

The University of Oklahoma Historical Journal Issue 3, Spring 2014

Undergraduate Editorial Board

Adriana Collins
Arthur Dixon
Brooke Hamilton
Monique Rodríguez
Morgan McCulloch
Austin Scheller

Faculty Advisors

Raphael Folsom
Robert Griswold
Garret Olberding

Table of Contents

Co-Winners of the Griswold Prize for Excellence in Undergraduate Historical Scholarship

Brooke Hamilton, *Bad Neighbors*, pp. 4 — 25

Connor Wilson, *Benjamin Franklin and George Adams, Jr.*, pp. 26 — 58

Runners-Up

Mallory Hogan, *The National and International Responses to the Trial of Julius and Ethel Rosenberg*, pp. 60 — 86

Dominic Granello, *Outrage at Oklahoma*, pp. 87 — 106

Arthur Dixon, **Hugo Falcandus**, pp. 107 — 131

Maggie Mckee-Huey, *The Role and Impact of Jewish Evangelism in Nineteenth Century Great Britain*, pp. 132 — 161

Honorable Mention

Daniel Glickstein, *American Support of the Iran-Iraq War*, pp. 163 — 182

Shorter Works

Nick Eckenrode, *Strangers in their Own Land*, pp. 184 — 198

Daniel Carney, *Navigating the Revolution*, pp. 199 — 209

Review of Books

Monique Rodríguez, *An Ambivalent Revolution*, pp. 211 — 214

Co-Winners of the Griswold Prize for Excellence in Undergraduate Historical Scholarship

Bad Neighbors:

A Look into the Complex Relations within the Creek Nation through the Acorn Whistler Crisis
of 1752

Brooke Hamilton

OU History Journal

April 7, 2014

Gunshots blared and chants echoed in the distance, awakening the sleepy town of Savannah in the summer of 1749.¹ Frightened and confused, the people of Savannah were startled by the commotion and summoned their local militia to investigate. The militia men returned, and the citizens of Savannah were astounded with their findings. Their men escorted over one hundred Lower Creek Indians into their town, a group who could not understand why their arrival startled the colonists.² Thomas and Mary Bosomworth, citizens of Georgia and two ingenious manipulators, had invited the Lower Creeks to a conference, “forgetting” to inform the Savannah government of the event they were to host. Invited to a conference by the Bosomworths, the Creek headmen arrived expecting to be showered with gifts by the Georgia government.³ Instead, they were given a headache and a front row seat to the 1740s version of a reality television drama.

The conference was part of a shady scheme designed by the Bosomworths to trick the Georgia Trustees into giving them land. Mary Bosomworth, a half-Creek/half-British woman, asserted her “rights” to ownership of the Creek land located along the banks of the Altamaha River. Her claim contradicted Creek values of communal land ownership, creating tension amongst not just the Georgians, but among the different Lower Creek communities as well. Screaming matches, drunken debauchery, and several “bad talks” occurred throughout the conference.⁴ Mary, Thomas, and Mary’s cousin Malatchi, Coweta headman, threatened that the Creeks would go to war if their demands were not fully met.⁵ After a week of madness, the Creeks were dismissed and sent home by a shook up and frightened Georgia government, ending

¹ Cockran, David H. *The Creek Frontier: 1540-1783*. (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1967) 133.

² Cockran, David H. *The Creek Frontier: 1540-1783*. (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1967) 135.

³ *The Colonial Records of the State of Georgia*. Vol. 25; edited by Allen D. Candler and Lucian Lamar Knight (Atlanta, Georgia: Chas. P. Byrd, State Printer, 1915) 414.

⁴ Cockran, David H. *The Creek Frontier: 1540-1783*. (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1967) 135.

⁵ Cockran, David H. *The Creek Frontier: 1540-1783*. (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1967) 143.

the impromptu conference without a solution or a promise of peace. However, a Lower Creek headman returned a few short days later, a man by the name of Alleck.

As the Creeks began to journey home, Alleck, the headman of Cusseta and husband of three Yuchi women, abandoned the group and marched back to Savannah. His fellow headmen probably questioned why he and two other Yuchi headmen turned around. The Indians already received their presents, the “conference” was over, and there was no incentive to return back to Savannah. For Alleck however, there was. Alleck’s property neighbored the tract of land that the Bosomworth’s claimed to own.⁶ If Alleck did not return to Savannah three things would happen. First, he would be forced to forever live next door to Thomas and Mary Bosomworth, a couple notorious for causing trouble in the colony. Second, Alleck would be turning his back on Creek culture and values of communal land ownership. Third, an unnecessary war would break out between the Creeks and the Georgia colonists, which would disrupt trade, damage property and potentially cause the death of numerous individuals. From Alleck’s perspective, Mary was a traitor, trying to manipulate both the Creeks and the British for personal gain, not regarding the grave consequences it would have on the Creek nation as a whole.

When Alleck entered the office of the Georgia Trustees’, President William Stephens, was probably bewildered and frightened by Alleck’s presence. President Stephens and the other Georgia Trustees began to listen intently as Alleck shared with them critical information about the character of Mary and Thomas Bosomworth. Alleck described the erratic traits the Bosomworths possessed, which the trustees had seen that week, explaining that it was all part of an act. According to the Trustees journal, “Three Chiefs from the Euchee Town in the Lower

⁶ Piker, Joshua. *The Four Deaths of Acorn Whistler* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2013) 231.

Creeks with a Party of their People...[and] gave a very Friendly Talk” with the Georgia officials.⁷ Alleck, being among the three, explained to the Georgians that the Creeks desired peace, not war, and that Mary Bosomworth “sent a great many bad talks to the Indians against white people,” and they were words that just fell onto deaf ears among the various Creek headmen.⁸ Alleck explained that Malatchi had no power to grant lands, because lands were the property of the whole nation,” revealing the ridiculousness of the Bosomworths’ and Malatchi’s schemes.⁹ This information assuaged the Georgian officials’ fear of eminent war with the Creeks.¹⁰ Through this, Alleck and his fellow Yuchis gained favor with the Georgia Trustees and squashed the schemes of the Bosomworths, thus deepening the rift between the two parties.

From the perspective of the Europeans, all Indian tribes functioned as one cohesive unit. Europeans believed the Indians thought the same, reasoned the same, and their tribes were structured the same. The events in 1749 were just the beginning of an outpouring of conflict within the Creek nation, and the dysfunction between the Bosomworths and Alleck carried over into South Carolina in 1752. On April 1, 1752, the bodies of six Cherokee men were discovered on the lawn of Governor James Glenn. The deaths were caused by a skirmish that had occurred earlier that day between a group of Lower Creek and Cherokee men. Skirmishes similar to these were common throughout the colonies, however, this one event turned out to be extraordinary. The deaths of the Cherokee men were blamed on one individual, Acorn Whistler, an Upper Creek headman from Little Okfuskee. Acorn Whistler, who was not even in Charleston on April 1, was put to death a few months later, serving as the sacrifice to cleanse the sins of the Creek

⁷ *The Colonial Records of the State of Georgia*. Vol. 25; edited by Allen D. Candler and Lucian Lamar Knight (Atlanta, Georgia: Chas. P. Byrd, State Printer, 1915) 419.

⁸ *The Colonial Records of the State of Georgia*. Vol. 25; edited by Allen D. Candler and Lucian Lamar Knight (Atlanta, Georgia: Chas. P. Byrd, State Printer, 1915). 419.

⁹ Cockran, David H. *The Creek Frontier: 1540-1783*. (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1967) 144.

¹⁰ Cockran, David H. *The Creek Frontier: 1540-1783*. (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1967) 144.

Indians.¹¹ The common question regarding this situation is how? How did an innocent man have to suffer for the actions of others? The answer is simple, years of conflict between neighboring tribes and individuals within the Creek nation caused Acorn Whistler's death. After the skirmish, conflicts between neighboring communities within the Creek Nation arose, struggling to make a decision on how to solve the "crisis" from April 1. Two neighboring communities in particular, the Coweta and Cusseta towns in Lower Creek territory, were constantly at odds with each other, and disagreed over the Acorn Whistler Crisis. Mary and Thomas Bosomworth, individuals connected to the Coweta community, and Alleck, headman of the Cussetas, came into great disagreement over the conflict.

The relationship between Alleck and the Bosomworths was more than a rivalry between dysfunctional neighbors, but was deeply rooted in years of tensions between the neighboring tribes of Coweta and Cussetas. These two sets of "bad neighbors" were the cause of the conflict that led to the death of Acorn Whistler. By first analyzing the communities of Coweta and Cusseta within the Creek Nation, one is able to see how the rivalry between the two communities caused tension among the Creeks. Both communities wanted to control the trade and to be the most powerful community in the Lower Creek Nation. The second set of "bad neighbors" that must be analyzed are Alleck and the Bosomworths. Their poor relationship is the result of the Coweta-Cusseta conflict, and reflects the issues between the two communities. Through investigating the relationships of these two sets of "bad neighbors" it is apparent that the conflicts and connections between the Cowetas-Cussetas and Alleck and the Bosomworths reveal how intra-tribal relations within the Creeks played a large factor in the death of Acorn Whistler.

¹¹ Piker, Joshua. *The Four Deaths of Acorn Whistler* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2013) 8.

The Creek Nation is composed of several different groups. First it is split into two groups, Upper and Lower Creek, and second, both groups are comprised of individual communities that have their own specific set of values and beliefs. According to Bryan Rindliesch, one of the great failures of the Europeans was that they misunderstood this structure, constantly attempting “to lump Creek people together to simplify cross-culture interactions and exchanges.”¹² Opposite of what the Europeans believed, Creek society was essentially a “landscape of conflicting town interest that superseded a unified national interest.”¹³ Alliances within the Creek Nation between the different communities were very “now” based, focusing on what the tribe specifically needed at the moment and collaborating to solve any issues at hand. Creek politics functioned by creating “alliances with mutually interested Creek villages to attain a specific political and/or economic interest.”¹⁴ The Creeks were able to connect to each other through regional associations, intra-Creek communication and trade networks, kinship and clan ties, shared origin stories and traditions. Ironically though, Daniel Richter points out that the “factional leaders independently cultivated ties to particular European colonies.”¹⁵ These “factions” prevented any of the European nations from gaining sole control over the Creek Nation, and protected the Creeks from “political as well as economic dependence on powerful European neighbors.”¹⁶ The dysfunction between the Cowetas and the Cussetas is a result of the two different “factions” or communities’ competing for favoritism from the British. For both the

¹² Rindliesch, Bryan “Our Lands Are Our Life and Breath: Coweta, Cusseta, and the Struggle for Creek Territory and Sovereignty during the American Revolution.” *Ethnohistory* 60, no. 4 (2013): 582.

¹³ Rindliesch, Bryan “Our Lands Are Our Life and Breath: Coweta, Cusseta, and the Struggle for Creek Territory and Sovereignty during the American Revolution.” *Ethnohistory* 60, no. 4 (2013): 582.

¹⁴ Rindliesch, Bryan “Our Lands Are Our Life and Breath: Coweta, Cusseta, and the Struggle for Creek Territory and Sovereignty during the American Revolution.” *Ethnohistory* 60, no. 4 (2013): 582.

¹⁵ Richter, Daniel K. “Native American History; Perspectives on the Eighteenth Century.” *The world turned upside-down; the state of eighteenth-century American studies at the beginning of the twenty-first century*. (2001): 279.

¹⁶ Richter, Daniel K. “Native American History; Perspectives on the Eighteenth Century.” *The world turned upside-down; the state of eighteenth-century American studies at the beginning of the twenty-first century*. (2001): 280.

Cowetas and the Cussetas, using the British to get what they want was not out of the ordinary, and was typical to use another people to see one's desires come to fruition.¹⁷

In the case of the Acorn Whistler crisis of 1752, the poor relationship between the Cowetas and the Cussetas was significant because the British did not understand why all of the Creeks were not of one mindset. They could not comprehend that like any nation, they were a diverse group of people with various interests. This made it difficult for negotiations with the Creek nation during the Acorn Whistler crisis, because in order for it to succeed, this set of bad neighbors would have to find common ground. In order for the two groups to find "common ground" either the Cowetas or the Cussetas were going to have to "give-in" to the other, becoming the "loser."

Compromise between the Cowetas and the Cussetas was difficult because the two communities had a history filled with feud and foul play. In 1718 the two groups made the "Coweta Resolution, pledging to negotiate with neutrality and peace with one another. Those were only mere words, and true peace between the Cowetas and Cussetas never happened. Instead from that point on, the Cowetas and Cussetas were "neighbor[s] and rival[s]" with each other, constantly trying to gain the upper hand of influence with the European traders and among other Creeks.¹⁸ Rindfleisch writes that "the Cusseta's leaders increasingly distanced themselves from the Cowetas despite shared histories of intercommunity, diplomacy, trade, and kinship."¹⁹ These two neighbors disagreed over a myriad of issues and each had their own agenda. During the period after the Coweta Resolution, the two groups invested great amounts of energy into

¹⁷ Rindfleisch, Bryan "Our Lands Are Our Life and Breath: Coweta, Cusseta, and the Struggle for Creek Territory and Sovereignty during the American Revolution." *Ethnohistory* 60, no. 4 (2013): 582.

¹⁸ Dubcovsky, Alejandra "One Hundred Sixty-One Knots, Two Plates and One Emperor: Creek Information Networks in the Era of the Yamasee War" *Ethnohistory* 59: 3 (2011) 501

¹⁹ Rindfleisch, Bryan "Our Lands Are Our Life and Breath: Coweta, Cusseta, and the Struggle for Creek Territory and Sovereignty during the American Revolution." *Ethnohistory* 60, no. 4 (2013): 581

developing their relationships with European traders. The Cowetas and Cussetas wanted power, and both especially wanted favor with British Charles Town and South Carolina.²⁰

Gaining favor with the Europeans was critical for the Cowetas and the Cussetas because it gave their community an advantage over the other. According to Steven Hahn, one of the primary ways the Creek communities gained this advantage was through trade commissions with the British.²¹ Hahn writes that “aspiring chiefs and warriors, for example, may have used the commissions as a symbolic marker of their contact with the colonies.”²² Traditionally among the Creeks, gaining “exotic items” from the “outside world” gave them great respect because it demonstrated their “connection to the outside world and their mastery of a wide array of esoteric knowledge.”²³ Seeking presents and items from the British, French and Spanish traders was not out of the ordinary for the Creeks, because possession of these items revealed favoritism from the foreign powers, and symbolized an alliance with these nations.

Seeking favoritism with the South Carolina government was advantageous for a more “practical reason” as well.²⁴ Trade commissions with the British were highly sought after amongst the different Creek communities, especially the Cowetas and the Cussetas. If a community gained a commission, the headmen of said town had the power to “speak as legitimate voices in Charles Town and to appoint friends and family members to subordinate

²⁰ Hahn, Steven. *The Invention of the Creek Nation, 1670-1763*. (Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 2004) 125.

²¹ Hahn, Steven. *The Invention of the Creek Nation, 1670-1763*. (Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 2004) 125.

²² Hahn, Steven. *The Invention of the Creek Nation, 1670-1763*. (Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 2004) 125.

²³ Hahn, Steven. *The Invention of the Creek Nation, 1670-1763*. (Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 2004) 125.

²⁴ Hahn, Steven. *The Invention of the Creek Nation, 1670-1763*. (Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 2004) 125.

positions of authority.”²⁵ By the time of the Acorn Whistler crisis, the British and Creeks were heavily intertwined with one another. Commissioned positions within the British government became “heritable property by passing their British-appointed titles from one generation to the next.”²⁶ The Cowetas and Cussetas competed for favor with the British government because once they held such positions they had an advantage over other tribes. The benefits of these positions made them irresistible and highly sought after, thus giving the British the upper hand. If at any moment a community fell out of favor or “chiefs proved to be unreliable allies to the English” the positions were easily replaced, because “more amenable souls were usually waiting in the wings.”²⁷ The Acorn Whistler crisis greatly affected both the Cowetas and the Cussetas because their position with the British rode on the outcome of the situation. Both competed with one another for trade, each possessing a different route that was critical for receiving goods from the British. According to Rindleisch, the primary goal of the Cussetas was to “divest their town agendas of Coweta input,” due to Cusseta headmen’s fears regarding “Coweta’s political dominance among the Lower Creeks.”²⁸ Whichever community “won” would gain favor with the British, thus making them a dominant force amongst the Lower Creeks. Power is what both communities desired, and they fought for it through gaining access to trade routes and presents.

The messy relationship between the Cowetas and Cussetas spilled over into the personal relationships between members of these communities. Returning to the events of 1752, one is able to see the effects of the dysfunctional relationship between the Cowetas and Cusseta’s,

²⁵ Hahn, Steven. *The Invention of the Creek Nation, 1670-1763*. (Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 2004) 125.

²⁶ Hahn, Steven. *The Invention of the Creek Nation, 1670-1763*. (Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 2004) 125.

²⁷ Hahn, Steven. *The Invention of the Creek Nation, 1670-1763*. (Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 2004) 125.

²⁸ Rindleisch, Bryan “Our Lands Are Our Life and Breath: Coweta, Cusseta, and the Struggle for Creek Territory and Sovereignty during the American Revolution.” *Ethnohistory* 60, no. 4 (2013): 584

through Alleck and the Bosomworths. Alleck was a Cusseta headman, and Mary Bosomworth, was a half-Coweta, half-British woman. Her husband Thomas was born in England and came to South Carolina as a minister, making for an interesting dynamics of people. The two parties' property bordered each other's, causing Alleck and the Bosomworths to consistently cross paths. The Bosomworth's wanted ownership of a parcel of land on the Altamaha River for trade purposes, and Alleck seemed to always be the one individual standing in their way. Alleck owned the land beside their desired tract on the Altamaha River, and had established a settlement there since earlier in the eighteenth century.²⁹ The Bosomworths were constantly opposed by Alleck, who went to great lengths in 1749, and again in 1752 to speak against their rights to that land and their legitimacy in the Creek nation.

On April 1 of 1752, Alleck was in South Carolina, traveling to visit Lieutenant Governor William Bull on his plantation, the same day the Osochi Creeks attacked a small band of Cherokees.³⁰ Upon receiving notice of the attack, Lieutenant Governor Bull instructed his son to send a letter to Governor Glenn, writing

“My father desires me to inform your Excellency that when Alec, the Creek Indian, comes to his House he will acquaint him with the Resolutions of this Government relating to Indians coming to Charles Town, that he will endeavor to acquaint him in such Manner as to avoid disquieting him, and advise him to stay at Sheldon till he sends to your Excellency and receives your answer”³¹

Lieutenant Governor Bull had received word that the attack had been launched by a group of Lower Creeks, and wanted to ensure Alleck that he was not being suspected for participating in

²⁹ Piker, Joshua. *The Four Deaths of Acorn Whistler* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2013) 231.

³⁰ Piker, Joshua. *The Four Deaths of Acorn Whistler* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2013) 55.

³¹ *The Colonial Records of South Carolina: Documents Relating to Indian Affairs, 1750-1765*, Vol. 1; edited by William L. McDowell, Jr. (Columbia, SC: South Carolina Department of Archives and History, 1958, 1970) 235.

the attacks, and inform him so he could pass the message along to other Creeks as well.³² Upon his arrival, Alleck was probably greeted by Lieutenant Governor Bull, and was immediately informed of the April 1 attack, and Alleck thought nothing more of it. Skirmishes between the Creeks and the Cherokees had been occurring for several years, which frustrated the British, whose "ambitious intent" since the 1720s had been to "end the Cherokee-Creek War."³³ However, the constant conflict between the Cherokees and Creeks made the April 1 attack seem nothing extraordinary, and probably Alleck did not think twice about it. Instead, he spent time with the Upper Creeks who were Little Okfuskee Headman, from Acorn Whistler's town. The Upper Creeks were awaiting the arrival of Acorn Whistler, so they would have known as well that the attack against the Creeks on April 1 would have been launched by the Lower Creeks.

The Bosomworth's found out about the April 1 Creek attack a few weeks after it happened, while in Charleston preparing to sail to England.³⁴ Upon receiving word of the attacks, the Bosomworths saw it as an opportunity to gain their hearts desires: land, power and revenge.³⁵ They then decided the "best route to London lay through Coweta," postponing their trip to England.³⁶ The events that followed suit were what David Cockran would call "the epitome of bosomworthism," due to the fact that Mary and Thomas were willing to see to the death of an innocent man, simply for wealth and social prestige.³⁷ The Bosomworth's claimed that Acorn Whistler, a Creek headman, was entirely responsible for the attacks, and in order to

³² *The Colonial Records of South Carolina: Documents Relating to Indian Affairs, 1750-1765*, Vol. 1; edited by William L. McDowell, Jr. (Columbia, SC: South Carolina Department of Archives and History, 1958, 1970).

³³ Hahn, Steven. *The Invention of the Creek Nation, 1670-1763*. (Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 2004) 180.

³⁴ Piker, Joshua. *The Four Deaths of Acorn Whistler* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2013) 220.

³⁵ Piker, Joshua. *The Four Deaths of Acorn Whistler* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2013) 222.

³⁶ Piker, Joshua. *The Four Deaths of Acorn Whistler* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2013) 220.

³⁷ Cockran, David H. *The Creek Frontier: 1540-1783*. (Norman, Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press, 1967) 135.

restore peace among the Cherokees and Creeks, Acorn Whistler had to die. Whistler, who many knew had been traveling from a trip to Lieutenant Governor Bull's estate, was not even near the attacks, yet had become the Bosomworths ticket to favor with the South Carolina Government. For the Bosomworth's the April 1 attack was a "dream come true" granting them a second chance to make up for their embarrassing performance at their "conference" in Savannah just three years prior. The Bosomworths had an opportunity to not only gain influence over the South Carolina government, but to restore their reputation among the Creeks as well. Immediately Mary and Thomas wrote to the South Carolina government to have Mary appointed as an interpreter for Governor Glenn to help resolve the Creek-Cherokee skirmish to prevent war from erupting between the two nations in South Carolina.³⁸ From this, the Bosomworth's hoped to receive a tremendous amount of money, gifts and property. After several unsuccessful attempts, Thomas Bosomworth finally received a commission from the South Carolina government to serve as the agent to the Indians in 1752, with Mary as his interpreter.³⁹ With revenge as their motivation, the floodgates had opened for an outpouring of drama and disaster.

The Bosomworths began their death-campaign for Acorn Whistler in Coweta, the town Mary partially belonged to and the home of her cousin, Malatchi. The goal of the Bosomworths was to convince the Creeks that the death of one single Little Okfuskee would suffice in preventing the deaths several other Creeks at the hands of the Cherokees. One of the greatest frustrations of the British living in the North American colonies was the revenge killings that existed within the Creek Nation and among other Indian Nations as well. In the Creek Nation, Hahn explains that

³⁸ *The Colonial Records of South Carolina: Documents Relating to Indian Affairs, 1750-1765*, Vol. 1; edited by William L. McDowell, Jr. (Columbia, SC: South Carolina Department of Archives and History, 1958, 1970) 264.

³⁹ Piker, Joshua. *The Four Deaths of Acorn Whistler* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2013) 220.

"When a murder occurs, for example, the victim's family reserves the right to avenge the death of its kinsman. This method of justice has the potential to spiral into a fratricidal war of cyclical revenge, but the Creeks lived in what might be called a provincial or small-town world that was intimately bound by ties of kinship and in which persons had much face-to-face contact with their peers"⁴⁰

In order to gain their payment from the British, the Bosomworths had to convince all of the Creeks that Acorn Whistler had to die. This meant they would have to persuade the family of Acorn Whistler to abandon this policy, while also ensuring the different communities within the Creek Nation agreed to do the same. Not an easy task, however, the Bosomworths were not too concerned when they arrived in Coweta to begin their assassination assignment. However, on July 27, 1752 a certain neighbor of theirs paid a visit to Coweta as well, Alleck of Cusseta.⁴¹

Alleck, who had been in South Carolina at the time, not only knew the truth, but was one of the Bosomworth's greatest opponents. Much to their dismay, on July 27, 1752, Alleck arrived into the town of Coweta to share the true story of Acorn Whistler's innocence.⁴² Alleck, who had visited Lieutenant Governor Bull within two days after the departure of Acorn Whistler, knew about the attacks, and would have been informed that the Governor publicly stated that Acorn and his followers were innocent.⁴³ In order to discredit Alleck and his story, the Bosomworths had to create a tale of their own.

⁴⁰ Hahn, Steven. *The Invention of the Creek Nation, 1670-1763*. (Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 2004) 147.

⁴¹ *The Colonial Records of South Carolina: Documents Relating to Indian Affairs, 1750-1765*, Vol. 1; edited by William L. McDowell, Jr. (Columbia, SC: South Carolina Department of Archives and History, 1958, 1970). 270

⁴² *The Colonial Records of South Carolina: Documents Relating to Indian Affairs, 1750-1765*, Vol. 1; edited by William L. McDowell, Jr. (Columbia, SC: South Carolina Department of Archives and History, 1958, 1970). 270

⁴³ *The Colonial Records of South Carolina: Documents Relating to Indian Affairs, 1750-1765*, Vol. 1; edited by William L. McDowell, Jr. (Columbia, SC: South Carolina Department of Archives and History, 1958, 1970). 235

When Alleck arrived in Coweta, he began to share what the Bosomworth's claimed were "stories" that had been "told by the white people to report" from Georgia.⁴⁴ Alleck's goal, like it had been in Georgia in 1749, was to ensure that the Bosomworth's lies were not believed and that Acorn Whistler was not punished for a crime he did not commit. Unlike in 1749, the Bosomworths were prepared to battle Alleck, determined to defeat the headman from Cusseta. To combat their neighbor, Mary began to spread a story of her own. In his journal, Thomas wrote about that "one Ellick, an Indian.... Had stole[n] three of my own horses from the Settlements in Georgia," and had also "brought up to the Nation with him and several other Lies."⁴⁵ In continuation with what Dr. Joshua Piker describes as an "extraordinary campaign of character assassination," the Bosomworth's forced Alleck to "restore the Horses and acknowledge himself as a Lier both before the Indians and white people of which he was very much ashamed."⁴⁶ Through establishing Alleck as a liar, the Bosomworths knew that was the only way to assassinate the credibility about their Cusseta neighbor.

The campaign against Alleck did not stop there. That August the Bosomworth's continued the defamation of Alleck, discrediting his story wherever it had been told. In meeting with the Pallachuaskelas, Thomas Bosomworth wrote that "Elleck when he was in liquor" gave a "talk" stating that what the Bosomworth's were promoting was "very bad Talks, but they were not to mind them" and instead should listen to Alleck's story once he was sober because "he had brought a good Talk from the Governor to make all straight."⁴⁷ Once Thomas Bosomworth had

⁴⁴ *The Colonial Records of South Carolina: Documents Relating to Indian Affairs, 1750-1765*, Vol. 1; edited by William L. McDowell, Jr. (Columbia, SC: South Carolina Department of Archives and History, 1958, 1970). 270

⁴⁵ *The Colonial Records of South Carolina: Documents Relating to Indian Affairs, 1750-1765*, Vol. 1; edited by William L. McDowell, Jr. (Columbia, SC: South Carolina Department of Archives and History, 1958, 1970). 270

⁴⁶ *The Colonial Records of South Carolina: Documents Relating to Indian Affairs, 1750-1765*, Vol. 1; edited by William L. McDowell, Jr. (Columbia, SC: South Carolina Department of Archives and History, 1958, 1970). 270

⁴⁷ *The Colonial Records of South Carolina: Documents Relating to Indian Affairs, 1750-1765*, Vol. 1; edited by William L. McDowell, Jr. (Columbia, SC: South Carolina Department of Archives and History, 1958, 1970). 285

started the stories, Alleck's credibility began to quickly diminish among the various Lower Creek headmen present in Coweta. Thomas and Mary continued to make assertions questioning why Alleck who "called himself a Head Man demean himself so much as to tell Lyes in order to screen a Man that deserved the greatest Punishment" for troubling the entire Creek Nation.⁴⁸

Despite the lies that the Bosomworths continued to spread about Alleck, the Bosomworths could not shake him because Alleck continued to oppose their stories and pursue the truth. Angered by the fact that Alleck refused to listen to his "Talks" unless another white interpreter was present, Thomas wrote in his journal in anger that:

"I must observe that, that ungrateful Villain Ellick, who has received so many distinguishing Favours from the English has been one of the chief Instruments made Use of in opposing every thing I have done...But Captain Ellick who is a very great Man in the Opinion of some.... the real Truth is, he is thought of so little Consequence in the nation that he is never asked or consulted upon any Public Affairs."⁴⁹

The hatred and determination to kill the reputation of Alleck is puzzling. Although they had prior conflicts with Alleck before, the Bosomworth's had poor relationships with numerous individuals besides Alleck. However, they chose only Alleck, the "headman with a sterling reputation and a glittering future" to pile their "sustained verbal abuse" onto him.⁵⁰ Their reasoning was more than just a need to settle an old score, but instead was critical to protect the Bosomworth's reputation. Up to that point, the Bosomworths had been using other Creeks, such as Malatchi and word of mouth to plant lies regarding Acorn Whistler and spread propaganda of

⁴⁸ 2 *The Colonial Records of South Carolina: Documents Relating to Indian Affairs, 1750-1765*, Vol. 1; edited by William L. McDowell, Jr. (Columbia, SC: South Carolina Department of Archives and History, 1958, 1970). 286

⁴⁹ 2 *The Colonial Records of South Carolina: Documents Relating to Indian Affairs, 1750-1765*, Vol. 1; edited by William L. McDowell, Jr. (Columbia, SC: South Carolina Department of Archives and History, 1958, 1970). 98

⁵⁰ Piker, Joshua. *The Four Deaths of Acorn Whistler* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2013) 234

Acorn Whistler's guilt.⁵¹ If Alleck's story was seen as the truth, then the Bosomworth's would have to personally defend their story, and openly play the role as the accuser of Acorn's guilt, instead of using others to spread their lies.⁵² Having learned their lesson from their experiences in Savannah, Georgia in 1749, destroying Alleck's credibility seemed to be the simple, effective method to prevent their plans from being foiled.

The tenacity which the Bosomworth's possessed towards the defamation of Alleck is deeper than just an expression of frustrations with a poor neighbor. It is a reflection of the rivalry between the Cowetas and Cussetas, and the two communities' intense struggle for power among the Creeks. Kinship and relationships were critical in the Creek nation, making politics messy and hard to follow. The Cowetas and Cussetas, being long-time rivals, had a very messy relationship, which determined the individual relationships of its community members.

Mary Bosomworth, understanding the complexities of Creek politics, used her various connections to work to her advantage in the murder of Acorn Whistler.⁵³ Mary Bosomworth's cousin was a Creek named Malatchi, who was the headman of the Cowetas and a person of great influence. In both the Savannah incident in 1749 and again in the murder of Acorn Whistler, Mary boasted of her strong connections to the Coweta tribe. Mary claimed to be the "queen" of the Coweta tribe.⁵⁴ However, Mary was also a descendant of another Creek community, the Osochis. The Osochis were the Lower Creek tribe that was the original perpetrators Governor

⁵¹ Piker, Joshua. *The Four Deaths of Acorn Whistler* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2013) 234

⁵² Piker, Joshua. *The Four Deaths of Acorn Whistler* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2013) 234

⁵³ Piker, Joshua. *The Four Deaths of Acorn Whistler* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2013) 234

⁵⁴ Cockran, David H. *The Creek Frontier: 1540-1783*. (Norman, Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press, 1967) 135.

Glenn held responsible for the April 1 attacks on the Cherokees⁵⁵. Ironically, although Mary did not claim association the Osochis tribe, she managed to shift the blame onto Acorn Whistler, who was not just from another community, but was an Upper Creek as well. Additionally, The Bosomworth's knew that by choosing to associate with the Cowetas, they would have a lot more leverage and influence over the Lower Creeks, based on their reputation of power they had among the Creek nation.⁵⁶ The Bosomworths were able to successfully set themselves to be in a position of authority, and to protect her Osochis relations.⁵⁷

Besides his knowledge of the truth and his Cusseta heritage, the Bosomworths had to eliminate Alleck because of his relationships with other Creek communities. The Bosomworths may have had the commission from Governor Glenn to prevent all-out war amongst the Indians; they were not easily accepted by all of the Creek towns. The Coweta-Cusseta rivalry, big in itself, was much greater based on the relations that the two towns had with other Creek communities as well. It was pivotal that the Bosomworths eliminate Alleck because he not only was the headman of the Cussetas, but was of the Yuchis as well. The alliance between the Yuchis and the Cussetas was incredibly strong, dating back to the 1720s.⁵⁸ Both the Yuchis and the Cussetas were "two of the three Creek communities" that chose to ally with the British instead of making peace with the Spanish-allied Yamasee in the 1720s.⁵⁹ The Cowetas however, chose to preserve their relationship with the Spanish, thus pitting themselves against both the

⁵⁵ Piker, Joshua. *The Four Deaths of Acorn Whistler* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2013) 55, 114.

⁵⁶ Piker, Joshua. *The Four Deaths of Acorn Whistler* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2013) 228.

⁵⁷ Piker, Joshua. *The Four Deaths of Acorn Whistler* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2013) 228.

⁵⁸ Piker, Joshua. "To the Backcountry and back again," *The Yuchi's Search for Stability in the Eighteenth-Century Southeast*, ed. Jason Baird Jackson (Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 2012), 95

⁵⁹ Piker, Joshua. "To the Backcountry and back again," *The Yuchi's Search for Stability in the Eighteenth-Century Southeast*, ed. Jason Baird Jackson (Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 2012), 195

Cusseta and Yuchi communities. The Yuchi's loyalty to the British went even a step further than the Cussetas. To demonstrate their pledge of allegiance to the British they presented a "British agent with scalps from a Spaniard and a Yamasee."⁶⁰ The Cusseta-Yuchi ties were also strengthened by "Captain Ellick, [who] married three Uchee wives."⁶¹ Thus, making the tarnishing of Alleck's reputation that much more pivotal, because if the Bosomworths eliminated Alleck, they also eliminated the Yuchees.

This is significant in regards to the Acorn Whistler crisis in that the Yuchis community was located just a few miles from Sheldon, the home of Lieutenant Governor Bull.⁶² Due to their close proximity to Lieutenant Governor Bull's plantation, the Yuchis would have been able to serve as witnesses to Acorn Whistler's whereabouts during the April attacks.⁶³ Both the Yuchis and the Cussetas had possessed stronger ties to the Europeans for the majority of the eighteenth century, and the Bosomworth's saw destroying Alleck as an opportunity to discredit both of these communities of people. Not only would they be able to seek revenge on their personal and regional rivals, they would be able to discredit the Yuchis and the Cussetas in the eyes of the British in South Carolina. Then they hoped the Cowetas would gain favor with the South Carolina government, giving the Coweta tribe, headed by Malatchi the upper-hand with the Europeans. Not only would it place the Coweta's in the dominant position, and due to Mary Bosomworth's kinship to Malatchi, would benefit her and Thomas greatly.

⁶⁰ Piker, Joshua. "To the Backcountry and back again, *The Yuchi's Search for Stability in the Eighteenth-Century Southeast*," ed. Jason Baird Hackson (Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 2012), 195

⁶¹ Piker, Joshua. "To the Backcountry and back again, *The Yuchi's Search for Stability in the Eighteenth-Century Southeast*," ed. Jason Baird Hackson (Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 2012), 195

⁶² *The Colonial Records of South Carolina: Documents Relating to Indian Affairs, 1750-1765*, Vol. 1; edited by William L. McDowell, Jr. (Columbia, SC: South Carolina Department of Archives and History, 1958, 1970). 235.

⁶³ *The Colonial Records of South Carolina: Documents Relating to Indian Affairs, 1750-1765*, Vol. 1; edited by William L. McDowell, Jr. (Columbia, SC: South Carolina Department of Archives and History, 1958, 1970). 235

The question is, why would Alleck allow his reputation to be tarnished to protect Acorn Whistler, when it was inevitable that someone's life would have to be sacrificed in order to bring about peace? There are two specific reasons, the first of which has to do with trade. The ability to trade was critical in gaining favor with the South Carolina government, and Alleck would have shared his story in order to try to prevent the Bosomworth's and Malatchi from gaining the upper hand for the Cowetas. For the Cussetas, one of their greatest fears was the Cowetas controlling the eastern trading path.⁶⁴ The eastern path was critical to economic and political power because was the key "trade connection between Charleston and Creek Country."⁶⁵ The Cussetas were located in a place in which they were positioned with "quick access to British trade routes," control over the distribution of European goods, and "political prestige due to their close proximity to the eastern seaboard."⁶⁶ However, they feared the "fact that Coweta headmen largely controlled that diplomatic and economic highway" through the earlier part of the eighteenth century.⁶⁷ The Cussetas, who had spent a good portion of the first half of the eighteenth century trying to gain control over the eastern trade path, knew that if the Bosomworth's, Malatchi, and the Cowetas gained favor with the South Carolina government, trade would be tough for them. In order for Alleck to protect the interests of the Cusseta people, he had to share his story regarding Acorn Whistler and had no choice to not put his reputation and dignity on the line for his community.

