," 311.

40 Yosef, "War Fantasies," 312-318.
41 Yosef, "War Fantasies," 319-324.
42 Shahid, "The Sabra and Shatila Massacres," 37.
43 Shahid, "The Sabra and Shatila Massacres," 39.
44 Kahan Commission, "Final Report of the Israeli Commission of Inquiry into the Events as the Refugee Camps in Beirut," 98-110.
45 Yosef, "War Fantasies," 312.

Subjects of the Empire and Subject to the Empire: Gender, Power, and The Inconceivable "Victims" of the British Raj, 1858-1947

By Zohra Saulat

It is compellingly contended that the era of colonialism has long ended. But as members of the global community accountable for preventing history's mistakes from being repeated, can we simply accept this claim and readily forget the consequences that resulted from the age of empires? Despite its brutalities, the British Empire in particular has been held in high regard due to its successful strategic implementations in empire building, control over knowledge production, and its brilliant physical and mental grasp of global dominance. At its height, in the early twentieth century, the British controlled approximately one-fifth of the world's population. This being the case, it is imperative to also explore the negative and detrimental consequences of British colonialism. Colonialism, as defined by the New Oxford American Dictionary, is "the policy or practice of acquiring full or partial political control over another country, occupying it with settlers, and exploiting it economically." [1] Undoubtedly, financial gain was the prime motive of the Empire, but Britain did not limit their modus operandi to exploiting production and resources. In order to reap optimal economic benefits, the British Empire had to also exploit human beings. Of course the natives — Indians and Africans for example — are the obvious targets of such exploitation. As scholars such as Edward Said have shown, the British ruled through both direct and indirect means, which necessitated the creation of a "radicalized" and "inferior" colonial "Other." Most scholarship regarding British rule is centered on the colonized people who constituted this "Other."

However, although less apparent at first, it becomes clear that British imperial subjects too were exploited for the sake of the Empire. Scholars Frederick Cooper and Ann L. Stoler discuss this phenomenon in "Tensions of Empire: Colonial Control and Visions of Rule. They contest: "Although the agents of colonization — officials, missionaries, and entrepreneurs — possessed seemingly immense culture-defining capacity, more and more evidence is emerging of the anxiety of colonizers lest tensions among themselves over class, gender, and competing visions of the kind of colonialism they wished to build fracture the façade." [2]

Given the wide breadth of scholarship, it would be most appropriate to evaluate members of the imperial society in the context of gender to understand how

they were subjugated to the British Empire. This paper will explore themes of gender ideals, relations, and roles in the British Empire in India. It will also touch upon status, rank, and class. These themes will fall under the larger umbrella of colonial control and patriarchy. These themes will be tied together and reinforced by concepts of agency, oppression, and victimhood. The focus on the role of gender in the Empire itself was an important historiographical trend in the scholarship of the British Empire. This focus is important in unraveling the misconception that the Empire was solely a male project. I will examine the scholarship of Susan Zlotnick, Mary Procida, Jean Jacques Van-Helten, Keith Williams, Patricia Hayes, Bernard Cohn, Frederick Cooper, and Ann Stoler. These particular scholars have each in their own way shed light on the role of women in the Empire and have explored the impact of gendered notions that both influenced and were influenced by British colonialism. The inclusion of a primary source is also telling. Therefore, I will assess George Orwell's short story "Shooting an Elephant" as it captures the hyper-masculinity and gender expectations of British officers. By incorporating the various research and the viewpoints of these scholars, it is my intention to reinforce the notion that British imperial subjects were simultaneously agents as well as products of the British Empire. Gender is just one lens through which we can view the evasive domination structure of the Empire. It is now maintained that gender is indeed a social construct. Bernard Cohn noted, "Colonial rule is based on forms of knowledge as much as it is based on situations of direct control." [3] By manipulating knowledge production, the British were able to impose their constructed definitions of femininity and masculinity to their advantage, fluidly adapting them when necessary. This produced an interesting mix of results on imperial subjects, as this paper will showcase.

The roles and realities of British women in the metropole, as well as British women in the colony, must be examined. According to Susan Zlotnick, British women, both in the colony *and* in the metropole, were instrumental to the efforts of the British Empire at home and abroad. They were not passive members of British society. Women were clearly perpetuators of the British Empire. Zlotnick writes, "When Utilitarians like Macaulay and James Mill were busily trying to assimilate India into the British Empire and Anglicizing it through educational and legal reforms, British women undertook an analogous task." [4] This analogous task was the incorporation of Indian food into the British diet. In fact, British women naturalized foods like "curry," making it culturally British. In the process of incorporation, the Indian origins of curry were forgotten as the food rose to the favorable ranks of tea and crumpets, a common feature of British society. [5] British women did so to neutralize the threat of the "Other." According to Zlotnick, this was done in order to protect the role of domesticity in English national identity when it was threatened. Zlotnick explains, "England's domesticity develops as a distinguishing feature of Englishness when the English noticeably and regularly begin to abandon their

firesides for colonial destinations." [6] In response, "middle-class women, as morally regenerative and utterly domestic figures, could take into their homes a hybrid like curry, the mongrelized offspring of England's union with Indian, and through the ideological effect of domesticating it, erase its foreign origins and represent it as purely English." [7] We see here that women were allowed to play a huge role in the British Empire's quest for control. Though the role was a domestic and traditional one, it should not be underemphasized. What should be brought to light, however, is the contradictory nature of British imperial authority. It encouraged the involvement of women, but limited it at the same time.

Away from the metropole, and into the depths of the Empire, we see women taking a completely different type of role. In the Indian colonies, the public and private spheres were no longer separated by gendered notions. Mary Procida addresses the many "modern" freedoms British women possessed throughout their residence in India. Rather than forcing women to stay in their traditional realms or constructing new feminine public roles for them, Anglo-Indian women were allowed to take on a greater role in the public face of the Empire. Consequently femininity and masculinity, in the Empire for Anglo-Indians became intertwined. As a result, women adopted masculine traits and participated in masculine activities: dressing in traditionally male attire, taking part in dominantly male sports like Polo, taking up arms, and even being addressed as "sir." [8] Therefore, in India it became more acceptable for British women to not only act in public spaces, but to also take on greater roles in the Empire. Procida emphasizes, "The empire may have been masculine, but it certainly was not exclusively male." [9]

Most striking is the fact that British men and women in India chose their own spouses based on companionship, mutual interests, and compatible professional goals. These were freedoms that were not often available to British women in the metropole. Procida writes, "Her admiration for the man who would become her husband stemmed not from feelings of awe or feminine inadequacy but rather from her cool assessment that here was someone who was her equal — and could be her partner — in hunting, shooting, and hanging firearms." [10] Acceptance and opportunities for education expanded for Anglo-Indian women, not to mention the growing recognition of women as political actors. Anglo-Indian women also represented their husband's imperial authority and often acted on their behalf during the husband's absence, free to make decisions. It was not uncommon for men to entrust their wives with top-secret details of the Empire.

Procida and Zlotnick share how women's roles, both in the metropole and in the colony, expanded in the backdrop of British colonialism. Indeed, women played a vital role as agents of the Empire. It appears as progress, yet we still see women chained to specific domestic roles. According to Zlotnick, the domestic ideology of the time was "profoundly conservative in its configuration of women

as purely domestic beings and profoundly radical in its ability to imagine them as the moral redeemers of the nation." [11] Despite their elevated status and gains, women in the Indian colonies were still tied to their husbands and subject to their circumstances. For example, Procida claims, "Wives of imperial officials found it impossible to make a sustained long-term commitment to local welfare projects since their husbands' job transfers made it unlikely that they would remain in a particular locale for an extended period of time." [12]

The expansion of women's roles and opportunities was done out of need rather than notions of genuine progressiveness. "Throughout the period of the Raj, the British community represented a miniscule percentage of the population of the subcontinent, yet the appearance of absolute dominance was crucial to imperial control." [13] Therefore, all Anglo-Indians were crucial to the imperial project — man or woman. Women were no longer subjected only to men; instead they became subjected to the Empire. As Procida clearly illustrates, "They were married not only to their husbands but to the Raj itself." [14] As is a common result of any nationalistic fervor, other personal desires of attainment fell to the background. Duty to the Empire became the focal point for one's identity, passions, and actions. For example, when choosing their spouses not only were mutual interests considered, but it was also equally, if not more, imperative to choose a spouse that would be best able to help serve the Empire. When it was convenient, marriage was used to serve the needs of the Empire. Rudyard Kipling wrote, "Marriage in India does not concern the individual but the Government he serves." [15] And when it was convenient, the Empire portrayed marriage, wives, and women negatively. The Victorian doctrine of "separate spheres" which located the home as the woman's realm was employed to this end when necessary.

Perhaps Kipling's statement is most evident in the case of British women's emigration to South Africa. Refined gentlewomen were encouraged by the British government to take up domestic positions that were cleverly portrayed in a more positive light by being referred to as "lady helps" or even "family friends" to avoid calling them servants. Higher functioning positions such as governesses and teachers were not needed. It was not a coincidence that only domestic roles were encouraged. The aim was to cure the supposed "surplus" of women in the metropole and to provide British officers in South Africa with a dutiful spouse.[16] There was clearly a great fear that men would embrace interracial relations, if not marriage, with native South Africans. This fear of racial intermixing and the sexual lasciviousness of native women was one that also played out in India. Thus, the solution would be the emigration of British women to the Transvaal. Scholars Jean Jaques Van-Helten and Keith Williams claim there are strong arguments that black women in South Africa were oppressed as women, as blacks, and as workers. However, British women too were oppressed as women due to the racist and sexist

discourse of imperialism, demanding the ideological repression of British women while at the same time granting them a share in the material spoils.[17] In this way, the perceived privilege granted to British women in the colonies was very much a form of subjugation that served the imperial project.

As we have seen, gendered notions that dictated the expectations, characteristics, and behaviors associated with femininity were defined by the Empire for the benefit of the imperial project. These definitions were dependent on what the Empire required and necessarily involved subjugation. Femininity was allowed a confined space in the domestic and private sphere. Women were regarded as inferior to men. Even if women faced advancement, their lives were still very much bound to patriarchy and the Empire. While they chose to be active agents of colonialism, they were simultaneously robbed of the very basic right to define their own gender. In many instances, imperial women were granted power and new freedoms they had never experienced before but were also still confined to specifically traditional roles. Any improvements in the condition of women were only granted to achieve colonial goals. Femininity in the Empire was not static across the board. Gender was constructed by the Empire, flexible to various situations, to fit the Empire's agenda.

Historian Rosalind O'Hanlon explains masculinity as one aspect of a person's identity that should be understood in relation to other men and other characteristics of identity such as class, occupation, race, and ethnicity." [18] Masculinity is a social construct that continually adjusts its own attributes over time. Masculinity was critical in British colonial rule. Patricia Hayes showcases how the British used their definition of masculinity to assert and maintain power over people of different races. This Anglo definition of masculinity was projected as the status quo and was thus internalized by the British as seen in the influential English intellectual George Orwell's short story "Shooting An Elephant" and in the case of English ethnographer Cocky Hahn and his experience in Africa.