⁶⁴ Rindleisch, Bryan "Our Lands Are Our Life and Breath: Coweta, Cusseta, and the Struggle for Creek Territory and Sovereignty during the American Revolution." *Ethnohistory* 60, no. 4 (2013):583

⁶⁵ Rindleisch, Bryan "Our Lands Are Our Life and Breath: Coweta, Cusseta, and the Struggle for Creek Territory and Sovereignty during the American Revolution." *Ethnohistory* 60, no. 4 (2013): 583

⁶⁶ Rindleisch, Bryan "Our Lands Are Our Life and Breath: Coweta, Cusseta, and the Struggle for Creek Territory and Sovereignty during the American Revolution." *Ethnohistory* 60, no. 4 (2013): 584

⁶⁷ Rindleisch, Bryan "Our Lands Are Our Life and Breath: Coweta, Cusseta, and the Struggle for Creek Territory and Sovereignty during the American Revolution." *Ethnohistory* 60, no. 4 (2013):583-584

There is one last key reason as to why Alleck had to intervene in the Acorn Whistler crisis. One of the ways the Cussetas tried to prevent the Cowetas from having total control of the eastern trading path from Charleston to Creek Country, is through an alliance with the Okfuskees of the Upper Creek. Since the 1720s, the Cowetas and the Okfuskees had been in conflict with one another. The Cowetas were encouraging the Okfuskees to rebel against the British in 1723, yet “the Okfuskees rejected efforts by Lower Creek headmen from Coweta.”⁶⁸ They instead traveled to Charleston to solidify relationships with the South Carolina government, thus pinning the Okfuskees against the Cowetas, and joining the side of the Cussetas.⁶⁹ The relationship between the two communities proved to be necessary in order to prevent the Cowetas from gaining control of the entire path. This alliance was beneficial for the Cusseta’s political interests and economic desires as well because they were able to contain the Cowetas sphere of influence. The headmen of Okfuskee “exhibited similar concerns for the eastern path,” inferring that they too, were probably worried about the influence that the Cowetas had on the eastern trade path.⁷⁰ For Alleck, preventing the death of Acorn Whistler was not a crusade for justice, but an effort to protect a political alliance. Without a headman, the community of Little Okfuskee would be lost politically, creating strife and weakening their abilities to trade effectively with the British. It was essential that Alleck keep the Okfuskee people as strong as possible because without their influence, the Cowetas could take greater control over the Eastern Trade Path, leaving the Okfuskees and the Cussetas with nothing at all.

⁶⁸ Piker, Joshua. *Okfuskee: A Creek Town in Colonial America*. (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2004) 26.

⁶⁹ Piker, Joshua. *Okfuskee: A Creek Town in Colonial America*. (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2004) 27.

⁷⁰ Rindfleisch, Bryan “Our Lands Are Our Life and Breath: Coweta, Cusseta, and the Struggle for Creek Territory and Sovereignty during the American Revolution.” *Ethnohistory* 60, no. 4 (2013): 584

For the Bosomworth's selecting Acorn Whistler to be their sacrificial offering to the British in Charleston made perfect sense. It frustrated their neighbor Alleck and harmed opposing communities of the Cowetas. Choosing an Okfuskee headman was an easy target because of the poor relations between the Cowetas and Cussetas. For the Bosomworths, targeting Acorn Whistler was simple because of his Okfuskee heritage, and it would be attainable to convince the Cowetas and their allies to side against Acorn. Several years' worth of conflict between the two groups made it easy for the Cowetas to comply and to not care whether the Bosomworths were being truthful or not. Not only by doing so did the Bosomworth's save the real perpetrators, the Osochis and kin of Mary, but they were able to hurt an ally of the Cusseta's whom Mary's Coweta cousin Malatchi held much disdain for. Alleck's decision to try to save Acorn Whistler's life when put into this context is not just a demonstration of good character, but is an attempt to save the reputation of his beloved Cusseta community, and prevent the Cowetas from gaining the upper hand.

Both the conflicts between Alleck and the Bosomworths during the Savannah Incident and the death of Acorn Whistler are reflections of a deeper rooted conflict between the Cowetas and the Cussetas of the Creek Nation. At first glance one might chalk up the circumstances as bad neighbors seeking revenge on one another, but it is so much more than that. Through analyzing the relationship between Alleck and the Bosomworths primarily through the years 1749 and 1752, one is able to step into the dynamic world of the Creek Nation. For many Europeans, it was hard to not see the Native tribes as single-minded nations, who act, think and feel the same way on various political and economic issues. The British government soon found out through the experiences of the Georgia and The South Carolina governments dealing with the relationship between Alleck and the Bosomworths that all Creeks were not of one mind. The

death of Acorn Whistler, although tragic, brings to light the dysfunction between the Coweta and Cusseta communities, along with exposing the difficulty that Native Tribes had with commitment and loyalty to anyone besides their selves. Both of these tribes were dedicated and loyal to the interests of their communities, being very consumed by what is going on within their communities, and often forgetting about the outside world. Both the Savannah incident and the death of Acorn Whistler prove that these were more than just fluke events that happened within Creek society, but were repercussions of a century long conflict. Acorn was forced to lose his life, and Alleck, saw the death of any credibility or notoriety that he had within the Creek community. What can be learned from this is that one must always choose their neighbors wisely.

BENJAMIN FRANKLIN AND GEORGE ADAMS, JR.:
ENLIGHTENED ENTREPRENEURS

Connor Wilson
History 4973: Living the Enlightenment
December 8, 2013

On April 8, 1758, Benjamin Franklin was on his first official diplomatic mission to England. Franklin was already world-renowned as an inventor and a scholar, and had traveled in his youth, but this marked the first major event in his political career. Still, he found the time to peruse the instrument shops that lined the streets of London, eventually entering the Fleet Street shop of the Adams family, the home of a future fellow writer and educator, George Adams, Jr., where he “bought of George Adams sundry electric implements,” as did some of his fellow electrical pioneers.¹ At the time of Franklin’s visit, Adams and his family were solely interested in producing instruments for use by others. Ironically, it was the War of American Independence, in which Benjamin Franklin himself played a major role, that led the Adams family to its new and highly successful business of producing books to teach others how to experience and experiment in the Enlightenment tradition – especially the owner’s son, George Adams, Jr., who spent the last decade of his life writing books that helped popularize science among the public.²

Both Franklin and Adams, Jr. provide a useful look into the development of the Enlightenment: Franklin, born as he was at the beginning of the eighteenth century, was able to experience (and aid in) its development; his books, especially his *Experiments and Observations on Electricity*, are a direct product of that early period of enlightenment.³ Adams, on the other hand, wrote near the end of the century, and with the full scientific experience of the rapidly

¹ James Delbourgo, *A Most Amazing Scene of Wonders* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2006), 296.

² John R. Millburn, *Adams of Fleet Street: Instrument Makers to King George III* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2000), 198.

³ Benjamin Franklin, *Experiments and Observations on Electricity, Made at Philadelphia in America, by Mr. Benjamin Franklin, and Communicated in Several Letters to Mr. P. Collinson, of London, F. R. S.*, (London, 1751), *Eighteenth Century Collections Online*, Gale, University of Oklahoma Libraries, accessed October 30, 2013, <http://find.galegroup.com/ecco/infomark.do?&source=gale&prodId=ECCO&userGroupName=norm94900&tabID=T001&docId=CW3308328711&type=multipage&contentSet=ECCOArticles&version=1.0&docLevel=FASCIMILE>

changing Enlightenment period behind him. Indeed, his works, such as his 1784 *Essay on Electricity*, were made possible by and draw greatly from the work of those predecessors.⁴

However, Adams and Franklin represent two distinct reasons for entering into the Enlightenment publishing market: Franklin began experimenting, and documenting those experiments, once he felt financially secure enough to do so. Thanks to his wealth, he was able to pursue his own scientific interests without worrying about their marketability, as others in the era had to.⁵ Though he was not averse to profiting from his work (and he certainly did), Franklin was primarily concerned with furthering his own goals, whether scientific or political in nature, through his writings.

Adams, Jr., on the other hand, began writing, whatever his ethics, out of a financial need to appeal commercially to the public; he saw it as a way to continue, and extend, his father's business from primarily supplying scientific instruments to describing their use for the public.⁶ Years before, Adams Jr.'s father had briefly entered into the world of science publications, and for similar monetary and marketing reasons, and Adams, Jr. was in that sense continuing the family business.⁷ The younger Adams was capitalizing on a growing market for experiments and educational writing that Franklin had contributed to, and even helped to create.⁸

⁴ George Adams, Jr., *An Essay on Electricity; in which the Theory and Practice of that Useful Science, are Illustrated by a Variety of Experiments, Arranged in a Methodical Manner*, (London, 1784), *Eighteenth Century Collections Online*, Gale, University of Oklahoma Libraries, accessed October 6, 2013, <http://find.galegroup.com/ecco/infomark.do?&source=gale&prodId=ECCO&userGroupName=norm94900&tabID=T001&docId=CW106985163&type=multipage&contentSet=ECCOArticles&version=1.0&docLevel=FASCIMILE>

⁵ Bernard Cohen, "Benjamin Franklin as Scientist and Citizen," *The American Scholar* 12, No. 4 (Autumn 1943), 474, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41204624>.

⁶ Millburn, *Adams of Fleet Street*, 198.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 32.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 198.

Although these two men's primary motivations for their scientific work differed, each represents the lasting legacy of Enlightenment science, one that continued to shape scientific practice long after that era had ended. Specifically, while the field became more open, and its practitioners worked to appeal to and reach a larger audience who might have been uninterested or ignored by scientists in previous times, science fell under the considerable influence of marketability and commercialism, creating an interesting interplay of the democratic and the commercial embodied in the writings of Benjamin Franklin and George Adams Jr.

The importance of commercialism in Enlightenment science has not always been fully appreciated by historians, although in recent years modern historians such as Barbara Stafford and Paola Bertucci have been more likely to acknowledge the significant impact in those formative years of scientific progress of scientists seeking economic gain for their work. 18th-century writers often portrayed Enlightenment efforts toward dissemination of information, and the idealization of natural philosophers, as means of encouraging improvement, whether for society itself or for the individual – essentially, promoting activities worth doing purely for their own intrinsic value. Over time, however, the degree to which historians accept this altruistic view of Enlightenment science has varied.

This shift in focus is especially obvious in the case of historians' explorations of Enlightenment experiments in electricity, which captured the public's imaginations because of its spectacular destructive power – a power that could, suddenly, be investigated, seen, and controlled. Typical of the traditional historian's view of the Enlightenment, in 1943 Bernard Cohen wrote an article on Franklin, who won fame for his investigations of electricity, significantly titled "Benjamin Franklin as Scientist and Citizen." As the title suggests, Cohen's article focused on Franklin as a primarily altruistic figure who worked selflessly for the

betterment of others, or for the intellectual enjoyment of scientific pursuits.⁹ Cohen writes that “by fulfilling his social obligation as he saw it, [Franklin] thereby achieved his full stature as a human being”.¹⁰ In other words, Franklin’s actions were shaped by a desire to better his society, to fulfill his obligations to society, whether through politics, science or another avenue. It is an attractive image: the great Enlightenment thinker who, after securing his fortune through other means, turns to intellectual pursuits and philosophy, whether natural or political in nature.¹¹ Elsewhere, in an earlier work, Cohen posits that all scientists strive for and are delighted when their discoveries lead to some practical use.¹² Indeed, he argues that science in the Enlightenment (though not, he insists, the science practiced by Franklin) was pragmatic and practical, focusing on useful discoveries that could improve society or help people in some way.¹³ Thus, to Cohen, writing in the 30’s and 40’s, the Enlightenment view of science was, in many ways, a valid one; it was an endeavor that was useful, and constructive, and practical. Cohen does not seem to find the question of marketability significant. However, that issue, suggesting as it does that Enlightenment scientists pursued their science with something other than pure practicality in mind, is a topic that intrigues many modern historians.

In recent years, it has become more common for historians to discuss public science in terms of the public and their desire for science as entertainment and product. Patricia Fara,

⁹ Cohen, “Benjamin Franklin,” 480.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 481.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 475.

¹² Bernard Cohen, “How Practical Was Benjamin Franklin's Science?,” in *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 69, no. 4 (October 1945), 291.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 293.

writing in the early 90's, examined the role of marketing in the sale and study of magnets.¹⁴ Magnets offer an interesting example of a product that had definite practical uses; Fara specifically emphasizes their benefits for sailors and the navy, who were in great need of high-quality, cheap magnets for compasses to improve navigation.¹⁵ This need was undeniably answered during the Enlightenment by scientists, not just in the improved quality of magnets, but in accessibility: the newer models were not just better but cheaper as well.¹⁶ And, as Fara points out, the men who made these discoveries and advances gained greatly in capital and fame. Of course, these products, while profitable, were a real benefit to those who needed them, bettering their lives – an outcome that seems at first to reflect the traditional idealistic view of Enlightenment science. However, Fara's interest is in exploring how that very practical product transitioned into a popular product altogether removed from its practical use. As happened with many scientific discoveries in the Enlightenment, the promoters of these magnets ran demonstrations to prove their efficacy, and Fara describes these events as “spectacular entertainment,” essentially no different from any other form of entertainment, and with the goal not of edifying but of selling the product, even though the promoters might have described them differently.¹⁷ In one striking example, she describes playing cards, printed with mathematic information about magnetism, yet priced far too high for anyone who would have had a practical need for such information.¹⁸ Indeed, she points out that even those scientists who undertook

¹⁴ Patricia Fara, “‘A Treasure of Hidden Vertues’: The Attraction of Magnetic Marketing,” in *The British Journal for the History of Science*, 28, no. 1 (March 1995).

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 23.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 17.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 21.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 5.

serious research in the academies, or who gave lectures to educate the public, were sometimes driven by the popularity of magnetism to include the subject, if in passing, to more readily attain grants or to increase the marketability of their work.¹⁹ Fara's portrayal, then, paints many natural philosophers of the Enlightenment as essentially showmen who often focused more on selling an idea or product than on making new discoveries, rather than as altruistic scientists pursuing the good of society.²⁰ This is a somewhat extreme view, admittedly, but not entirely untrue. Fara deliberately attempts to break down the idealized view of the Enlightenment furthered by earlier writers like Cohen, and other historians have shared her desire for reexamining the aims of Enlightenment scientists.

Historian Barbara Stafford explains that “the Enlightenment idea of progress was pictorialized as tireless doing”; that the ideal of the era, as depicted in artistry, was of a people who shunned idolatry.²¹ But that emphasis on action and constructive work meant that some sought a way to *combine* pleasure and edification all in one. Electricity, with its spectacular and, above all, visible effects, offered a grand way to do this. It was new; it was exciting; and it offered a palpable display of nature's, and thus God's, power. Another benefit was that the study of electricity was, above all, thoroughly modern. Lightning was previously known to the public, and magnetism was understood in a limited way by them as well,²² but the ability to control and create lightning was not just intellectually exciting, but also visually so – the effects could be

¹⁹ Ibid., 22.

²⁰ Ibid., 34.

²¹ Stafford, Barbara, *Artful Science: Enlightenment Entertainment and the Eclipse of Visual Education* (Cambridge: The MIT Press, 1992), 163.

²² Fara, “Hidden Vertues,” 11.

spectacular, and this made both demonstrations and experimentation at home a potentially popular business.

Stafford addresses this public interest in science in her book, *Artful Science: Enlightenment Entertainment and the Eclipse of Visual Education*. “Aristocratic jeux d’esprit and occult problèmes divertissans,” she argues, were adjusted to accommodate a new “science mania” – in other words, a new and popular desire for scientific knowledge and research.²³ She specifically mentions one practitioner, Charles Rabiqueau, who attained popularity with spectacular scientific demonstrations that were, in a way, more like shows than science lectures; his performances were described at the time as akin to a library, as they made the subject available to those who could not afford to purchase the books required for self-instruction.²⁴ To Stafford, the combination seen in public demonstrations was a hybrid between science, education, and entertainment – a way of passing time both enjoyably and constructively, in essence.²⁵ This is certainly true of the new electric science, which could be visually very exciting (Rabiqueau, for example, was known to deliberately hook himself to energized wires for the entertainment of his audience), but nevertheless attendance was believed by many at the time, according to Stafford, to be a constructive way to improve oneself and one’s youth.²⁶ Learning, and learning to be rational, would thus allow one a deeper connection to one’s religion, and therefore scientific demonstrations and entertainment were constructive rather than purely leisure (although of course, the educational value of many such pursuits might be somewhat questionable). This attitude is interesting, since it opens the door to religious scientists, who

²³ Stafford, *Artful Science*, 29.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 183.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 51.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 70.

sought to understand their respective beliefs through the context of discovery – or by taking God out of the equation, in a sense, through Deism. In any case, Stafford argues that one of the basic ideals of the Enlightenment was, if not always learning through doing, at least doing²⁷ – so being able to obtain enjoyment while still ostensibly improving one’s knowledge was thus a great boon. This public interest in science, as complicated as it might be, created a market for science that could lead to real profit for those practicing it.

These modern historians, as well as others, find in the Enlightenment not the grand pursuit of discovery that earlier writers described, but a period in which the need for exposure and marketability regularly shaped scientists’ pursuits. Trent Mitchell, who wrote at length about the economic and political ramifications of the invention of the lightning rod, rather than its utility, viewed science in the Enlightenment as a way of reaching and influencing a public that was already interested in the topic.²⁸ But what all these authors, even earlier historians like Cohen, seem to agree on is that one undeniable reality of the Enlightenment was a populace ravenous for new and exciting scientific discoveries.

Science and philosophy were not just important intellectual endeavors in the Enlightenment; they were its entertainment, its popular culture – they were, basically, a growing industry the product of which was valued not for its practical nature, but its connection with knowledge.²⁹ In some cases, this meant that men and women who would have been shut out from academia in centuries past became able to enter into the important intellectual discussions of the day – a kind of democratization of intellectualism. For example, some physicists, both lecturers

²⁷ Ibid., 163.

²⁸ Trent Mitchell, “The Politics of Experiment in the Eighteenth Century: The Pursuit of Audience and the Manipulation of Consensus in the Debate over Lightning Rods,” in *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, 31, no. 3, (Spring, 1998), 308.

²⁹ Fara, “Hidden Vertues,” 32.

and academicians, found themselves faced with the question of how to deal with earnest pupils who lacked the fundamental knowledge of mathematics required to learn the subject, but nevertheless were willing to make the effort to learn.³⁰ In other cases, the intention to disseminate science was not wholly altruistic – public science was big business, and not everyone going into the business was careful or scrupulous enough to present the truth – and yet, often enough, even these practitioners would attract crowds.³¹ Bacon has often been given credit for the modern scientific method and its emphasis on empiricism, even by 18th-century writers; George Adams, Jr., himself wrote about this in the introduction to his *Lectures*, and gave Bacon credit for helping to find a way to disprove false claims about natural (and religious) philosophy.³² But part of the reason these pursuits held such sway over the public was the connection they made between the physical and the religious, rather than asserting a simply physical nature. Some found in scientific discoveries a new justification for ethics; others found religion, or a way to understand God – this was especially true for the field of electricity.

It is easy to view this movement as solely the realm of the financially elite, and certainly some marketed products directly to the richer parts of society.³³ But, as Alexi Baker recently noted in her lecture on “Polite Society and the Public Theatre,” the Enlightenment era British

³⁰ Paula Findlen, “A Forgotten Newtonian,” in *The Sciences in Enlightened Europe*, ed. William Clark et al. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press 1999), 343. Findlen focuses on Cristina Roccati, an 18th century lecturer who focused on physics.

³¹ Robert Darnton, *Mesmerism and the End of the Enlightenment in France* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1968), 10-11.

³² George Adams, Jr., *Lectures on Natural and Experimental Philosophy, Considered in It's Present State of Improvement*, (London, 1794) *Eighteenth Century Collections Online*, Gale, University of Oklahoma Libraries, Accessed October 8, 2013, <http://find.galegroup.com/ecco/infomark.do?&source=gale&prodId=ECCO&userGroupName=norm94900&tabID=T001&docId=CW106774705&type=multipage&contentSet=ECCOArticles&version=1.0&docLevel=FASCIMILE>, 3:32.

³³ Fara, “Hidden Vertues,” 5.

public – both the wealthy and the working class – held a fascination for natural philosophy. This fascination led to a robust market in scientific instruments, lectures and publications that encouraged people to explore science for themselves. For the elites, this was fueled at times by a genuine interest in science, and sometimes by a desire to appear fashionable.³⁴ Baker notes that decorating one’s home with scientific instruments, as well as purchasing, reading and discussing books on science, became signs of one’s refinement and taste. But the creators of such items also encouraged the general public to take an interest in natural philosophy, redesigning their demonstrations and publications to highlight the more entertaining aspects of science and scientific study. Some speakers in this era were liked for their ability to reach those with less education,³⁵ or for being an affordable alternative to more expensive methods of education.³⁶ Many elements of society could enter into this world, rather than just the wealthy. As the audience was broad and numerous, lectures and publications ranged from the relatively serious to the rather lightweight. But, Baker argues, Enlightenment era society saw the growth of a thriving, highly profitable market for the study of natural philosophy at a time when commercialism was a central concern, especially in urban areas.³⁷

Science was big business. For example, Franz Mesmer made his living performing public demonstrations of his “animal magnetism” and explaining his theories to an enthusiastic audience – an audience made of admirers from all levels of society, from merchant to aristocrat to, on occasion, the religious elite. And while today we know that his Mesmerism was complete

³⁴ Anita Baker, *Polite Society and the Public Theatre*, podcast audio, Newtonian Audiences, MP3, accessed December 4, 2013, http://www.enlighteningscience.sussex.ac.uk/resources_for_teachers/newtonian_audiences/.

³⁵ Findlen, “A Forgotten Newtonian,” 344.

³⁶ Stafford, *Artful Science*, 159.

³⁷ Baker, *Polite Society*.

falsehood, it is not clear that he himself knew this, and is certainly clear that his fans did not. Indeed, they defended it fervently against its detractors, among whom can be counted the illustrious Benjamin Franklin himself, who was part of a Royal Society commission to investigate Mesmer's claims, and found the concept to be fundamentally unsound.³⁸ Unlike Franklin, Mesmer's fans found the subject edifying, entertaining, but also inherently practical – healings done through mesmerism were a common and popular pursuit.³⁹ And while Robert Darnton has argued that Mesmerism, with its arcane rules and its contradiction of other modern natural philosophies, was in the end anathema to the kind of scientific growth with which many credit the Enlightenment⁴⁰ – and perhaps rightly so – it still offered qualities that fit into that populist mold; it was practical, it was comprehensible (if not always admitting of full explanation), and it was exciting. Entertainment could be educational, constructive, profitable – all these things and more.⁴¹

It is important for the reader to understand that electricity, however, had a somewhat special place in the Enlightenment. Mesmerism had been popular both as a science and, as its popularity grew, as a justification for politics (not unlike Franklin's own use of his scientific fame and exploits for political gain),⁴² but the electric forces had the potential to be far more valuable. After all, they could be tested and replicated successfully, and unlike Mesmerism they had the benefit of having a basis in the known world – no one would deny the existence, for

³⁸ J. L. Heilbron, "Benjamin Franklin in Europe: Electrician, Academician, Politician," in *Notes and Records of the Royal Society of London* 61, no. 3 (Sep. 22, 2007), 363.

³⁹ Darnton, *Mesmerism*, 59.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 159.

⁴¹ Stafford, *Artful Science*, 29.

⁴² Darnton, *Mesmerism*, 3.

example, of lightning. Of course, one might argue over its source and cause, but the effects were obvious. Sparks and magnetism were thus a far cry from the invisible power of Mesmer, which healed or influenced invisibly⁴³ – and electricity became a popular phenomenon. Thinkers of the day wrote many works on the subject, sometimes in an attempt to create discourse on the subject, though others simply restated accepted knowledge to make a quick profit – sometimes with outlandish packaging, like the infamous Gustavus Katterfelto, who was known to raise his daughter up with the aid of a steel helmet and strong magnets⁴⁴. Many of these works were hugely successful publishing projects, like Benjamin Franklin’s *Experiments and Observations on Electricity*.⁴⁵

Obviously, then, the new technologies of the Enlightenment had considerable popular appeal, and there was a desire among the public to have access to these new ideas – as well as the old. Those responsible could become wealthy and famous; for example, Benjamin Franklin remains a popular and often-discussed figure of American history, and not just because of his involvement in the Revolution, but for his inventions and discoveries as well. He was, of course, a central figure in the founding of the nation and the creation of its legal underpinnings, and continued to work diplomatically for the new American republic for many years after the revolution. Bernard Cohen argues that this idea of Franklin as a political figure first of all is unfair to the man, because his other accomplishments (in science, and in publishing) were

⁴³ Darnton, *Mesmerism*, 16.

⁴⁴ Fara, “Hidden Vertues,” 24.

⁴⁵ “Franklin, Benjamin,” in *Complete Dictionary of Scientific Biography*, Vol. 5 (Detroit: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 2008), accessed November 1, 2013, <http://go.galegroup.com/ps/i.do?id=GALE|CX2830901508&v=2.1&u=norm94900&it=r&p=GURL&sw=w&asid=5c09ea78df8ce8010252cf025780b503#contentcontainer>, 138.

impressive.⁴⁶ But in truth it is clear from Franklin's actions that he considered politics to be incredibly important, and they remained a priority before and after his famous scientific career – which, though clearly a passion for him, he was not above using to further those political goals. Of course Franklin was much more than just a diplomat – he was a child of the Enlightenment, born in 1706. As such, he was in a perfect position to experience much of the intellectual and scientific growth that the time had to offer, and it is fair to say that he certainly tried a great many things, often with great success. And yet, he cared very little for traditional methods of teaching; he felt the Classical education was insufficient, or unimportant, in the modern era. Instead, Franklin felt educators should emphasize practical pursuits and knowledge, like modern languages or sciences.⁴⁷

When he was young, Franklin served apprenticeship to a printer, and as a result came into contact with new ideas from all levels and spheres of literate society.⁴⁸ But he also learned something else: having control of information, and being known for its dissemination, also gave one influence over his fellows; inspired by the evangelism of one of the great preachers of the age, George Wakefield,⁴⁹ Franklin published pamphlets, and used his popular *Poor Richard's Almanac* (one of the publications that helped make his fortune), for the purposes of propagandizing to the public.⁵⁰ *Poor Richard's Almanac* offered advice and trivia on all manner of scientific pursuits – some practical, such as meteorology, but many topics were included

⁴⁶ Cohen, "Benjamin Franklin," 474.

⁴⁷ George N. Heller, "'To Sweeten Their Senses': Music, Education, and Benjamin Franklin," *Music Educators Journal* 73, no. 5, (2007): 24.

⁴⁸ Philip Dray, *Stealing God's Thunder* (New York: Random House, 2005), 26.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 75.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 77.

simply to educate and amuse the reader (or, perhaps, Franklin himself).⁵¹ Even at this early date, Franklin was combining two interests, politics and science, though he was as yet an amateur in both. Most of these endeavors, whether on his own behalf or simply as a means of employment, emphasize his constant striving not just to understand, but to spread information to others. But it should be emphasized that Franklin was not just writing for the educated elite. His works, especially his later scientific tracts, would reach a great number of people, enlightened and unenlightened alike.

Though he had dabbled in the sciences before, Franklin's most active research was done after 1746, when he found himself, thanks to his printing job and book sales, wealthy enough to retire and engage in natural philosophy and other pursuits that, while interesting, were less likely to be profitable.⁵² Specifically, Franklin had become fascinated with electricity, wanted to explore the discipline to the best of his ability, and endeavored to document his experiments carefully so that others could do the same and personally see the same results.⁵³ His experiments helped him to improve his own understanding of electricity, but they also made him famous, and increased his not inconsiderable wealth.⁵⁴

In the preface to the 1751 edition of his *Experiments and observations on electricity*, the editor of the work writes that "some persons to whom [these experiments] were read, and who had themselves been conversant in electrical disquisitions, were of opinion [...] that it would be doing a kind of injustice to the publick, to confine them solely to the limits of a private

⁵¹ Ibid., 27.

⁵² Cohen, "Benjamin Franklin, 475.

⁵³ "Franklin, Benjamin," 133.

⁵⁴ Ibid., 135.

acquaintance.”⁵⁵ The work, made up of a series of letters Franklin had written to fellow enthusiasts and experimenters, is intriguing. Rather than merely a discourse on discoveries and laws, the letters set down, step by step, unusual phenomenon and interesting effects that Franklin had discovered electricity offered:

A man standing on wax may be electrified a number of times, by repeatedly touching the wire of an electrified bottle (held in the hand of one standing on the floor) he receiving the fire from the wire each time: yet holding it in his own hand, and touching the wire, tho’ he draws a strong spark, and is violently shock’d, no Electricity remains in him; the fire only passing thro’ him from the upper to the lower part of the bottle.⁵⁶

For some of these effects he provides an explanation, but the letters are interesting for another reason: in each case, he describes several experiments that the readers can do for themselves, many of which are quite simple and modest in scope – but with such a fascinating and untapped source of discovery as electricity (and its related field, magnetism), such effects were an end in and of themselves. For example, many of the experiments in the first letter involve magnetizing and moving about small objects in order for the experimenter to see the interplay of the positive and negative forces of magnetism:

Lay two books on two glasses, back towards back, two or three Inches distant. Set the electrified phial on one, and then touch the wire; that book will be electrified *minus*; the electrical fire being drawn out of it by the bottom of the bottle. Take off the bottle, and holding it in your hand, touch the other with the wire; that book will be electrified *plus*; the fire passing into it from the wire, and the bottle at the same time supply’d from your hand. A suspended small cork-ball will play between these books ‘till the equilibrium is restored.⁵⁷

Another letter involves Franklin describing experiments to determine how, and where, the electrical charge is transmitted,⁵⁸ something that he wanted to understand in order to determine

⁵⁵ Franklin, *Experiments and Observations on Electricity*, 2.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, 8.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 7.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 20.

what, in fact, electricity might *be*. It may be somewhat hard for us to remember today that simply understanding what an electrical circuit *is*, much less how it works, was considered by the public and scientists alike at this time ground-breaking research. While these may be basic tenets of science in the modern era, for Benjamin Franklin and the Enlightenment public at large electricity was a field still being defined – it is significant that the terms used in the modern day to describe electrical current – “‘plus,’ ‘minus,’ ‘positive,’ ‘negative,’ ‘battery,’ and many other words [...] – are still basic in electrical discussion.”⁵⁹

In truth, however, few of the experiments in Franklin’s manuscript are strictly practical, in the sense that they offer a useful effect, but they also offer an opportunity for the reader to become involved in the scientific process. Many are relatively simple to do, and create effects that are tangible for the experimenter, even if at times Franklin’s examples may seem to illuminate little of the underlying nature of the phenomenon. But it is significant that, when Franklin states something categorically – for example, that “the direction of the electrical fire being different in the charging, will also be different in the explosion” – there often follows an exhortation to the readers to try something, or do something, in order to prove to themselves that the effect exists:

To prove this; take two bottles that were equally charged thro’ the hooks, one in each hand; bring their hooks near each other, and no spark or shock will follow; because each hook is disposed to give fire, and neither to receive it. Set one of the bottles down on glass, take it up by the hook, and apply its coating to the hook of the other; then there will be an explosion and shock, and both bottles will be discharged⁶⁰

This seems to fit with Stafford’s idea of the Enlightenment individual’s learning by doing. It would have been simple for Franklin merely to write down in his letters the theories that he had

⁵⁹ Cohen, “Benjamin Franklin,” 475.

⁶⁰ Franklin, *Experiments and Observations on Electricity*, 20.

developed; they certainly form an important part of the work. But instead the document is a combination of theory and practical, hands-on experimentation. It is possible that he was inspired by his earlier experiences as a writer and his tendency towards the practical to do this, but the reason is less important than the result: simply reading about theory in a book did not fit the needs of the people for whom such a book was written, but Franklin's book offered ways in which any individuals who could read and obtain a copy could test these experiments for herself – or, for entertainment purposes, she could of course share the experience with others. Perhaps this is part of why his work took off commercially the way that it did, and why he became such a celebrity in his own era.

This kind of hands-on experience was a new way for Enlightenment thinkers to bridge the gap between their ideas and a willing, eager public – and Franklin did so with great success. Naturally, of course, Franklin's *Experiments* offered his conclusions in the book, and while future experimenters have improved upon his work, his conception of the positive and negative forces of electricity has remained the dominant terminology to this day. As such, Franklin's book is a successful work of scientific inquiry. But commercially, too, it was an instant hit; it enjoyed several reprints and revised editions, and continued to sell in later years, even being translated into foreign languages and published in countries far removed from his homeland.⁶¹ It was first published not in his native colonies but in London, from which many new and exciting ideas and gadgets were being shipped far and wide – including Franklin's new book.⁶² This success led not just to further editions of the *Experiments and observations on electricity*, but to a great many other works by Franklin on a variety of topics. Clearly, while he continued to look into subjects

⁶¹ "Franklin, Benjamin," 135.

⁶² Dray, *Stealing God's Thunder*, 77.

that interested him (something not all thinkers in this era were free to do, thanks to their need to sell copies and seats for their shows), he was not averse to making money on the side, or republishing his work to continue profiting from its popularity.

Some writers have remarked on the relative lack of any practical application in many of Franklin's electrical studies. However, as Joyce Chaplin has pointed out, he was hardly alone in this: Enlightenment thinkers "instead asked more abstract questions about electricity, particularly about its ability to give clues as to the nature of matter."⁶³ Lightning was, in essence, a force of nature, and studying it might give to the public an understanding of how the world worked on a fundamental level – or, perhaps, how God worked through those laws of nature. Indeed, science and religion are hard to separate, especially in Franklin's case, as he was essentially a Deist. But, despite his own shaky relationship with organized religion, Benjamin Franklin found his work connected with a higher power. Immanuel Kant himself, that great Enlightenment philosopher, was impressed by the man's inventiveness; he went so far as to claim that Franklin's invention of the lightning rod marked him as a "modern Prometheus."⁶⁴ Others, perhaps trying to promote him in a more distinctly nationalist context, dubbed him the American Jupiter.⁶⁵ Both of these names, derived from mythology, demonstrate the powerful implications of what he had accomplished. Prometheus is especially significant; he was the mythic figure who stole the power of fire from the gods and gave it to man. Electrical scientists had, in their own way, seemingly captured a natural power – and it could be controlled.

⁶³ Joyce E. Chaplin, "Benjamin Franklin and Science, Continuing Opportunities for Study," *Perspectives on Science* 14, no. 2 (2006): 143.

⁶⁴ Delbourgo, *A Most Amazing Scene of Wonders*, 3.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, 279.

Still, his work with electrical power, embodied in that work and his later inventions based on the technology, remained his greatest scientific legacy. By the time he was sent to Paris in 1776, he was world famous for his explorations of electricity and an honorary member of the Royal Academy of Sciences – and despite his success in the field, many asked him to give up diplomacy and return to scientific study.⁶⁶ But, to their disappointment, he did not – he seems to have felt that, despite his liking for experimentation, his role as a politician and diplomat and his desire to work for the advantage of the North American colonies were more important.

Franklin's ability to combine his scientific ideas and his political ideals is clearly illustrated in the conflict between himself and another 18th century inventor, Benjamin Wilson. Both were inextricably linked to the study of lightning, and both had their own design for a lightning rod to prevent the damaging effects of that phenomenon (Franklin favored his pointed lightning rod, while Wilson's was blunt).⁶⁷ In theory, this was a simple, practical issue, but it became an inherently political one as well, thanks to simple fact that Wilson was a loyal British citizen and Franklin, for his part, represented a colonial America already on its way to revolution. For, while Wilson first publicly criticized Franklin's design in 1764, it was in 1772 that the British government asked both men, among others, to work together in a committee to determine which design was best – and both men used the situation to benefit not just their design of choice but their political allegiance as well.⁶⁸ The rhetoric used seems to have been

⁶⁶ "Franklin, Benjamin", 130.

⁶⁷ Trent A. Mitchell, "The Politics of Experiment in the Eighteenth Century: The Pursuit of Audience and the Manipulation of Consensus in the Debate over Lightning Rods," in *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 31, no. 3 (Spring 1998), 308.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, 314.

shaped by their politics as well as their science, all in a debate that in theory could have been boiled down to an empirical resolution.⁶⁹

Franklin was an accepted luminary, and communicated regularly with the Royal Society and learned scholars in Europe.⁷⁰ He certainly had supporters, but Wilson had his as well, and they tended to be on opposing sides of the debate slowly brewing over the issue of the colonies.⁷¹ Franklin seems to have appealed to the popular European vision of the colonies,⁷² and his advocacy of their cause linked him in the eyes of the public to the burgeoning soon-to-be republic. He has been seen by some as a kind of altruistic figure, working for the good of society and the betterment of science – Cohen certainly argued for that interpretation – but Franklin seems to have had no qualms about pursuing his own interests or goals. He certainly managed to remain above some of the more ridiculous extravagances of the period (Benjamin Wilson, for example, actually built a giant lightning generator to represent the rainclouds for his lightning rod demonstrations, eschewing practicality in favor of being impressive and convincing during his conflict with Franklin⁷³). Thanks to his relative financial independence, he was less limited by the vagaries of the public science marketplace than some of his contemporaries, but in politics he used the outcome of that market, his supporters and popularity, to his own advantage. But his works carried with them genuine scientific research, and he invented some practical and popular items still used today. That in itself sets him apart from another participant in the same field of writing, George Adams, Jr., whose collections of experiments, marketed to the public as

⁶⁹ Ibid., 316.

⁷⁰ “Franklin, Benjamin,” 130.

⁷¹ Mitchell, “The Politics of Experiment,” 318.

⁷² Delbourgo, *A Most Amazing Scene of Wonders*, 144.

⁷³ Mitchell, “The Politics of Experiment,” 320.

educational works, were mostly based upon the work of others; and whose initial goal with his books was not discovery, but profit.

The Adams family instrument business began some time in 1734, under the auspices of George Adams, Sr., in London's Fleet Street.⁷⁴ The company initially earned its profits producing devices for the East India Company, especially sextants, and later would do the same for the British navy.⁷⁵ This would comprise the bulk of their business even into son George Adams Jr.'s ownership of the company. However, George Adams, Sr. was inspired by popular science publications of the time, several of which had helped fuel an interest in microscopes – something of relevance to an instrument maker.⁷⁶ To benefit from that public interest, he produced two publications during his lifetime, and his attempt to explain and justify the use of microscopes was sufficiently popular to justify a new edition later on in his life.⁷⁷ They would also serve as a catalyst for his far more prolific son's writing career. His son, then, would have been exposed to not just the technical questions of the Enlightenment-era instrument market, which included, as a necessity, knowledge of scientific developments in order to remain competitive, but also to the educational and, importantly, *commercial* potential of writing scientifically for public consumption. As Adams, Sr. himself pointed out, the writer or demonstrator has the ability to show his audience the facts, and thereby lead the public to an understanding of the subject at hand.⁷⁸ This sentiment would not have seemed unusual to Benjamin Franklin, or to the many other men and women of the period interested in the sciences

⁷⁴ Millburn, *Adams of Fleet Street*, 14.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, 20.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, 32.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, 37.