A common theme seen in Hayes' article "'Cocky' Hahn and the 'Black Venus': The Making of a Native Commissioner in South West Africa, 1915-46," was the alliance of masculinity and violence. In the narrative regarding "Cocky" Hahn, also dubbed as "The Whip," an administrator and ethnographer in South West Africa, there are many violent examples of hyper-masculinity during his rule. A product of Paarl Boy's High School, which aimed to foster "discipline of body and mind," [19] Hahn was educated with an emphasis in physicality. Both sport and flogging were essential to school life for this was seen as essential in "becoming a man." [20] According to Hayes, "this ethos had some similarities with the Muscular Christianity that emerged in English public schools from the 1830.[21] This ethos was designed to cultivate "discipline, service, and authority," built upon paternalistic overtones of male responsibility towards the "weaker sex" and the "weaker races." In addition, Hahn not only vigorously participated in the "rough" sport of Rugby but

he was also involved in expeditions during the Great War. In the 1920's, Hahn was at the center of legal investigations. A junior officer by the name of Percival Chaplin made accusations of mistreatment against Hahn's administration. Interestingly enough, Chaplin's character served as a contrast of the romanticized image of Hahn. Chaplin was described as "childish and weak." Additionally, he was said to have had poor hunting skills and lacked talent in sportsmanship.[22] It is through this series of investigations that Hahn's use of violence in his rule, which was not only projected towards men, but was extended towards women, comes to light. It was alleged that Hahn would resort to kicking when his fists grew tired of beating men. Hahn was also accused of not only taking photographs of women during their graphic coming of age ritual, but he was said to have branded an African woman's buttocks with a swastika. He was also accused of kicking a woman in her genitalia. On top of the dehumanizing and degrading physical and sexual abuse towards Africans, it is important to note that these victims, these women, were mentioned nameless as an afterthought during the trial. This trend of sexual violence was not solely limited to South Africa; it was apparent throughout the Empire. Hahn was exonerated and this reveals the extent to which colonial law itself reinforced gendered expectations. Hahn engaged whole-heartedly in acts that were rooted in racial and gendered superiority. Through his education and environment, Hahn was raised with a sense of paternalistic "duty" over the "weaker" race and entitlement over women. Not only did these victims suffer physical and sexual abuse by the hands of the glorified "Cocky" Hahn, they were also victims of Hahn's ethnographic work — their Ovambo knowledge production was out of their control. This reveals the flaws of colonial knowledge production and its evident biases. It can be no clearer than this that Cocky Hahn was a tool of British imperialism that exerted his hyper-masculinity to maintain power, thus reinforcing British rule.

It can also be said that the British were also victims of pressure to portray British own ideals of masculinity. In George Orwell's "Shooting an Elephant," readers meet a conflicted British officer in Burma. Within the first few paragraphs of the narrative, Orwell vividly describes his character's situation: "All this was perplexing and upsetting. For at that time I had already made up my mind that imperialism was an evil thing and the sooner I chucked up my job and got out of it the better. Theoretically – and secretly, of course – I was all for the Burmese and all against their oppressors, the British. As for the job I was doing, I hated it more bitterly than I can perhaps make clear. In a job like that you see the dirty work of Empire at close quarters … All I knew was that I was stuck between my hatred of the empire I served and my rage against the evil-spirited little beasts who tried to make my job impossible." [23]

This expression of hatred for the Empire from a British subject is a scandalously shocking admission. The British officer's feelings are a peculiar

combination of empathy and hatred for the native subjects. Struggling to choose sides, we see the young officer's conflict tested. He was torn between shooting an elephant, which had wreaked havoc upon a native village, and letting the elephant go. However, in the end, he succumbed to popular pressure from the natives. He described himself as a hated man among them. He felt that he could not risk losing respect in their eyes, reminding himself that the British were expected never to show fear. He held on to this ideal of masculinity as he shot the elephant multiple times in order to maintain his power. In the aftermath, British notions of legality assured him. According to British law, he had done the right thing.

In both of these articles, the performance of masculinity was marked by physicality: both sexual violence and display of virile strength. These were standard definitions of masculinity as defined by the Anglo-European and British cultures. Cocky Hahn represented Anglo ideals of masculinity through acts of degrading violence tied to factors of both race and gender. He asserted his power through violence. Orwell's protagonist did the same. He was tested by both British ideals and native pressure and expectations. To gain respect and appease the natives, as well as to follow the protocol, he shot the elephant, despite his personal misgivings. Both cases are very telling of the prevailing and overarching ideology behind masculinity. The notions that define masculinity not only seem to be so easily accepted, but are also very complicated. Cocky denied the allegations of his violence, while Orwell's officer admitted his inner conflict and guilt. Cocky Hahn represents a willing agent of empire, while Orwell, tormented and pressured to commit unreasonable and gruesome acts, is clearly an inconceivable victim of the British Empire.