⁷⁸ Peter Heering, "An Experimenter's Gotta Do What an Experimenter's Gotta Do—But How?" *Isis* 101, no. 4 (December 2010): 804.

– and, as shall be seen, was an idea that his son was to seize upon in his own intellectual investigations of electricity.

George Adams, Jr., strove at first to follow in his father's footsteps, selling instruments to the navy and deriving the majority of his profits from the family business. Thanks to continued warfare, especially the eventual onset of the American War of Independence, profits were initially high, but when the war ended, the naval source of revenue dropped quickly.⁷⁹ It is possible that this is what caused his return to the writing that had briefly occupied his father, though he also was likely inspired by the popular culture of the era. However, it is certain that he began by retracing his father's footsteps, revising the elder Adams' still-popular work on microscopes, which publishers wanted to reissue.⁸⁰ But Adams felt a need for a new commercial niche in order to sustain the business, and he found it in the growing public market that books like Franklin's had helped develop for electrical experimentation. It should be noted that Adams, Sr., had likely created some of the instruments Franklin himself used to experiment, and Adams, Jr., continued this trade,⁸¹ but he also saw potential in the manuscript market that his father had contributed to, and the last decade of his life would be spent in the creation of a large variety of works on multiple subjects.⁸²

Considering his trade, it should not be surprising that the first work Adams, Jr., wrote on his own was his 1784 *Essay on Electricity*, a substantial work that was to include not just an explanation of the theory of the science, but experiments in order to demonstrate those ideas.⁸³ In

⁷⁹ Millburn, *Adams of Fleet Street*, 198.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, 198.

⁸¹ Paola Bertucci, "John Wesley and the Religious Utility of Electrical Healing," *The British Journal for the History of Science* 89, no. 3 (September 2006): 353.

⁸² Millburn, *Adams of Fleet Street*, 245.

⁸³ *Ibid.*, 198.

substance, then, it was akin to Franklin's own experiments and writing, although thanks to the later publishing date it was perhaps more theoretically advanced in its understanding of the science. But while Franklin seems to have viewed his work as almost altruistic, and was only able to turn to scientific experimentation and discourse once he had already made his profits through other work, for Adams this publication seems to have been at least in part spurred by a need to simply draw a profit from a popular type of publication – the fact that such a work could be popular and profitable is itself indicative of the social climate of his era and the ideas that culture valued. And while his work may have been somewhat mercurial in nature, he seems to have embraced the idea that knowledge and the publication of that knowledge was capable of improving the individuals who partook of it.

The preface to Adams's work on electricity is worthy of note. "The science of electricity," he writes, "is now generally acknowledged to be useful and important; [...] at a future period it will [likely] be looked up to as the source from whence the principles and properties of natural philosophy must be derived."⁸⁴ In other words, the study of what people had once thought something of a novelty by Adams' time they accepted as a useful and, perhaps, even revelatory pursuit. But, he argues, nature is too complex to be explained simply; certainly this work, at least, does not explain the deeper theories of electricity. The book, he says, is meant to make the essential parts of the science "easy, pleasant, and obvious to the young practitioner"⁸⁵ so that such readers, or anyone uninformed in such matters, can learn for themselves the proof for the new laws of this science. The work is meant to be very definitely, then, a *practical* instructive tool that can appeal to broad audiences rather than the professional –

⁸⁴ Adams, Jr., *An Essay on Electricity*, iii.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, iv.

to the general public, rather than those who already have attained some mastery of the subject. In a sense, this differentiates his work from Franklin's early electrical publications: while Franklin's book was made up of practical demonstrations, they were originally addressed to fellow aristocrats – learned friends, essentially – and later revised and compiled by the author and his publisher for public consumption. Adams is writing here specifically, and directly, for as broad an audience as possible.

Adams writes that he wishes to show the connection between experiment and theory,⁸⁶ and the work itself is indeed very didactic in tone and writing style:

In chapter 6 we observed, that the different appearances of light on electrified points was deemed a criterion of the direction of the electric fluid. That the luminous star, or globule, shews the point is receiving the electric matter, whilst the luminous brush, or cone, indicates that it is proceeding from the point. We shall now examine the states of the different sides of the Leyden bottle by these appearances.⁸⁷

This is not the work of someone trying to prove his theories, but someone explaining already known concepts. Indeed, he often cites the work of other people (and he would have been versed in new developments in order to keep his shop up-to-date). In any case, the experiments build upon each other in order to demonstrate the basic principles of the science – including principles, of course, that Benjamin Franklin had set down, such as the presence of positive and negative charge in electrically charged substances.⁸⁸ Its usefulness as an educational text is somewhat suspect: the explanation of what exactly is being demonstrated by the text, and how, is sometimes explained too briefly, especially when compared to the detailed nature of the rest of the work. At other times the work continues at length, giving exhaustive lists of what effect various substances will have upon others without really explaining why, as when Adams

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, 2.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, 103.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, 6.

explains what charge rubbing different objects on each other will generate: this takes the form of a chart of objects and what objects will create a positive or negative static charge when rubbed on them – including, bizarrely, a “list of electric substances, and of the different electricities produced by them,” which includes the explanation that rubbing any “substance with which it has been hitherto tried” on a cat will create a positive charge.⁸⁹ Other substances range from glass to hare’s skin. Some of these may be ideas that he found in other books, and many seem strange or incorrect in the light of a modern understanding of electricity or of magnetism, but Adams can hardly be held to such standards. His goal was to provide some theories, and to give his readers ways to achieve a *tangible* effect demonstrating those theories. If the theory proved to be incorrect or flawed, experimenters could discover that for themselves, through practical application.

Still, Adams often does not explain exactly what the examples and rules in the manual mean. Unlike Franklin, whose works strove to explain the reason for or makeup of electricity, proven through the experiments described, Adams is seemingly more concerned with creating a practical manual for performing experiments, even if the result is not always as instructive as one might hope. It is a practical work, providing experiments that can be performed by the layman, whether through objects available at home or via specialized machines, which would, of course, be available for purchase in Adams’s shop:

Since the publication of Dr. Priestley’s History, the electrical apparatus has been considerably augmented, and many new experiments have been made. To describe the one, and to arrange the other, under such heads as will point out the connexion between the experiments and the received theory of electricity, was one of the principal views I had in composing this essay. I also wished to put into the hands of my customer a tract, which might enable them to use, with ease and satisfaction, the electrical machines and apparatus which I recommend.⁹⁰

⁸⁹ Ibid., 13.

⁹⁰ Ibid., 2-3.

It was not intended by Adams to be a scholarly treatise on the subject.⁹¹ Instead, readers find detailed and step-by-step instructions not just for the experiments but the procedure of setting up instruments and machinery to perform them:

These experiments may all be made with a small and portable apparatus; consisting generally of two brass tubes, as A and B, fig. 22, each of these is supported on a glass pillar G, which screws into a wooden foot H, a pair of small bith balls suspended on linen threads, as I, K, fit upon each tube by means of a small brass ring; these tubes, with a piece of sealing wax or a glass tube, are sufficient to illustrate the greater part of the experiments in this chapter.⁹²

He also, at times, provides an explanation of the terminology of a field and some theorists whose works may apply.⁹³

The *Essay on Electricity* is, then, not a text demonstrating Adams's innovations in the field, but simply his attempt to cater to the public desire for that combination of information and entertainment that so defined the Enlightenment – a way for Adams to accomplish the important task of spreading information while also, by giving the public what they wanted, making a good profit. In a way, the book is analogous to a modern-day textbook, in that the discoveries within are not usually Adams's own, and perhaps not even all of the experiments – instead, the value comes from how comprehensibly it is explained and how comprehensively the material is covered.

If Adams hoped to gain some new business through his publication, that desire was unequivocally fulfilled. Even after his death, publishers continued to revise and reissue the *Essay*, to add new discoveries and experiments, and to keep his texts current with the popular interests of the time. For example, publishers added a section on animal electricity to the 1799

⁹¹ Millburn, *Adams of Fleet Street*, 200.

⁹² Adams, Jr., *An Essay on Electricity*, 51.

⁹³ *Ibid.*, 331.

edition; they apparently felt the work was somewhat lacking, but that its popularity and value came in the detail and breadth of its experiments.⁹⁴ Clearly, his method continued to resonate with the public. But while Adams's writing career may have begun as a means of making money, he did not lose track of that idea of his father's – that information, properly explained, could improve those receiving it. This idea, not far removed from the way many others viewed the Enlightenment, would be a recurring theme throughout the rest of his writing career. The last years of his life were a decade of frequent publishing, in which he continued to grow in popularity and subscribers to his published works. The most obvious embodiment of this philosophy must be his final work, the *Lectures on natural and experimental philosophy*, a massive five-volume work that sought to demonstrate conclusively the basis of scientific principles, of scientific experimentation (as embodied, of course, in the iconic Roger Bacon, the “friend and father of modern philosophy”⁹⁵) that would promote a comprehension of, and blossoming thereby in the reader of, a religious natural philosophy – a way to show up the “pretenders to philosophy” who undermined religion through their scientific discoveries.⁹⁶ A thorough examination of his final, multi-volume work is beyond the scale of this paper, but its preface is telling in its insistence that through scientific discovery, through an understanding of nature and physics, can come an understanding of God and of religion⁹⁷ – and, because they base their criticisms in a falsification of reason, the false philosophers who deny religion or corrupt it will, at least according to Adams, inherently be shown as liars if those who listen to them can test their claims. This transformation from the somewhat secular philosophy espoused in the *Essay*

⁹⁴ Millburn, *Adams of Fleet Street*, 207.

⁹⁵ Adams, Jr., *Lectures on Natural and Experimental Philosophy*, 40.

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, vii.

⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, viii.

on Electricity at first may seem surprising, but in both cases the goal is to educate a willing public in order to equip them to learn and judge for themselves, so that when confronted with other thinkers' theories, they will be able to judge or accept those ideas for themselves. And certainly Adams's methods must have found a willing audience: at least a thousand copies of his *Lectures* were ordered by subscribers *ahead* of publication,⁹⁸ and the volumes continued to be published and reprinted after his death.

George Adams, Jr., represents an interesting Enlightenment figure: he was clearly concerned with his business and with profits, but at the same time seems to have sought to defend and promote the public's relationship with science and religion through his works. But, as was demonstrated by the public relationship to science during this time, those two categories were not always so distinct. Natural philosophy might give insight into religion, it might even shape or replace it – but in all cases, the pursuit of enlightenment was important. Franklin, and Adams offer us intriguing ways of approaching the issue: Franklin seems to have been interested most of all in discovery, and in discourse – and, through expanding the discussion to a greater number, could promote those causes. Adams is perhaps more complex. Was he a mercurial man who became a scientific missionary, or was he striving, with his appeals to religion, to defend and justify the pursuits and interests he had followed throughout his career? In any case, his approach to education, which relied heavily on explaining the work of others in a more accessible (and entertaining) way, demonstrates that his intended audience, at least, was a populist one. Franklin and Adams thus appear to be diametrically opposed – one worked for profit, the other for the betterment of science and education after having already made his profits – but the success, and the popularity, of both demonstrates clearly that, whatever the justification

⁹⁸ Millburn, *Adams of Fleet Street*, 245.

for their efforts, science as an experience was something that truly resonated with society on a fairly large scale in the Enlightenment.

Both these men were indicative of and contributed to the Enlightenment trend towards public, hands-on science, both as profitable entertainment *and* as a means of education. Given the chance to learn new theories, the greater populace took advantage of it, whether by reading or by attending public lectures and demonstrations – but for the people to really engage with the subjects, that education had to have some value as a practical entertainment. Philosophically, as much as politically and scientifically, the Enlightenment was a complicated and paradoxical period. Some argued for more openness and debate; others publicly condemned those goals while implementing new ideas in scientific experimentation and theology *in private*. As we have seen, Enlightenment scientific documents often sought to popularize new inventions and discoveries, and to offer simplified methods for investigating science. But this ideology on the part of those already knowledgeable and involved in academia would have been worthless without a corresponding desire by outsiders to enter into that world. One of the characteristics of the Enlightenment, as many have noted, is that, coinciding with a greater dissemination of knowledge from the top down, there existed a desire on the part of the lower classes for that same knowledge. Attempts by scientists to fulfill that desire took many forms.⁹⁹ Some efforts took the form of published books – guides, in essence, to the hitherto closed world of science. Others involved speeches, sometimes even for free, expounding upon some new discovery or argument; Benjamin Franklin was actually inspired by just such a movement, the Great Awakening, although that affected the realm of religion.¹⁰⁰ And, of course, there was the ever-

⁹⁹ Stafford, *Artful Science*, xxi.

¹⁰⁰ Delbourgo, *A Most Amazing Scene of Wonders*, 96.

popular demonstration: an exciting yet (in theory) educational event in which the presenter would perform some experiment, or dissection, or other practical proof of his or her ideas – even if, as was sometimes the case, those ideas were completely wrong. In any case, those responsible for producing popular science works were often trying to reach whoever they could – even if that audience was relatively lacking in knowledge of the subject. This trend of combining both commercialism and scientific inquiry, a trend documented in the works of Benjamin Franklin and George Adams, Jr., is an approach that continues long after the Age of Enlightenment, thus becoming a lasting hallmark of the Enlightenment era.

Bibliography

- Adams, George, Jr. *An Essay on Electricity; in which the Theory and Practice of that Useful Science, are Illustrated by a Variety of Experiments, Arranged in a Methodical Manner*. London, 1784. *Eighteenth Century Collections Online*. Gale. University of Oklahoma Libraries. Accessed October 6, 2013.
<http://find.galegroup.com/ecco/infomark.do?&source=gale&prodId=ECCO&userGroupName=norm94900&tabID=T001&docId=CW106985163&type=multipage&contentSet=ECCOArticles&version=1.0&docLevel=FASCIMILE>.
- Adams, George, Jr. *Lectures on Natural and Experimental Philosophy, Considered in it's Present State of Improvement*. Vol. 1, *Medicine, Science and Technology*. London, 1794. *Eighteenth Century Collections Online*. Gale. University of Oklahoma Libraries. Accessed October 8, 2013.
<http://find.galegroup.com/ecco/infomark.do?&source=gale&prodId=ECCO&userGroupName=norm94900&tabID=T001&docId=CW106774705&type=multipage&contentSet=ECCOArticles&version=1.0&docLevel=FASCIMILE>.
- Baker, Anita. *Polite Society and the Public Theatre*. Podcast audio. Newtonian Audiences. MP3. Accessed December 4, 2013.
http://www.enlighteningscience.sussex.ac.uk/resources_for_teachers/newtonian_audiences.
- Bertucci, Paolo. "John Wesley and the Religious Utility of Electrical Healing." *The British Journal for the History of Science* 89, no. 3 (September 2006): 341-362.
- Brigden, Susan. *New Worlds, Lost Worlds: the Rule of the Tudors*. New York: Penguin Group, 2002.
- Chaplin, Joyce E. "Benjamin Franklin and Science, Continuing Opportunities for Study." *Perspectives on Science* 14, no. 2 (2006): 232-51.
- Cohen, Bernard. "How Practical Was Benjamin Franklin's Science?." In *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 69, no. 4 (October 1945): 284-293.
- Cohen, Bernard. "Benjamin Franklin as Scientist and Citizen." *The American Scholar* 12, No. 4 (Autumn 1943): 474-481. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41204624>.
- Darnton, Robert. *Mesmerism and the End of the Enlightenment in France*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1968.
- Delbourgo, James. *A Most Amazing Scene of Wonders*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2006.
- Dray, Philip. *Stealing God's Thunder*. New York: Random House, 2005.

- Fara, Patricia. "‘A Treasure of Hidden Vertues’: The Attraction of Magnetic Marketing." In *The British Journal for the History of Science*, 28, no. 1 (March 1995): 5-35.
- Findlen, Paula. "A Forgotten Newtonian." In *The Sciences in Enlightened Europe*, ed. William Clark et al. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press 1999): 313-349.
- Franklin, Benjamin. *Experiments and Observations on Electricity, Made at Philadelphia in America, by Mr. Benjamin Franklin, and Communicated in Several Letters to Mr. P. Collinson, of London, F. R. S.* London, 1751. *Eighteenth Century Collections Online*. Gale. University of Oklahoma Libraries. Accessed October 30, 2013. <http://find.galegroup.com/ecco/infomark.do?&source=gale&prodId=ECCO&userGroupName=norm94900&tabID=T001&docId=CW3308328711&type=multipage&contentSet=ECCOArticles&version=1.0&docLevel=FASCIMILE>.
- "Franklin, Benjamin." In *Complete Dictionary of Scientific Biography*. Vol. 5. Detroit: Charles Scribner's Sons, 2008. Accessed November 1, 2013. <http://go.galegroup.com/ps/i.do?id=GALE|CX2830901508&v=2.1&u=norm94900&it=r&p=GVRL&sw=w&asid=5c09ea78df8ce8010252cf025780b503#contentcontainer>.
- Heering, Peter. "An Experimenter's Gotta Do What an Experimenter's Gotta Do—But How?" *Isis* 101, no. 4 (December 2010): 794-805.
- Heller, George N. "‘To Sweeten Their Senses’: Music, Education, and Benjamin Franklin." *Music Educators Journal* 73, no. 5 (1987): 22-26.
- Kant, Immanuel. "What Is Enlightenment?" *Columbia University*. Translated by Mary C. Smith. Accessed October 7, 2013. <http://www.columbia.edu/acis/ets/CCREAD/etscc/kant.html>.
- Millburn, John R. *Adams of Fleet Street: Instrument Makers to King George III*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2000.
- Mitchell, Trent A. "The Politics of Experiment in the Eighteenth Century: The Pursuit of Audience and the Manipulation of Consensus in the Debate over Lightning Rods." In *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 31, no. 3 (Spring 1998): 307-331.
- Stafford, Barbara. *Artful Science: Enlightenment Entertainment and the Eclipse of Visual Education*. Cambridge: The MIT Press, 1992.
- Wood, Allen W. *Kant*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2005.

Runners-Up

The National and International Responses to the Trial of Julius and Ethel Rosenberg

Mallory Hogan

Professor Keppel

HIST 4973

May 7, 2013

"What is there about this case that has aroused the world?... What is it that prompts fifteen members of the Israeli Government to cable to me a protest of your sentence? What is it that has caused France to burn with indignation at the case?"¹ This was the question that Emmanuel Hirsch Bloch, the attorney to Julius and Ethel Rosenberg, posed to the court on December 30, 1952.² In this one of many appeals to save his clients from the electric chair, Bloch implied that Judge Irving Kaufman's failure to revoke the death sentence could result in a national and international backlash against the U.S.³ Judge Kaufman was unwilling to concede to any pressure from the U.S. public, or the public of any other country for that matter, stating that, "When the day comes when we succumb to the pressure we might as well close the doors of justice."⁴ In the end, Judge Kaufman ruled to maintain the Rosenbergs' death sentence.

This appeal took place after the Rosenbergs had spent over two years either in court or in New York's Sing Sing Prison. The case of the Rosenbergs (as well as the events surrounding it) remains to be an intriguing but harrowing look at the state of U.S. justice during the Cold War. Accused of recruiting his brother-in-law David Greenglass to spy for the Soviet Union, Julius Rosenberg was arrested in July of 1950.⁵ Ethel Rosenberg was later charged that August with conspiring to commit espionage and was arrested as well.⁶ In March of 1951, after weeks of giving testimony and maintaining their innocence, the couple was found guilty under Judge Kaufman, who sentenced them

¹ "Decision Reserved in Rosenberg Case," *The New York Times*, December 31, 1952.

² Ibid.

³ Ibid.

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ Robert Meeropol and Michael Meeropol, *We Are Your Sons*, (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1975), xxix.

⁶ Ibid.

to death a month later.⁷ The Rosenbergs were taken to Sing Sing Prison, where they were kept for the next two years as numerous court appeals and outside pleas for clemency failed.⁸ On June 19, 1953, the Rosenbergs' death sentence was carried out, and the United States (as well as the rest of the world) was left to consider the implications and lasting effects of this event.⁹

Initially, the Rosenbergs' plight was something that only seemed to interest the media in the U.S. Once the trial began in March 1951, the press was eager to showcase "what was undoubtedly the best publicized spy hunt of all time."¹⁰ But the press did more than simply report on the ongoing trial; there is some evidence to suggest that the media was, in some ways, an active participant in the trial. Virginia Carmichael claimed in her book *Framing History: The Rosenberg Story and the Cold War* that prosecutor Myles Lane as good as convicted Ethel Rosenberg when he stated during a news conference that her actions may have been a contributing factor to the war in Korea.¹¹ To make such a statement to the press was later considered to be a violation of the Sixth Amendment, but this decision was made two years after the fact.¹² For Ethel, the damage was already done. Lane's words and other instances of prosecutors in the case using the media to purport foregone conclusions may have helped make the jury's guilty verdict even more of an inevitability.¹³ Bloch brought up the role of the press in the trial during one of his appeals against the Rosenbergs' death sentence, as a December article in the *New York Times* reported:

⁷ Ibid, xxx.

⁸ Ibid.

⁹ *We Are Your Sons*, xxxii.

¹⁰ *The Rosenberg File*, 170.

¹¹ Virginia Carmichael, *Framing History: The Rosenberg Story and the Cold War*, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1993) 89.

¹² *Framing History*, 89.

¹³ *Framing History*, 91.

Mr. Bloch said that a 'virulent atmosphere' had pervaded the courtroom during the Rosenberg trial. He charged that much of this atmosphere resulted from inflammatory material furnished to the press by J. Edgar Hoover, director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and Irving H. Saypol, then the United States Attorney.¹⁴

Bloch was likely referring to the media's manipulation of Hoover's press releases regarding the Rosenbergs' arrests,¹⁵ as well as Saypol's selective reports to news journalists.¹⁶ Both men were also involved in feeding the story of the arrest of William Perl, a former member of the communist party who was charged with perjury, to the media in a way that would further their own personal goals while also slanting the case against the Rosenbergs.¹⁷ The defendants thus argued that the press had made them "victims of pretrial and during-trial newspaper publicity in the New York City area."¹⁸ Since the Rosenbergs' jury was not sequestered,¹⁹ the media could easily play a part in influencing their verdict and, ultimately, the outcome of the trial. Even so, Judge Kaufman chose to forego Bloch's request for a new trial.²⁰

Not all press coverage of the trial was slanted against the accused's favor, however. Prior to her arrest, the *Los Angeles Times* featured an article that presented Ethel as a caring wife and mother who was simply concerned with seeing that her husband and brother's innocence was proven in court.²¹ A month later, the *New York Times* reported on Ethel's arrest with in an interesting take on the event. The article described Ethel first and foremost as a "mother of two small children," and pointed out

¹⁴ "Decision Reserved in Rosenberg Case," *The New York Times*, December 31, 1952.

¹⁵ *Framing History*, 88.

¹⁶ *The Press, the Rosenbergs, and the Cold War*, 37.

¹⁷ *Framing History*, 90.

¹⁸ *The Press, the Rosenbergs, and the Cold War*, 82.

¹⁹ *Framing History*, 41.

²⁰ *Ibid*, 90.

²¹ "Family Link in Alleged U.S. Spy Ring Disclosed: Housewife Broods Over Fate of Husband and Brother Facing Trial for Espionage," *The Los Angeles Times*, June 19, 1950.

the woman's short stature and light weight,²² almost as if to imply surprise that such a small and apparently delicate person could be involved in a Soviet spy ring. Whatever Myles Lane's intentions were when he blamed the Rosenbergs for the Korean War, his statement did not turn the press against the couple completely. Reporters seemed to be more interested in constructing a story that would grab an audience, complete with interesting characters and surprising turns, than they were with making their own judgments. *That* kind of reporting would come later in response to international criticism to the case. As the U.S. media presented the story of the trial to the people, it also began to pick up on the growing public response to the case throughout the country, especially in the days following the couple's death sentence. Pleas for clemency gradually became louder and louder in the U.S.

One response to the trial was the establishment of the National Committee to Secure Justice in the Rosenberg Case (NCSJRC), founded a few months after the couple's sentencing in April of 1951.²³ The organization took up donations for a retrial and sought to create a grassroots movement on the Rosenbergs' behalf, something that was apparently somewhat successful, as other committees protesting the Rosenbergs' sentence spread throughout the country.²⁴ In December of 1952, the committee held a vigil in front of the White House and planned to continue the ceremony until the couple received either "executive clemency" or their execution, the latter of which was slated for the week of the January twelfth at the time.²⁵ Demonstrations reached to New York as well, as that same month, an issue of the *Los Angeles Times* featured an article about a

²² "Plot to Have G.I. Give Bomb Data To Soviet Is Laid to His Sister Here," *The New York Times*, August 12, 1950.

²³ *We Are Your Sons*, xxx.

²⁴ *The Press, the Rosenbergs, and the Cold War*, 66.

²⁵ "White House Picketed by Rosenberg Group," *The Washington Post*, December 29, 1952.

protest near Sing Sing Prison, where the Rosenbergs were being kept as they awaited their execution.²⁶ The demonstration, which reportedly consisted of over seven hundred people, marched near the prison and hosted a few speakers on the couple's behalf.²⁷ One protester explained the demonstration's opinion on the Rosenbergs' death sentence: "I want to particularly impress that the security of the American people does not demand the death of the Rosenbergs. Their condemnation to death is an act of terror."²⁸ Public protest apparently had some effect on the case, since the Supreme Court and President Eisenhower did review petitions that were made on behalf of the Rosenbergs; however, the petitions ultimately only bought the couple a few more months. The execution date was moved from January to March, then finally to the week of June 15.²⁹

Requests for clemency continued into the Rosenbergs' final months. In June of 1953, only days before the couple's execution, the Los Angeles Rosenberg Committee held a protest against the death sentence, though attendance at the event reportedly dwindled as time went on.³⁰ Another plea was a letter from the Rosenbergs' ten-year-old son Michael to President Eisenhower.³¹ The letter was reprinted in full in the *Los Angeles Times*, after being made available to the public by the NCSJRC.³² The publishing of Michael Rosenberg's letter in the newspaper is one example of the U.S. media sympathizing with the young family's plight, or at least wanting to show both sides of the developing story, something that could also be said for numerous newspapers' disclosing

²⁶ "Demonstration for Atom Spies Curbed" *Los Angeles Times*, December 22, 1952.

²⁷ *Ibid.*

²⁸ *Ibid.*

²⁹ *We Are Your Sons*, xxxi.

³⁰ "Ruling on Rosenberg Stay Today," *Los Angeles Times*, June 17, 1953.

³¹ "Rosenberg Son, 10, Asks Clemency of Eisenhower," *Los Angeles Times*, June 1, 1953.

³² *Ibid.*

of Ethel Rosenberg's letter to the president.³³ The release of these letters to the public was apparently done with the couple's consent, as they had hoped that their messages would be seen sympathetically by the outside world and could perhaps even save them from their sentence.³⁴ As the Rosenbergs' execution date drew still nearer, the case garnered more and more pleas for mercy. Gradually, the U.S. media began to pick up on the rest of the world's response to the ongoing trial.

In December 1952, the *New York Times* reported that around two hundred letters from numerous countries, as near as England and as far as Australia, were being sent to the U.S., supporting the Rosenbergs in their request for a reconsideration of their sentence.³⁵ The letters' senders included "scientists, clergymen, educators and union officials."³⁶ In January of 1953, six months before the condemned couple was scheduled to be executed, the *Times* ran a story on a rally in East Berlin, in which "several thousand persons" gathered with prominent speakers and members of the clergy to protest the Rosenbergs' death sentence.³⁷ The article also said that the "head of the Christian Democratic Union in East Germany" had requested the pope's help in the matter.³⁸ This request was only one of many appeals sent to the pope on the Rosenbergs' behalf, as the following month, the *Los Angeles Times* printed an article that said Pope Pius XII had informed the White House that he had received numerous pleas for the U.S. government to spare Julius and Ethel Rosenberg.³⁹ The reporter made a point to stress that the pope himself had not requested anything of President Eisenhower, but only that the Vatican

³³ "Letter by Mrs. Rosenberg to the President," *The New York Times*, June 20, 1953.

³⁴ *We Are Your Sons*, xxii.

³⁵ "200 Letter Back Rosenberg Appeal," *The New York Times*, December 30, 1952.

³⁶ *Ibid.*

³⁷ "Rally in East Berlin," *The New York Times*, January 7, 1953.

³⁸ *Ibid.*

³⁹ "Pope Sends New Note on Atom Spies," *Los Angeles Times*, February 15, 1953.

had apparently received so many appeals for the Rosenbergs that it felt compelled to inform the U.S.⁴⁰ The *Chicago Daily Tribune* ran a story on the letters as well, saying that the pope had acted “out of the motives of charity... without being able to enter into the merits of the cases.”⁴¹ As the Rosenbergs’ execution neared, other countries’ efforts to save the couple seemed to become more and more desperate and impractical, as the *Los Angeles Times* reported:

As agitation over the case increased abroad, the Polish Communist government announced it has offered political asylum to the Rosenbergs if this country will free them. The State Department promptly denounced the offer as an ‘impertinence.’⁴²

But by June 19, 1953, no amount of international outrage or protest had managed to secure a pardon for the couple, and the two were executed that night.⁴³

An article from the *New York Times*, published only a week after the execution of the couple, reported on an averted protest of the sentence in the House of Commons in London.⁴⁴ The *Times* quoted Steven Davies, a member of the Labor Party, as saying that he (and his fellow protesters) wanted the U.S. Embassy in England closed and all remaining U.S. troops in the country gone.⁴⁵ The article went on to say that the head of the Labor Party dismissed Davies’ demands and said that such views had “no support on this side of the House.”⁴⁶ The case had apparently ignited a furor among people in England, though it did not gain state support (as the article quoted also mentioned that neither the Conservative nor Labor Party would want to “jeopardize Anglo-American

⁴⁰ Ibid.

⁴¹ “Pope in New Message Calls Ike’s Attention to A-Spies,” *Chicago Daily Tribune*, February 15, 1953.

⁴² “Ruling on Rosenberg Stay Today.”

⁴³ “‘Murder’ Charged in Rosenberg Case,” *The New York Times*, June 24, 1953.

⁴⁴ “Rosenberg Protest Spurned in Commons,” *The New York Times*, June 26, 1953.

⁴⁵ Ibid.

⁴⁶ Ibid.

relations,")⁴⁷ The United Kingdom's newspaper *The Manchester Guardian* reported on the Rosenbergs' funeral, making a note of Bloch's eulogy to the couple in which he referred to President Eisenhower as "a military dictator garbed in civilian attire," and said that his clients were victims of "cold, deliberate murder" sponsored by the state.⁴⁸ In United Kingdom, the Rosenberg case was one of growing public scrutiny, and this inquiry spread to France as well.

On June 17, 1953, only two days before the Rosenbergs were executed, Harold Callender of the *New York Times* published a piece saying that the U.S. Embassy in Paris was nearly overwhelmed with protesters and opposition to the couple's death sentence.⁴⁹ Callender commented on the matter:

It reflects a revulsion against the death sentence for espionage in peace time, disturb [sic] of justice in the United States and a desire to show that United States officials have been led into error by an unduly passionate pursuit of the "cold war."⁵⁰

Those challenging the Rosenbergs' sentence included Roman Catholic Archbishop of Paris, the speaker of the France's National Assembly, and many notable French writers.⁵¹ The presence of such a variety of people, Callender purported, showed that the opposition to the Rosenbergs' sentence consisted of far more people than Communist sympathizers, and that the matter was therefore much greater than drawing a line between true patriots anti-American people.⁵² The reporter did admit, however, that it should be noted that so many protests may have been more interested in just criticizing the U.S. itself, but that this possibility did not dismiss the legitimacy of the people's questions: "This concern

⁴⁷ Ibid, xxx.

⁴⁸ "America Under a Dictator," *The Manchester Guardian*, June 22, 1953.

⁴⁹ Harold Callender, "French Pleas on Rosenbergs Laid to Mercy and Politics," *The New York Times*, June 17, 1953.

⁵⁰ Ibid.

⁵¹ Ibid.

⁵² Ibid.

and doubt have been badly expressed and have appeared in odd company. But they are no less real for that.”⁵³

The U.S. made some efforts to combat international protests, as in January 1953, the U.S. embassy in Paris released statements to forty European countries that explained the U.S.’s side of the Rosenberg case.⁵⁴ French newspapers widely reported on the statement,⁵⁵ and while the information did manage to convince some people of the couple’s guilt, many still maintained that the Rosenbergs should not have received a death sentence.⁵⁶ The growing protests in France apparently made quite an impression on the U.S. ambassador to the other country, as he had reportedly warned President Eisenhower that going through with the Rosenbergs’ execution could "outrage all France and do America irreparable harm abroad," and that it could "play into the Reds' hands by making martyrs" of the couple.⁵⁷ The couple’s case had gripped France with a furor, as the same article reported that the “walls of the capital [were] plastered with pictures of the Rosenbergs and their children.”⁵⁸ The ambassador had also been warned that “the execution of the Rosenbergs will give French Communists the best anti-American weapon imaginable.”⁵⁹ President Truman was told something similar before he left office in 1953, and was advised to give the couple life imprisonment instead,⁶⁰ but he did not heed this advice. Now that the U.S. embassy in Paris was being bombarded about the Rosenberg case more than ever, it was becoming more and more apparent that the couple’s execution could mean an international backlash. What’s more, the ambassador’s

⁵³ Ibid.

⁵⁴ “Court Points Rosenbergs' Way to Stay,” *The Washington Post*, January 6, 1953.

⁵⁵ Ibid.

⁵⁶ *The Rosenberg File*, 374.

⁵⁷ “Spare A-Spies, U.S. Envoy in Paris Asks Ike,” *Chicago Tribune*, June 12, 1953.

⁵⁸ Ibid.

⁵⁹ Ibid.

⁶⁰ John F. Neville, *The Press, the Rosenbergs, and the Cold War*, (Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers), 97.

warning to President Eisenhower about the Rosenbergs eventually being used as tools for communist propaganda would eventually prove to be true.

The French press had been badgering the U.S. embassy for information on the Rosenberg case since 1952.⁶¹ Initially, the case only received attention from communist and leftist newspapers,⁶² but when the court decided to maintain the couple's death sentence in October of that year,⁶³ more of the French press began to pick up on the story, analyzing the trial and questioning the justice of the verdict.⁶⁴ Howard Fast, a well-known American communist, had visited France earlier that year and spoken with the French Communist Party about the Rosenberg case,⁶⁵ and had also written in an article in the French communist newspaper *L'Humanite* about the trial.⁶⁶ Both actions sparked interest in the case abroad, and the French press began to demand clemency for the Rosenbergs, with at least one paper saying that the couple was innocent, and some claiming the death sentence was a sign of the U.S.'s increasing paranoia.⁶⁷ This was an idea that seemed to echo throughout Europe, as "war hysteria" was another allegation made against the court in its ruling of the Rosenbergs' case. The *Los Angeles Times* reported on some activity in the Soviet press, where this charge was being brought up: "Soviet newspapers, directing their attention for the first time to the case of Julius and Ethel Rosenberg, said today the 'progressive public of the United States and the entire world' considers them 'the victims of the war hysteria.'"⁶⁸ In November 1952, the *New York Times* reported that "twenty prominent rabbis and religious leaders in Jerusalem"

⁶¹ *The Press, the Rosenbergs, and the Cold War*, 80.

⁶² *Ibid.*

⁶³ *We Are Your Sons*, xxxi.

⁶⁴ *The Press, the Rosenbergs, and the Cold War*, 80.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, 81.

⁶⁶ *The Rosenberg File*, 350.

⁶⁷ *The Press, The Rosenbergs, and the Cold War*, 81.

⁶⁸ "Ruling on Rosenberg Stay Today," *The Los Angeles Times*, June 17, 1953.

had petitioned for President Truman to spare the Rosenbergs of the death sentence, saying that it was not right for the couple to be put to death for espionage charges during a time of peace.⁶⁹ The Rosenbergs' execution was increasingly seen as a rash and unnecessary punishment, as well as a sign that perhaps the U.S. was in danger of sinking into fascism.⁷⁰

While it could be fairly argued that other countries' protests to the Rosenberg trial was at least partly out of a desire to criticize the U.S.,⁷¹ there is another factor that one should consider when comparing the press coverage of the case in the U.S. and abroad. In December 1952, eleven members of the Czechoslovakian Communist Party were hanged in Prague after being tried as guilty of treason in a series of show trials.⁷² Those executed included Rudolf Slansky, a leader of the Party, and his trial and conviction was a point of contention among communists abroad.⁷³ The Prague trials drew (accurate) accusations of anti-Semitism, as eight of the eleven Party members executed were Jewish and were specifically charged with conspiring Zionist plots against the state.⁷⁴ The allegations of anti-Semitism were in sharp contrast to what western communists wanted to promote in their movement, especially in the aftermath of World War II, but the executions in Prague stood as an ugly contradiction to these ideals for the world to see.⁷⁵ So when news of the court's decision to forgo an appeal on the Rosenberg case hit Europe, the potential diversion from the events in Prague was perhaps too good to pass up.⁷⁶

⁶⁹ "Jerusalem Sends a Rosenberg Plea," *The New York Times*, November 19, 1952.

⁷⁰ *The Rosenberg File*, 350.

⁷¹ *The Rosenberg File*, 350.