By examining British imperial subjects in the metropole and in the colony, we can see that colonialism not only affected the natives, but its arms outstretched to infect its own. However, there was not a single outcome of colonialism. According to Frederick Cooper and Ann Stoler, colonial regimes, and by extension the "colonizers," were subject to change and were not always invincible.[24] They claim, "It remains difficult to keep the dynamics of colonizer and colonized in view at the same time, just as it is difficult to assess how much of the colonization process was shaped by the colonized as well as the colonizers. The colonial encounter entailed struggles over different forms of knowledge, over group boundaries, over moralities, over the intimate details of work and life."[25] In fact, as we have seen, the matter becomes even more complicated and varied when gender is thrown into the mix. The role of British women expanded during the last segment of British imperialism. The importance and trust given to women were no doubt improvements from the conditions they had endured before. Women stepped out into the public sphere and took on roles that had exclusively belonged to men. Activities such as sports and clothing shed their trivial gendered connotations as well. However, these accommodations were given only for the demanding

and vital task of running an empire, not due to a genuine egalitarian expansion of the mind. In this way, women — although agents perpetuating the rule of British imperialism — were simultaneously victims of the very Empire they served. Similarly, men too were agents and victims of the Empire. Cocky Hahn represented the hyper-masculine ideal of British Imperialism. Despite the violent verbal, physical, mental and sexual abuse he would commit during his rule, his contemporaries would continue to glorify him. In abusing his victims, the brutish Cocky sought to maintain his, and British, power. Orwell was consciously aware of his status as a victim alongside his position of imperial officer. As a British subject he felt obligated to act out British protocol despite his compelling feelings towards the natives, who hated him because of what he represented. Orwell did not identify with British ideals but was also simultaneously rejected by the natives.

I have explored a single potent feature of British imperialism. Gender is one context of many that can be observed to gain a clearer picture of the ugly realities of the British Empire in both Africa and Asia. Even within a specific topic like gender and its dynamics, there is no clear-cut, overarching outcome. The effects of imperialism on British imperial subjects, men and women alike, are just a few pieces of the far larger puzzle of domination. Putting together this puzzle will hopefully contribute to a realization of the tragedies conducted by human hands on countless levels.

1   *New Oxford American Dictionary*, 3rd ed., (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010).
2   Frederick Cooper and Ann L. Stoler, "Introduction Tensions of Empire: Colonial Control and Visions of Rule," *American Ethnologist* 16:4 (1989), 609.
3   Bernard Cohn, "Representing authority in Victorian India" in *The Invention of Tradition*, ed. E. Hobsbawm & T. Ranger (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 182.
4   Susan Zlotnick, "Domesticating Imperialism: Curry and Cookbooks in Victorian England," *Frontiers: A Journal of Women Studies* 16 (1996), 52.
5   Zlotnick, "Domesticating Imperialism," 64.
6   Zlotnick, "Domesticating Imperialism," 64.
7   Zlotnick, "Domesticating Imperialism," 54.
8   Mary Procida, "Good Sports and Right Sorts: Guns, Gender and Imperialism in British India," *Journal of British Studies* 40:4 (2001), 461.
9   Procida, "Good Sports and Right Sorts," 460.
10   Procida, "Good Sports and Right Sorts," 454.
11   Zlotnick, "Domesticating Imperialism," 53.
12   Procida, "Good Sports and Right Sorts," 461.
13   Procida, "Good Sports and Right Sorts," 466.

14 Mary Procida, *Married to the Empire: Gender, Politics and Imperialism in India, 1883-1947* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002), 36.

15 Procida, *Married to the Empire*, 38.

16 Jean Jacques Van-Helten and Keith Williams, "The Crying Need of South Africa: The Emigration of Single British Women to the Transvaal, 1901- 10," *Journal of Southern African Studies*, 10:1 (1983), 17-38.

17 Van-Helten, "The Crying Need of South Africa," 38.

18 See for example Rosalind O'Hanlon, "Manliness and Imperial Service in Mughal North India," *Journal of the Economic & Social History of the Orient*, Vol. 42 Issue 1, (February 1999): 47-94.

19 Patricia Hayes, "'Cocky' Hahn and the 'Black Venus': The Making of a Native Commissioner in South West Africa, 1915-1946," *Gender and History* (1996), 250.

20 Hayes, "'Cocky' Hahn and the 'Black Venus,'" 250.

21 Hayes, "'Cocky' Hahn and the 'Black Venus,'" 250.

22 Hayes, "'Cocky' Hahn and the 'Black Venus,'" 258.

23 George Orwell, "Shooting an Elephant," *Shooting an Elephant and Other Essays* (London: Secker and Warburg, 1950).

24 Cooper and Stoler, "Tensions of Empire," 609.

25 Cooper and Stoler, "Tensions of Empire," 609.

Edward Coles and the Fight to Defeat Slavery in Illinois

By Greg Staggs

The push to formally allow slavery in the Northwest Ordinance, which had been established by as a free territory, was a pressing question raised by some of Illinois' earliest and most influential politicians. This controversial measure was supported by a large number of voters, particularly in the state's southernmost counties. When Edward Coles took the governorship of Illinois in 1822, he became determined to stand on his principles and protect the freedoms granted to all people living in what he determined to be a "free state." [1] For the next two years, Illinois experienced a tremendous amount of political turmoil regarding the issue of slavery. The vote to establish a new state constitution in Illinois was heavily promoted by pro-slavery forces. In February 1823, a majority vote in the state's General Assembly was reached to propose a Constitutional Convention as a means to advance the legal practice of slavery within the state of Illinois. The culmination of Edward Coles' effort to defeat slavery in Illinois came in August 1824. In the 1824 general election, 56 percent of the state's populace voted against the Convention.[2] The issue of slavery in Illinois would be settled for the remainder of Coles' term, but it would not completely disappear from Illinois political rhetoric. The topic of slavery in Illinois would be discussed throughout the 19th century and even debated famously by political heavyweights such as Abraham Lincoln and Stephen Douglas. However, the push for pro-slavery legislation in Illinois would never be as strong as it was during the 1820s. My argument is that if not for the extraordinary efforts of Edward Coles, the legal practice of slavery in Illinois could have very well been achieved.

The French were the first Europeans to introduce the practice of slavery in Illinois. Phillip Renault brought African slaves to "Illinois Country" or "Upper Louisiana" in the early 18th century along the Mississippi River, south of modern St. Louis. When the British took control of the Illinois region from France in 1763, the presence of slaves was limited but still existed nonetheless. The earliest point of contention for slave-owners in the region of Illinois came in 1783 after the American Revolution. The Virginia Act of Cession (drafted by the Virginia Commonwealth Legislature) confirmed that anyone who claimed citizenship of Virginia "shall have their possessions and titles confirmed to them." [3] In 1787, Article VI of the Northwest Ordinance was drafted in the Confederation Congress to declare "there

shall be neither slavery nor involuntary servitude in the said territory." [4] For the next 30 years, these two conflicting statements of law would coexist throughout the early history of the Illinois Territory.

Population estimates from 1820 show that nearly 70 percent of the black population in Illinois was enslaved.[5] For the most part, the practice of slavery in early nineteenth century Illinois was concentrated in two southern counties. Gallatin and Jackson Counties provided Illinois with an early source of revenue based on work done by slaves in salt mines. Salt proved to be a viable export and source of tax revenue for the state.[6] The work in the southern Illinois salt mines was labor intensive and dependent on the use of African American slaves. By the time Illinois achieved statehood in 1818, Article VI of the first State Constitution prohibited the introduction of slavery and involuntary servitude. However, Illinois Article VI did make room for indentured servants to be brought to Illinois under short term one-year contracts to work in the salt mines.[7] When Edward Coles was elected governor in 1822, the question of whether or not to allow slavery became a critical point of debate. The salt industry produced a small class of elites within southern Illinois. This group of wealthy Illinoisans had influence within the Illinois legislature.[8] Coles would be up against significant political momentum to propagate the use of slave labor.

The atmosphere of Illinois in the early 19th century was largely influenced by the culture and politics of the American South.[9] The southern influence would shape the culture of Illinois in the 1820s and contribute immensely to the debate of whether or not to allow slavery during Edward Coles' term as Governor. When Illinois was admitted as a state in 1818, three-quarters of Illinois' population was southern-born. Virginia and the Carolinas contributed to 38 percent of the Illinois populace, while 37 percent came from the western lands of Kentucky and Tennessee.[10] The rivers of southern Illinois, Mississippi, Ohio and Wabash, would provide entryways for many southern immigrants, including Edward Coles. Illinois' early population was concentrated in the major river valleys south of Vandalia. Most settlers in the southern Illinois region were forced to clear land for farming themselves. Slave labor was present in the state's early days, but it was never a dominant means of agricultural production. Although the majority of the people in early Illinois could not afford slaves of their own, the influence of the American South was notable and the practice of slavery was something well known to early Illinoisans.

De facto slavery was practiced but it never took on the weight and magnitude of large-scale production as in the South. Although the 1818 Illinois Constitution forbade slavery and involuntary servitude, there were careful inclusions that allowed the de facto practice to exist. For example, Illinoisans who had settled in the "Territory period" prior to statehood were allowed to keep their slaves according to the 1783 Virginia Act of Cession. As previously mentioned, this group included

a handful of wealthy landowners in southern Illinois.[11] Edward Coles would have fallen into a new group of southern settlers who were allowed to retain their slaves from other states when they moved to Illinois, as long as they were registered. The earliest slave-owners in Illinois as a whole felt that slavery, as it was practiced in that state, "had been and would continue to be unique." [12]

Southern political dominance was a large theme in Illinois' early development. During the "Territory period" Ninian Edwards and Jesse Thomas emerged as the leading politicians of Illinois. Prior to statehood, Edwards served as Governor of the Illinois Territory from 1809 through 1818. Both men would serve as Senators during Edward Coles' governorship in the 1820s. Both Edwards and Thomas were natives of states where slavery was practiced widely. Edward was born in Maryland and raised in Kentucky while Thomas was born in Virginia and also raised in Kentucky. Another southerner who played a large role in early Illinois politics was Shadrach Bond, the first State Governor of Illinois. The southern influence on politics in Illinois was present but not every notable political figure was a native of the South. Elias Kent Kane, for example, was a native of New York. Kane worked alongside Jesse Thomas and professed pro-slavery views.[13] The views held by the early Illinois political elite were not entirely homogenous. Ninian Edwards and Jesse Thomas were know to be huge rivals and supported candidates with varied stances on slavery. Native Kentuckian Daniel Pope Cook was also a notable figure, primarily because of his anti-slavery views. With all things considered, there was a significant amount of support for slavery in Illinois politics that existed in the early 1820s. Whether or not that stance originated North or South of the Mason-Dixon Line remains a secondary concern. What we do know about Governor Edward Coles is that he was born into an environment where slavery existed as a vital part of a family's economic success. Perhaps the best description of Coles' early journey from landed Virginia gentry to an anti-slavery fighter in Illinois was summed up by former Illinois Secretary of State, Thomas Lippincott:

> There were those who wrote more in the newspapers, but there was no one more indefatigably nor more disinterestedly engaged in the efforts to keep out the curse of slavery than Edward Coles, then governor of the state. He had been rich, was still possessed of a competence, perhaps a considerable wealth, but had had diminished this wealth, whatever it was, by the voluntary emancipation of the slaves that fell to him by heir ship, and this he had done against the earnest protest of his family, who proposed to purchase the slaves by giving him an equivalent in other property. Instead of this, he brought them to Illinois,

emancipated them and settled them on land he purchased for them as theirs. When the effort was put forth to make Illinois a slaveholding state, he united with its opponents with a zeal worthy of a noble hearted Virginian gentleman.[14]

The question of slavery would influence policy when Edward Coles was elected Illinois' second governor in 1822. Coles made it apparent that he opposed slavery. How did he arrive at his point of view?