⁷² *The Rosenberg File*, 348.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, 349.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*

In the aftermath of the Prague trials, the French communist press swept up the Rosenberg story with enthusiasm. After the Slansky trial had reached its verdict but before the executions were carried out, *L'Humanite* compared the sentence to that of the Rosenbergs: "The condemnation to death of Ethel and Julius Rosenberg is exactly the opposite of the condemnation of Slansky. The former is a crime. The latter is action taken against criminals."⁷⁷ The author of the *L'Humanite* article reaffirmed that at least some communists of western Europe would side with the Soviet Union's brand of justice, and use the Rosenbergs' sentence as a diversion from this obviously problematic stance. This tactic did not go unnoticed by the foreign press, as Alistair Cook of the United Kingdom's *Manchester Guardian* wrote a month after the executions in Prague, "'What about the Rosenbergs?' is the parrot-cry of every Communist who is challenged with the recent evidence of anti-Zionism in Soviet policy."⁷⁸ Reporters in the U.S. caught on to the propaganda game as well, as one *Washington Post* article showed:

Plainly... the antisemitic [sic] propaganda is not intended for export to the West... as is shown in the frantic efforts of the party to counteract the effect of the Prague trials on British and American Jews. This, apparently, is not so much from fear of further defections of Jewish comrades from the party, as because the antisemitic [sic] propaganda collides in a most embarrassing manner with the propaganda campaign now being waged in behalf of Julius and Ethel Rosenberg.⁷⁹

A month later, the *Post* continued to criticize the use of the Rosenberg trial in communist press:

[An] editorial writer told his readers that Communist measures against Jews actually are defensive steps to fight "American Zionists who seek to undermine socialism..." Today's article said the Soviet and East German constitutions specifically forbid "racial hatred" and declared the American conviction and death

⁷⁷ "SAUCE FOR THE GOOSE?: Rosenberg Appeal and Slansky," *The Manchester Guardian*, November 30, 1952.

⁷⁸ Alistair Cook, "The Rosenbergs: Motives of Communist Agitation," *The Manchester Guardian*, January 15, 1953.

⁷⁹ "Communist Antisemitism." *The Washington Post*. January 17, 1953.

sentence against atomic spies Ethel and Julius Rosenberg was “racial hatred.” The Prague execution of eight Jewish Communist leaders last December, on the other hand, was described as the people “protecting themselves from Zionist and Israel mechinations [sic].”⁸⁰

These accusations were certainly not far off, as one newspaper quoted the French Communist Party leader Jacques Duclos as saying that “all those who accuse the Soviet Union of anti-Semitism should watch their words... We Communists defend Ethel and Julius Rosenberg – and they are Jews.”⁸¹ The two cases were being played against each other in strange, round-about effort to present the capitalist U.S. or the communist Soviet Union as less barbaric than the other. The Prague trials, along with Stalin’s other purges of Jews in the national communist parties throughout Europe,⁸² were a timely counter to the Rosenberg trial in an odd sort of international propaganda war. These propaganda battles did not go unnoticed by the various movements to save the Rosenbergs, either, and the leaders of the movements had quite a task of trying to keep the press war from derailing their goal.⁸³ The NCSJR already had to deal with accusations of the movement being a communist ploy, and numerous press confrontations about the Prague trials did nothing to discourage such allegations.⁸⁴

To say that the Rosenberg and Prague trials were instruments in an international argument over which side was more anti-Semitic is not to say that all of these allegations came from a place seeking to manipulate the public. As the discussion of anti-Semitism in the Rosenberg case continued abroad, particularly in France, some drew comparisons between the case and the Dreyfus Affair, referring to the case of Alfred Dreyfus, a French

⁸⁰ “East Germans Again Narrow Blast at Jews,” *The Washington Post*, February 16, 1953.

⁸¹ “12,000 at Paris Rally,” *The New York Times*, February 18, 1953.

⁸² *The Press, the Rosenbergs, and the Cold War*, 102.

⁸³ *The Press, the Rosenbergs, and the Cold War*, 85.

⁸⁴ *The Press, the Rosenbergs, and the Cold War*, 86.

Jewish military officer who was charged with treason in 1864.⁸⁵ Dreyfus was completely innocent of the charges and the “evidence” against him was incredibly weak, but his case had been continually fueled by the anti-Semitism that was rampant in France at the time, and he was eventually given a life sentence to the notorious prison at Devil’s Island.⁸⁶ Though Dreyfus was later fully exonerated and freed from prison in 1906, and even went on to serve the French military in World War I,⁸⁷ the case stood as a testament to the hysteria and danger of anti-Semitism, one that remained fresh in the French public’s memory when the country turned its attention to the Rosenbergs’ plight. The supposed parallels between the two cases was further purported by William Reuben, who ran a series on the Rosenberg trial that was featured in the American communist newspaper *The Guardian*.⁸⁸ Reuben’s articles on the Rosenbergs followed a similar pattern to that of Emile Zola’s famous 1898 *J’accuse* letter to the French president, in which Zola called out all the participants in the trial who were responsible for wrongfully sending Dreyfus to Devil’s Island.⁸⁹ Reuben’s series implied that the Rosenberg case was a government frame-up, as well as an effort to eradicate Americans with “left-wing backgrounds” without having to respect their rights.⁹⁰ Furthermore, the Rosenbergs’ attorney, Bloch, said that French League of the Rights of Man, which was originally founded to defend Dreyfus, was one of the many voices speaking out against his clients’ condemnation.⁹¹ It seemed that—to many people in France—the Rosenbergs’ case hit rather close to their own

⁸⁵ Steven Lubert, “Why the Dreyfus Affair Does and Doesn’t Matter,” review of *Why the Dreyfus Affair Matters*, by Louis Begley, Greenbag Journal. http://www.greenbag.org/v13n3/v13n3_review_lubet.pdf.

⁸⁶ Ibid.

⁸⁷ Ibid.

⁸⁸ *The Press, the Rosenbergs, and the Cold War*, 58.

⁸⁹ Eric Cahm, *The Dreyfus Affair in French Society and Politics* (New York: Longman Publishing, 1996), 64.

⁹⁰ *The Press, the Rosenbergs, and the Cold War*, 60.

⁹¹ “Decision Reserved in Rosenberg Case.”

country's history, and such a gross miscarriage of justice could not be allowed to happen again.⁹²

Back in the U.S., however, charges of anti-Semitism in the Rosenberg case did not go over quite as well. Julius Klein, described as the former “commander of the Jewish War veterans” in a December 1952 piece from the *Chicago Daily Tribune*, slammed claims of anti-Semitism as “red trickery,” that it was all simple deception and emotional manipulation that could be expected of communists, and that the communists’ failure to call out the anti-Jewish motivations behind the Prague trials was proof of this.⁹³ Klein also purported that the Rosenbergs could not truly be considered Jews “because Judaism is as incompatible with communism as any other religion.”⁹⁴ Another member of the veterans group later sent Judge Kaufman a telegram in which he noted his approval of the decision, and also commented on what he saw as the manipulation of the Rosenbergs’ faith: “We despise equally those who would callously use the Rosenbergs to injure the Jews and those who would callously use the Jews to help the Rosenbergs. No American can tolerate either.”⁹⁵

Lucy Dawidowicz, the late Jewish historian, condemned claims of anti-Semitism as well, reiterating Klein’s sentiment that the accusations were means of “moral blackmail” at the hands of Communists, and that Jewish Americans should therefore distance themselves from any movement advocating or fighting for the Rosenbergs’ release, such as the NCSJRC.⁹⁶ Robert and Michael Meeropol, the Rosenbergs’ sons (who were later adopted by Abel and Anne Meeropol, hence the change in name), saw

⁹² *The Press, the Rosenbergs, and the Cold War*, 81.

⁹³ “Klein Condemns ‘Red Trickery’ to Save 2 Spies,” *Chicago Daily Tribune*, December 20, 1952.

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*

⁹⁵ “Clemency Ban Assailed by Atomic Spies,” *Los Angeles Times*, January 4, 1953.

⁹⁶ *The Rosenberg File*, 353.

anti-Semitism as a non-issue as well in their book *We Are Your Sons*, in which they quote one of their father's letters on the matter: "Oliver 'Pontius' Pilat, New York *Post* reporter planted the germ. He mad the accusation and tried to establish his lie, prima facie, as a fact, that we claim we were convicted because we were Jews and because of anti-Semitism."⁹⁷ Such accusations, Julius wrote, were crafted by the media to further villainize himself and his wife.⁹⁸ He believed that others may have been truly convinced of the charges of anti-Semitism, but such convictions were more in response to the threat of possible violence against Jews in wake of the trial.⁹⁹ In other words, Julius Rosenberg seemed to believe that American Jews were concerned about any possible future hate crimes committed against them in "retaliation" to his and his wife's alleged crimes.

Even after the Rosenbergs' sentence was carried out, discussion of anti-Semitism and war hysteria's possible roles in the case continued on the international level. Over a month after the Rosenbergs' execution, the *New York Times* ran another story on how the U.S. representatives to the World Jewish Congress had disagreed with another organization member's assertion that the case had been an act of anti-Semitism.¹⁰⁰ More specifically, there had been accusations that the case was sparking anti-Semitism in the U.S., to which representatives Louis Segal and Dr. Maurice L. Perlzweig responded that such claims were unfounded, and that the Rosenberg case was not relevant to Jewish interests at all.¹⁰¹ This view coincided with those of most main-stream Jewish organizations (such as the American Jewish Committee) in the U.S., as well as those of

⁹⁷ *We Are Your Sons*, 164.

⁹⁸ *Ibid.*

⁹⁹ *Ibid.*

¹⁰⁰ "Rosenberg Bid Fails at Jewish Congress," *The New York Times*, August 7, 1953.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*

the American Civil Liberties Union.¹⁰² Ronald Radosh and Joyce Milton's *The Rosenberg File* goes as far to imply that these organizations' denunciations of charges of anti-Semitism, while fairly sound, were likely due in part to wanting to stay in the U.S. government's good books, or rather, "disassociate themselves from any taint of Red."¹⁰³ Klein's earlier assertion that Judaism was as incompatible with communism as any other faith was perhaps partly intended to accomplish the same thing.

Nearly a week after the executions, the *New York Times* reported that the Communist Party had released a statement that charged the U.S. with murder, that the Rosenbergs' sentence was "an act of Fascist violence," and that it was a sign of the "Hitlerization of America."¹⁰⁴ The Polish newspaper *Trybuna Ludu* echoed this sentiment, referring to the U.S. Federal Bureau of Investigations as "the American gestapo."¹⁰⁵ Another demonstration was held at the U.S. embassy in Israel, while elsewhere in the country, protesters decried "American fascists."¹⁰⁶ Not all foreign press was lambasting the U.S. however, as at least one Italian newspaper purported that "if American spies against Russia were involved the Communists would have put an end to them without so much ceremony," referring to the Rosenbergs' two years worth of appeals.¹⁰⁷ It seemed as though the Rosenberg case would remain a point of contention between the U.S. and the rest of the world for years to come.

¹⁰² *The Rosenberg File*, 352.

¹⁰³ Ibid.

¹⁰⁴ "'Murder' Charged in Rosenberg Case."

¹⁰⁵ "A-Spies Killed by 'FBI Thugs,' Says Red Press," *Chicago Daily Tribune*, June 21, 1953.

¹⁰⁶ "Crowds Gather in Israel," *The New York Times*, June 21, 1953.

¹⁰⁷ Ibid.

Discussion of the press war between the U.S. and communists abroad continued as well into the mid 1950s, coinciding with the time of junior Senator Joseph McCarthy and his notorious communist witch hunts:

The committee [on Un-American Activities] notes that “in virtually every area the Rosenberg campaign was initiated and conducted by members of the Communist Part.” ...Our U.S. Information centers... had almost nothing with which to counter the mass of Communist propaganda... The result was that we suffered considerable damage to our prestige abroad, while at home the Communists had a field day in their customary task of sowing seeds of dissension...”¹⁰⁸

The Committee on Un-American Activities criticized the U.S.’s apparent lack of sufficient response to the onslaught of anti-American propaganda, and seemed to consider the affair a communist victory even though the Rosenbergs were executed in the end. The Rosenbergs were being projected as martyrs, just as the U.S. ambassador had warned President Eisenhower and others had warned Truman. Along with other countries’ concern that the U.S. was becoming warped by paranoia and the newly dubbed “McCarthyism,” some people may have seen the execution as a sign of future hostilities between the United States and the Soviet Union, as an article in the *Manchester Guardian* said that “the decision to carry out the death sentence seemed to imply a conviction on the part of the American Government that the cold war must irremediably become a hot one.”¹⁰⁹ Abroad, the case and subsequent execution continued to draw criticism in the following years, as in 1954, the *New York Times* reported on a conference was held in Vienna, Austria, during which lawyers from numerous European countries had apparently discussed plans to create an “international tribunal for the holding of a Rosenberg counter-trial.”¹¹⁰ Those who sponsored the conference included Emmanuel

¹⁰⁸ “Red Propaganda for Atom Spies.” *The Los Angeles Times*. August 30, 1956.

¹⁰⁹ “French United by Rosenberg Case,” *The Manchester Guardian*, June 22, 1953.

¹¹⁰ Will Lissner, “Reds Aim to ‘Try’ Rosenbergs Again,” *The New York Times*. January 7, 1954.

Bloch.¹¹¹ One American lawyer speculated that the conference had been held as “counter-propaganda” to the recent international news of legal rights violations in communist countries.¹¹² This article was printed in 1954, nearly half a year after the Rosenbergs’ execution, showing that the international discussion of the case would continue for some time. Going by the American lawyer’s assessment, the Rosenbergs would also continue to be used as tools in an ongoing international propaganda game. Both of the Rosenbergs likely foresaw this, as Julius wrote in his last letter from Sing Sing, “Ethel wants it known that we are the first victims of American fascism.”¹¹³

The questions of the couple’s innocence and whether the trial had been properly handled came back into the public’s consciousness rather recently, as in 2008, their friend and accused co-conspirator Morton Sobell admitted to the charges against him and said that Julius was also involved.¹¹⁴ Ethel, according to Sobell, was only distantly involved, and was truly only implicated along with Julius because she was his wife.¹¹⁵ The 1995 release of the Venona documents, the result of the U.S. Army Signal Security Agency’s fifty year project to decrypt thousands of telegrams transmitted to and from Soviets in the U.S., incriminated Julius as well.¹¹⁶ Ethel’s role in the entire affair remains less certain. Sobell’s statement about the true reasons for Ethel’s arrest are at least partly accurate, as the prosecutors had hoped that threatening her with a death sentence would eventually pressure Julius to confess.¹¹⁷ At the very least, Ethel likely knew of her husband’s work

¹¹¹ Ibid.

¹¹² Ibid.

¹¹³ *The Press, the Rosenbergs, and the Cold War*, 139.

¹¹⁴ Sam Roberts, “Figure in Rosenberg Case Admits to Soviet Spying,” *New York Times*, September 11, 2008, <http://www.nytimes.com/2008/09/12/nyregion/12spy.html>.

¹¹⁵ Ibid.

¹¹⁶ *The Rosenberg File*, xv.

¹¹⁷ *The Rosenberg File*, 98.

for the Soviet Union.¹¹⁸ The National Committee to Secure Justice in the Rosenberg Case remains in operation to this day, though it has since changed its name to reflect its new goal in reopening the case.¹¹⁹ The renamed Committee to Reopen the Rosenberg Case acknowledges the facts revealed by Sobell and the Venona records, but maintains that the Rosenbergs were still wrongly executed because they were charged with passing information on the atomic bomb to an enemy nation, even though the Soviet Union and the United States were allies at the time of the alleged crime.¹²⁰ The Committee hopes to have the U.S. Department of Justice review the case and acknowledge its flaws, and possibly exonerate the Rosenbergs of the “wrongful verdicts” in effort to keep hysteria-sponsored executions from happening in the future.¹²¹

As for the rest of the world’s current view of the Rosenberg case, perhaps little has changed. Steven Lubet, a law professor at Northwestern University, wrote a review for a book that dealt with the Dreyfus Affair, in which he briefly talked about how he once had a French foreign exchange student in one of his classes who discussed the Rosenberg case with him.¹²² According to his student, the Rosenberg case was a part of every secondary school’s curriculum in her home country, and that it was taught as an American counterpart to the Dreyfus Affair.¹²³ This discussion took place sometime in the early 2000s, and it is possible that French education has changed since, but there is still something to be said for the fact that the Rosenberg case has continued to be interpreted as an example of the U.S.’s past dealings with anti-Semitism and war hysteria.

¹¹⁸ *The Rosenberg File*, 450.

¹¹⁹ "An Excerpt from 'Exoneration' by Emily Arnow Alman and David Alman: NCRRC," accessed April 15, 2013, <http://ncrrc.org/an-excerpt-from-exoneration-by-emily-arnow-alman-and-david-alman-2>.

¹²⁰ "Frequently Asked Questions: NCRRC," accessed April 15, 2013, <http://ncrrc.org/rosenbergs/faq>.

¹²¹ *Ibid.*

¹²² "Why the Dreyfus Affair Does and Doesn't Matter," 340.

¹²³ *Ibid.*

Assuming Lubet's student's word is anything to go by, France was still purporting the same (or at least, a very similar) version of the Rosenberg case that it had used nearly half a century before, even after the release of the Venona documents confirmed Julius' involvement in Soviet spy activity. Even so, perhaps this view of the Rosenberg case is justified. June 19 of 2013 marked the sixtieth anniversary of the couple's execution, and yet there has been no movement by the U.S. Department of Justice to acknowledge the possible mishandling of the trial, despite the efforts of the NCRRC. Even if the case was not a simple product of anti-Semitism or Cold War hysteria as many have speculated, there is still no excuse for the fact that, as of now, there is no proof of Ethel Rosenberg's guilt, or at least, no proof that she was guilty of the charges made against her. That alone ought to be enough for a reexamination of the case and perhaps Ethel's exoneration, but such a reaction has yet to be seen. Dreyfus was eventually pardoned by the president of the Republic, and apparently his case is still openly taught as a mishandling of justice at the hands of his own country.¹²⁴ If the U.S. has done nothing similar for the memory of Ethel Rosenberg, then it is little wonder that the case is viewed with such scrutiny by the outside world to this day.

¹²⁴ Ibid, 330.

Works Cited

“12,000 at Paris Rally.” *The New York Times*. February 18, 1953.

<http://search.proquest.com.ezproxy.lib.ou.edu/pagepdf/112609980/Record/13D760EDD294457C854/31?accountid=12964>.

"A-Spies Killed by 'FBI Thugs,' Says Red Press." *Chicago Daily Tribune*. June 21, 1953.

<http://search.proquest.com.ezproxy.lib.ou.edu/docview/178508861/13D7A52E120999D96C/32?accountid=12964>.

"America Under a Dictator." *The Manchester Guardian*. June 22, 1953.

<http://search.proquest.com.ezproxy.lib.ou.edu/docview/479490071/13D75E7592B24CD1916/47?accountid=12964>.

“An Excerpt from 'Exoneration' by Emily Arnow Alman and David Alman." Accessed April 15, 2013. <http://ncrc.org/an-excerpt-from-exoneration-by-emily-arnow-alman-and-david-alman-2>.

Cahm, Eric. *The Dreyfus Affair in French Society and Politics*. New York: Longman Publishing, 1996.

Callender, Harold. “French Pleas on Rosenbergs Laid to Mercy and Politics.” *The New York Times*, June 17, 1953.

<http://search.proquest.com.ezproxy.lib.ou.edu/docview/112816866/13C839686B27C0F8423/1?accountid=12964>.

Carmichael, Virginia. *Framing History: The Rosenberg Story and the Cold War*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1993.

“Clemency Ban Assailed by Atomic Spies.” *Los Angeles Times*. January 4, 1953.

<http://search.proquest.com.ezproxy.lib.ou.edu/docview/166490550/13D6F905BBB6CE86DCF/2?accountid=12964>

“Communist Antisemitism.” *The Washington Post*. January 17, 1953.

<http://search.proquest.com.ezproxy.lib.ou.edu/docview/152540146/13D6113139132245FDF/5?accountid=12964>.

“Court Points Rosenbergs' Way to Stay.” *The Washington Post*. January 6, 1953.

<http://search.proquest.com.ezproxy.lib.ou.edu/pagepdf/152632431/Record/13D6FB87FE33B13B0CB/2?accountid=12964>.

“Crowds Gather in Israel.” *The New York Times*. June 21, 1953.

<http://search.proquest.com.ezproxy.lib.ou.edu/docview/112783418/13D7A52E120999D96C/33?accountid=12964>.

“Demonstration for Atom Spies Curbed.” *Los Angeles Times*. December 22, 1952.

<http://search.proquest.com/pagepdf/166400737/Record/13D6470B3F750DC7AD7/1?accountid=12964>.

“Decision Reserved in Rosenberg Case.” *The New York Times*. December 31, 1952.

<http://search.proquest.com/pagepdf/112446087/Record/13D6488BBFE6E54C7AB/2?accountid=12964>.

“East Germans Again Narrow Blast at Jews,” *The Washington Post*, February 16, 1953.

<http://search.proquest.com.ezproxy.lib.ou.edu/docview/152625875/13D6F905BBB6CE86DCF/5?accountid=12964>.

“Family Link in Alleged U.S. Spy Ring Disclosed: Housewife Broods Over Fate of Husband and Brother Facing Trial for Espionage.” *Los Angeles Times*. June 19, 1950.

<http://search.proquest.com.ezproxy.lib.ou.edu/docview/166120424/13D60F9F82D7BF96C01/7?accountid=12964>.

"Frequently Asked Questions: NCRRC." Accessed April 15, 2013.

<http://ncrrc.org/rosenbergs/faq>.

“French United by Rosenberg Case,” *The Manchester Guardian*, June 22, 1953.

<http://search.proquest.com.ezproxy.lib.ou.edu/docview/479504554/13D7A90DD9310B0457D/145?accountid=12964>.

“Jerusalem Sends a Rosenberg Plea.” *The New York Times*. November 19, 1952.

<http://search.proquest.com.ezproxy.lib.ou.edu/docview/112440704/13D760EDD294457C854/10?accountid=12964>

“Klein Condemns ‘Red Trickery’ to Save 2 Spies.” *Chicago Daily Tribune*. December 20, 1952.

<http://search.proquest.com.ezproxy.lib.ou.edu/docview/178446923/13D5AF5B59055E0051F/4?accountid=12964>.

"Letter by Mrs. Rosenberg to the President," *The New York Times*, June 20, 1953.

<http://search.proquest.com.ezproxy.lib.ou.edu/docview/112794161/13D7F1B081671B7187B/14?accountid=12964>.

Lissner, Will. "Reds Aim to 'Try' Rosenbergs Again." *The New York Times*. January 7, 1954.

<http://search.proquest.com.ezproxy.lib.ou.edu/pagepdf/113158180/Record/13D7A90DD9310B0457D/161?accountid=12964>.

Lubet, Steven. "Why the Dreyfus Affair Does and Doesn't Matter." Review of *Why the Dreyfus Affair Matters* by Louis Begley.

http://www.greenbag.org/v13n3/v13n3_review_lubet.pdf.

“‘Murder’ Charged in Rosenberg Case,” *The New York Times*, June 24, 1953.

<http://search.proquest.com/pagepdf/112817861/Record/13D7077CDEC57DD22D5/2?accountid=12964>.

Nevill, John F. *The Press, the Rosenbergs, and the Cold War*. Westport, CT: Praeger, 1995.

“Plot to Have G.I. Give Bomb Data To Soviet Is Laid to His Sister Here.” *The New York Times*. August 11, 1950.

<http://search.proquest.com.ezproxy.lib.ou.edu/docview/111583632/13D60D2101A71B7187B/1?accountid=12964>.

“Pope Sends New Note on Atom Spies.” *Los Angeles Times*. February 15, 1953.

[http://search.proquest.com.ezproxy.lib.ou.edu/docview/166425343/13C8397A9B
FB0B6BA6/1?accountid=12964](http://search.proquest.com.ezproxy.lib.ou.edu/docview/166425343/13C8397A9BFB0B6BA6/1?accountid=12964).

“Pope in New Message Calls Ike’s Attention to A-Spies.” *Chicago Daily Tribune*.

February 15, 1953.

[http://search.proquest.com.ezproxy.lib.ou.edu/docview/178537514/13C839912C8
24B8F34F/1?accountid=12964](http://search.proquest.com.ezproxy.lib.ou.edu/docview/178537514/13C839912C824B8F34F/1?accountid=12964).

Radosh, Ronald and Joyce Milton. *The Rosenberg File*. London: Yale University Press, 1983.

“Rally in East Berlin,” *The New York Times*. January 7, 1953.

[http://search.proquest.com/pagepdf/112649436/Record/13D657BEF3229A3C718
/2?accountid=12964](http://search.proquest.com/pagepdf/112649436/Record/13D657BEF3229A3C718/2?accountid=12964).

“Red Propaganda for Atom Spies.” *The Los Angeles Times*. August 30, 1956.

[http://search.proquest.com.ezproxy.lib.ou.edu/docview/166995173/13D6BE19F2
362B68366/7?accountid=12964](http://search.proquest.com.ezproxy.lib.ou.edu/docview/166995173/13D6BE19F2362B68366/7?accountid=12964).

Roberts, Sam. “Figure in Rosenberg Case Admits to Soviet Spying.” *New York Times*.

September 11, 2008. <http://www.nytimes.com/2008/09/12/nyregion/12spy.html>.

“Rosenberg Bid Fails at Jewish Congress.” *New York Times*, August 7, 1953,

[http://search.proquest.com/docview/112632113/13C822BAB5E8FD517/1?accoun
tid=12964](http://search.proquest.com/docview/112632113/13C822BAB5E8FD517/1?accountid=12964).

“Rosenberg Protest Spurned in Commons.” *New York Times*, June 25, 1953.

[http://search.proquest.com/docview/152554460/13C8204FF425CF701C1/3?acco
untid=12964](http://search.proquest.com/docview/152554460/13C8204FF425CF701C1/3?accountid=12964).

“Rosenberg Son, 10, Asks Clemency of Eisenhower.” *Los Angeles Times*. June 1, 1953.

[http://search.proquest.com.ezproxy.lib.ou.edu/docview/166510664/13C8399EB3
A669114E8/1?accountid=12964](http://search.proquest.com.ezproxy.lib.ou.edu/docview/166510664/13C8399EB3A669114E8/1?accountid=12964).

“SAUCE FOR THE GOOSE?: Rosenberg Appeal and Slansky.” *The Manchester*

Guardian. November 30, 1952.

<http://search.proquest.com.ezproxy.lib.ou.edu/docview/479441392/13D5AF5B59055E0051F/2?accountid=12964>.

“White House Picketed by Rosenberg Group,” *The Washington Post*, December 29, 1952.

<http://search.proquest.com.ezproxy.lib.ou.edu/docview/152501774/13D6ADCACEA1285BD54/54?accountid=12964>

Dominic Granello

Honors Thesis

Outrage at Oklahoma:

Campus Protests in the Weeks after the Kent State Shootings

In his book, *The Debate over Vietnam*, David Levy suggests that college campuses, as a whole, were not the breeding grounds of antiwar protests as they are often depicted in popular culture. He states that, “In fact, if one was considering only a person’s age, older Americans were far more likely to oppose the war than were younger ones.” He cites Gallup polls from 1965, 1968, and 1971. In all three polls, the “Under 30” age group expressed a greater support of the Vietnam War than the middle-aged and older demographics. By his estimation, “Probably fewer than half of all campuses experienced organized antiwar activity during the 1960s.”¹

However, measuring the percentage of campuses that hosted protests has its pitfalls. Levy explains that a large number of colleges had no culture of protest on campus at all, especially if they were small, conservative, vocational, or were two-year institutions. These schools either lacked the infrastructure to organize protests, attracted the sorts of students supported the war, or students did not see them as an adequate stage for antiwar protests. Rather, “elite” institutions hosted the largest number and the most visible of campus protests. Levy defines “elite” as the 150-200 most prestigious universities in the country that had a reputation and attracted students from beyond their immediate communities (the University of Oklahoma met those criteria). And even within that subset of universities at which protests were the most common, it is important to remember that “opponents of the war on America’s leading campuses were able to project an image of discontent with the war than was probably actually the case.” Even into the mid-1960s,

¹ Levy, David. *The Debate over Vietnam*. Second edition. Johns Hopkins University Press. Baltimore, 1995. p.103

support for the war among younger Americans was widespread enough that students often staged counter-demonstrations when antiwar protesters tried to draw attention to themselves. When a group of about seventy-five protesters heckled cadets at an ROTC ceremony at Cornell in 1965, they faced shouts and even thrown eggs from about four thousand students who did not approve of them.² Conservative student organizations such as the Young Republicans and the Young Americans for Freedom provided an organizational structure for students who were in favor of the war. But as the war went on and public support declined for it across all demographics, the antiwar groups became “more vocal, more visible, more energetic, more deeply aroused, [and] more profoundly engaged.”³

Until 1970, the anti-war movement had not impacted the University of Oklahoma campus. There were no organized student strikes, no occupation of administration buildings, and no demonstrations that broke out into violence or ended in arrests. The University had about 12,000 students at the time most of whom were white. Black and Native American students made up a small minority. OU tended to attract a more urban student body from a larger radius compared to Oklahoma’s other flagship university, Oklahoma State University. Some students published an underground paper that published articles against the draft and the war, but overall the University of Oklahoma had been a tranquil place compared to hot-beds of student protest found on the East and West Coasts. Many OU students focused their energy on issues other than the Vietnam War. The Afro-American Student Union lobbied for the creation of an African-American Studies curriculum, socially liberal students wanted easy access to birth control

² DeBenedetti, Charles. *An American Ordeal: The Antiwar Movement of the Vietnam Era*. Syracuse University Press. Syracuse. 1990. p. 119

³ Levy, David. *The Debate over Vietnam*. Second edition. Johns Hopkins University Press. Baltimore, 1995. p.106

literature on campus, and students of all political streaks were upset when the university raised the mandatory on-campus residency age from twenty-one to twenty-four in order to pay off the newly constructed dormitory towers.

On May 4th, 1970, thousands of students gathered at Kent State University to protest U.S. military incursion into Cambodia. Members of the Ohio National Guard attempted to disperse the students, and the students responded by throwing back the guardsmen's tear gas canisters and lobbing bricks. The guardsmen opened fire on the crowd in a moment of confusion. The guardsmen killed four students and wounded another nine. Two of the slain students were not even participating in the protest, but had just walking from one class to the next. Furious reactions erupted on college campuses across America. According to Kirkpatrick Sale, "from May 5 to May 8, there were major campus demonstrations at a rate of more than 100 a day, students at a total of at least 350 institutions went on strike and 536 schools were shut down completely for some period of time." Furthermore, more than half of all universities in the nation experienced demonstrations in the days following the Kent State shooting.⁴ Charles DeBenedetti's data corroborates those statistics and adds that, "Over 4,000 students were arrested from San Francisco State to Swarthmore, while 7 percent of the country's schools reported violent protests including property damage or personal injury."⁵ Students at Brandeis University took the initiative to create The National Student Strike Information Center in an attempt to co-ordinate student strikes across the country.⁶ At the University of Texas Austin,

⁴ Sale, Kirkpatrick. *SDS*. Vintage Books. 1974.

⁵ DeBenedetti, Charles. *An American Ordeal: The Antiwar Movement of the Vietnam Era*. Syracuse University Press. Syracuse. 1990. p. 242-243

⁶ Zaroulis, Nancy & Sullivan, Gerald. *Who Spoke Up?: American Protest Against the War in Vietnam 1963-1975*. Doubleday & Company, Inc. Garden City, New York. 1984. p. 320

hundreds of students marched on the state capitol on May 5th, and a demonstration of over 10,000 students and other citizens of Austin took place on the 8th.⁷

There was a good deal of concern amongst university administrators about “outside agitators” instigating student protests on campus, and this anxiety only increased after the Kent State shooting. On May 5th, Hollomon met with an impromptu committee of faculty members to figure out “What to do about these kookies that were infiltrating the campus from Berkeley and Michigan and Wisconsin.”⁸ Bill Jones confirmed that “we had an element [of agitators] at that time...that was moving literally from campus to campus promoting these demonstrations,” and that “we were dealing with professional agitators for lack of a better term.”⁹ However, these fears may have been unfounded, or even a deliberate effort to scapegoat the unrest on campus to nebulous outsiders. Some antiwar activists made their home in Norman. Though the members of the struggling SDS chapter on campus had stopped meeting regularly in 1969, due to low recruitment numbers and police surveillance of the SDS office, activists frequently congregated at the Renaissance Fair, a coffee shop on Campus Corner. Activists printed up *The Jones Family Grandchildren*, an anti-draft and antiwar newspaper in the back room and distributed copies on campus.¹⁰ There is no evidence that “outside agitators” played any significant role in the protests that occurred in the weeks following Kent State. Perhaps they were very covert in their efforts, but it appears that bona fide OU student activists planned the demonstrations that took place on Brooks Street, the North Oval, and in the football stadium.

⁷ *Twentieth Century Texas: A Social and Cultural History*. Ed. Storey, John W. and Kelley, Mary L. University of North Texas Press. 2008. p. 186

⁸ Hollomon, Herbert. Personal interview with Herbert Hengst. April 8, 1980.

⁹ Jones, Bill. Personal interview with Herbert Hengst. February 2, 1984.

¹⁰ Wright, Michael. *The Sociology of Human Relations*. M.A. Thesis. University of Oklahoma. p. 16

The University of Oklahoma was not immune to the tension that gripped colleges across the country. The next day students gathered to protest outside of the ROTC building on campus, known as the Armory, just north of the football stadium. As the most tangible symbol of the military on campus, the ROTC program was the logical target for protestors to express their anger. However, this protest did not carry a tone of sadness or rage that one might expect the day after national guardsmen shot students on another college campus. In fact, the *Oklahoma Daily* described the protest as having a “holiday atmosphere”.¹¹ Students tossed Frisbees to each other, blew bubbles, and danced about as the ROTC cadets practiced the drills that they were going to perform at an awards ceremony the next week.

Some people held the opinion that this first protest was not particularly serious. OU campus police chief Bill Jones said that, “It wouldn’t have mattered what the hell the reason was, they would have been doing their little fairy dances and carrying on to get themselves on TV.”¹² A film of the protest shows one of the demonstrators wearing an Uncle-Sam top hat.¹³ But as the protest continued the demonstrators gradually got more into the faces of the cadets, the nature of the event became darker and angrier. The protesting students walked amongst the cadets, taunted and jeered at them, and encouraged them to break ranks and participate with them in the demonstration. But even then, the protesters did not manifest their anger into physical violence. According to Michael Wright, one of the protesting students, “I don’t recollect it [the protest] as

¹¹ Davis, Fred. “Disorder Hits Campus”. *The Oklahoma Daily*. May 6, 1970, p. 1

¹² Jones, Bill. Personal interview with William McKeen. March 26, 1986.

¹³ Hockman, Ned. *May 5th Through 12th: The University of Oklahoma*. Norman: The University of Oklahoma Office of Motion Picture Production, 1970. Archived at Oklahoma Historical Society.

being vicious. The protestors did not throw things at the ROTC cadets. I don't recall seeing anyone assaulted.... I do recollect that the general tenor was 'friendly taunts.'"¹⁴

Bill Jones had a different recollection of the interactions between the protesters and the cadets. Bill Jones praised the ROTC, stating that, "These cadet officers were being everything but spit on and their commanders kept them in tow and kept them in line and did not over-react."¹⁵ Whatever the level of venom the protesters packed into their shouts, the atmosphere definitely took a sour turn when a student, Keith Green, started waving a Viet Cong flag. Campus police grabbed the flagpole away from him, and forced him to the ground when he wrestled with the officers over the flag. The officers arrested Green and charged him with flying the flag of an enemy nation.¹⁶ In his subsequent trial, his lawyer, Stephen Jones, successfully argued that the statue was unconstitutional and the judge dismissed the case. Jones would later gain national notoriety for representing Oklahoma City bomber Timothy McVeigh.¹⁷ Because Green was visually impaired, he brought a fellow protester to accompany him to the police car. Once the protestors saw Green being taken away to be arrested, they turned on the campus police. According to Gordon Christenson, assistant to university president Herbert Hollomon, "That provoked a mob...then it was against students, because they got this poor martyred symbol there and the cops tackled him. So students who would not have participated immediately congregated around."¹⁸

¹⁴ Wright, Michael. Personal interview with William McKeen. April 26, 1986.

¹⁵ Jones, Bill. Personal interview with William McKeen. March 26, 1986.

¹⁶ Davis, Fred. "Disorder Hits Campus". *The Oklahoma Daily*. May 6, 1970, p. 1

¹⁷ Voices of Oklahoma website. http://www.voicesofoklahoma.com/stephen_jones.html. Accessed 12/13/13.

¹⁸ Christenson, Gordon. Personal interview with William McKeen

Hundreds of students surrounded the police car on Brooks Street for over an hour, despite police exhortations to disperse. They also “let all the air out of the tires, jumped up and down on it, beat the hell out of it, and were trying to light rags in the gas tank.”¹⁹ Eventually Bill Jones requested help from the Oklahoma Highway Patrol. The troopers advanced on the protesters in formation with billy clubs at the ready. They were able to transfer the police officers and their detainees into a “paddy wagon”. A few blocks away they transferred the group into a different police cruiser to take them to the police station.²⁰ The Highway Patrol arrested two other students who had scuffled with them as they tried to clear the street.²¹ After the crowd had thinned officers drove the battered police car away on its flat tires, and order re-emerged just as quickly as it had disappeared. According to State Attorney General G.T. Blankenship, who had been sent to campus by Governor Bartlett to observe the demonstration, “All of a sudden everything stopped, as if turning off a switch.”²²

Despite all of the chaos and anger, there were remarkably few injuries. Only one student went to the hospital to have cuts on his chin treated.²³ The fortuitous absence of violence is exemplified in an anecdote from that day. During the skirmish, a pistol somehow fell from the holster of one of the police officers. “That conjured up all kinds of wild thoughts about who was

¹⁹ Jones, Bill. Personal interview with William McKeen. March 26, 1986.

²⁰ Fulkerton, Ron. “It was a Party – At First”. *The Daily Oklahoman*. May 6, 1970, p. 16.

²¹ Pitts, Teresa. “Student Unrest Breeds Rally”. *The Oklahoma Daily*. May 7, 1970, p.1

²² Blankenship, G.T. Personal interview with William McKeen April 27, 1986.