Edward Coles was born December 15, 1786 in Albemarle County, Virginia. Edward was the youngest of five sons and a member of the third generation of landed Virginia gentry. The family landholdings included nearly 15,000 acres of corn, wheat and tobacco. Edward Coles' father also owned 71 slaves.[15] Although he was born to a wealthy planter family, Coles pursued a much different path. Coles made his anti-slavery views known shortly after his father died in 1810.[16] At 22 years old, he inherited a portion of his family's property, including slaves. Edward Coles would have been destined to live the life of an American planter, if not for his moral opposition to owning slaves. As one scholar points out, his "inspiration for anti-slavery commitment did not come from his immediate family." [17] As a young man, Edward Coles was largely influenced by the republican ideals he learned at the College of William and Mary. The Reverend James Madison, the College's president, taught one of his classes.[18] The topic of this course was moral philosophy. Reverend Madison professed a vision of the republican ideal that was based on the belief that authority is tied to the rights of individuals by natural law.[19] Edward Coles and Reverend Madison weighed the issue of whether or not the institution of slavery was just and moral. This was a critical moment of development when Coles determined that "man could not of right hold property in his fellow man." [20]

In 1809, Edward Coles was appointed private secretary to President James Madison. The issue of slavery would remain in the background for the next ten years. But from time to time, the topic of the morality of slavery came up in conversations with President Madison. During this period Coles also established and maintained correspondence with Thomas Jefferson. Madison and Jefferson's passive approach to ending slavery were consistent with many American leaders of the time. Men of high political standing, especially within the plantation regions of the American South, chose to side-step the issue publically. Madison compromised his own beliefs by taking an approach towards "benevolence and paternalism." [21] In a letter written by Edward Coles to Thomas Jefferson in 1814, Coles hesitantly confronted the former president on the issue of slavery. Drawing on his beliefs to guide his ambition against the institution, Coles urged Jefferson to assert his influence and put an end to "this most degrading feature of British Colonial policy." [22] Throughout the back and forth dialogue between Jefferson and Coles, it

became apparent that Jefferson encouraged Coles to withhold his anti-slavery intentions. Jefferson instructed Coles to "reconcile yourself ... and when the phalanx is formed, bring on and press the proposition perseveringly until its accomplishment." [23] Coles did not like the suggestion of his political mentors to be tentative in his fight against slavery and would make it his political goal to aggressively oppose slavery when he moved to Illinois.

In the spring of 1819, Edward Coles traveled with his inheritance of 17 slaves aboard a flatboat on the Ohio River.[24] Somewhere between Pennsylvania and Kentucky, Coles assembled his travel mates and liberated them. Coles would later describe this moment:

> The effect on the newly freed was electrical. They stared at me and at each other, as if doubting the accuracy or reality of what they had heard. In breathless silence they stood before me, unable to utter a word, but with countenances beaming with expression which no words can convey, and which no language can now describe. As they began to see the truth of what they had heard, and to realize their situation, there came on a kind of hysterical, giggling laugh. After a pause and unutterable emotion, bathed in tears and with tremulous voices, they gave vent to their gratitude, and implored the blessings of God on me. When they had in some degree recovered the command of themselves, Ralph said he had long known I was opposed to holding black people as slaves, and thought it probable I would some time or other give my people their freedom, but that he did not expect me to do it so soon.[25]

It was certainly a powerful moment for both Edward Coles and the people to whom he granted freedom. As the newly freed Ralph Crawford remarked, Coles had professed these views on slavery for a long time. Because of his firm opposition to slavery, Coles knew that he would be unable to practice his beliefs in Virginian. Virginia law stated that anyone who wanted to free his slaves must move out of the state.[26] Prior to Coles' manumission, President James Monroe appointed Coles to the position of Land Registrar in the newly formed state of Illinois. Edward Coles settled outside of modern day Edwardsville on a 6,000 acre farm.[27] Coles truly allowed his freed slaves to achieve economic independence by hiring several of his freed men and women to work the land and tend the house on his property. His freed workers were paid in cash and given property of their own.[28] Meanwhile, Coles kept up with local politics of his new state and maintained his beliefs on eliminating slavery.

In 1822, the Illinois gubernatorial election was up for grabs. Edward Coles, a Virginia aristocrat with anti-slavery views was very much an outsider to Illinois politics. He fashioned himself as a political independent, unaffiliated with any of the

state's dominant factions. Before Coles even emerged as a candidate, the first name to appear on the ballot was Joseph Phillips. Phillips was southern-born, a native of Tennessee. He served as Illinois Territorial Secretary from 1816 to 1818, prior to statehood. Illinois' first governor, Shadrach Bond, appointed Phillips to be the Chief Justice of the Illinois Supreme Court.[29] Factional politics were beginning to emerge in Illinois, and Joseph Phillips was associated with the anti-slavery Ninian Edwards faction and represented proslavery views. He was also known to favor a constitutional convention as a method to clarify the issue of slavery in Illinois.[30] The other primary threat to Edward Coles in the 1822 election was also a member of the Ninian Edward faction, Thomas C. Browne. Browne was a Kentucky native who also represented the pro-slavery position. James B. Moore, a member of the Illinois State Militia, was the fourth candidate. Moore took an anti-slavery stance and would ultimately finish a distant fourth in the election.

Coles won the election but the numbers are revealing about the strength of pro-slavery views in Illinois. Edward Coles received 2,854 votes, while Phillips finished second with 2,687 votes. Browne finished a close third with 2,443 votes. The two pro-slavery candidates eclipsed Coles' total with over 5,000 combined votes.[31] If factional rivalries had not existed, there may not have been a need for two pro-slavery candidates. A breakdown of the election results show that Coles received less than 10 percent of the popular vote in Gallatin and Jackson Counties, where the slaveholding population was prominent.[32] It is very interesting to consider what might have happened if Browne or Phillips did not run for governor in 1822. Would the votes have gone to Coles or the other pro-slavery candidate?

Edward Coles did not waste any time espousing his views about slavery in his inaugural address. He requested "just and equitable provisions be made for the abrogation of slavery in the state," and referenced the Northwest Ordinance as a means to justify his stance.[33] This rubbed many of the Illinois legislators the wrong way. From this point on, Coles would be portrayed by many politicians and members of the Illinois press as an "arrogant outsider" who was out of touch with the laws of the land. His major political opponents included Illinois' first Secretary of State, Elias Kent Kane. Kane was largely influential on the written language of Article VI in the Illinois Constitution, which enabled the practice of indentured servitude.[34] He went to great lengths to oppose Coles in the newspaper, the *Illinois Republican*. Kane's apprentice, Sidney Breese, wrote a series of letters attacking the anti-slavery views of Edward Coles. These letters were penned under the pseudonym of "Ames." The goal of Ames's letters was to educate the public about the supposed benefits of slavery for the lower classes in the state. The image of Coles and the territorial elite in Breese's writings were exaggerated to portray Illinois as a state that allowed slavery to exist among the privileged classes.[35] Perhaps Edward Coles imagined that

Illinois would be an idyllic frontier to manumit his slaves while journeying aboard his flatboat on the Ohio River. Elias Kent Kane and his associates made every effort to oppose the new governor of Illinois, especially on the issue of slavery.

Illinois' economy in the early 1820s was unstable. In the meantime, Missouri was attracting a large flow of wealthy southern immigrants who brought their slaveholdings to western lands. Much of the pro-slavery rhetoric cited the economic success of Missouri as a slave state and pointed out the benefits for Illinois if it could attract the same abundance of wealthy planters to the state.[36] Pro-slavery politicians in Illinois used the state's slumping economy as a means to show how slavery could provide labor for proposed projects such as the canal that would link the Illinois River to Lake Michigan. The overall message behind the pro-convention politicians of Illinois was that the 1818 Constitution inadequately represented the needs of the current population. Slavery was not apparent on the surface of their message but it certainly existed as an underlying force. In February 1823, the pro-slavery forces of Illinois got the deciding vote in the General Assembly to formally ask the voters of the state to decide on a constitutional convention. The movement to hold this convention was largely underlined by pro-slavery sentiment. The pro-convention vote was decided by a two-thirds majority. Pike County, in western Illinois, was represented by anti-slavery advocate, Nicholas Hansen. On February 11, 1823, the Illinois House voted against the convention. The pro-convention crowd determined Hansen to be the deciding vote. Pro-slavery advocates resorted to bullying tactics in order to get their way. The next day, Hansen was forcibly removed from his position and replaced with pro-conventionist, John Shaw, who provided the deciding vote and the proslavery advocates got their wish.[37]

Pro-slavery legislation was now at the doorstep of Edward Coles' political career in Illinois. His main purpose for venturing West to Illinois was to escape the plantation economy and the pragmatic views toward slavery that were so pervasive in his home state of Virginia. The Illinois governor had become a target because of his anti-slavery views in a state that he believed to be free. Throughout the first-half of 1824, Coles made it a priority to defend the views of his anti-slavery politics in Illinois. He used the *Vandalia Intelligencer* as his vehicle to gather support from Illinois voters. The governor used his skills in presenting the arguments of each side of the debate, while criticizing the pro-convention promises of financial gain for each county that voted in favor of the convention.[38] He argued that expanding slavery in the North would only prolong its existence and pointed out that any expansion of slavery would tarnish the reputation of the United States as a symbol for freedom throughout the world.[39]

The key issue of forming a constitutional convention to further the practice of slavery in Illinois was voted down by the general population in the 1824 August election. The push to initiate a new Illinois Constitution would be laid to rest for

the remainder of Coles' term as governor. There were other factors that led to the result of the 1824 election. Coles was certainly not the only politician who opposed slavery in Illinois. Daniel Pope Cook won a Congressional seat in that same election and throughout his campaign professed his opposition to slavery. Another factor that contributed to the 1824 election results was the state's rapidly changing demographics. The northern counties of Illinois received an influx of Baptist and Methodist settlers who firmly opposed slavery. The influx of anti-slavery support certainly played a significant role in the election results. Among the Illinois politicians, general reactions to the results on the convention issue were limited and neutral. Thomas Lippincott described the overall mood following the election: "The defeated party submitted quietly, the triumphant party rejoiced without noise of show." [40]

Despite the restraint described in Lippincott's account, Edward Coles must have felt a certain amount of pride regarding the defeat of the pro-slavery forces in Illinois. The election results of 1824 were the culmination of his extraordinary efforts to fight slavery in Illinois. In 1860, prior to the outbreak of the Civil War, the former governor remembered his political efforts in detail:

> As I still feel, and the longer I witness the disgraceful scenes of the present times, in upholding and extending slavery - the greater interest and more hearty satisfaction I feel at the part I acted, and the gratification I derive from reflection on the course I pursued, and the agency I had in preserving the prairies of Illinois from the curse of slavery. I assure you this is to me a source of great consolation as I approach the termination of my earthly existence and calmly review the past and anticipate the future. Whether I get credit as helmsman for steering the Illinois ship of state through the conflicting tempests which raged so violently between the extremes of freedom and slavery, I certainly review my conduct on that tempestuous occasion with approbation and indescribable satisfaction.[41]

To be born in to the Virginia planter class, was a gift that allowed Edward Coles to pursue a political career in the early nineteenth century. Coles had the privilege to align himself with powerful men like the former presidents, James Madison and Thomas Jefferson. What set Coles apart from his family and mentors was that he chose to act on his convictions and oppose slavery. He actually practiced what he preached and believed.