²³ Tempest, Rone. “OU Students, Police Clash Over Protest”. *The Daily Oklahoman*. May 6, 1970, p.1

going to get shot with it,” said Jones. But after the dust had settled, a man simply walked up and told an officer that he had found the gun on the ground, and handed it back over.²⁴

Coincidentally, Bill Moffitt was sworn in as the student body president at a student congress meeting that evening. He was the first African-American student ever elected to the position. Immediately afterwards, he spoke at a rally of two thousand students on the South Oval. He implored the students to keep their cool, and warned them that, “We can’t change the world with dead students.” He left the crowd with the suggestion that they re-assemble on the North Oval the next morning.²⁵ He then went to his new office and met with a number of students who wanted to help him keep the protests on campus peaceful. Moffitt designated a special group of “peace marshals” that were to wear a white armband with a black peace symbol during protests. This group expanded over the course of the week and included faculty members as well. In just a few days the peace marshals grew to dozens of students and professors from across the political spectrum.²⁶ The peace marshals kept tempers cool and proved to be invaluable in their role as a neutral “buffer zone” between protesters and ROTC cadets at the awards ceremony later that week.

Demonstrations continued on campus the following days. On May 6th, about three thousand students congregated on the North Oval to listen to nine different speakers over two hours. No violence or damage to the university occurred, but rather students listened to various professors, including Dr. Shanker Dwivedi, who had participated in nonviolent protests against British colonialism in his homeland of India and assured the students that “Non-violence is not

²⁴ Jones, Bill. Personal interview with William McKeen. March 26, 1986.

²⁵ Martin, Kay and Sandgarten, Alan. “Moffitt Says ‘Keep Cool’”. *The Oklahoma Daily*. May 6, 1970, p.2

²⁶ Moffitt, Bill. Telephone interview with William McKeen. April 27, 1986.

the weapon of cowards, but of brave peoples.” Other speakers denounced the war in Southeast Asia or the actions of the National Guard at Kent State. Some of the speakers urged the students to vote for a strike. Hollomon was another scheduled speaker.

John F. Kennedy appointed Hollomon as an Assistant Secretary for the Department of Commerce during his administration and later Lyndon B. Johnson promoted him to Undersecretary of Commerce as a part of his Great Society programs. But Hollomon left Washington in 1967 due to his disagreements with Johnson’s escalation of the Vietnam War.²⁷ So when Hollomon appointed to his position at OU, he found himself a liberal in a very conservative state. He was well-liked by many students because of his easy-going and approachable character, but his informal nature often irked parents and administrators, especially when they received reports that he occasionally drank beer with students. Former university president George Lynn Cross heard rumors that Hollomon had even smoked cannabis with groups of students, but there is no evidence to corroborate those claims.²⁸ Hollomon tried to approach his work from the position of a technocrat as much as possible. During his time as the president-designate, he established over twenty committees to examine how he could improve the structure of the university administration and wrote a report based on those findings. Despite pressure from some students to make an official antiwar statement on the behalf of the university, Hollomon told the crowd on the North Oval that, “I don’t believe that the university should have a policy on the war or on problems of the cities as formal university policies.” The students initially greeted him with jeers and frequently interrupted him, but as he explained his dedication to freedom of speech on campus, reactions to him warmed slightly amongst the

²⁷ *Biography of J. Herbert Hollomon*. Office of Media Information. University of Oklahoma.

²⁸ Cross, George Lynn. Personal interview with William McKeen. February 27, 1986.

crowd. “The most important thing about our university,” he said, “is that this kind of thing [protests] can happen. And we’re not going to stop you.”²⁹

Hollomon’s calming words and even keel at the North Oval demonstration paid valuable dividends later on in the week. Up until that point, students had no indication of how he would react to protests on campus. Had he not spoken to the students, they might have signaled that he was opposed to demonstrators or that he did not care about what they had to say. But by telling the students that he would defend their freedom of expression and make peace on campus his priority, he was able to humanize himself to the student body. This establishment of a relationship and dialog between the students and the administration laid the groundwork for cooperation between the two that was able to keep tensions on campus from boiling over.

There were, of course, some students who were not won over by Hollomon’s rhetoric. Jody Bateman, a member of the national board for the SDS, accused Hollomon of using a façade of amiability to attempt to co-opt and defang the student protests. He felt that the university administration was intentionally working to undermine the authenticity of the antiwar movement by “loving it to death” so that it might become “part of his [Hollomon’s] show” of empty protests to be held at the university’s convenience.³⁰ But it seems that most students on campus did not hold this negative view of Hollomon, because later that night over one hundred students took up Hollomon on his offer to meet with them in his house to discuss their concerns, even when they disagreed with him.³¹

²⁹ Pitts, Teresa. “Student Unrest Breeds Rally”. *The Oklahoma Daily*. May 7, 1970, p.1

³⁰ Bateman, Jody. Personal interview with Herbert Hengst. June 6, 1985.

³¹ Fulkerson, Ron. “Hollomon Keeps his Cool in a Crisis. *The Daily Oklahoman*. May 7, 1970, p.1,5.

After the speeches on the North Oval, Bill Moffitt went to Walker Tower where he gave a brief press conference listing the demands of the student body. He reported that the students wanted the university administration to disarm the campus police force, make birth-control literature easily accessible to students, and to end all university-sponsored research of biological and chemical weapons. It should be noted that neither the Vietnam War, nor Cambodia, nor Kent State was mentioned at all. Moffitt made it clear that the Student Congress had drawn up the list earlier, and he was just the messenger. But the questions from the reporters focused on those controversies that were not on the list. One reporter asked Moffitt if the guardsmen at Kent State were justified in their actions because the students were throwing bricks at them. “Bricks are not bullets,” Moffitt replied. He went on to explain his own disagreement with the war and his disgust at the events at Kent State before concluding with his thoughts on the situation on campus.

“I’m sure the governor wants to protect the property of the citizens of Oklahoma....That’s why we are trying to open up lines of communication with the governor now, we can speak together and I can tell him our position and he can tell me his. As such, we are operating on different planes and we’re both reacting against one another and I don’t think that’s absolutely necessary.”³²

Many of the student protesters had negative opinions of Governor Bartlett, and according to Bateman, “Bartlett’s idea of order on campus was having somebody killed or hurt.”³³ He had been elected governor as a conservative, pro-war Republican, and he had little patience for protests on the campuses under his jurisdiction.

³² Hockman, Ned. *May 5th Through 12th: The University of Oklahoma*. Norman: The University of Oklahoma Office of Motion Picture Production, 1970. Archived at Oklahoma Historical Society.

³³ Bateman, Jody. Personal interview with Herbert Hengst. June 6, 1985.

Meanwhile on that Wednesday, about seventy-five students occupied the purchasing office on the third floor of Evans Hall. But this protest was more well-mannered than the one the day before at the ROTC drill practice. No violence occurred, and no university property was destroyed or damaged. The occupation seemed to have a party mood that was similar to the initial tenor of the previous day's protests. The students just hung out in the office and listened to rock-and-roll music, putting the purchasing staff more or less a day behind in their work. An Oklahoma City newspaper, *The Daily Oklahoman* interviewed D.R. Kimrey, the Director of Purchasing for the university, about the occupation. When asked about the goals of the protesters, Kimrey replied that he had not received a list of objectives or demands. "I don't even know what's going on. We're occupied, that's all." He went on to say that he had asked that same question to one of the protesters, who simply told him, "I don't know. I'm just here." The occupiers left the office when it closed at 5 PM.³⁴ There were rumors that the occupation would resume the following day at 9 AM, but it did not materialize.³⁵

Many students at OU also expressed their anger over the Kent State shootings by calling for an official student strike to close the university. This response was common across the United States. According to the *New York Times*, "Some 400 of the nation's 2,500 higher academic institutions were affected by strikes."³⁶ However, many OU students felt that a strike would not be a worthwhile endeavor. The editorial staff of the *Oklahoma Daily* took an official stand against a strike in their May 7th column, in which they stated that: "We cannot agree that a strike is a solution to this problem [police/military abuse of student protesters]. And we do not believe

³⁴ "Life Under an 'Occupation'". *The Daily Oklahoman*. May 7, 1970, p.53

³⁵ Pitts, Teresa. "Frustrated Peace Settles". *The Oklahoma Daily*. May 8, 1970, p.7

³⁶ "Students Step up Protests on War". *The New York Times*. May 9, 1970, p. 1

that it will help this nation get out of Cambodia any faster.”³⁷ At eleven o’clock that evening, the Student Congress tallied the votes: 3,628 in favor of the strike and 3,831 against the strike. Though the strike was defeated, the voted reflected a deep divide amongst the students on campus. University faculty did not participate in the voting, nor was there a separate vote on a strike amongst the faculty.

Despite the failure of the vote, hundreds of students decided to strike anyway. They picketed in front of most buildings on the North and South Ovals. Students hoisted signs calling for an end to the Vietnam War, the U.S. military campaign in Cambodia, and criticizing the National Guard’s actions at Kent State. Peace marshals also had a presence on camps. By this point a number of faculty members had become involved in the marshal program, and they stationed themselves about every hundred feet on both ovals. One of the more active faculty members, Dr. Larry Hill, was a political science professor who was against the war. He explained that there was no formal leadership structure to the marshal program, but that, “There was a small group who gradually became active and I suppose leadership just flowed to us.”³⁸ The marshals made sure that the students on strike did not harass or impede the students who wanted to go to class, and the day went by without any major confrontations.

On Monday, May 11th, many students on campus felt certain that there was going to be a protest during the ROTC awards ceremony scheduled for the next day. However, there had been no attempt to organize a demonstration. So campus activist Michael Wright took the initiative and printed up some fliers for a meeting in Dale Hall later that day. Over 400 students showed

³⁷ ‘Referendum Vote Today’. *The Oklahoma Daily*. May 7, 1970, p.1

³⁸ Hill, Larry. Personal interview with William McKeen. April 1, 1986.

up.³⁹ At the meeting they decided that they would protest on the field during the ceremony in OU's football stadium. The students also agreed that it would be wise to keep in place the system of faculty and student Marshals that had been effective at keeping the peace during Friday's demonstrations.⁴⁰ At some point somebody suggested that as one of the leaders of the activists on campus, Michael Wright should take a position as one of the chief marshals. He accepted the role.⁴¹

A bit later, Bill Jones stopped by the meeting at the request of student-body president Bill Moffitt to answer questions from the students. He assured the students that, "The role of the police is to keep peace on the campus. It is as much our role to protect you as anyone else on campus."⁴² Later, Jones and Wright worked out some basic guidelines about how the protest was going to go the next day. They agreed on the compromise that the protesters would stay in an end zone while the ROTC cadets performed their drills and accepted their awards in the center of the field. The faculty and student peace marshals were to provide a buffer between the two groups to ensure that no physical confrontations would take place.

On the day of the protest, Herbert Hollomon, G.T. Blankenship, and other administrators were in the press box of Oklahoma Memorial Stadium. Only five campus police officers were stationed in the stadium. The protesters entered at 3:30PM, before the cadets marched in. They immediately went to the middle of the field and sat, contrary to the agreement that Jones and Wright had made the day before. After requests to vacate the field from Jones's bullhorn, the

³⁹ Wright, Michael. Personal interview with William McKeen. April 26, 1986.

⁴⁰ Moffitt, Bill. Telephone interview with William McKeen. April 27, 1986.

⁴¹ Wright, Michael. Personal interview with William McKeen. April 26, 1986.

⁴² Papps, Val. "Discussion Plans Protest Activities". The Oklahoma Daily. May 12, 1970, p.2.

stadium public address system, and the student and faculty peace marshals, the protesters, several hundred in number, took their time moving into the endzone. Four o'clock came and went, and some protestors refused to leave the field.⁴³ Tensions began to escalate. The protesters did not know that Bob Lester, the Public Safety Commissioner of the state of Oklahoma, was in the press box monitoring the situation. The protesters were also unaware that he had at his command 150 highway patrol state troopers stationed on the football practice field, not even a mile away.⁴⁴ By about 4:30, all but four protestors had retreated into the endzone. Bill Jones went and spoke to them. "I'm going to ask you for the final time to get off the field," he said. "If you don't do that I'm going to place you under arrest and take you to jail." The protesters, one of whom was a Vietnam veteran, did not resist, but calmly accepted Jones's instructions in a calculated act of civil disobedience. They followed him out of the stadium "just like little lambs."⁴⁵ The protesters in the south endzone saw that the four students were being arrested, but they did not make any move to harass Jones or to block their path out of the stadium.

After Jones removed the four students from the middle of the field, a large number of students were not yet actually in the endzone. At some point there was a misunderstanding and some protesters thought that they been given the right to stand all the way up at the ten yard-line. At this point, Colonel Leroy Land, the commander of OU's ROTC program, made a concession to allow the protesters that space rather than risk igniting another conflict. In Jones's estimation, Land's flexibility that day made him an unsung hero of the event.⁴⁶

⁴³ Davis, Fred. "Protesters Mar Honors Ceremony". The Oklahoma Daily. May 13, 1970, p.1

⁴⁴ Oklahoma State Archives, Office of the Governor, Dewey Bartlett. 8-R-19, Box 7, Folder 5.

⁴⁵ Jones, Bill. Personal interview with William McKeen. March 26, 1986.

⁴⁶ Jones, Bill. Personal interview with William McKeen. March 26, 1986.

Land's decision not to escalate the tension in the stadium was particularly beneficial because Governor Bartlett was perfectly content to do so. He was not in the stadium personally that day, but he spoke with Blankenship, Lester, and Hollomon over the telephone in the press box. Bartlett expressed his desire to use the National Guard Troops that he had stationed a few miles south of the campus to keep the peace. Hollomon vehemently disagreed with him. "I'll broadcast what they do to these kids," he threatened. "Every mother and father in Oklahoma will be on your back." Bartlett initially thought this was a bluff, but Hollomon pressed him further, and assured him that, "I will do that. That's the only way I know how to stop you."⁴⁷ Bartlett was evidently nervous that a riot would break out, but backed down in the face of Hollomon's threats.

The telephone exchange between Hollomon and Bartlett showed an underlying tension between the two over how the university would handle protests. The animosity between the two men was personal as well as political. Even at social events they made an effort to avoid each other.⁴⁸ According to Ron Fulkerton's report to the Oklahoma City newspaper, *The Daily Oklahoman*, Bartlett had pressured Hollomon to use campus police to eject or arrest the students that had occupied the purchasing office earlier in the week. Ultimately Hollomon won the battle and kept Bartlett from imposing his will on the campus. But Bartlett had his revenge. He had appointed a number of the members on the board of regents, and between them and other regents who did not like how Hollomon had managed the university for their own reasons, the board voted not to renew his contract.

The ceremony began as almost one hundred faculty and student peace marshals patrolled a sort of no-man's-land between the cadets and the protesters. Many of the protesters chose to

⁴⁷ Hollomon, Herbert. Personal interview with Herbert Hengst. April 8, 1980.

⁴⁸ Jones, Stephen. Personal interview with Dominic Granello. December 13, 2013.

remain seated during the National Anthem, and shouts and chants of varying levels of obscenity rang from the south end of the field throughout the ceremony. This disrespect angered many of the about 3,000 spectators in the stadium bleachers, many of whom were relatives of the ROTC cadets. "I'm so mad I could spit," one mother of a cadet said, "I'd kick my son across the field if he let his country down like these demonstrators are doing."⁴⁹

The level of attention that was being paid to the ceremony and protest in the stadium is perhaps best expressed to Oklahomans by the fact that OU's head football coach, Chuck Fairbanks, along with a couple members of the Sooner football team, came out to help with crowd control. Though protesters initially greeted them with jeers, Fairbanks informed the protesters that he too was against the war in Vietnam, and that he and his players were there just to help everybody "stay cool."⁵⁰

The rest of the ceremony went on without incident, save for a scuffle in which a student who was upset with the demonstrators came down from the bleachers and kicked one of them. Peace marshals immediately separated the two, and the campus police decided to simply eject him from the venue. Campus police officers took the four students who had been arrested to the Norman PD station and booked them for "disrupting a lawful assembly. All four pleaded innocent and walked free that evening after posting the \$500 bond."⁵¹

⁴⁹ Tempest, Rone. "OU Protest of ROTC Calm Although Four Arrested". *The Daily Oklahoman*. May 13, 1970, pp.1-2

⁵⁰ Burr, David. Personal interview with William McKeen. July 3, 1984.

⁵¹ Tempest, Rone. "OU Protest of ROTC Calm Although Four Arrested". *The Daily Oklahoman*. May 13, 1970, pp.1-2

Later that day, a television reporter interviewed Hollomon about the day's events. He summarized his remarks with the statement that "It was a beautiful day." By this he meant that he was proud of the dedication and effectiveness of the peace marshals, the self-control of the protesters, the flexibility of the ROTC cadets and officers, and the general fact that the protest went about as well as it could have.⁵² But a large number of viewers interpreted it as an endorsement of the protester's disruption of the ceremony, and Hollomon's opponents used it as ammunition in their campaign to prevent the renewal of his contract.

There were some instances of property damage at the University of Oklahoma, though none of them took place in conjunction with a demonstration. According to Bill Jones, arsonists set fires in Walker Tower, a building on the "South Base" area of campus, and Dr. Sharp's home suffered damage from a Molotov cocktail thrown over the fence.⁵³ Malevolent pranksters sent bomb threats to the ROTC armory building, but fortunately they all proved to be hoaxes.⁵⁴ President Hollomon even received a bomb threat on the night of 5th, just hours after the protest that had resulted in an arrest. A campus police officer drove him around in secret and he stayed at a friend's house until he got the all-clear from Bill Jones. He immediately returned to his office where he met with students to hear their concerns about the university's actions earlier that day and what its policies concerning protests would be going forward.⁵⁵

For a period of about a week the University of Oklahoma was a pressure cooker that could have exploded into violence or vandalism at any moment. So why did it not? The simple

⁵² Hollomon, Herbert. Personal interview with Herbert Hengst. April 8, 1980.

⁵³ Jones, Bill. Personal interview with Herbert Hengst. February 2, 1984.

⁵⁴ Land, Marjorie. Personal interview with William McKeen. March 28, 1986.

⁵⁵ Hollomon, Herbert. Personal interview with Herbert Hengst. April 8, 1980.

answer is that the people in leadership positions across the campus, and most students in campus in general, knew that an outbreak of violence on campus would only have negative consequences for everyone involved. Many people made a concentrated effort to make sure that did not happen. Herbert Hollomon kept his office open late into the night on May 6th. He had discussions with small groups of any students who wanted to talk with him. He tried to make it clear that they did not have to resort to violence to be heard.⁵⁶ Likewise, despite the confrontation between students and police on the 5th, Bill Jones went out of his way to talk with the students and assure them that the primary objective of the OU police officers was to protect the students of the university, and that he would only call in the Highway Patrol again if he felt that OU PD had lost control of a situation.⁵⁷

Despite the fact that he had been elected as the student body president less than a week before, Bill Moffitt showed poise and courage in his efforts to cool the tempers of angry students. In fact, he had been sworn in only hours before he stood on the hood of stranded police car and urged the crowd to disperse.⁵⁸ It is noteworthy that even though he had run on an “activist” platform, he did not set himself in opposition to university administration or attempt to use the tension to extort concessions from them. Rather, he partnered with them in an effort to keep the peace on campus at all costs.

Michael Wright took similar steps to demonstrate his commitment to nonviolent protests. He engaged in open communication and negotiated in good faith with Bill Jones. His example of

⁵⁶ Fulkerton, Ron. “Hollomon Keeps his Cool in Crisis”. The Oklahoma Daily. May 7, 1970, p.1

⁵⁷ Pippis, Val. “Discussion Plans Protest Activities”. The Oklahoma Daily. May 12, 1970, p.2.

⁵⁸ Moffitt, Bill. Telephone interview with William McKeen. April 27, 1986.

cooperation with campus authorities without compromising his principles set a precedent that the vast majority of student protestors followed.

Every university faced a unique set of challenges in the weeks following the tragedy at Kent State. Some universities carried on with business as usual while others were not able to fully re-open until the fall. The University of Oklahoma fell between those extremes. The proposed strike failed but won over 3,000 student votes, and the students who were passionate about the strike picketed classes anyway. The entire week was a tense time on campuses throughout the nation. Several factors may have determined whether a campus was wracked by violent protests or simply mourned the loss of fellow students in a peaceful manner. OU shared demographic characteristics with schools erupting in violence and with schools that emerged from the difficult week relatively unscathed. On one hand, it was an “elite” flagship university with a national reputation and a relatively urban student body. But on the other hand it was not particularly racially diverse, and was located in a conservative state in the middle of the country. This combination of factors, along with the calming efforts of campus leaders such as Herbert Hollomon, Bill Moffitt, Michael Wright, and Bill Jones explains the events that occurred at OU in May of 1970. Ultimately, the University of Oklahoma was fortunate to have student, faculty, and staff leaders who collaborated to avoid violent protests on campus.

Hugo Falcandus, the *History of the Tyrants*, and the Normalization of Norman Sicily

By Arthur Dixon

“Norman Sicily” and “Hugo Falcandus”

The historical processes that gave rise to what we call “Norman Sicily” produced a complex, multifaceted, and idiosyncratic kingdom that scarcely fits under the banner of “Norman” in the first place.¹ Sicily in the twelfth century displayed pronounced differences from conventional models of medieval European civilization because it had experienced periods of dominance by the Byzantine Empire and by Islamic peoples, unlike most mainland European kingdoms. The closest sociopolitical parallels to the Sicilian experience can be found in the Christian kingdoms of Iberia as they asserted themselves alongside the remnants of Islamic al-Andalus, but even these nascent states did not accurately mirror the Sicilian experience.² In Sicily, phases of settlement and government by Greek Christians and Muslims before the dominance of Latin Christians left an ingrained political, cultural, and social legacy.

When Sicily’s first Latin king, Roger II, created his throne in 1130, he inherited a tradition of centralized, bureaucratic rule on the island (but not on the mainland, which had been subject to more fighting and political chaos).³ Roger’s new kingdom was culturally plural, with areas of either Muslim or Greek Christian population under the loose control of a Latin Christian elite that relied heavily on the court structures and administrative abilities of Greeks and Muslims. Additionally, the persistent recurrence of foreign conquest had given Sicily a social system that could be anachronistically described as “colonial”. Rule by foreigners was an established norm of Sicilian history up to that point, and in general the inhabitants of the island accepted it with little concern. Yet, after the reign of Roger II, these political, cultural, and social models shifted dramatically.

¹ Alex Metcalfe, *Muslims and Christians in Norman Sicily: Arabic speakers and the end of Islam* (London: Routledge Curzon, 2003), 24.

² Hugh Goddard, *A History of Christian-Muslim Relations* (Chicago: New Amsterdam Books, 2000), 98.

³ Graham A. Loud, trans., *Roger II and the Creation of the Kingdom of Sicily* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2012), 21.

During the tenures of the following two kings of Sicily, William I “the Bad” (1154-68) and William II “the Good” (1166-89), a paradigm shift occurred in the kingdom. A combination of demographic and political factors increased the presence and power of Latin Christians from mainland Europe, bringing about a new stage in Sicilian sociopolitical history. Under the two Williams, Sicilian politics departed from their previous centralized model and moved closer to the fragmented, feudal norm of mainland kingdoms like France. Sicily also grew increasingly culturally homogeneous, replacing its former tolerance of cultures and faiths with dominance by Latin Christians and clearly delineated subaltern status for Muslims. And, although Sicily would fall victim to multiple conquests in the subsequent centuries, Sicilians became more tangibly opposed to government by foreigners as a defined Sicilian identity arose from the colonial order. The agency behind these changes lay with the social elites of Sicily—primarily the nobles who interacted with the royal court in Palermo. While William I and II reigned, the Sicilian nobility rose to the fore as a force behind political, cultural, and social transition.

In an effort to explain why these changes occurred and how they were justified at the time, I have turned to a well-known chronicle entitled *The History of the Tyrants of Sicily*. The authorship of the *History of the Tyrants* is unknown, but it is popularly ascribed to “Hugo Falcandus”—a stand-in for the real author, as scholars know that no real “Hugo Falcandus” composed the work.⁴ The pseudonym appeared on the first printed edition of the chronicle in 1550, and was perhaps reconstructed from the disintegrating flyleaf of the medieval manuscript.⁵ The chronicle covers the years from 1154 to 1169, beginning with the succession of William I and ending three years into the reign of William II. Falcandus does not address every element of Sicilian history during this period in equal depth; he focuses on conspiracies and revolts carried out by various elements of the Sicilian elite against others. Especially active as conspirators and rebels are Sicily’s feudal nobles, who appear locked in a constant struggle against the official class that controls the royal court. Through his descriptions of the conspiracies and

⁴ From this point on, I will identify the author of the *History of the Tyrants* as Falcandus without a first name or quotation marks.

⁵ Graham A. Loud and Thomas Wiedemann, trans., *The History of the Tyrants of Sicily by ‘Hugo Falcandus’, 1154-69* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1998), 28.

revolts orchestrated by Sicily's aristocracy, Falcandus reveals that nobles perceived Sicily's political, cultural, and social idiosyncrasies as increasingly unnatural and unacceptable; they took action to, as they saw it, *normalize* a kingdom that functioned incorrectly.

This conclusion is drawn from Falcandus's language in connection with more concrete information on demographics and cultural production. The *History of the Tyrants* indicates that Falcandus was a close observer of the nobility, or perhaps even a member himself, so it is an appropriate source for an analysis of elite opinions.⁶ Falcandus seems invested in justifying conspiracy and revolt against the bureaucracy, further validating his perspective, and the notion of normalizing Sicily from the top down has interesting implications regarding the mysterious authorship of the *History of the Tyrants*.

Demographics and Cultural Production

In order to place Falcandus' rhetoric of normalization within its context, it is helpful to consider two more concrete elements of Sicily's medieval development: demographic shifts that made continental Europeans more prominent and cultural production that shifted away from multicultural artistic forms toward Latin norms.

The demography of Norman Sicily reflected its status as a Latin Christian colony with negotiated relationships between the new elite and the previous population. Alex Metcalfe provides linguistic and onomastic evidence of demographic shift based on this colonial system. The demography of Sicily's predominantly Islamic regions did not change rapidly at the outset of Latin Christian rule; as is typical in colonial relationships, the northern European and Italian warriors who moved into Sicily after 1060 maintained existing models of social stratification.⁷ Sicilian Muslims—often neighbors of Greek Christians—were familiar with the social and financial system of *dhimmi* status, which provided members of other monotheistic faiths with guarantees of freedom from persecution in exchange for taxation. Newly arrived Latin Christians

⁶ Loud and Wiedemann, *History of the Tyrants*, 28-42.

⁷ Metcalfe, *Muslims and Christians in Norman Sicily*, 176-177.

inserted themselves into this structure upon their political conquest of Sicily, having few other options due to the human presence of Islam in their new territory.

But the island's demographic makeup shifted over the course of colonization, especially after Roger II cemented Latin rule through formation of the Kingdom of Sicily. Metcalfe suggests that the opportunity for economic involvement with the growing Latin elite led to a process of "Latinization" among Sicily's Muslim population, with learned Muslims increasingly complicit in the fiscal workings of the Christian government.⁸ Rising Latin settlement across social lines brought about two demographic changes: (1) Muslims converted to Christianity, typically the Greek rite but under the direction of the Latin ecclesiastical system; and (2) the remaining Muslim population grew more concentrated in specific regions of the island, particularly the more traditionally Islamic southwest. With the foundation of the abbey of Monreale in 1174, William II entrusted the management of the entire Muslim community neighboring Palermo to a single Latin church.⁹ A Muslim population under paternalistic Latin religious control was a manifestation of the Latinizing sociocultural current that dominated Sicily in the second half of the twelfth century. Metcalfe states that by the end of William II's reign in 1189 "large numbers of Latin Christian settlers, merchants, churchmen and aristocratic families from outside Sicily could . . . wield their power more freely at the expense of the dwindling Muslim communities and their reduced political influence around the court and royal palaces."¹⁰ The influx of Latin Christians into Sicily's political apparatus provided the incentive for further Latin settlement, which gradually diminished both the numbers and the status of the Islamic population.

Just as the demographic composition of Sicily shifted toward Latin homogeneity during the reigns of William I and II, the kingdom's cultural production adopted Latin forms and purposes. A salient example of this process is the imposing primary source of the Capella Palatina, the internal chapel of the royal palace complex in Palermo. From the coronation of Roger II to the death of William II, this room changed to reflect a

⁸ Metcalfe, *Muslims and Christians in Norman Sicily*, 180-181.

⁹ David Abulafia, "The End of Muslim Sicily," in *Muslims Under Latin Rule, 1100-1300*, ed. James M. Powell (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990), 109.

¹⁰ Metcalfe, *Muslims and Christians in Norman Sicily*, 181.

sociocultural project of Latinization. The architectural studies of William Tronzo provide a basis for these claims.

Upon its completion under the direction of Roger II in 1140, the Capella Palatina included a variety of structural and decorative features that suggested an inheritance of Greek and Islamic cultures in terms of both taste and function. Two of the church's most striking features were a royal balcony overlooking the nave and a Greek Christian image of Christ "Pantokrator" at the apex of the choir dome.¹¹ Another non-Latin feature was a set of Arabic inscriptions over the chapel's doorways, now almost entirely lost. The first extant segment reads: "graciously / and you make haste to kiss and to salute him. Roger has competed with". The second reads: "kiss its corner after having embraced it / and contemplate the beautiful things that it holds".¹² According to Tronzo, these Greek and Arabic inclusions in the Capella Palatina indicate conscious efforts on the part of Roger II and his artisans to capture non-Latin styles and meanings. In the case of the king's balcony and the image of Christ Pantokrator, the church was designed to elevate the Latin king above his visitors and physically closer to God during the Greek ritual of the *prokypsis*, also practiced by the emperor in Constantinople.¹³ Jeremy Johns postulates that the Arabic doorway inscriptions were coopted from Fatimid Egyptian artwork, reflecting the desire of Roger II to recreate the grandeur of the Fatimid palaces he had heard of from Arabs in his own kingdom.¹⁴ In general, the Rogerian chapel suggested an inheritance and adaptation of Greek and Islamic artistic forms. This does not suggest that Roger or his administration were wholeheartedly in favor of cultural plurality and *convivencia*, but it does imply that continental Latins were willing to Sicilian-ize rather than forcing Sicily to adopt mainland norms.

Under William I and II, the layout and decoration of the Capella Palatina changed to conform to more typically Latin structures. William I had mosaic scenes from the Old Testament and the lives of Peter and Paul added to the walls of the nave and the aisles, and William II had a new superstructure added to the throne platform in

¹¹ William Tronzo, *The Cultures of His Kingdom* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997), 55.

¹² Translations by Jeremy Johns. In Tronzo, *The Cultures of His Kingdom*, 45.

¹³ Tronzo, *The Cultures of His Kingdom*, 116.

¹⁴ Tronzo, *The Cultures of His Kingdom*, 105.

the western wall of the nave.¹⁵ The distinctly Christian decoration and textual evidence from Romuald of Salerno indicate that the Capella Palatina was regularly used for liturgical services under William I; under Roger it may have served primarily as a venue for royal audiences, but under his son it adopted a more Christian appearance and employed more canons.¹⁶ William II's expanded throne platform implies a move away from the Greek rituals of kingship adopted by Roger. The coronation program (or "ordo") of William II included recitation of the *laudes regiae*—a traditional royal liturgy for Western Christian kingdoms.¹⁷ The *laudes* does not require as much prostration before the king as the Greek *prokypsis*, and the refurbishment of the throne platform rather than the balcony suggests that the platform replaced the balcony as the royal liturgy switched from Greek to Latin. The form and function of the Capella Palatina shifted from generally Sicilian to specifically Latin under William I and II, representing both a preference for Latin artistic styles and a more continental conception of kingship.

Recent analyses of Sicilian demographics and cultural production from the mid-1100s affirm a pattern of Latinization in both the population and the monarchy. In neither case did this pattern entail a thorough change from one norm to another, and heavy influence from Greek and Islamic traditions remained prevalent despite increased numbers of Latin settlers and shifts to Latin liturgies. Yet, it is certain that Latinization did occur. What remains to prove is that this process, beyond the realms of demography and art, was justified and enacted by nobles as an effort to normalize Sicily.

Normalization through Conspiracy in the History of the Tyrants

In order to prove this point, I will now turn in earnest to Falcandus' *History of the Tyrants*. Of particular interest in the chronicle are four noble conspiracies that affirm the elite desire for normalization in three different dimensions. The first and second are the conspiracies against Maio of Bari, chief *emir* of Sicily under William I; the third is the conspiracy against *Caid* Peter, a palace eunuch who served on the triumvirate of royal advisers following the fall of Maio; the fourth is the conspiracy against Stephen of Perche, a French relative of the regent queen Margaret of Navarre

¹⁵ Tronzo, *The Cultures of His Kingdom*, 125.

¹⁶ Tronzo, *The Cultures of His Kingdom*, 125.

¹⁷ Tronzo, *The Cultures of His Kingdom*, 127.

who served as royal chancellor and Archbishop of Palermo. Each of these conspiracies affirms the elite desire for normalization in a distinct part of the Sicilian body politic perceived as abnormal.

Extracting evidence from the *History of the Tyrants* requires an appreciation for authorial bias. Luckily, I plan to focus on the rhetorical position of Falcandus towards each conspiracy rather than the sparse objective facts that he provides. This method turns the *History of the Tyrants* into a far more fruitful historical source. Although the authorship of the chronicle remains unknown, the data provided on military, ecclesiastical, and political affairs confirms that the author was involved in some capacity with the court at Palermo.¹⁸ An illustrative example is the detailed discussion of Caid Peter's botched expedition to North Africa and the loss of the city of Mahdia to Almohad forces.¹⁹ The passage includes accurate information on a treaty with the Byzantine emperor, embassies sent from Mahdia to Palermo, and the logistics of Caid Peter's fleet ("It consisted of about 160 galleys").²⁰ These observations make it hard to conceive of a Falcandus who did not occupy the environs of the court, and the biased opinions of a participant in the royal court are ideal indicators of Latin elite opinions. I will reflect further on the question of authorship after discussing the four noble conspiracies that most strongly indicate the desire for normalization.

Conspiracies against Maio of Bari

The conspiracies against Maio of Bari suggest that nobles perceived the need to normalize Sicily's extraordinary state of non-feudal political centralization. The bureaucratic centralization personified by Maio was non-feudal in two dimensions: firstly, it implied by its very nature that the baronial class was subordinate to royal officials; secondly, it suggested that noble genealogy was not necessary for political power. Falcandus acknowledges that the claim that Maio's father "used to sell olive-oil at Bari" was only a rumor, but it is true that Maio emerged from the class of Italian urban elites rather than any aristocratic lineage.²¹ His rapid rise through the ranks of the

¹⁸ Loud and Wiedemann, *History of the Tyrants*, 29.

¹⁹ Loud and Wiedemann, *History of the Tyrants*, 78-81.

²⁰ Loud and Wiedemann, *History of the Tyrants*, 78.

²¹ Loud and Wiedemann, *History of the Tyrants*, 69.

Sicilian administration implied genuine usefulness or political skill. He attained the old Arabic title of emir after ten years of service under Roger II and William I as a scribe and chancellor. For most of Roger's reign, the Greek administrator George of Antioch held this position.²² Maio inherited a post with tremendous potential for political power—the emir was the advisor and representative of the king, connecting the aloof royal presence to the practical operations of the Palermitan bureaucracy. It is impossible to gauge the moral consistency of Maio's character based only on the extant sources, but he occupied an elevated position and demonstrated political capability. Unfortunately, in Falcandus' opinion, Maio was

a beast than whom none more repellant pest could be found, none more effective in achieving the destruction and the overthrow of the realm. For he had an intellect that could grasp anything; his eloquence was equal to his intellect; he had the ability to pretend and dissemble whatever he pleased; his mind, keen on sexual gratification, contrived intercourse with women married and unmarried, especially noble ones. He was particularly keen to overcome the chastity of those who had a reputation for decency. Once he had tasted the desire for power, he turned over many plans in his mind, he exhausted his spirit with many schemes, and was borne forward by constant incitements to wickedness; yet he managed to hide the tempest within his seething mind behind a calm appearance.²³

In literary terms, Maio is the primary antagonist of the *History of the Tyrants*. He is depicted as a domineering bogeyman who incessantly attempts to bolster his personal power at the expense of others, exploiting his closeness to the king in order to assassinate William and “seize control of the realm.”²⁴ This scheme requires that Maio eliminate a number of the Latin nobles “with whom Sicily was flourishing at the time,” and against whom he is naturally opposed.²⁵ Maio's dictatorial power and his ostensible

²² Loud, *Roger II*, 41.

²³ Loud and Wiedemann, *History of the Tyrants*, 60.

²⁴ Loud and Wiedemann, *History of the Tyrants*, 61.

²⁵ Loud and Wiedemann, *History of the Tyrants*, 61.

hatred of Latin nobles justify the first conspiracy that the nobles enact against the conniving emir.

The conspiracies against Maio begin in the *History of the Tyrants* when Maio attempts to recruit the noble Godfrey, Count of Montescaglioso, into his own plot to assassinate the king.²⁶ Godfrey feigns agreement and willingness to place Maio on the throne, but he then reveals the scheme to a group of fellow nobles—some from Sicily and some from the mainland—and they concoct a plot to turn the regicide against Maio. Interestingly, they are apparently unconcerned at the thought of murdering the king. Falcandus tells us they did not have “any objection to assassinating the king, because of the tyrannous regime he was exercising against the nobility”.²⁷ This opinion, which holds true as the web of plots is enacted, underlines the commitment of Sicily’s Latin nobles to their unfairly limited feudal rights. They are willing to dislodge the top of the feudal pyramid and replace the king with his son in order to enthrone a monarch who will sufficiently respect the feudal order. After Maio’s anticipated murder of William I, the nobles plan to turn against him “as though they were the assassinated king’s avengers,” placing William’s son on the throne and eliminating Maio in the ensuing chaos.²⁸

Count Godfrey’s counterplot fails when another noble, Count Everard, reveals Maio’s plot to William; the king refuses to accept the notion of Maio’s treachery, but he holds Godfrey in Sicily until Maio has him “blinded and imprisoned”.²⁹ Maio then takes revenge on Everard. The count goes hunting with his followers one day, and Maio accuses him of leaving the court “with a large force of knights,” which represents “clear proof of rebellion”.³⁰ Maio has Everard dragged back to court, where his eyes are gouged out and his tongue is cut off. Unsurprisingly, “opposition died down throughout the kingdom” after this demonstration.³¹ Maio takes the opportunity to consolidate rule over the mainland, particularly the region of Apulia, placing members of his family in

²⁶ Loud and Wiedemann, *History of the Tyrants*, 68.

²⁷ Loud and Wiedemann, *History of the Tyrants*, 70.

²⁸ Loud and Wiedemann, *History of the Tyrants*, 70.

²⁹ Loud and Wiedemann, *History of the Tyrants*, 75.

³⁰ Loud and Wiedemann, *History of the Tyrants*, 76.

³¹ Loud and Wiedemann, *History of the Tyrants*, 77.

important administrative and military positions.³² These actions inspire violent revolt in Apulia and unrest in Calabria, which is the source of the conspiracy that finally ends Maio's dominion.

The agent of Maio's death is Matthew Bonellus, a young noble with links to the Calabrian aristocracy. He is intimately connected to Maio through his betrothal to the emir's young daughter, although his affections actually lie with an illegitimate daughter of Roger II who Maio keeps out of his reach.³³ Maio sends Matthew as his embassy to Calabria to ease the tensions of the mainland nobles. But, after a long talking-to supposedly delivered by Roger of Martorano, Matthew experiences a change of heart regarding his potential father-in-law. Roger of Martorano condemns the notion of a commoner—even one as wealthy as Maio—rising to greater power than an aristocrat, and he condemns the emir for exploiting a young noble like Matthew in matters of marriage. He explains, “no excuse can permit a young man of the highest nobility and unsullied reputation such as you . . . to gape at filthy lucre”.³⁴ Roger's rhetorical appeal to Matthew as Sicily's last hope for proper government eventually accomplishes its goal, and Matthew agrees to strike Maio down “as soon as possible”.³⁵

After arriving at Palermo from the mainland, Matthew utilizes the existing conflict between Maio and Archbishop Hugh of Palermo to his advantage. Maio is in the process of slowly poisoning the archbishop, and while the emir is visiting his rival's house one night Matthew organizes his knights in the city streets and coordinates an ambush.³⁶ When Maio exits the house, Matthew himself springs into action and fells the emir with his sword, calling out, “Look, traitor, here I am: I am avenging the nobility you destroyed, even if belatedly, to put a limit to your unspeakable wickedness, and with a single blow against you I will erase both the title of admiral [emir] and of false king”.³⁷ After Maio's death, Matthew becomes a sort of popular hero while the eunuchs of William's palace work to incite anger against him; he eventually participates in a revolt against the king himself, is briefly pardoned, and is finally accused of treason and

³² Loud and Wiedemann, *History of the Tyrants*, 77.

³³ Loud and Wiedemann, *History of the Tyrants*, 86-87.

³⁴ Loud and Wiedemann, *History of the Tyrants*, 88.

³⁵ Loud and Wiedemann, *History of the Tyrants*, 90.

³⁶ Loud and Wiedemann, *History of the Tyrants*, 94.

³⁷ Loud and Wiedemann, *History of the Tyrants*, 97.

severely punished. The supposedly heroic Matthew ends up blinded and mutilated in the royal dungeons.³⁸

Rather than focusing on any character in this drama specifically, I will discuss the rhetoric with which Falcandus describes the noble revolts against Maio. At various points in the text, Falcandus juxtaposes Maio's sinister actions with descriptions that frame him as an opponent of the nobility and of the normal system of feudal rule. A key example comes as Maio consolidates his power after the castigation of Count Everard. Regarding his effort to assassinate and replace the king, Maio "thought that this would be easiest to do if he first won the love of the populace and if he appointed his family and relations to the highest offices of the realm so as to protect himself against the pride of the nobility by their support".³⁹ Here, as at other points in his description, Maio intends to subvert the standard sociopolitical order, seeking to dominate the entire "populace" of the kingdom from a central administrative position at Palermo, rather than allowing feudal nobles to individually control their fiefs. He intends to establish control over the kingdom through bureaucratic means, replacing the hereditary aristocracy with a bureaucratic class peopled by his "family and relations". He specifically plans to defend his new dictatorial order from the nobility, recognizing that their position is rightful but caring only for his own advancement.

Roger of Martorano's speech to Matthew Bonellus is another key moment of anti-centralist, anti-bureaucratic rhetoric. Roger instructs the younger man,

Hold before your eyes the kind of parents who bore you, and you should understand that every approach to wrongdoing is barred to you, and that an obligation to spurn wickedness is imposed upon you. Indeed, if you were to see no one opposing the crimes of this traitor, then you at least ought to avenge the nobility whom this man is so horribly persecuting.⁴⁰

Matthew's high birth requires him to act against a lowborn bureaucrat who does not know his place in feudal society. Maio's rise to power manifests his "wickedness," and he

³⁸ Loud and Wiedemann, *History of the Tyrants*, 124.

³⁹ Loud and Wiedemann, *History of the Tyrants*, 77.

⁴⁰ Loud and Wiedemann, *History of the Tyrants*, 88.

is a “traitor” both to his rightful king and to the social order of the kingdom. But the key notion in this passage is Roger’s exhortation to Matthew to “avenge the nobility”—the administrator supposedly targets the kingdom’s rightful ruling class on purpose, “persecuting” them with the goal of undermining their power and claiming it for himself. Framing Matthew’s mission against Maio as vengeance clearly expresses the notion that Maio is interrupting normality, or that he pertains to a sociopolitical schema that is inherently destructive of the existing system. The nobles are, in a sense, conservatives; they desire a return to the traditional, normal order, whether or not their idea of normality conforms to the truth.

The narrative of Maio’s assassination closes his portion of the *History of the Tyrants* on the same note of vengeance against a violator of sociopolitical normality. When Matthew summons up the image of the “nobility you destroyed” and says he will “erase both the title of admiral and of false king”, he lays out the two sides of the conflict over normality. The feudal nobility is the conservative ideal, while the titled bureaucrats (e.g. the admiral) are social disruptors, tearing apart the fabric of a society that should be dominated by nobles from their fiefs. Maio of Bari, the central administrator who rose from middling origins to a position of great power, must be destroyed in order to normalize the kingdom.

Conspiracy against Caid Peter

The conspiracy against the eunuch Caid Peter sought normalization by opposing the advancement of a cultural outsider to Latin norms. At the time of the conspiracy, Peter offended Latin nobles by virtue of both his position and his personal identity. He served as *familiares curiae* on William II’s regency council during the king’s infancy, a professional bureaucrat (like Maio) in a position of power over nobles.⁴¹ In personal terms, he was a product of Sicily’s Islamic past. Peter was a castrated palace slave in the mold of the eunuchs who once served the Aghlabid and Kalbid emirs of Sicily, and who continued to serve the Fatimid caliphs in not-so-distant Cairo.⁴² In episodes before the

⁴¹ Jeremy Johns, *Arabic Administration in Norman Sicily: The Royal Diwan* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 224.

⁴² W. Montgomery Watt, *The Influence of Islam on Medieval Europe* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1972), 5.

conspiracy and in his description of the conspiracy itself, Falcandus paints Peter not as a consummate, Maio-esque villain but as a cultural outsider naturally opposed to the Latin order. The nobles conspire against him to remove this unacceptable influence and restore what they see as normality.

Peter came up once before in this study of Falcandus' chronicle, during the loss of the city of Mahdia to Almohad forces. From the outset, Falcandus depicts Peter as a false Christian and a cultural alien: "Like all the palace eunuchs, this man was a Christian only in name and appearance, but a Muslim by conviction".⁴³ Peter is deployed to North Africa with a fleet to defend Mahdia against the Almohad advance, and Falcandus writes that Sicilian victory is within reach when Peter—"who was commanding the fleet and planned the whole thing"—suddenly abandons the fight and sails off, leaving the important outpost to languish from lack of supplies before submitting to Almohad conquest.⁴⁴ Falcandus blames the loss of Sicily's colonial possessions on a traitor to the sociocultural identity of Sicily. During the siege of Mahdia, Peter is established as a dangerous and unacceptable outsider based on his position as a palace eunuch and his supposed religious proclivities. These factors later serve to justify the noble conspiracy that undermines him.

After the death of William I, Sicily's queen Margaret of Navarre is left with the task of constructing an effective regency council until her child son, the future William II, reaches majority. She is already served by a group of three *familiars*, but she makes a critical decision to consolidate power:

Further, she did not wish the *familiars* of the court to remain on the same equal level of honour with one another as they used to have: for she granted supreme power over all affairs to Caid Peter, placing him in a position which overshadowed that of the others, and told the Bishop-Elect of Syracuse and the notary Matthew that as his assistants they should

⁴³ Loud and Wiedemann, *History of the Tyrants*, 78.

⁴⁴ Loud and Wiedemann, *History of the Tyrants*, 79.

indeed be present at council meetings and call themselves *familiares*, but that they should obey his orders in everything.⁴⁵

The decision to elevate Peter to a position of singular power would not have been a bad one if not for Peter's cultural identity. Falcandus reports that the eunuch would have been a sensible administrator and a strong leader "if the vice of his race had not cancelled out his innate peaceableness and prevented him from genuinely abandoning his hatred of Christianity".⁴⁶ Few concrete events in the *History of the Tyrants* provide legitimate evidence of Peter's aversion to Christianity; he is manipulated by Latin Christians against other Latin Christians before the characters fall into place who will put an end to his stint in power.⁴⁷

Peter's key antagonist is Count Gilbert of Gravina, a relative of Margaret's who arrives in Sicily after receiving news of the old king's death, hoping to acquire a position of influence as "Master Captain of the whole realm".⁴⁸ He soon realizes that this ambition will not be easily attained, as the queen refuses to place Caid Peter "in second position to anyone" and the count lacks sufficient military support to replace the eunuch by force upon his arrival.⁴⁹ So, Gilbert begins to plot Peter's demise with Richard Palmer, the English cleric previously mentioned as the "Bishop-Elect of Syracuse". While the two Latins conspire, Gilbert visits the queen—with Peter by her side—and vocally complains about the travesty of Peter's power. He tells her, "All the leading men were already angry that she had passed over the counts and other prudent men by whose judgment the court ought to be guided, and put a castrated slave in charge of the entire realm".⁵⁰ After this apt summation of noble sentiments toward the palace eunuchs, Peter realizes he is in danger.

With Gilbert's desire for Peter's ousting verbally expressed, both the count and the eunuch begin to build up support for a potential military conflict. The breakdown of supporters for each party reveals an interesting truth about the social dynamics of the

⁴⁵ Loud and Wiedemann, *History of the Tyrants*, 139.

⁴⁶ Loud and Wiedemann, *History of the Tyrants*, 139.

⁴⁷ Johns, *Arabic Administration in Norman Sicily*, 225.

⁴⁸ Loud and Wiedemann, *History of the Tyrants*, 144.

⁴⁹ Loud and Wiedemann, *History of the Tyrants*, 144.

⁵⁰ Loud and Wiedemann, *History of the Tyrants*, 145.

period. Falcandus reports: “the barons and other noblemen who possessed any estates or fiefs preferred the Count of Gravina to be at the head of the court and be appointed captain, while the salaried knights (together with their constable), except for a few from north of the Alps, preferred the rewards of Caid Peter”.⁵¹ The nobles most invested in a continental-style feudal system approve of Gilbert’s moves against Peter while professional soldiers fight for the party with greater access to the institutions of power. Those who perceive the need for continental norms oppose the eunuch while those who simply care about getting paid are disinterested. It is also telling that even salaried soldiers “from north of the Alps” oppose Peter, implying that those who originate from heavily feudal areas such as France and the Holy Roman Empire remain ideologically opposed to Peter’s rule despite its practical benefits. Ultimately, fearful that “a secret plot was being hatched against him,” Peter flees from Sicily and takes up employment—where he belongs, according to Falcandus—at the court of “the King of the Almohads”.⁵²

Once again, the rhetoric of this story reveals the noble interest in normalizing Sicily. The conspiracy against Peter mirrors the one against Maio in certain respects. It coalesces around a single noble opponent and it includes a manifesto delivered through oratory. Count Gilbert’s speech to the queen parallels Roger of Martorano’s speech to Matthew Bonellus, and both speeches outline the nobility’s complaints against a figure who disrupts feudal normality. Gilbert’s suggestion to the queen that “it was a miracle that she did not change the organisation of the court, since it could not stay any longer in the condition it was” articulates the need for conservative change.⁵³ The speech and Falcandus’ narration construct the image of Peter as a cultural outsider who, although not personally evil, simply does not belong in the framework of Sicilian society. Falcandus’ descriptions of Peter are among the most positive character portraits in the *History of the Tyrants*, which is perhaps not saying much, as Falcandus is pessimistic and scathing about almost everyone. Yet, he praises Peter’s “gentle disposition” and “liberality”.⁵⁴ In this case, the noble conspiracy does not rely on moral antagonism between nobles and bureaucrats, as was the case with Maio. The only justification for

⁵¹ Loud and Wiedemann, *History of the Tyrants*, 146.

⁵² Loud and Wiedemann, *History of the Tyrants*, 147.

⁵³ Loud and Wiedemann, *History of the Tyrants*, 145.

⁵⁴ Loud and Wiedemann, *History of the Tyrants*, 139, 142.

conspiracy is Peter's abnormality; his post is alien to feudal political norms and his character is alien to continental Latin culture, so he must go.

Conspiracy against Stephen of Perche

The final conspiracy I will analyze is also the most ironic. Stephen of Perche was neither a commoner nor a cultural outsider to Latin norms. In fact, he was a French nobleman who ended up in Sicily as a result of his familial connection to Queen Margaret. On the surface, no better candidate could exist for a leader of Sicily's Latin feudal elite. However, at this point in its history, Sicilian culture was normalizing in another respect: after generations of regular conquest, a distinct Sicilian identity began to emerge and elites as well as subalterns began to resent rule by foreigners. Despite his nobility and Latin identity, Stephen of Perche was rendered abnormal by his non-Sicilian origins, and the conspiracy against him rested on this foundation.

According to Falcandus, Stephen of Perche is the uncle of Count Gilbert of Gravina and the son of the Count of Perche, and Queen Margaret warmly welcomes him upon his arrival in Sicily. In short order, she appoints Stephen chancellor of the kingdom, such that "he undertook the burden of the entire administration and took precedence at court after the queen".⁵⁵ Stephen places fellow Frenchman Odo of Quarrel in a position of authority as master of the royal household. Odo had previously advised him to remain in Sicily "until it should happen that some other friends or relatives with whom he could equally share his plans came from France to join him".⁵⁶ Even while providing the basic exposition of Stephen's arrival, Falcandus implies the growing French hegemony that the new chancellor will impose over the kingdom of Sicily.

A few sentences later, the nobles of the Palermitan court begin to chafe against Stephen's rising influence:

They unguardedly uttered angry words, saying that it was a disgrace that this foreign-born boy had occupied the highest position of the court and burst out into such confident authority that he thought no one worthy to

⁵⁵ Loud and Wiedemann, *History of the Tyrants*, 162.

⁵⁶ Loud and Wiedemann, *History of the Tyrants*, 162.

be his associate, and wanted to administer the government of this great realm on his own and tower over everyone else by virtue of his unprecedented power. They, however, who had grown old in the service of the court, who had taught it to overcome or avoid lots of difficulties and dangers through their advice, were now despised, humiliated and rejected, and thought unworthy of any respect. The queen, who was a Spaniard, was calling this Frenchman her relative, talking with him far too familiarly and looking at him as though with eyes full of desire; there was cause to fear that a forbidden liaison was hiding under the cover of a blood-relationship.⁵⁷

In this outline of noble complaints against Stephen, his foreignness is the main point of contention. His inexperience with the affairs of Sicily makes him inappropriate to rule, and his unacceptability is expounded upon by a rumor of incest. At this early stage in a long-term conspiracy, “Matthew the notary,” along with other administrators and aristocrats, is included among the roster of plotters against the chancellor.⁵⁸

Meanwhile on the Italian mainland, Apulian nobles incite the queen’s brother Count Henry of Montescaglioso to remove his rival Count Richard of Molise—one of the queen’s favorites—from his undue position of power.⁵⁹ Count Henry arrives in Palermo to plead his case before the royal court, but Stephen convinces him not to take action against Richard.⁶⁰ Count Henry then apparently befriends the chancellor, despite the protests of the Palermitan nobles who continue to jealously oppose Stephen’s elevated status. Claiming that Henry must either “be enslaved to the queen’s dishonourable wishes and . . . be conniving at her sexual, or more properly incestuous, liaison with the chancellor himself,” the nobles convince Henry to join their cause, forming a coalition of Sicilians including the eunuch Caid Richard and the notary Matthew against the chancellor.⁶¹ Hearing rumors of the growing conspiracy, and hoping to avoid what “had

⁵⁷ Loud and Wiedemann, *History of the Tyrants*, 169.

⁵⁸ Loud and Wiedemann, *History of the Tyrants*, 172.

⁵⁹ Loud and Wiedemann, *History of the Tyrants*, 175.

⁶⁰ Loud and Wiedemann, *History of the Tyrants*, 177.

⁶¹ Loud and Wiedemann, *History of the Tyrants*, 180.

happened at the time of Caid Peter,” Stephen attempts to dodge the plot by moving the royal court to Messina.⁶²

The change of scenery is futile, for soon a Messinesi noble allied with the conspiracy convinces many locals to join in, and “a large proportion of the citizens secretly took an oath to Count Henry”.⁶³ Henry even “set a definite date on which he would suddenly attack and kill the chancellor,” but a city judge in league with the conspirators betrays their cause and reports their plans to Stephen. Count Henry is summoned before the queen and the future king, and is scolded (in a moment of high irony) by Count Gilbert of Gravina, the very nobleman who forced Caid Peter out of the kingdom. Henry goes into a fortress dungeon until he can be transported, under the guidance of Odo of Quarrel, back to his ancestral lands in Iberia.

But Odo remains at Messina for the moment, and Henry’s conspiracy merely changes hands. The new leaders are “Caid Richard, Master Chamberlain of the palace, and the notary Matthew and Bishop Gentile of Agrigento”—a multicultural cadre of palace administrators who rely on both noble and popular support to unseat Stephen.⁶⁴ The bureaucrats target their rival by bringing up a legal complaint that will garner support. They cite

. . . John of Lavadin, who had recently been given Matthew Bonellus’s estates at the chancellor’s request, [who] was injuring the townsmen under his control to the extent of demanding one-half of the movable property that they owned. He claimed that this was the custom of his own land. They on the contrary asserted the liberties of the citizens and townsmen of Sicily, and stated that they owed no income and no dues, but that they did occasionally let their lords have what they asked for, on their own terms and of their own free will, when there was a pressing need; it was only those Muslims and Greeks who were classified as villeins who had to pay tithes and an annual money rent.⁶⁵

⁶² Loud and Wiedemann, *History of the Tyrants*, 181.

⁶³ Loud and Wiedemann, *History of the Tyrants*, 184.

⁶⁴ Loud and Wiedemann, *History of the Tyrants*, 196.

⁶⁵ Loud and Wiedemann, *History of the Tyrants*, 197.

Matthew Bonellus—the man who ousted the evil Maio of Bari—was replaced by a French aristocrat with no understanding of the traditional feudal arrangements of Sicily, which relied on cultural differences to establish social castes. Stephen ignores their complaint; “he preferred to be seduced by the arrogance of some of those he had brought with him from France”.⁶⁶ The Sicilian political scene then seems ripe for a combined noble and popular uprising against the chancellor; the conspirators now have “maximum opportunity to arouse the hatred of many citizens and townsmen against him, claiming that it was his intention that the entire population of Sicily should be forced to pay annual renders and exactions, as was the custom in Gaul, where free citizens did not exist”.⁶⁷ Yet, once again, Stephen hears of the conspiracy before it can be brought to fruition and arrests Matthew, Caid Richard, and the Bishop of Agrigento.⁶⁸ Without organized leadership, the conspiracy seems doomed for the second time.

According to Falcandus it is Odo Quarrel, Stephen’s assistant in Messina, who enables the conspiracy’s culmination. During his time in the city, Odo supposedly extorts money from the ships passing through to Syria. The citizens of Messina express indignation about his financial wrongdoing, suggesting that he is “allowing foreign-born pirates to carry off to France the treasury of the realm”.⁶⁹ Odo also insults groups of urban Greeks in Messina’s gambling dens, and a mob of Greeks assaults the local official known as the *stratigotus* for his inaction against Odo’s effrontery. Next, Messina’s Latin elite act to mobilize the disgruntled Greeks:

When the Latins, who had come to hate the French because of [Odo’s] maritime exactions, saw that the Greeks too had been turned against them by new injustices, they started to urge them to rebel, claiming that what the French intended was to expel the whole Greek community and take over their homes, their vineyards and their other farms . . .⁷⁰

⁶⁶ Loud and Wiedemann, *History of the Tyrants*, 198.

⁶⁷ Loud and Wiedemann, *History of the Tyrants*, 198.

⁶⁸ Loud and Wiedemann, *History of the Tyrants*, 199.

⁶⁹ Loud and Wiedemann, *History of the Tyrants*, 200.

⁷⁰ Loud and Wiedemann, *History of the Tyrants*, 201.

The monarchy acts to quell the nascent rebellion, sending a sternly-worded letter to the citizens of Messina that affirms royal support for Stephen and Odo, but the message is never heard. When Messina's rebellious population gathers before the *stratigotus* to hear the words of King William and Queen Margaret, a riot breaks out and the crowd moves to "kill Odo Quarrel and then set free Count Henry".⁷¹ The rioters succeed on both counts, releasing Henry before executing Odo in the streets of Messina. As the killing of the hated official takes place, "the Greeks were busy slaughtering anyone from north of the Alps they could find".⁷²

The conspiracy comes to a close shortly after. The notary Matthew, while imprisoned in the palace at Palermo, organizes a team of loyal palace guards under the leadership of the castellan Constantine to assassinate Stephen, but his plot is given up once again by the master of the stable. So, Constantine turns to the citizens of Palermo to do the job, sending out servants to stir up different parts of the city against the chancellor.⁷³ Matthew and Caid Richard are both freed by the crowds that besiege Stephen's residence, eventually driving him into a tall bell-tower where he accepts their terms. He agrees to leave Sicily for good, along with the "Frenchmen" who support him.⁷⁴ Count Henry of Montescaglioso arrives triumphantly in Palermo and places himself, along with Matthew and Caid Richard, in power as *familiares*.⁷⁵

The conspiracy against Stephen of Perche is the most idiosyncratic plot (or series of plots) described by Falcandus, and also the hardest to fit into the model of conspiracies for normalization. Nonetheless, the rhetoric of the revolt confirms that normalization was a guiding concern of the elites who directed the conspiracy and the subalterns who participated. From its inception in the *History of the Tyrants*, the multi-phase conspiracy against Stephen conceives of the chancellor as "this Frenchman"—a foreigner issuing commands to Sicilians from a position of ignorance. The nobles who originate the plot, the palace bureaucrats who take over the reins, and the urban

⁷¹ Loud and Wiedemann, *History of the Tyrants*, 203.

⁷² Loud and Wiedemann, *History of the Tyrants*, 206.

⁷³ Loud and Wiedemann, *History of the Tyrants*, 210.

⁷⁴ Loud and Wiedemann, *History of the Tyrants*, 212.

⁷⁵ Loud and Wiedemann, *History of the Tyrants*, 214.

commoners who revolt against Odo and Stephen all act based on the injustice of a foreigner taking control of their society. Yet, Sicilian society was built on a series of foreign conquests and cultural amalgamations; Sicilians were used to living under some level of political control from nobles or administrators of diverse cultural and geographic origins. Why should the case of Stephen of Perche have been any different?

Based on the rhetoric of Falcandus, the conspiracy against Stephen—almost unique in its amplitude across levels of society—was an affirmation that the colonial paradigm of Sicily’s history was no longer acceptable. The logic is confusing, as Stephen himself was from the mainland, but the revolt against Stephen still represented a move toward mainland norms. Traditional feudal kingdoms were not meant to be administrated by foreigners with profound cultural differences that made them unable to comprehend the legal and social processes of the land. This in itself was abnormal, even if the foreigner in question came from a more traditional feudal society. Stephen’s status as an alien from Sicilian society made him unsuitable to rule; the nobles of the island wanted a normal, non-colonial system of feudal government. Additionally, the violence in Messina against those “from north of the Alps” was a powerful demonstration of Sicilian displeasure with the colonial paradigm. The massacre foreshadowed another rebellion, over a century later, against another French ruler: the famous uprising known as the Sicilian Vespers. The conspiracy against Stephen by a united front of Sicilians manifested the current of normalization shifting the island away from the status of a Mediterranean colony and toward the status of a European kingdom.

Juxtaposed with more concrete evidence, the *History of the Tyrants* confirms that a desire for normalization toward mainland European models was present and prominent among the elites of twelfth-century Sicily. The growing population and power of mainland Europeans on the island represented the push away from Sicilian idiosyncrasy and toward continental normality in human terms. The alterations in the form and function of the Cappella Palatina represented the same movement in terms of art and ceremony. The *History of the Tyrants* evidences the desire for normality with literary clues. The chronicle’s rhetoric in its description of the causes and justifications of conspiracy proves that continental normality was a profound concern for Sicilian elites. The major conspiracies discussed in the *History of the Tyrants* are all couched in

terms of normalization. Maio of Bari is abnormal as a commoner holding central power, Caid Peter is abnormal as a pseudo-Christian eunuch, and Stephen of Perche is abnormal as a foreigner. Their examples prove that Sicilian elites wanted to live in a politically feudal, culturally Latin, and socially non-colonial land which, in their opinion, constituted a normal European kingdom.

Normalization and Authorship

The elusive author of the *History of the Tyrants* need not have been Latin himself. Arab, Greek, and Latin courtiers would have been equally capable of writing Latin prose in Sicily's late twelfth century. Yet, the rhetoric of normalization employed by Falcandus does have some bearing on his identity. Falcandus clearly understood the feudal, Latinizing, xenophobic discourse of Latin elites; in fact, such discourse may be so prominent in the *History of the Tyrants* partly because Falcandus amplified it himself. The narrator of the chronicle is typically on board with the conspiracies he describes. He despises Maio and sees his murder as righteous. His presentations of Peter and Stephen are less scathing, but he still acknowledges that their identities make them unsuitable for their roles. Peter is a Muslim who cannot help but hate Christians, and Stephen is a foreigner who cannot understand Sicily. Falcandus's opposition to these figures suggests his own personal investment in the project of normalization. The Latin feudal elite of Palermo benefitted most from this project, so it is tempting to believe that Falcandus himself was a member, a proponent, or an employee of this elite.

I cannot make any definitive suggestions for the chronicle's authorship on this basis alone, but the argument for normalizing discourse erodes the cases for the two candidates cited by Graham A. Loud: Robert of San Giovanni and Eugenius of Palermo, "son of the Emir John".⁷⁶ The former was a Latin notary who followed Stephen of Perche. His cultural loyalties match up well, but his personal loyalties suggest that he was not caught up in the move toward normalization.⁷⁷ The latter was a Greek palace official and intellectual who would hardly have advocated the reconstruction of Sicily on

⁷⁶ Loud and Wiedemann, *History of the Tyrants*, 32.

⁷⁷ Loud and Wiedemann, *History of the Tyrants*, 31.

mainland European foundations.⁷⁸ Unfortunately, reading the *History of the Tyrants* as a testament to the normalization of medieval Sicily only offers vague parameters of ethnicity and ideology for the chronicle's elusive author. This study can clarify who Falcandus was not, but it cannot pinpoint who he was.

“A letter concerning the Sicilian tragedy”

In closing, I will add a brief observation regarding a text that is typically published as a supplement to the *History of the Tyrants*: a letter to Peter, the “Treasurer of the Church of Palermo”.⁷⁹ Scholars believe Falcandus was the other correspondent, based on the long-term connection between the letter and the *History of the Tyrants* and on stylistic similarities between the two. The message to Peter laments the approach of Holy Roman Emperor Henry VI with his wife Constance, a daughter of Roger II and the legitimate heir to the Sicilian throne after the death of William II.⁸⁰ Falcandus anticipates the arrival of a new brood of “foreigners”, “Germans” whose “madness” has “no experience of being ruled by the guidance of reason, or being deflected from its aims by human sympathy, or deterred by religious scruples”.⁸¹ He sees Sicily as a victim of treachery:

You are an island whose condition is wretched, and fate damned. You have nurtured and educated your children to the end that when they grow up to the hoped-for strength, they first tested that strength on you, and then—fattened on the abundance of your breasts—trample upon and tear your womb! Many who were once nursed in your lap and by your goodness have later harmed you in this way with many injuries and in many battles. Constance too, brought up from her first cradle for many years in the riches of your delights, educated and moulded by your instruction and manners, later left to enrich foreigners with your wealth, and now returns with huge forces to repay you with a disgraceful recompense, so as to

⁷⁸ Loud and Wiedemann, *History of the Tyrants*, 33.

⁷⁹ Loud and Wiedemann, *History of the Tyrants*, 252.

⁸⁰ David Abulafia, *Frederick II: A Medieval Emperor* (London: Allen Lane, 1988), 79.

⁸¹ Loud and Wiedemann, *History of the Tyrants*, 253.

violently tear apart the apparel of her most beautiful nurse and stain with foreign filth the elegance with which you exceed all other realms.⁸²

Here lies the final irony. Falcandus bemoans the upcoming loss of Sicily's "elegance"—her organic and distinctive style of life and government—to a group of barbarians from the continent. As Henry VI approached in 1194, preparing to put an end to what we call "Norman Sicily" and to initiate the island's Hohenstaufen period, Sicily had its best ever chance at normality.⁸³ The kingdom would be ruled by a strong, feudal, continental monarch legitimized by his familial connection to the old Norman kings.

Yet, at that critical moment, the former proponent of the normalizing project wrote to a friend bemoaning the prospects of a nonindigenous, purely European regime. The desire for normalization evoked by the *History of the Tyrants* is nowhere to be found in the letter to Peter. This does not mean the theory of shared authorship is false; it means that the impulse of normalization only extended so far, and was mediated by desires for autonomy and elite continuity. The upper echelons of Sicilian society (Falcandus included) may have balked at the idea of dominion by the Holy Roman Emperor, but their desire to rule the kingdom as they saw fit still rang true. Elite opinions were subject to radical change, but the rhetoric of the letter by no means delegitimizes the dominant current in the *History of the Tyrants*: the normalization of Norman Sicily.

⁸² Loud and Wiedemann, *History of the Tyrants*, 255.

⁸³ Abulafia, *Frederick II*, 80.

Arthur Dixon

Bibliography

- Abulafia, David. *Frederick II: A Medieval Emperor*. London: Allen Lane, 1988.
- Goddard, Hugh. *A History of Christian-Muslim Relations*. Chicago: New Amsterdam Books, 2000.
- Johns, Jeremy. *Arabic Administration in Norman Sicily: The Royal Diwan*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Loud, Graham A., trans. *Roger II and the Creation of the Kingdom of Sicily*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2012.
- Loud, Graham A. and Thomas Wiedemann, trans. *The History of the Tyrants of Sicily by 'Hugo Falcandus', 1154-69*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1998.
- Metcalf, Alex. *Muslims and Christians in Norman Sicily: Arabic speakers and the end of Islam*. London: Routledge Curzon, 2003.
- Powell, James M., ed. *Muslims Under Latin Rule, 1100-1300*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990.
- Tronzo, William. *The Cultures of His Kingdom*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997.
- Watt, W. Montgomery. *The Influence of Islam on Medieval Europe*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1972.

THE ROLE AND IMPACT OF JEWISH EVANGELISM IN NINETEENTH CENTURY
GREAT BRITIAN: THE LONDON SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIANITY
AMONGST THE JEWS

Maggie McKee-Huey

Honors Research

May 8, 2013

For the last 2,000 years of history, there have been many efforts to convert God's Chosen People, the Jews, to Christianity. In his book, *The Emergence of The Hebrew Christian Movement in Nineteenth-Century Britain*, Michael Darby quotes famous British Christian twentieth century author and professor, C.S. Lewis, on his interpretation of what a converted Jew is:

“In a sense the converted Jew is the only normal human being in the world. To him, in the first instance, the promises were made and he has availed himself of them. He calls Abraham his father by hereditary right as well as by diving courtesy. He has taken the whole syllabus in order as it was set; eaten the dinner according to the menu. Everyone else is, from one point of view, a special case, deal with under emergency regulations. To us Christians the unconverted Jew (I mean no offence) must appear as a Christian manqué; someone very carefully prepared for a certain destiny and then missing it. And we ourselves, we christened gentiles, are after all the graft, the wild vine, possessing ‘joys not promised to our birth,’ though perhaps we do not think of this so often as we might. And when the Jew does come in he brings with him into the fold dispositions different from, and complementary of, ours; as St. Paul envisages in Ephesians 2:14-9.”¹

In the history of Great Britain, the Jews have had an important role in their own development as a people and for British society. Beginning in the late eighteenth century, perspectives began to change about Jews in Britain. The question over how to evangelize to Jews became a concern for many Britons throughout the Empire and at home. Among the many questions that were asked

¹ Michael R Darby, *The Emergence of the Hebrew Christian Movement in Nineteenth-Century Britain* (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 2.

during the nineteenth century was the Jewish Question, which played a key role in Great Britain's opinions and interactions with the Jewish population at home and throughout the Empire. It is important to know the implications on what it meant to be a converted Jew, and even more so during the nineteenth century. Britain in the nineteenth century, put forth many different missionary efforts at home and abroad. In particular, Jewish missions were a significant part of these missionary efforts. One missionary group took on the task to answer the Jewish Question by means of Jewish evangelism. The most prominent and influential evangelist organization, exclusively for evangelism toward the Jews that emerged in the nineteenth century, was the London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews (often referred to as the LSPCJ or the London Society).²

William T. Gidney, author of *The History of the London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews from 1809 to 1908*, who was the Secretary of the LSPCJ at the time, describes how it was founded in 1809 by Joseph S.C.F. Frey, a converted Jew and German immigrant.³ His book thoroughly chronicles the one-hundred years of the LSPCJ by segmenting chapters into different periods of its existence. For Great Britain, the establishment of the London Society would prove to have a significant impact on the Jewish community, the attitudes about Jews and diminishing anti-Semitism, and indirectly on what would become the Zionist movement. Many scholars and historians attribute that its importance to examples of success, including its period of success of genuinely converting Jews to Christianity, its outreach and help to the poorer Jewish community in London, its establishment as a non-denominational organization, and its influence for Jewish evangelism in Europe, the United States, and other

² Mel Scult, *Millennial Expectations and Jewish Liberties: A Study of the Efforts to Convert the Jews in Britain up to the Mid-Nineteenth Century* (Leiden: Brill, 1978), 97.

³ W.T. Gidney, *History of the London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews from 1809 to 1908* (London: LSPCJ, 1908), 34.

parts the world.⁴ The LSPCJ established Jewish Christian churches and schools for Jewish converts and auxiliary institutions in Great Britain and throughout the British Empire. They also printed pamphlets and Hebrew New Testaments, and passed out informational tracts to the Jewish community in England, especially in East London. Most significantly, the LSPCJ helped lead to the rise of what became known as the Hebrew Christian movement in Great Britain.⁵ Although the history of Jewish Missions and the emergence of Hebrew Christianity in Great Britain are not widely discussed, their significance is important to understand on the impact they had as a whole and the implications of their attitudes toward Jews and Jewish evangelism on the British population, as well as their indirect influence on the emancipation of the Jews and the developing Zionist movement in Great Britain.

By the beginning of the nineteenth century, there were approximately 20,000 to 26,000 Jews living in England. Among those, 15,000 to 20,000 lived primarily in London.⁶ Jewish immigrants, most of which were from Eastern Europe, primarily settled in East London. The majority of the Jewish population of London during the nineteenth century lived in Spitalfields or Whitechapel. During the eighteenth century, Sephardic Jews made up two-thirds of the wealthy Jewish population.⁷ By the beginning of the nineteenth century, a large portion of London's Jews were Ashkenazic, although there was also a small but influential body of Sephardic Spanish Jews who were wealthy and prosperous. The status of London's Jews ranged from merchant princes to peddlers and hawkers. Already, by the nineteenth century, a significant portion of London's Jews were becoming increasingly Anglicized. Typically synagogues held services in Hebrew, and the Jews who attended had a traditional Torah observant lifestyle.

⁴ B.Z. Sobel, *Hebrew Christianity: The Thirteenth Tribe* (New York: Wiley, 1974), 139.

⁵ Darby, *The Emergence of the Hebrew Christian Movement in Nineteenth-Century Britain*, 8.

⁶ V.D. Lipman, *Social History of the Jews in England, 1850-1950*, (London: Watts, 1954), 6.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 7.

However, these “Anglicized” Jews went to Reform Synagogues which held services in English, and did not adhere to certain practices, in some cases rejecting the Talmud altogether.⁸ By 1850, England’s Jewish population was approximately 35,000, with about 18,000 to 20,000 living in London alone.⁹

Primarily throughout their history, the Jews were often marginalized for not being Christian and for not believing in Jesus Christ as the Messiah. Jews in Great Britain, as a whole, were more tolerated and were better off than their fellow Jews on the Continent, particularly in Eastern Europe. Many Jews immigrated during the mid-1700s to 1800s to England, because of the religious tolerance and better standard of living.¹⁰ In the beginning of the nineteenth century, the majority of the Jewish population in Britain was part of the middle class, although they were only a very small portion of this demographic. As the nineteenth century progressed, there was a significant influx of Jewish immigrants who were mostly poor, uneducated, and were seen as aliens to native Britons. Despite these initial hindrances, throughout the nineteenth century, the Jewish community prospered in Great Britain.¹¹ Biases between Gentile Christians and Jews still existed. Moreover, Jews did not have the same legal status as their Anglican counterparts, similar to how Dissenter denominations did not either. Jews wanting to make a new life in Britain were under pressure to convert, because of many restrictions that were placed on people who were not members of the Church of England. The Jewish Naturalization Act, which was passed in 1753, granted Jews the same rights as other non-Anglican British citizens. However, Jews were still not allowed to hold a seat in Parliament or vote. Attempts were made in 1833, 1834, and 1836 for Jews to be in Parliament, but were turned down by the House of Lords. By

⁸ Gidney, *History of the London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews from 1809 to 1908*, 29-30.