Edward Coles' moral obligation to end the practice of slavery was the driving force of both his personal and political lives in Illinois. Governor Coles' opposition to pro-slavery legislation in the earliest days of Illinois' statehood should be his most

enduring political legacy. Edward Coles was a man of principle who sought to govern according to his beliefs. He stood firmly on the notion that all men were equal and made a greater personal effort than any politician of his day to defeat slavery.

[1] The Northwest Ordinance (1787) was intended to be a framework for governance of the territory prior to statehood and prohibited slavery and involuntary servitude. The Virginia Act of Cession (1783) permitted residents in the Illinois Territory to retain possessions and titles confirmed to them that protected slavery. David Ress perceived Coles to simply be ignorant of the de facto practice of limited slavery in Illinois, which was later protected by the 1818 Constitution. See David Ress, *Governor Edward Coles and the Vote to Prohibit Slavery in Illinois, 1823-23* (Jefferson, Missouri: Mcfarland & Company, 2006), 2.

[2] Robert Sutton, "Edward Coles and the Constitutional Crisis in Illinois, 1822-1824," *Illinois Historical Journal 82*, 1 (Spring 1989), 45.

[3] James E. Davis, *Frontier Illinois* (Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1998), 91.

[4] Davis, *Frontier Illinois*, 96.

[5] Population of the United States, 1790-1820 (Washington, D.C., 1864), 598-602, quoted in Ira Berlin, *Generations of Captivity: A History of African-American Slaves* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2003), Table 2.

[6] James Simeone, *Democracy and Slavery in Frontier Illinois: The Bottomland Republic* (DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 2000), 25; Kurt Leichtle and Bruce G. Carveth, *Crusade Against Slavery: Edward Coles, Pioneer of Freedom* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2011), 75-76.

[7] Simeone, *Democracy and Slavery*, 25.

[8] Simeone, *Democracy and Slavery*, 25.

[9] Davis, *Frontier Illinois*, 123; Ress, *Governor Edward Coles*, 1.

[10] Davis, *Frontier Illinois*, 159.

[11] Leichtle and Carveth, *Crusade Against Slavery*, 76; Simeone, *Democracy and Slavery*, 25.

[12] Simeone, *Democracy and Slavery*, 20.

[13] Davis, *Frontier Illinois*, 165.

[14] Thomas Lippincott, "Edward Coles, Second Governor of Illinois: Correspondence with Reverend Thomas Lippincott," *Journal of the Illinois Historical Society* (1908-1984), 3, 4 (January 1911), 60-61.

[15] Leichtle and Carveth, *Crusade Against Slavery*, 10. The properties of Thomas Jefferson and James Madison, respectively, were located within the same region near the Blue Ridge Mountains.

[16] Ress, *Governor Edward Coles*, 32.

[17] Suzanne Cooper Guasco, *Confronting Slavery: Edward Coles and the Rise of Antislavery Politics in Nineteenth-Century America* (DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 2013), 29.

[18] Madison was a second cousin to the more famous future United States president and mentor to Edward Coles.

[19] Guasco, *Confronting Slavery*, 30; Leichtle and Carveth, *Crusade Against Slavery*, 12.

[20] Edward Coles to W.C. Flagg, March 28, 1861, "Governor Coles' Autobiography: Letter from Governor Edward Coles to the Late Senator W.C. Flagg: Early Settlement in Madison County," *Journal of the Illinois State Historical Society* (1908-1984), 3, 3 (October 1910), 61.

[21] Guasco, *Confronting Slavery*, 61.

22   Edward Coles to Thomas Jefferson, July 31, 1814, "Letters of Edward Coles," *The William and Mary Quarterly*, 7, 2 (April 1927), 97.

23   Suzanne Cooper Guasco, "To Put into Complete Practice Those Hallowed Principles: Edward Coles and the Crafting of Antislavery Nationalism in Early Nineteenth-Century America," *American Nineteenth Century History* 11, 1 (March 2010), 18.

24   Ress, *Governor Edward Coles*, 11.

25   Leichtle and Carveth, *Crusade Against Slavery*, 69-70. Ralph Crawford had previously traveled with Coles to Illinois in 1815.

26   Leichtle and Carveth, *Crusade Against Slavery*, 69-70.

27   Sutton, "Edward Coles and the Constitutional Crisis," 36.

28   Ress, *Governor Edward Coles*, 76.

29   Kurt Leichtle, "The Rise of Jacksonian Politics in Illinois," *Illinois Historical Journal* 82, 2 (Summer 1989), 93.

30   Sutton, "Edward Coles and the Constitutional Crisis," 39.

31   Leichtle, "The Rise of Jacksonian Politics in Illinois," 98.

32   Ress, *Governor Edward Coles*, 96.

33   Simeone, *Democracy and Slavery*, 18.

34   Davis, *Frontier Illinois*, 165.

35   Simeone, *Democracy and Slavery*, 57-59.

36   Simeone, *Democracy and Slavery*, 21, 49.

37   Sutton, "Edward Coles and the Constitutional Crisis," 42.

38   Coles continued to use his debating skills that he learned at William and Mary in his discussions with Reverend Madison and later, with Presidents Madison and Jefferson.

39   Leichtle and Carveth, *Crusade Against Slavery*, 126.

40   Thomas Lippincott to Edward Coles, undated, "Correspondence," 61.

41   Thomas Coles to Thomas Lippincott, June 15, 1860, "Correspondence," 63.