⁹ Lipman, *Social History of the Jews in England, 1850-1950*, 9.

¹⁰ T.M. Endelman, *The Jews of Britain, 1656 to 2000* (Berkeley: University of California, 2002), 76-77.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 79.

1858, Parliament passed the bill and the full emancipation of the Jews of England was finally accomplished.¹²

Even in the first decades of the nineteenth century, evangelism to the Jewish people was a difficult subject to address. Many Christians, even in Britain, believed that the Jews were the ones responsible for crucifying Jesus and that they no longer had God's divine blessing, despite the fact that most of the first century believers were in fact Jewish followers of Jesus Christ.¹³ In return, many Jews viewed Christianity as an alien religion to Judaism that did not support God's plan and had persecuted them for centuries. However, prior views on how to deal and interact with Jews were changing among Anglican and Dissenters in Britain. R.H. Martin discusses how already many Gentile Christians saw Jews as "half Christians" because they followed and understood the "Old Testament Faith."¹⁴ In many ways, Jewish evangelism was sought by missionaries as a way to remove the biases of both Christians and Jews in Britain. Moreover, there was an increased desire among many Christians, who were genuinely concerned about the salvation and welfare of the Jews not only in Britain, but throughout the world.¹⁵ As a result, more emphasis and reasons were put in place, primarily in the nineteenth century, for Jewish evangelism in Great Britain. Furthermore, as historian R.M. Smith asserts, it is important to understand that the efforts of Missions for the Jews in Great Britain began as an interdenominational cause that sought their conversion and salvation.¹⁶

¹² Gidney, *History of the London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews from 1809 to 1908*, 28-29.

¹³ Darby, *The Emergence of the Hebrew Christian Movement in Nineteenth-Century Britain*, 3.

¹⁴ R.H. Martin, "United Conversationist Activities among the Jews in Great Britain, 1795-1815: Pan-Evangelism and the London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews," *Church History* 46 (1977): 441.

¹⁵ Hannah Adams, *A concise account of the London Society for Promoting Christianity Amongst the Jews* (Boston: Printed by John Eliot., 1816)UNIV OF OKLAHOMA LIBRARIES's Catalog, EBSCOhost : 2.

¹⁶ R.M. Smith, "The London Jews' Society and Patterns of Jewish Conversion in England, 1801-1859," *Jewish Social Studies* 43 (1981): 284.

To completely convert the Jews to Christianity and allow them to forget who they were as God's people with a rich biblical tradition and observance of the Mosaic Law, the Torah, was an attitude that many Gentile Christians in Britain shared. However, many Biblical scholars, theologians, missionaries, and churchmen before the nineteenth century believed and proposed that Jewish Christians should continue their Torah observant lifestyle. In simplest terms, they could still be Jews while believing in Jesus as the Messiah.¹⁷ However, this view was not shared by other such scholars, particularly those of the Anglican Church. Jewish evangelism emerged out of the need to convert the Jews to Protestant Christianity in a way that was directed toward the Jews personally. This, in many ways, was the most crucial aspect and reason for the emergence of Jewish evangelism in nineteenth century Britain. It became a priority to missionaries and theologians to change the attitude that spreading the Gospel should be "to the Jew first"¹⁸ and that the Jews were not in the same category as "heathens" who needed to be converted. Rather, they were a people who also followed the same God, but who did not fully accept Jesus Christ.¹⁹

In the nineteenth century, it became important for Great Britain to evangelize those who were not already believers of Jesus Christ in the British Empire. To many, it was viewed and accepted that converting those at home would lead to more success in converting those abroad. Moreover, this notion provided grounds and reasons for converting Jews to Christianity in a way that was directed toward who they were as the People of Israel. There are many reasons and theories behind why Jewish evangelism gained prominence during the nineteenth century in Great Britain, although historians and scholars on the subject have varying opinions for the

¹⁷ Darby, *The Emergence of the Hebrew Christian Movement in Nineteenth-Century Britain*, 35.

¹⁸ See Romans 1:16 and 2:10.

¹⁹ R.H. Martin, "United Conversationist Activities among the Jews in Great Britain, 1795-1815: Pan-Evangelism and the London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews": 437.

causes. Was Jewish evangelism just a disguise for Jewish assimilation or just a better way to treat the Jews? Or rather, was it just another component of greater missionary movements in nineteenth century Britain? Moreover, could it have been connected to the growth of social reform movements or to the growth of millenarian beliefs? John M. Yeats maintains that the underlying cause for British Missions to the Jews was part of the primary effort for global evangelism and expansion of the Empire.²⁰ In other words, Jewish evangelism was another facet of general missionary growth in the nineteenth century. Inevitably, if the British were able to convert those who were known for so long for their rejection of Christianity, than not only would their other missionary movements succeed, God would ultimately bless the Empire for her good work. *A Concise Account of the LSPCJ*, which was written in 1816 and gives a general overview of the London Society, furthers this claim in that “The ultimate triumphs of Christianity itself are represented, as in a measure, suspended upon the conversion of the Jews. The world is to wait for them.”²¹ With the conversion of the Jews to Christianity, there would be no better or more successful people to deliver the message of God to the rest of the world.²²

In many ways, the emergence of Jewish evangelism of the nineteenth century is linked to the millenarian beliefs of the eighteenth century. Historian T.M. Endelman holds a slightly different view and assesses that “the associated conviction that the conversion of the Jews was linked to the Second Coming and that England had a special role to play in ushering it in,” rather than the general growth in evangelist missions. Moreover, different resources such as pamphlets, sermons, and tracts that shared these millenarian views, were very popular during the

²⁰ John M. Yeats, "To the Jew first": conversion of the Jews as the foundation for global missions and expansion in nineteenth-century British evangelicalism." *Southwestern Journal Of Theology* 47 (2005): 208.

²¹ Adams, *A concise account of the London Society for Promoting Christianity Amongst the Jews*, 10.

²² Yeats, "To the Jew first": conversion of the Jews as the foundation for global missions and expansion in nineteenth-century British evangelicalism": 215.

Revolutionary and Napoleonic wars. This time of political turmoil made many Christians in Britain believe that the new millennium was upon them.²³

The Restoration of the Jews to Israel was one of the primary goals of Jewish evangelism of the nineteenth century. Restoring the Jews to Israel meant fulfilling God's ultimate promise to His People. N.I. Matar expounds upon this assessment in his analysis of the Restoration movement of the Jews to the land of Israel. He states that during this period "Restoration was now part of the white man's burden and of the colonial enterprise that would dominate the nineteenth century."²⁴ In a variety of ways, the Restoration movement was a precursor to the Zionist movement. Both Anglicans and Dissenters were part of the movement for Jewish evangelism. From the stand point of many Anglicans, they believed that the Church of England was the true and most blessed Church of God. Therefore, the Restoration must be orchestrated by efforts of evangelism from the British toward the Jews. To return to Israel as believers in Christ was the ultimate plan of God. Moreover, to be the cause of the Redemption of the People of Israel meant a role of great importance to Great Britain. *A Concise Account* of the LSPCJ explains this further:

"Great Britain, in particular, is eminently distinguished for the variety and importance of her benevolent institutions; among which the London *Society for promoting Christianity amongst the Jews*, must be peculiarly interesting to all who are devoutly waiting for the redemption of Israel."²⁵

In other words, Great Britain's distinguished position as the world's global power and her benevolent nature made her the most qualified to pursue evangelizing efforts to the Jews and

²³ Endelman, *The Jews of Britain, 1656 to 200*, 69-70.

²⁴ N.I. Matar, "The Controversy over the Restoration of the Jews: From 1754 until the London Society for Promoting Christianity among the Jews." *Durham University Journal* 82 (1990): 39.

²⁵ Adams, *A concise account of the London Society for Promoting Christianity Amongst the Jews*, 2.

help return God's People to the Holy Land to be blessed. Her example would lead to many more societies and organizations with similar pursuits.

The London Missionary Society (LMS), which was an interdenominational group established in 1795, was the primary organization for evangelism in London and other parts of Great Britain.²⁶ Under the umbrella of the LMS, initial attempts of proselytizing Jews and for Jewish Evangelism were made. One man saw that the effort to promote Christianity among the Jews was not sufficient. As a result, Joseph Samuel Christian Frederick Frey founded the London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews in 1809. Born in Franconia, Germany in 1770, he was the son of Samuel Levi Frey, a Jewish private tutor.²⁷ Frey describes in his biography, *The Narrative of the Reverend Joseph Samuel C. F. Frey*, how he was trained to be a synagogue Cantor and ritual slaughterer for ceremonial religious services.²⁸ His narrative also describes how he became a converted Jewish Christian and the early years of the growth of the London Society, as well as his involvement. Frey came to England in 1801 to work for the London Missionary Society where he desired to reach out to his fellow Jews in London and preach the Gospel.²⁹ Frey would often visit different synagogues in London and would talk about the Gospel wherever he traveled. His involvement with the LMS and devotion to his Jewish brethren gave him the desire to focus more attention on sharing Jesus Christ with them. Frey believed that,

“The conversion of the Jews to Christianity, whether it be considered with regard to the glory of Jehovah—their own degraded and guilty state—or with reference to that happy

²⁶ Gidney, *History of the London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews from 1809 to 1908*, 33.

²⁷ Joseph Samuel C. F. Frey, *Narrative of the Reverend Joseph Samuel C. F. Frey* (New-York : W.B. Gilley, 1817) UNIV OF OKLAHOMA LIBRARIES's Catalog, EBSCOhost: 1.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, 12.

²⁹ Gidney, *History of the London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews from 1809 to 1908*, 33.

influence upon the Christian church, and the world at large, which the Holy Scriptures encourages us to anticipate, is a most desirable object.”³⁰

However, he perceived that the work the LMS was doing was not helpful for truly evangelizing the Jews of London. Moreover, he saw that the transitional period for Jews after conversion was crucial and needed more attention. Since converted Jews were coming from a different background than most new Christians, they needed to deal with their identities as Jews and as new Christians. He proposed a variety of ways to expand outreach to the Jews, such as establishing an industry house to provide jobs to poor Jewish immigrants. Yet all of his ideas were rejected.³¹ The leaders of the LMS felt there was not enough money for such specific projects and would hurt the organization. As a result, Frey resigned from the LMS with the reason that the mission of Jewish evangelism had not worked in helping in their transition and livelihood. Thus, in 1809, he formed the London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews which became the first organized missionary movement specifically to evangelize the Jews in England.³²

The primary purpose of the London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews was both spiritual and temporal. The LSPCJ was established to help the Jews in London, not only with the spiritual aspects of their lives, but with their overall well-being also. After leaving the LMS, Frey’s movement gained popularity and needed a larger space to preach in. Frey would preach to large crowds on Sundays and have lectures during the week to hundreds of his “Jewish brethren.” The LSPCJ leased an eighteenth century Huguenot Church building on Church Street in Spitalfields in London, which already had a large Jewish population of immigrants, and named

³⁰ Joseph Samuel C. F. Frey, *Narrative of the Reverend Joseph Samuel C. F. Frey* (New York: J.K. Moore, 1834 [11th edn.]) *Princeton Theological Seminary Library*. 119.

³¹ Martin, “United Conversationist Activities among the Jews in Great Britain, 1795-1815: Pan-Evangelism and the London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews”: 442.

³² Scult, *Millennial Expectations and Jewish Liberties: A Study of the Efforts to Convert the Jews in Britain up to the Mid-Nineteenth Century*, 96-97.

it the Jews' Chapel.³³ This chapel, as Michael Darby assesses, “was the first modern Hebrew Christian congregation to be established in Britain by a Jewish missionary society, although non-Jewish worshippers were also welcomed.” Moreover, it was in this chapel that the foundations of the Hebrew Christian movement originated.³⁴ Many LSPCJ institutions, like the Jews' Chapel, encouraged involvement from Jewish Christians as well as Gentile Christians.

The London Society primarily evangelized to the Jews of East London, who were mostly of the poorer classes.³⁵ *The Concise Account* describes that “Men of piety and benevolence, of talents and learning, of influence and rank, of nobility and royalty, have come forward to assist in promoting the temporal and eternal welfare of the Jews.”³⁶ The LSPCJ's mission to help the Jews, both in spiritual and temporal spheres, was a major aspect of Frey's outlook on Jewish evangelism. It promoted education, social welfare, and missionary training among those involved and with the new converts. The LSPCJ was not a Jewish emancipation or Zionist movement, nor was it a social welfare organization. Although, it had a great amount of influence in many of these areas, Mel Scult describes its main objective was to evangelize the Jews in Great Britain, and eventually reach the Jews of the world.³⁷ The LSPCJ made use of tracts and pamphlets which they created, printed, and passed out to the London Jewish community. One of the London Society's pamphlets, *Missions to Jews*, lists the premise of their sevenfold work focus, which were: Evangelistic and Pastoral, Educational, Bible distribution, Prayer Book distribution, Tract distribution, Colportage, and Medical Missionary.³⁸ In particular the London Society stressed the importance of producing Hebrew translations of the New Testament to use as a way to

³³ Frey, *Narrative of the Reverend Joseph Samuel C. F. Frey* [11th edn.], 125.

³⁴ Darby, *The Emergence of the Hebrew Christian Movement in Nineteenth-Century Britain*, 53.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, 7-8.

³⁶ Adams, *A concise account of the London Society for Promoting Christianity Amongst the Jews*, 3.

³⁷ Mel Scult, “English Missions to the Jews: Conversion in the Age of Emancipation,” *Jewish Social Studies* 35 (1973): 13.

³⁸ W.T. Gidney, *Missions to Jews* (London: LSPCJ, 1899 [5th edn.]), 56.

evangelize the Jews. The first Hebrew New Testament was published in 1817. By 1819, over 10,000 copies of a second edition were printed.³⁹ Moreover, the Hebrew New Testament was a crucial tool for LSPJC missionaries to use. *The Manchester Guardian* on October 24, 1865, describes how “A general restlessness of heart and mind existed among the Jewish people; an increasing demand for the New Testament continued to be a marked feature of every missionary station.”⁴⁰

The temporal aspects of the society were important to the LSPCJ, but the spiritual outreach was the primary focus. For example, the LSPCJ tried to provide jobs and ways for converted Jews to make a living after being rejected by the Jewish community. In 1810, The London Society established a House of Industry to manufacture cotton for candle wicks; however this effort failed after a year and became a printing office in the Jews’ Chapel.⁴¹ More jobs were also created for a short period initially. The printing office, which made tracts, Hebrew New Testaments and other publications of the LSPCJ was able to pay for its own expense and furnished “useful employment to the Jewish youths under the Society’s care.”⁴²

Patronage to the London Society was one of the primary sources of funding for the LSPCJ, along with donations and collection funds. The Society would often preach collection sermons on tithes and donating money. However, the amount of support was not enough to initially fund the efforts of the LSPCJ. An issue of the *Christian Observer* in 1818 reported on the committee meeting and dealings of the Society, and said that improvements were made with the various financial needs. The report stated that “The debts with which it has so long been burdened are now fully discharged, and the system of economy, what has been so vigorously

³⁹ Gidney, *History of the London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews from 1809 to 1908*, 56.

⁴⁰ "Society for Promoting Christianity among the Jews." *The Manchester Guardian (1828-1900)*, Oct 24, 1865.

⁴¹ Darby, *The Emergence of the Hebrew Christian Movement in Nineteenth-Century Britain*, 56.

⁴² London Society for Promoting Christianity among the Jews." *Christian Observer, Conducted by Members of the Established Church (1802-1842)* 17, (1818): 857.

pursued during the last two years, may be considered to have produced its full effect.” The account goes on to say that more money came through from several other departments to pay older debts. It also discusses how the printing and distributing of Hebrew New Testaments were primarily funded by contributions from individuals and associations.⁴³ Much of the other various funds went both to temporal and spiritual relief efforts. Gidney states that when the London Society was first established, “the temporal benefit of Jews was as much an object as their spiritual; but as early as 1819 the first of the then ‘Rule and Regulations’ was altered, and the Society’s sole object was declared to be purely spiritual.”⁴⁴ However, he recounts that the need in the Jewish community was still great and that some means needed to be found to assist them. He explains that it was the Temporal Relief Fund and other charitable groups, such as the Operative Jewish Converts’ Institution and the Wanderer’s Home, which helped toward this effort.⁴⁵

The leadership, missionaries, theologians, supporters and patrons were crucial for the development of the London Society. Besides Frey, who was the founding father of the London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews, there were many other prominent spiritual and temporal leaders who were influential and important in British society. At the time, even the Prince Regent, George IV, was asked to become the first Patron of the LSPCJ, but he declined the offer. However, the Duke of Kent, future father of Queen Victoria, was elected to the position in 1813 and held it until 1815.⁴⁶ He had an integral part in helping the LSPCJ establish the first Jewish Christian compound for Jewish converts, which included a church and school, called Palestine Place. At the grand opening, it was described that the foundation, both spiritual

⁴³ Ibid.

⁴⁴ Gidney, *History of the London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews from 1809 to 1908*, 218.

⁴⁵ Ibid., 219.

⁴⁶ Ibid., 37.

and temporal, “was laid by His Royal Highness the Duke of Kent, on April 7th, 1813, in the presence of nearly 20,000 spectators.” Not only was the Duke of Kent there as a significant presence, there were other prominent supporters, too including slavery abolitionist William Wilberforce and religious activist Lewis Way.⁴⁷ Members of the Clapham Sect, a group of Anglican social reformers, such as Wilberforce and Charles Simeon, were firm supporters and patrons of the London Society. Others included Lord Shaftesbury and Lord Bexley, President of the LSPCJ from 1848-1885, and Chancellor of the Exchequer from 1812 to 1823, respectfully.⁴⁸ Lord Shaftesbury had “an ardent desire for the complete redemption of God’s people Israel, and for their restoration both to His favor and to their own land.”⁴⁹ Their support and patronage, along with many others from Parliament and the Church of England, provided the necessary backing to continue and expand the LSPCJ’s efforts for Jewish evangelism.

Prime Minister Benjamin Disraeli is considered to be one of the most famous Jewish Christians of the nineteenth century. Although he was not a direct supporter or a product of the Society, Disraeli was the ideal Jewish Christian who the Society promoted. Nadia Valman describes that the LSPCJ saw “as exemplary for his philosemitic Christianity: ‘Though a Christian, he was proud of his Jewish origin, and ever upheld the traditions of his race.’”⁵⁰ By 1816, missionary work in London grew and that “lectures to the Jews and also to Christians on Jewish subjects were continued in Ely Place Chapel, St. Swithin’s, London Stone, Bentinck Chapel and elsewhere.” The Jews’ Chapel at Spitalfields had to be given up, because the bishop refused to allow it to be a place of worship for the Anglican Church.⁵¹ Frey had already by this time decreased his involvement in the Society and in May that same year resigned from the

⁴⁷ Ibid., 41.

⁴⁸ Scult, “English Missions to the Jews: Conversion in the Age of Emancipation”: 3.

⁴⁹ Gidney, *History of the London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews from 1809 to 1908*, 402.

⁵⁰ T.M. Edelman. and T. Kushner, eds., *Disraeli’s Jewishness* (London: Vallentine Mitchell, 2002), 80.

⁵¹ Gidney, *History of the London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews from 1809 to 1908*, 57.

Society and left for the United States, where he would be involved in Jewish Missions and teach Hebrew.⁵² After Frey left, his work was carried out primarily by Reverend Lewis Way, the Secretaries, and the Chaplin.⁵³

The London Society was founded on the principle in which “the Established Church and Christians of various denominations of Dissenters can cordially unite.”⁵⁴ The LSPCJ was originally founded as a non-denominational organization that allowed for Anglicans and Dissenters to work together to evangelize the Jews. Initially, LSPCJ helped create a bond between Anglicans and Dissenters, in order for them to come together on the common ground of trying to convert Jews to Christianity. However, problems arose when issues, such as the sacraments and establishing churches for these newly converted Jewish Christians, became prevalent. The problem over Baptism, for example, “was a rock sufficiently dangerous to wreck the Society, to say nothing of other theological differences.”⁵⁵ Denominational issues forced the LSPCJ to have two different types of lectures to preach to the Jews on Sundays: one by the Dissenters, the other by the Anglicans.⁵⁶ The issue of ordination also caused tension in the management and affected the mission of the London Society. Although Frey had been ordained by the London Mission Society in 1805, it was also a non-denominational group and not a church. As a result, he was not allowed to deliver the sacraments. When the LSPCJ was established, Frey wanted to become fully ordained. However, many of the Anglicans in the Society were apprehensive to ordain him.⁵⁷ R.H. Martin maintains that this pan-evangelistic movement “was based on the hope that if Anglicans and Dissenters could cooperate in a

⁵² Frey, *Narrative of the Reverend Joseph Samuel C. F. Frey*, 144-150.

⁵³ Gidney, *History of the London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews from 1809 to 1908*, 58.

⁵⁴ Adams, *A concise account of the London Society for Promoting Christianity Amongst the Jews*, 5.

⁵⁵ Gidney, *History of the London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews from 1809 to 1908*, 46.

⁵⁶ Martin, “United Conversationist Activities among the Jews in Great Britain, 1795-1815: Pan-Evangelism and the London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews”: 446.

⁵⁷ Darby, *The Emergence of the Hebrew Christian Movement in Nineteenth-Century Britain*, 55.

common mission to the Jews, they could also resolve ecclesiastical differences that had divided them for centuries.”⁵⁸ Although the primary goal of the London Society was to evangelize Britain’s Jews, it did earnestly seek to unite not just Jews and Christians, but also Anglicans and Dissenters. Ultimately, this outcome did not occur and was a failure as a nondenominational movement.⁵⁹ After more disagreements and theological issues, the LSPCJ fell under Anglican leadership and control by 1816.⁶⁰

The London Society established churches, schools, and other institutions in London, Great Britain, and throughout the Empire during the nineteenth century. Palestine Place was founded as a center for the first Jewish Christian church and schools acquired by the London Society in Bethnal Green. It was “accomplished to the glory of God and the salvation of many Jews.” The church was opened on July 16th 1814 and “was the first place of worship set apart in England for Christian Jews.” Moreover, Palestine Place was the center of Jewish missionary work in London for over eighty years. Within the London Society, forty-one converted Jewish believers assembled as a group called The Children of Abraham, which was established on September 9th, 1813 in the Jews’ Chapel. This was the first exclusive Hebrew Christian Association to be established in history.⁶¹ The Children of Abraham allowed the LSPCJ to communicate and have public knowledge of the current state of the poorer Jewish community.⁶² Other associations such as the Hebrew Christian Prayer Union were established during this period of the emergence of Hebrew Christianity. By 1889, it was renamed the Hebrew Christian Union and had over 630 members. The Society also published different journals and other news

⁵⁸ Martin, “United Conversationist Activities among the Jews in Great Britain, 1795-1815: Pan-Evangelism and the London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews”: 448.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 438.

⁶⁰ Gidney, *History of the London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews from 1809 to 1908*, 51.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 41-43.

⁶² Darby, *The Emergence of the Hebrew Christian Movement in Nineteenth-Century Britain*, 61.

sources such as *Jewish Intelligence*, which became *Jewish Missionary Intelligence*, *The Jewish Expositor* which was originally called *The Jewish Repository*, *Israel's Advocate*, and *The Voice of Israel*, as well as the Annual Reports which chronicled the annual dealings of the Society.⁶³ Hebrew Christian churches and centers, such as Palestine Place and what became known as the Episcopal Jews' Chapel, were seen as acceptable to the Christian community in the neighborhood and many had taken an interest in the "salvation of Israel."⁶⁴

Along with established churches and centers of worship, providing schooling and education for young Jewish children and their parents was also part of the London Society's outreach. The value of education that Jewish parents stressed for their children was important for the schools of the LSPCJ, particularly at Palestine Place, and was a factor that significantly aided the London Society in its mission and work. By 1822, almost "300 Jewish children had enjoyed the benefit of Christian instruction given by the Society."⁶⁵ Moreover, according to Gidney, for over 75 years at Palestine Place, "the schools received, boarded, and educated 1253 Jewish children."⁶⁶

The London Society stressed the importance of recruiting and training both Gentile and Jewish Christians to be missionaries for the LSPCJ. By 1899, the Society employed "a staff of 174 Missionaries – Ordained, Lay, Medical, Parochial Agents, Scripture Readers, Colporteurs, Schoolmasters and Mistresses, Depôt Keepers, &c." Among the missionaries, eighty-two were Jewish Christians. Missionary candidates would be "trained at the St. John's College of Divinity, Highbury, and reside in a Hostel, under the charge of the Rev. S.T. Bachert."⁶⁷ The Hebrew College opened in Palestine Place in 1840 in order to train missionaries, and Dr. McCaul was

⁶³ Gidney, *Missions to Jews*, 78.

⁶⁴ Darby, *The Emergence of the Hebrew Christian Movement in Nineteenth-Century Britain*, 87.

⁶⁵ Gidney, *History of the London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews from 1809 to 1908*, 71.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 532.

⁶⁷ Gidney, *Missions to Jews*, 57-59.

placed in charge, because of his “experience and special qualifications.”⁶⁸ The Society established auxiliaries between 1810 and 1815 in places such as Dublin, Edinburgh, Glasgow, Halifax, Brighton, Leicester, York, Cambridge, Liverpool, Manchester, Norfolk, Bristol, and Weymouth. These auxiliaries and other committees that were established by the LSPCJ helped build and finance this missionary cause. Gidney describes, in particular, how the Westminster Auxiliary Committee, which was composed of Dissenters, “rendered much help in the way of funds and counsel, and was regarded as the premier Auxiliary ‘both from its contiguity and superior importance.’”⁶⁹

The international and transnational pursuits and missionary stations by the LSPCJ were examples of the growing movement of Jewish evangelism in the Empire. By 1822, the LSPCJ grew in its transnational and international pursuits, and more British Missionary Societies to the Jews were established. In Scotland and Ireland, The Church of Scotland Jewish Mission in 1840, the Free Church of Scotland Mission in 1842, and the Presbyterian Church in Ireland Mission, in 1842, were established. In Great Britain, the British Society for the Propagation of the Gospel among the Jews (BSPGJ) was established in 1842.⁷⁰ Frey and The London Society knew from the beginning that the Jewish population in London was only a small fraction of all the Jews in the world who needed to be reached. Gidney describes how the LSPCJ’s goal was to evangelize the Jews in London. However, they “could no longer be content with such a restricted field as our own country offers, with its mere handful of a few thousands of the scattered race.”⁷¹ Their pursuits for missions abroad in the Empire were part of their work and they established auxiliary committees and missionary centers in Europe, Palestine, and other areas of the Empire. Including

⁶⁸ Gidney, *History of the London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews from 1809 to 1908*, 216.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, 45.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, 214.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, 57-58.

the original location in London, the LSPCJ's pamphlet, *Missions to Jews*, gives a list of forty stations and the year of their establishment ranging from 1809 to 1897. Some include prominent European cities such as Vienna, Paris, and Rome, as well as other significant sites like Jerusalem.⁷² During the nineteenth century, the London Society also established schools in Jerusalem, Damascus, Tunis, Bucharest, Safed, Isfahan, Tehran, and Constantinople.⁷³ Gidney stresses that for the LSPCJ "Wherever the Jews are, there lies the Society's work. Moreover, the Jews abroad are not surrounded by the same pure and sound Christian principles and life as those in England, and their spiritual need is proportionately greater." Here Gidney expresses England's view about their role in the world and further explains reasons for Jewish evangelism according to the London Society. The LSPCJ asserted that its main priority was to evangelize the Jews of London.⁷⁴ Jews in Britain had more of an opportunity to learn about the Gospel, that was why it was also imperative for the London Society to spread their movement abroad. The new societies and other missionary groups did take some focus away from the LSPCJ. However for a growing cause and movement, it was inevitable that more Jewish missionary organizations would emerge as a result. Gidney assesses, "We suppose that, in the onward march of events, the multiplication of agencies having the same end in view was inevitable. Still, we cannot forget that until the year 1875 the Society was alone in the field, and enjoyed the undivided support of Churchmen interested in the cause."⁷⁵

It was a primary goal and desire of the LSPCJ to change the attitudes about Jews among Gentile Christians in Britain. Archdeacon Sinclair of the London Society describes that,

"We must not treat the Hebrew as if he personally had rejected the Lord whom we believe to be the Messiah. Nineteen centuries of unnatural and unchristian treatment have

⁷² Gidney, *Missions to Jews*, 56.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, 59.

⁷⁴ Gidney, *History of the London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews from 1809 to 1908*, 55-56.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, 414.

made it impossible for him to share our faith. He has been thrown back upon himself, and he has not thought of Christianity as even a possibility.”⁷⁶

However, Hebrew Christians experienced persecution from both Gentile Christians and unconverted Jews. Many Jewish Christians were alienated in their communities and lost their jobs as a result of their conversion. Both sides questioned the authenticity of conversion for many of these new Jewish Christians and were skeptical about their actions.⁷⁷ On November 1, 1854, *The Manchester Guardian* reported in its article “Conversion of the Jews” that many non-converted Jews and Gentile Christians in Britain questioned the sincerity of Jewish converts and that Jewish converts were deceitful. The issue criticized why Jews would want to become Christians in the first place,

“What did they gain by becoming Christians? The society did not support them; for one of their fundamental laws was that not 6d. of the general funds of the society could go for the temporal support of a Jew or Jewish convert... When a Jew was converted, this society had nothing more to do with him; he dropped into the next Christian congregation, or made his way in the world as best he could. The object of the society was to convert Jews, not to support them.”⁷⁸

This point of view that the LSPCJ and Jewish converts had was a negative consequence of the Society’s change in focus on temporal relief. Violent and abusive actions against Jewish converts also occurred. Many Jewish Christians, who worshipped at the Jews’ Chapel in Spitalfields, were socially isolated and ostracized, and deprived of employment within the Jewish community. Moreover, Hebrew Christians were not only harassed by non-converted Jews, but they were also rejected by Christian Gentiles.⁷⁹ Opposition (from both Jews and Gentile Christians) to the LSPCJ rose because of its primary purpose to evangelize the Jews of England. Several pamphlets were written and produced to counteract the Jewish evangelism, including one called *The*

⁷⁶ Gidney, *Missions to Jews*, 114-115.

⁷⁷ Gidney, *History of the London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews from 1809 to 1908*, 625.

⁷⁸ “Conversion of the Jews.” *The Manchester Guardian (1828-1900)*, Nov 01, 1854.

⁷⁹ Darby, *The Emergence of the Hebrew Christian Movement in Nineteenth-Century Britain*, 55.

London Society Examined. Gidney describes that they were “written with an unconcealed desire to damage the cause and bring it into public disrepute, have fallen into limbo of forgetfulness as they well deserved to do.”⁸⁰ However, despite these setbacks for converted Jews, the LSPCJ was able to continue their outreach to them. By the end of the nineteenth century, a total of 2,022 Jews were baptized in London by missionaries of the LSPCJ.⁸¹

There were many problems that faced the London Society, such as funding, baptism, need for a separate church, temporal relief, and educating new missionaries.⁸² Increasingly with Jewish converts, the need for keeping some traditional aspects of Judaism in accordance with Christianity caused many theologians and preachers (both Jewish and Gentile) to reevaluate worship and organization in LSPCJ churches. Moreover, as more Jews were being converted by LSPCJ missionaries, the desire for a Hebrew Christian church/denomination emerged. However, as Darby assesses, “It is apparent that the LSPCJ was intent on incorporating its Hebrew Christian converts within a community of Gentile and Jewish Church of England worshippers rather than allowing them the freedom to establish their own independent Hebrew Christian church.”⁸³ Under the Rules and Regulations of the Society, rules eight and nine state that the LSPCJ was under the Church of England, and therefore all missionary matters and styles of worship would be in agreement with Anglican theology.⁸⁴ Alexander McCaul, who was the leading theologian of the London Society in the 1830s, was instrumental in the organization of Hebrew services. It was not that having literature or services in Hebrew was negative, in fact there was Anglican liturgy available in Hebrew; rather it was assumed that eventually converts would assimilate and go to regular Anglican churches. Moreover, he like many desired the

⁸⁰ Gidney, *History of the London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews from 1809 to 1908*, 78.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, 533.

⁸² *Ibid.*, 629.

⁸³ Darby, *The Emergence of the Hebrew Christian Movement in Nineteenth-Century Britain*, 96.

⁸⁴ Gidney, *History of the London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews from 1809 to 1908*, 53.

conversion and Restoration of the Jewish Nation to Palestine, and “When prejudice of the Gentiles had been overcome he wished to see some of them preach to the Jewish people.”⁸⁵ The London Society was not ready for Jewish Christians to establish their own denomination nor was it the intent. Moreover, another problem that faced the LSPCJ and the Anglican Church was too much emphasis was placed on converts becoming missionaries. The Society felt that making Jewish converts into missionaries would help the growth of the LSPCJ and help more Jews become Christians. However, many were unqualified and needed more education. This was true also for Gentile Christian missionaries of the London Society.⁸⁶

The emergence of Hebrew Christianity in Great Britain was a direct reflection of the missionary work of the London Society and other organizations that were established afterward. The need for a separate Hebrew Christian church was important for many Jewish converts in Great Britain, because it allowed them to hold on to their identity as Jews while believing in Jesus Christ. Although he founded the LSPCJ and had no aspiration to create a separate church, Frey believed that the ceremonial observances of Judaism were no longer necessary, and in comparison to Christianity were more of a burden. Michael Darby assesses that “Despite these reservations, Frey was motivated to assemble Jewish converts in ethnic association for mutual encouragements and edification, and can justifiably be characterized as the father of Modern Hebrew Christianity.”⁸⁷ However, there were many advocates of Jewish converts retaining their practices and becoming Christian believers. Moreover according to Darby, “It can be seen that the LSPCJ was eager to promote the restoration of the Jewish people to Palestine but was not yet

⁸⁵ Darby, *The Emergence of the Hebrew Christian Movement in Nineteenth-Century Britain*, 95.

⁸⁶ H.J. Schonfield, *The History of Jewish Christianity from the First to the Twentieth Century*, (London: Duckworth, 1936), 231.

⁸⁷ Darby, *The Emergence of the Hebrew Christian Movement in Nineteenth-Century Britain*, 67.

ready to allow Jewish Christians the opportunity to develop a theological system of their own.”⁸⁸ Therefore, it was not up to the LSPCJ or the Church of England to help Jewish converts make their own Hebrew Christian church, because they had not been restored to their homeland yet. However, Hebrew Christianity and missions to Jews in nineteenth century Great Britain had a significant impact on the next century for Christian-Jewish relations at home and throughout the world. More importantly, the Hebrew Christian movement laid the ground work for its successor—modern Messianic Judaism.

Whether or not the London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews was ultimately successful is up for debate. The period of 1830 to 1850 is considered to be the “palmy days” of the entire history of the LSPCJ.⁸⁹ This is the period where not only were more Jews being led to the Gospel, but the London Society had continually reached out to the Jewish community at home and abroad. The society had also circulated approximately 60,000 publications.⁹⁰ More importantly, the number of New Testaments sold to Jews by 1909 grew significantly, “considering the amount of persuasion and effort attending the sale of each volume. Nearly a million Old Testaments have been circulated and 25,723 copies of the Liturgy of the Church of England in Hebrew, and over five million tracts.”⁹¹ The LSPCJ did have a significant impact on the lives of Jews and Christians in Britain during the nineteenth century and beyond. Darby summarizes the contributions in that:

“The LSPCJ brought about the most important changes in the civil, political, literary and religious conditions of the Jews in Britain. Its supporters removed much of the prejudice which oppressed the Hebrew people in the realm, initiated a general kind attitude among

⁸⁸ Ibid., 119.

⁸⁹ Gidney, *History of the London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews from 1809 to 1908*, 217.

⁹⁰ “Society for Promoting Christianity among the Jews.” *The Manchester Guardian (1828-1900)*, Oct 24, 1865.

⁹¹ Gidney, *History of the London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews from 1809 to 1908*, 625.

the English towards the Jews and thus paved the way for the removal of their civil and political disabilities.”⁹²

The Manchester Guardian cited that the LSPCJ reported that by 1865 “of the 50,000 Jews in England the Society counted about 4,000 converts” and considered this to be a great accomplishment.⁹³ Although the number of Jews who converted were a small percentage of the Jewish population in Great Britain, the impact of the London Society was still great. Both Gentile and Jewish Christians worked together to spread the Gospel and help the Jewish community in London and abroad. In doing so, it helped implement a new mindset among the British about the Jews and removed many anti-Semitic tendencies. Moreover, the London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews planted the seeds and ideals that would be crucial aspects of the Zionist Movement in Great Britain.

The London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews has had a lasting impact and legacy for a number of reasons. The LSPCJ remained the largest Jewish missionary organization into the twentieth century. What is even more significant is that the London Society still exists today under a different name as the Church's Ministry Among Jewish People (CMJ).⁹⁴ It is hard to quantify the total impact of the LSPCJ, but there are significant remnants of its legacy. According to data gathered by A.E. Thompson, who wrote *A Century of Jewish Missions*, the Society had over 200 missionaries in 52 different sites. By 1903, the annual income of the London Society was a quarter of a million dollars.⁹⁵ The London Society had its times of success and stagnation, but through all of this it was able to reach and impact Great Britain in a variety of ways. Gidney assesses that “There is little doubt that the known results of Missions to Jews, when the restriction of the field and the means to cultivate it are taken into account, will be found

⁹² Darby, *The Emergence of the Hebrew Christian Movement in Nineteenth-Century Britain*, 137.

⁹³ "Society for Promoting Christianity among the Jews." *The Manchester Guardian (1828-1900)*, Oct 24, 1865.

⁹⁴ For more information look at CMJ Website, <http://www.cmj.org.uk/>.

⁹⁵ A.E. Thompson, *A Century of Jewish Missions* (New York: 1902), *Supplemental Index*, EBSCOhost, 279.

to be quite as great as in any other missionary cause.”⁹⁶ N.I. Martar argues that the Restoration movement in Great Britain was a key reason why the LSPCJ was established, along with other Jewish Missions. Not only did the Restoration of Israel mean for Jews to accept Jesus as the Messiah, but it also meant to return them to Palestine.⁹⁷

Zionism was not a central focus of the LSPCJ, yet the growth of its popularity was important to the Society. Gidney discusses Austrian Jew Theodore Herzl’s 1896 pamphlet, *The Jewish State*, which launched the Zionist movement and “seemed to offer an escape from Anti-Semitism in Russia.” The first Zionist conference was held in 1897 with “kindled wide-spread enthusiasm.” In 1900, the fourth Congress was held in London.⁹⁸ Although the LSPCJ did not claim to be a Zionist organization, its work in different Jewish communities helped with attitudes and planted the early seeds of Zionism in Britons. Moreover, the LSPCJ helped establish the Hebrew Christian movement which would effect centuries to come. Semitic language expert and historian H.J. Schonfield assesses that,

“It must be clearly recognized, however, that the Missions to the Jews, mainly founded in the nineteenth century, paved the way directly for the reconstitution of Jewish Christianity as an organic spiritual community, not only because of their high-souled efforts won thousands of Jews for Christ and so provided the living materials for such a reconstitution, but because some of them sponsored and assisted for the first hesitant steps of Jewish Christians to unite with one another in a corporate existence.”⁹⁹

The London Society was truly an innovative and remarkable movement of nineteenth century Great Britain. Although it did not achieve all of its goals, it impacted and influenced many attitudes among the Jews and Christians in Britain. Many scholars believe the LSPCJ failed as an Evangelistic institution; however it influenced better attitudes toward Jews and Hebrew Christianity. Moreover, it marked a point in history where tolerance to Jews became more

⁹⁶ Gidney, *History of the London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews from 1809 to 1908*, 625.

⁹⁷ Matar, “The Controversy over the Restoration of the Jews: From 1754 until the London Society for Promoting Christianity among the Jews”: 32.

⁹⁸ Gidney, *History of the London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews from 1809 to 1908*, 519, 587.

⁹⁹ Schonfield, *The History of Jewish Christianity from the First to the Twentieth Century*, 209.

widespread. It was part of the genuine outgrowth of concern for God's people and their welfare from Gentile Christians, and was another aspect of the general missionary and Evangelical interests in British society.¹⁰⁰ This Jewish missionary movement, along with others that were established during the nineteenth century, laid the foundation and was an instrumental part of the Hebrew Christian movement.

¹⁰⁰ Smith, "The London Jews' Society and Patterns of Jewish Conversion in England, 1801-1859": 286.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

- Adams, Hannah. *A concise account of the London Society for Promoting Christianity Amongst the Jews*. Boston: Printed by John Eliot., 1816, *UNIV OF OKLAHOMA LIBRARIES's Catalog*, EBSCOhost.
<http://libraries.ou.edu/access.aspx?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=cat00057a&AN=uok.a2869516&site=eds-live>
- "Conversion of the Jews." *The Manchester Guardian (1828-1900)*, Nov 01, 1854.
<http://search.proquest.com/docview/473834057?accountid=12964>.
- "Extracts from the Sixteenth Report of the London Society for Promoting Christianity among the Jews." *Israel's Advocate; Or, the Restoration of the Jews Contemplated and Urged (1823-1827)* 2 (1824): 164.
<http://search.proquest.com/docview/126223407?accountid=12964>.
- Frey, Joseph Samuel C. F. *Narrative of the Reverend Joseph Samuel C. F. Frey* (New-York : W.B. Gilley, 1817) *UNIV OF OKLAHOMA LIBRARIES's Catalog*, EBSCOhost.
<http://libraries.ou.edu/access.aspx?url=http://opac.newsbank.com/select/shaw/40875>
- , *Narrative of the Reverend Joseph Samuel C. F. Frey* (New-York : J.K. Moore, 1834 [11th edn.]) *Princeton Theological Seminary Library*.
<http://www.archive.org/details/narrativeofrevjo00frey>.
- H. K., B. "COMMUNICATION FROM A CONVERTED JEWESS TO THE HUSE OF ISRAEL." *Jewish Chronicle* (450937) 7, no. 6 (December 1850): 127-128. American Antiquarian Society (AAS) Historical Periodicals Collection: Series 3, EBSCOhost.
<http://libraries.ou.edu/access.aspx?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=h9j&AN=53737620&site=ehost-live>
- "Jewish Intelligence, and the Monthly Account of the Proceedings of the London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews. London, June 1843." *Spirit of Missions* 8 (October 1843): 367-370.
<http://libraries.ou.edu/access.aspx?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=h9j&AN=43354473&site=ehost-live&kw=true&acc=false&lpId=div11&ppId=divp1&twPV=null&xOff=0&yOff=0&zm=fit&fs=null&rot=0&hid=2&docMapOpen=true&pageMapOpen=true>.
- "London Society for Promoting Christianity among the Jews." *Christian Observer, Conducted by Members of the Established Church (1802-1842)* 17, (1818): 857.
<http://search.proquest.com/docview/89391195?accountid=1296>

"Society for Promoting Christianity among the Jews." *The Manchester Guardian* (1828-1900), Oct 24, 1865, <http://search.proquest.com/docview/474521361?accountid=12964>.

Gidney, W.T., *History of the London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews from 1809 to 1908* (London: LSPCJ, 1908).

—, *Missions to Jews* (London: LSPCJ, 1899 [5th edn.]).

Thompson, A. E., *A Century of Jewish Missions* (New York: 1902), *Supplemental Index*, EBSCOhost.
<http://libraries.ou.edu/access.aspx?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edo&AN=44037193&site=eds-live>.

Secondary Sources

- Cohn-Shebok, D. *Messianic Judaism* (London: Cassell, 2000).
- Darby, Michael R. *The Emergence of the Hebrew Christian Movement in Nineteenth-Century Britain*, Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- Eisen, M. "Christian Missions to the Jews in North America and Great Britain," *Jewish Social Studies* 10, 1948, pp. 31-66.
- Endelman, T.M. *The Jews of Britain, 1656 to 2000* (Berkeley: University of California, 2002).
- Edelman, T.M. and T. Kushner, eds., *Disraeli's Jewishness* (London: Vallentine Mitchell, 2002).
- Lipman, V.D., *Social History of the Jews in England, 1850-1950*. London: Watts, 1954.
- Martin, R.H., "United Conversationist Activities among the Jews in Great Britain, 1795-1815: Pan-Evangelism and the London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews," *Church History* 46 (1977): 437-452. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3164439>.
- Matar, N. I., "The Controversy over the Restoration of the Jews: From 1754 until the London Society for Promoting Christianity among the Jews." *Durham University Journal* 82 (1990): 29-44. <http://129.15.14.66/illiad.dll?Action=10&Form=75&Value=542520>
- Rubinstein, W.D., *A History of Jews in the English Speaking World: Great Britain* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1996).
- Schonfield, H.J., *The History of Jewish Christianity from the First to the Twentieth Century* (London: Duckworth, 1936).
- Scult, Mel., "English Missions to the Jews: Conversion in the Age of Emancipation," *Jewish Social Studies* 35 (1973): 3-17. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4466746>.
- , *Millennial Expectations and Jewish Liberties: A Study of the Efforts to Convert the Jews in Britain up to the Mid-Nineteenth Century* (Leiden: Brill, 1978).
- Smith, R.M., "The London Jews' Society and Patterns of Jewish Conversion in England, 1801-1859," *Jewish Social Studies* 43 (1981): 275-290. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4467142>.
- Sobel, B.Z., *Hebrew Christianity: The Thirteenth Tribe* (New York: Wiley, 1974).
- Yeats, J M., "To the Jew first": conversion of the Jews as the foundation for global missions and expansion in nineteenth-century British evangelicalism." *Southwestern Journal Of Theology* 47 (2005): 207-223.
<http://libraries.ou.edu/access.aspx?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=rh&AN=ATLA0001600829&site=ehost-live>

Honorable Mention

American Support of the Iran-Iraq War: A Pyrrhic Victory

The Iran-Iraq War lasted from 22 September 1980 until 20 July 1988, cost over \$1 trillion, and resulted in anywhere from five hundred thousand to one million deaths.¹² This conflict caused irreparable damage to both countries and the aftershocks are still felt today. But this devastating war is often overlooked; overshadowed by the 1991 Gulf War and the collapse of the Soviet Union. Nevertheless this war is worth reexamining. This paper seeks to answer how heavily the United States supported both parties of the war, and whether its' long-term goals were achieved. Evidence suggests that while America publicly touted a neutral stance, it instead very clearly tilted to each country throughout the conflict. Furthermore, given over twenty years of distance and perspective, the United States' intended strategic outcomes in tampering with the war were never realized. If anything American involvement catalyzed long-term repercussions that are still grappled with today. A careful examination will support the above reasoning and draw out a cautionary lesson for future American foreign policy.

There are many facets to the Iran-Iraq war, and this essay cannot adequately cover all of it. Instead the focus will remain centered upon the United States and its' involvement in the war. This examination will begin with a brief overview of the eight year war and then move into a deeper examination of US relations with Iraq and Iran respectively. Each topic is covered chronologically, giving the necessary background and then following the developments throughout the war. Then factors which influenced America's position in the conflict will be explained, and the concluding segment will consolidate the analysis and connect the lesson of this conflict to current events.

¹ Iran Chamber, http://www.iranchamber.com/history/iran_iraq_war/iran_iraq_war3.php

² Dilip Hiro, *The Longest War* (Psychology Press, 1989), 1

Iraq invaded Iran in 1980 for many reasons. First, the Islamic Revolution in Iran and subsequent rise of Shia radicals in the country was seen as a grave threat to Saddam Hussein's Sunni secular Ba'athist regime in Iraq. Second, it was a power-play by Saddam to obtain control of the Shatt al-Arab waterway. This river nominally sets the border between Iraq and Iran and serves as the sole outlet to the Persian Gulf. There had been previous struggles over how much of the territory was controlled by each state which had been temporarily resolved in 1975 with the Algiers Agreement, but Saddam saw this war as a chance to regain the advantage. Lastly, it was a direct challenge to Iran for uncontested regional hegemony. Saddam was best described as "motivated by fear, opportunism, and overconfidence, a mixture of defensive and offensive calculations...Iraq's decision to resort to force was a compound of a preventive war, ambition and punishment for a regional rival."³ Major histories of the war all tend to agree that Saddam was the clear aggressor and imposed the war upon Iran.

Rather than describe each individual battle, it is better to divide the war into broad characterized segments. From the invasion in 1980 until 1982 Iraq's military had the upper hand and wreaked havoc inside Iran's borders. By mid-May of 1982 Iran rallied and drove the invading army back into Iraq, then took the ill-fated initiative to push across the border and continue the war. From 1982 to 1984 the war was largely a stalemate, with devastating losses on both sides. From 1984 through the end of the conflict the ground war remained stagnant, but two new developments arose at this time. First, both parties began bombing raids on cities and caused massive civilian casualties. Secondly, Iraq began targeting cargo ships moving through the Persian Gulf. This would escalate from both sides into what was later called the Tanker War.

³ Dilip Hiro, *The Longest War*, 39

While this is by no means an all-encompassing history of the Iran-Iraq War, it provides the necessary context needed for the purposes of this work.

Prior to discussing the details of the conflict, it is important to discuss the individual relationships of the involved countries. US-Iraqi relations were severed by the Iraqis in 1967, following the Six Day War.⁴ Full diplomatic relations were not restored until November of 1984⁵ in the middle of the Iran-Iraq conflict. Curiously, the United States did establish a special-interests section within the Belgian Embassy in Baghdad in 1972. The official reasoning for this is not explicitly stated, but it does not appear to be a coincidence that the USSR and Iraq signed a Treaty of Friendship shortly before the reopening of US diplomatic channels.⁶ Presumably US diplomats at the time sought to counter Moscow's growing and uncontested influence within Iraq. America was nominally neutral at the beginning of the Iran-Iraq War, but documentation proves that it supported Iraq as early as 1981. In March of that year, "the US State Department lifted a freeze of five Boeing planes to Iraq that could easily be fitted to carry troops."⁷ The United States tilted further to the Iraqi camp in February of 1982 when it excluded Iraq from its list of terrorist-sponsoring states,⁸ thus allowing for economic and military aid to be delivered freely. Iraq's military advances into Iran were halted in May 1982 when the Iranian army pushed the invading forces back onto Iraqi soil. In June of that same year, a National Security Decision Directive was produced which included the statement that authorized "whatever was necessary and legal to prevent Iraq from losing the war with Iran."⁹ One can assume that the reversal in Iraq's military successes helped encourage America's shift from neutrality. By December of

⁴ U.S. Department of State Country Page – Iraq, <http://history.state.gov/countries/iraq>

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ U.S. Country Studies – the Soviet Union and Iraq, <http://countrystudies.us/iraq/82.htm>

⁷ Kenneth Timmerman, *Death Lobby*, (Houghton Mifflin, 1991), 80

⁸ Efraim Karsh, *The Iran-Iraq War*, (St. Martin's Press 1989), 80-81

⁹ Affidavit of Howard Teicher (Case No. 93-241, US District Court - Southern District of Florida)

1983 Iraq had won the United States over to the point that Donald Rumsfeld was sent as a special US presidential representative to visit with Saddam Hussein. Rumsfeld also met with Iraqi foreign minister Tariq Aziz, and Rumsfeld's personal notes from that event state that "the US had no interest in an Iranian victory; to the contrary, we would not want Iran's influence expanded at the expense of Iraq." Furthermore, "the behavior of Iran...is unacceptable."¹⁰ He also ironically stated that "having a whole generation of Iraqis and Americans grow up without understanding each other had negative implications and could lead to mix-ups."¹¹

Starting with Rumsfeld's visit in late 1983, the United States definitively chose their preferred combatant in the Iraq-Iran conflict. Full diplomatic relations were restored in November of 1984, and by December the United States began providing Iraq with military intelligence. One single transaction from 1984 truly exemplifies how partisan the United States had become; the sale of helicopters by Bell, an American company. Bell sold 20-25 helicopters to Iraq with the promise that they would not be retrofitted or modified for military use. America accepted this explanation and green-lighted the sale. The main issue here was that Bell sold the helicopters directly to Iraq's Ministry of Defense.¹² The arms trade and US support were no longer being concealed; it had become an open secret to anyone who was looking closely.

In an unlikely but most helpful fashion, the United States also began throwing huge sums of cash to Iraq through a food credits program. On paper, the US was merely giving credit to Iraq to purchase American food. In actuality, however, this credit program was "an elegant way of helping Baghdad without dipping into the State Department's foreign aid budget."¹³ There is

¹⁰ Personal notes of Donald Rumsfeld, 1983

¹¹ Ibid.

¹² Affidavit of Howard Teicher

¹³ Timmerman, *The Death Lobby*, 126.

infinitely less oversight for agricultural aid and credits, and thus Washington was able to covertly provide much-needed economic relief to Iraq. Iraq could then redirect its limited funds towards bolstering its war-making capabilities instead of having to worry about purchasing wheat and other food items.

US-Iranian relations were much rockier; having deteriorated rapidly after the 1953 American-sponsored overthrow of Muhammad Mossadeq. The “American” Shah, Mohamed Reza Shah Pahlavi, was put in power by the US following this coup. Reza Shah ruled for the next two decades, drifting further and further towards a restrictive and stifling authoritarian rule. Temper and resentment against the Shah, his security forces, and America finally boiled over and resulted in the 1979 Iranian Revolution and the Iranian Hostage Crisis. These two events embarrassed America greatly on the international stage and that sting was still fresh when the Iran-Iraq War erupted. On this end, therefore, it is fairly easy to ascertain why the US was not keen on facilitating an Iranian victory. Moving from words to actions, the United States increasingly became directly involved in the Iran-Iraq conflict as time went on. Following the Islamic Revolution, the United States emplaced a strict arms embargo on Iran (Operation Staunch).¹⁴ Furthermore, anti-revolution officers sabotaged equipment within the military.¹⁵ These events combined to put the Iranian military at a distinct disadvantage for the ensuing war. The United States had partnered closely with Iran and the Shah prior to 1979, and had delivered countless amounts of weapons and military technology. Post-1979 the Iranians were cut off from US supplies and had to purchase spare parts and equipment on the black market, with the addition of a stiff price markup.¹⁶ This had a direct effect on Iran’s military capabilities; they

¹⁴ Anthony Cordesman, *The Iran-Iraq War and Western Security*, (Jane’s Publishing, 1987), 79

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 26

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 28

were forced to spend significantly more on arms and parts, and the used black-market weapons were much more likely to malfunction.

Iran's luck turned from bad to worse in April of 1983 when the US Embassy in Beirut was bombed. Over 200 Americans were killed, the most deadly attack abroad that the United States had ever withstood. Shortly after this disaster the US intelligence community determined that the perpetrators of the bombing had links back to Iran.¹⁷ Consequently, "halting the spread of the Iranian revolution...was no longer an abstract concern, it had become a top priority."¹⁸ This single event decisively pushed the US into the Iraqi camp, and US officials subsequently "launched 'an interagency effort, with the participation of Defense, CIA, and State,' to help Iraq."¹⁹ The massive scope of the agencies involved clearly shows the intensity with which America was pursuing revenge against Iran.

By 1984 Iran's military had repelled the Iraqi belligerents and pushed even deeper into Iraqi territory. This rapid change in balance alarmed the superpowers, which led to increased support from the United States and the Soviet Union. Furthermore, the Iranian advances spurred the Iraqis to begin implementing chemical weapons. Unfortunately the international community, predominantly as a result of American efforts, was slow and soft when confronting the chemical issue. The US had plenty of evidence dating back to 1979 that Iraq was building and preparing for the production and use of chemical weapons, but no action was taken. In 1984 US intelligence intercepted an Iraqi message which boldly declared that "the invaders should know that for every harmful insect there is an insecticide capable of annihilating it whatever their

¹⁷ Timmerman, *The Death Lobby*, 129

¹⁸ *Ibid.*

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 130

number and Iraq possesses this annihilation insecticide.”²⁰ The strong rhetoric makes it all too apparent that the Iraqis were openly and proudly using chemical weapons to decimate the Iranian fighters. As a result of the previous events discussed and the personal stances of the American government, Washington turned a blind eye to these attacks. Indeed, DIA analyst W. Patrick Lang would later write that “the use of gas on the battlefield by the Iraqis was not a matter of deep strategic concern. What Mr. Reagan’s aides were concerned about was that Iran not break through to the Fao peninsula and spread the Islamic Revolution to Kuwait and Saudi Arabia.”²¹ When the issue of chemical weapons came up within the United Nations, Secretary of State George Schultz sent a cable giving explicit instructions to the US delegate to the UN on how to best frame the American response to the chemical weapon issue, and to “work to develop general Western position in support of a motion to take ‘no decision’ on Iranian draft resolution on use of chemical weapons by Iraq.” He also directed to vote in favor of the resolution only if it received “broad support and sponsorship”²² from other countries. Furthermore, Schultz declared that the US delegation should emphasize that “the UN Human Rights Commission is an inappropriate forum for matters dealing with chemical weapons.”²³ The American bias at this stage is quite apparent; the United Nations is of course the best venue to address the employment of chemical weapons. US attempts to halt this process were ostensibly a ploy to silence the Iranian claims and aid the Iraqis.

Washington iced out Iran even further in subsequent years. Tehran found a cold shoulder even when they tried to help. In June of 1985 TWA 847 was hijacked by Hezbollah, in the hopes of gaining the release of Shia prisoners. Iran intervened and expressed its desire to resolve the

²⁰ US Cable from William Eagleton, Document 41, <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB82/>

²¹ Patrick Tyler, “Officers Say U.S. Aided Iraq in War Despite Use of Gas,” *New York Times*, 18 Aug. 2002

²² National Security Archive, <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB82/iraq47.pdf>

²³ Ibid.

situation, but the United States refused to acknowledge this. Indeed, Iranian president Rasfanjani “directed (an) ambassador to pressure Hezbollah to release the hostages”, and this act would eventually result in the successful diffusion of the situation.²⁴ Despite these overtures, Americans remained unresponsive and frigid towards them. In President Reagan’s 1985 speech addressing the hijacking incident, Iran was not even mentioned once.

Moving to the latter years of the conflict, the Iran-Contra arms transfer was a watershed moment in the Iran-Iraq saga. Proper analysis and facts are rarely employed when the affair is discussed, however. Reagan did not give military arms to the newly-formed Khomeini regime. He was not in collusion with the Revolutionary Iranian government; rather Iran-Contra was a third-person deal between the Israelis and some moderate Iranians opposed to the ruling regime with the hinted condition that some hostages might be released upon transfer of the arms. In fact, the Americans did not seek out the deal to begin with, and it was initially met with hesitance and skepticism by the Reagan administration. Most warmed to the idea after some time, however. Secretary of Defense Weinberger referenced the plan in his personal diary, stating that he “met with Colin Powell (and Richard) Armitage re: NSC plan to let Israelis give Iranians 50 HAWKS (missiles) and 3300 TOWs (missiles) in return for 5 hostages.”²⁵ In a more disturbing note, Presidential Finding 1-17 at one point stated “if all of the hostages are not released after the first shipment of 1000 weapons, further transfers would cease.”²⁶ The cavalier manner in which the no-strings distribution of 1000 destructive heavy missiles is disturbing, and again highlights how indifferent Washington had become to ending the war.

²⁴ TritaParsi, *Treacherous Alliance*, (Yale University, 2007), 115

²⁵ Secretary of Defense Weinberger Personal Diary, Document 14, <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB210/>

²⁶ Presidential Finding 1-17, Document 13, <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB210/>

As noted, Iran-Contra was largely pushed by Israel. Then Prime Minister Shimon Peres told Reagan in September of 1986 that “Israel and the US need to establish a broader strategic relationship with Iran.”²⁷ Israel’s interests are easily explained by their old concept of periphery doctrine; essentially to establish positive relations with countries bordering the Arab world to balance power.²⁸ “Israel was looking for inroads to the new regime...based on the assumption that Iran and Israel would continue to need one another as they faced a hostile Arab world.”²⁹ This courtship was not one-sided, Iran desperately sought out Israel for direct aid as well as for back-channels into the United States. One diplomat was quoted as saying to an Israeli that “if Iran wins this war we shall not forget to thank who helped us...you will witness a dramatic change in Tehran’s position towards Israel.”³⁰ Before the nuclear issue of contemporary times, a partnership between Iran and Israel made sense. Both states were surrounded by unfriendly countries, and both made numerous alliances and arms deals to secure their futures. Ultimately the Iran-Contra affair would become a public scandal, however, and both the Iranian moderates and the Americans involved were heavily burned by this experience.

The Tanker War, as touched upon earlier, involved military escalation by both the Iranians and the Iraqis and thus must be addressed separately here. By 1987 increased Iraqi bombings in the Persian Gulf threatened civilian traffic so much that the United States intervened and reflagged Kuwaiti cargo ships in the area.³¹ This military activity took place under the name

²⁷ Parsi, *Treacherous Alliance*, 1

²⁸ Karsh, *The Iran-Iraq War*, 156

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 155

³⁰ Parsi, *Treacherous Alliance*, 155

³¹ In this context reflagging meant 1) having the civilian Kuwaiti ships fly an American flag (for identification purposes), 2) offering these ships all of the protection by the US Navy that American ships would receive, and 3) in some cases provide an American crew onboard and/or a military escort to ensure security when moving through the Persian Gulf

Operation Earnest Will.³² The drastic uptick in attacks upon civilian ships during this time period is shown in Figure 1.1, and highlights the primary reason the United States was drawn into providing military support.

Table 1 *Attacks on Ships in the Arabian Gulf Region by Belligerent, 1981-1988*

Attacker	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	Total
Iraq	5	22	16	53	33	66	89	38	322
Iran	0	0	0	18	14	45	92	52	221
Total	5	22	16	71	47	111	181	90	543

Source: O'Rourke, "Gulf Ops," in U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings, May 1989.

Regrettably the US-protection of Kuwaiti vessels was seen at least by the Iranians as a tacit support of Iraq. The highest US military official at the time himself declared "reflagging and convoying Kuwaiti tankers would not be a neutral action."³³ On the first US-escorted convoy one of the reflagged tankers, the *Bridgeton*, struck an Iranian mine.³⁴ Just weeks later American helicopters caught an Iranian vessel laying more mines, and they attacked the ship and captured the crew.³⁵ In October two Iranian speedboats engaged American ships in the gulf with small arms fire. America consequently set Iran's Rostam oil rig on fire and "destroyed the Rashadat oil rig with 1,065 shells."³⁶ More amphibious skirmishes occurred between Iran and the United States in the following months. On 14 April 1988 America's USS *Samuel B. Roberts* was hit by an Iranian mine, resulting in almost \$100 million in damages.³⁷ On July 3 the USS *Vincennes*, a Navy cruiser, was providing radar coverage in the area. It "responded to a request for assistance

³² Selby, Michael W. *Without Clear Objectives: Operation Earnest Will*. Naval War College, 1997.

³³ *Ibid.*, 12

³⁴ Michael O'Rourke, "The Tanker War", *United States Naval Institute Proceedings* (114, 1988)

³⁵ *Ibid.*

³⁶ Farhang Rajee ed., *Iranian Perspectives on the Iran-Iraq War* (University Press of Florida, 1997), 15-16

³⁷ Sabahat Khan. *Iranian Mining of the Strait of Hormuz: Plausibility and Key Considerations*. (Institute of Near East and Gulf Military Analysis, 2010), 4

from two neutral tankers being harassed by Iranian small craft. During the ensuing engagement, the cruiser would mistakenly shoot down an Iranian civilian airliner with 290 passengers aboard.”³⁸ The *Vincennes* was moving into a hostile area in a heightened sense of anxiety, but the actions are inexcusable.³⁹ Shortly after this tragic incident both the Iranians and the Iraqis came to the table, accepted United Nations Resolution 598, and fell into an uneasy peace.⁴⁰

So what explains the evolution of US involvement from officially-declared neutrality to putting warships into the Persian Gulf, shelling oil rigs, and attacking aircraft? It would appear that the American President and his advisers had a large hand in pushing this escalatory agenda. As a Presidential candidate in 1979 Ronald Reagan watched the Islamic Revolution of Iran unfold, and suffered through the series of embarrassments from the Iranian hostage crisis. His stance towards Iran was made clear in his 1980 “Strategy for Peace” document, declaring that “In Iran, terrorism has been elevated to the level of national policy in the assault on the US embassy and the year-long captivity of our fellow-citizens.”⁴¹ Aside from domestic and economic issues, a huge cornerstone of Reagan’s campaign was that he was a strong, assertive Republican who would not cower down or be intimidated on the international stage. Thus it would have been political suicide for him to adopt a subservient stance towards Iran, the country who had continued to humiliate and challenge America throughout his campaign. Reagan relatively stood by his rhetoric; even in his 1987 National Security Strategy towards the end of

³⁸ Ibid.,18

³⁹ For a detailed minute-by-minute description leading up to the shooting, see 78-83 in chapter 14 of *The Iran-Iraq War*, Anthony Cordesman

⁴⁰ UNSC Resolution 598, (1988), <http://www.refworld.org/cgi-bin/tehis/vtx/rwmain?docid=3b00f20e64>

⁴¹ Ronald Reagan Strategy for Peace Address, <http://www.reagan.utexas.edu/archives/Reference/10.19.80.html>

his tenure he yet again repeated his strong claim of the “use of terrorism as an instrument of state policy” in reference to Iran.”⁴²

President Reagan’s personal rhetoric and comments after-the-fact also paint a different portrait than his National Security Strategies and official documents portrayed. His depiction in his autobiography, *An American Life*, of the Iranian Shah and his downfall in 1979 clearly show his perspective on history. Regarding the Revolution and overthrow of the Shah,

it was a terrible treatment for a man who had been our *friend* and *solid ally* for more than thirty-five years⁴³...our government’s decision to stand by piously while he was forced from office led to the establishment of a despotic regime in Teheran that was far more evil and far more tyrannical than the one it replaced. And, as I was to learn through personal experience, it left a legacy of problems that would haunt our country for years to come.”⁴⁴ (emphasis added)

His read of history seems inaccurate; that a violent crackdown and continued reign under the Shah would have prevented the Islamic Revolution, or simply made it go away. This notion does not hold with past examples within the Greater Middle East. As seen in the Arab Spring, stricter authoritarian rule tends only to radicalize the repressed until a breaking point is reached. Furthermore, it is a stretch to refer to the Shah as a “friend”. He was a young and malleable American tool at the beginning of his career, which was exactly why he was selected to be placed upon the Peacock Throne.

Drawing predominantly again from his autobiography, Reagan succinctly crystallizes his thoughts and feelings during his tenure as President. Ayatollah Khomeini was described as “summarily executing hundreds of Iranians” and “trying to export the Islamic revolution to

⁴² Ronald Reagan. *The National Security Strategy of the United States*. Washington DC: The White House, Jan 1, 1987. http://nssarchive.us/?page_id=48

⁴³ Ronald Reagan, *An American Life*, (Simon & Schuster, 1990), 218

⁴⁴ Ibid 219

neighboring countries,”⁴⁵ which were equal sins at that point in time. Common throughout his musings were references to the looming Soviet threat and radical Islamic terrorism. America believed that the Ayatollah Khomeini was going to die soon and that this would raise the “possibility of new instability in this strategic country that the Soviets would almost certainly try to exploit.”⁴⁶ Furthermore; “Under the Shah, Iran had played a pivotal role in our efforts to keep an eye on its neighbor, the USSR. We wanted to ensure that the next government in Teheran was moderate and friendly.”⁴⁷ Reagan also clearly understood Tehran’s close ties to terrorism and violence throughout the Middle East; Hizballah is described in his autobiography as “pro-Iranian Islamic Jihad” and “Iranian-dominated”, “trained, equipped, and controlled by Iranian Revolutionary Guards.”⁴⁸ Later on Reagan lumped other undesirables into his list; declaring that “Qaddafi is talking to Iran and Syria about a joint terrorist war against us.”⁴⁹

Despite the publicly-touted notion that the United States was neutral throughout the Iran-Iraq War, it clearly chose sides twice. Gary Sick suggested that then-National Security Advisor Zbigniew Brzezinski met with Saddam Hussein just months before the outbreak of war, and hinted to Saddam that the US would “tolerate an Iraqi invasion of Iran.”⁵⁰ After the conflict began a top NSC staffer described how Reagan authorized “whatever was necessary and legal to prevent Iraq from losing the war with Iran,”⁵¹ and published a classified National Security Directive to that effect as well in mid-1982. Colonel W. Lang, a senior and well-respected analyst within the Intelligence Community at the time, echoed this idea; stating that CIA and

⁴⁵ Ibid 489

⁴⁶ Ibid.

⁴⁷ Ibid.

⁴⁸ Ibid.

⁴⁹ Ibid., 496

⁵⁰ Farhang Rajaee, *Iranian Perspectives on the Iran-Iraq War*, 50

⁵¹ Affidavit of Howard Teicher,

DIA officials were “desperate to make sure that Iraq did not lose”⁵² to Iran. Years into the conflict, however, an Iraqi victory lost its initial appeal. By 1985, one CIA agent described the strategy at the time quite eloquently, saying that “we didn’t want either side to have the advantage; we just wanted them to kick the crap out of each other.”⁵³ It was beneficial for the United States to see its’ two major foes in the region wage a destructive campaign against each other, and they seized the strategic opportunity.

And despite the time that this conflict occurred in, the US stance cannot be explained away by the specter of the Cold War with the USSR. Conversely, the Soviet support to the combatants follows the Americans’ closely. At the outset the USSR officially declared neutrality, however there was marked “displeasure with Saddam Hussein for initiating a war that would drive the moderate Gulf States towards the United States...and provide a pretext for the further extension of US military power into the region.”⁵⁴ At the same time the United States was ironically concerned that “the Soviets might be able to exploit the situation to extend their reach into the Gulf.”⁵⁵ Moscow was not pleased with Iran either, as Iran continued to support the *mujahedin* fighting the Russian military in neighboring Afghanistan. Despite this, they allowed other countries, such as Syria, Libya, and North Korea, to deliver arms to Iran.⁵⁶ In mid-1982 the Soviet Union shifted its favor to Iraq, in a move that closely paralleled the American decision. Primarily, Iran’s encroachment upon Iraqi soil concerned the Soviets. Iran also increasingly cracked down upon Tudeh⁵⁷, the Iranian communist party.

⁵² Patrick Tyler, “Officers Say U.s. Aided Iraq in War Despite Use of Gas,” *New York Times*

⁵³ George Crile, *Charlie Wilson's War*, (Grove Press, 2003), 275

⁵⁴ Karsh, *The Iran-Iraq War*, 204

⁵⁵ Lawrence G. Potter and Gary Sick, *Iran, Iraq, and the Legacies of War*, (Macmillian, 2004), 197

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 206

“Tudeh’s top political leadership...were arrested on charges of spying for the Soviet Union. This move was followed...by the formal dissolution of the Tudeh party and the expulsion of eighteen Soviet Embassy officials.”⁵⁸

In retaliation the USSR began to increasingly funnel more weapons and support to Iraq and severely limited its oil-imports, which significantly wounded the Iranian economy.⁵⁹ Since Cold War politics did not dictate the United States’ position, the ideology and viewpoints of Reagan were instead the primary factors.

In contrast to private papers and writings, the official unclassified documents at the time exhibited a mild, non-partisan tone. Prior to 1987, the Reagan administration generally professed a non-committal and neutral stance publicly. Then, Reagan’s official stance as detailed in his 1987 National Security Strategy outlined that “economic and security assistance, together with a *prudent but responsive* policy of arm sales within the region, remains an essential part of efforts to strengthen Israel and *moderate* Arab regimes” (emphasis added)⁶⁰. At this point the use of arm sales as a tool to further American interests was openly declared. Moderate Arab regimes were to be supported, but neither Iran nor Iraq at the time fit within that category by 1987. This subtly highlights Washington’s disinterest in a decisive Iraqi or Iranian victory. A desire was also expressed to “remain firmly committed to a prompt and honorable negotiated settlement of the Iran-Iraq War...until Iran ceases its efforts to prolong the senseless war with Iraq, we will work actively to block the flow of arms and military material to Iran.”⁶¹

This duplicity is jarring in retrospect, and all depictions of the conflict are quick to note the questionable approach America took. Specifically, this duplicity is between documents and reports written during/around the time of the war, and those written from 1991 onwards. The

⁵⁸ Ibid.

⁵⁹ Ibid.

⁶⁰ Ronald Reagan. *The National Security Strategy of the United States*, 1987

⁶¹ Ibid.

former category appears callous and calculating, now. For example, in 1987 Anthony Cordesman wrote “The West should continue to try to reduce the flow of arms to Iran to help ensure Iraq’s ability to obtain arms and financial support.”⁶² Even after seven years of bloody conflict he was still advocating strategic maneuvers to further American interests. Texts from the latter categories excoriate the US for its complicity in extending the conflict, however. One such author suggests that

The absence of a strong and unequivocal international condemnation of Iraq for its use of chemical weapons, and the Western tilt toward Iraq generally...undermined international law and institutions, may have misled Saddam Hussein into believing that he would also get away with the invasion of Kuwait, and gave the impetus for Iranian programs of weapons of mass destruction⁶³

Thomas McNaugher makes a further case that the US downing of the Iranian airbus in 1988 was a result of America’s increasing role in the conflict. He shows that the captain of the *Vincennes* fired in defense of his ship, “but his ship would not have been in danger had the Navy’s mission been confined to defending US flagships.”⁶⁴ This argument, although extreme, certainly bears merit. The US mission creep eventually led that Navy captain to an escalated situation with limited choices. The *Vincennes* incident is important for two reasons; it is often forgotten despite its critical importance to US-Iranian relations, and this event is the perfect capstone of US involvement in the war. This event marks the final evolution from a declared stance of neutrality to an escalated warship presence acting kinetically in the Persian Gulf.

The Iran-Iraq war could have been moderated and pacified by the international community. Instead, it was exploited to bleed regional powers and further various countries’ policies and interests. From the United States perspective, it was an optimal situation. America

⁶² Anthony Cordesman, *The Iran-Iraq War and Western Security*, 157

⁶³ Potter and Sick, *Iran, Iraq, and the Legacy of War*, 152

⁶⁴ Efraim Karsh, *The Iran-Iraq War*, 190

held no love for Iraq or Iran at the onset of the war. When Iraq had the momentum the US nominally supported them, and when Iran struck back and encroached onto Iraqi territory the US aided Iraq further. But halfway through the war, Washington reached the decision to prolong the conflict and let both countries destroy each other. And as has been dissected, this strategy was not driven by ideological Cold War fears. It resulted from the administration's enmity for Iran at the beginning. In later years, the strategy was shaped around weakening US foes in the region. The perilous fighting was coaxed and encouraged for years to weaken regional powers and further shape the world to the liking of the West. But the desired goals of a moderated Iranian Revolution and a weakened Iraq were not realized. Since 1988 Iran has continued to engage in bitter rhetoric with the United States, and relations show no sign of improving significantly. Iraq flouted international law and invaded Kuwait just two years after the Iran-Iraq War ended, in addition to employing chemical weapons upon its own Kurdish population.

The lesson to be drawn from this case is to beware the dilemma of short-term reward over long-term risk and uncertainty. Personal grudges as well as cold strategic calculations led the United States to pursue a questionable course of action for eight years. Most concerning was the white-washing of Iraq's use of chemical weapons. While this analysis is aided by hindsight, it nevertheless presents lessons for future foreign policy endeavors. Long-term repercussions must be evaluated prior to embarking upon a strategy, even if it is particularly attractive in the short-term. The current civil war in Syria is one modern situation that this axiom must be applied to. At the time of this writing a news article just described how the current Obama administration is reconsidering arming Syrian rebels with high-powered anti-aircraft rocket launchers.⁶⁵ These

⁶⁵ David Ignatius, "Obama Appears Ready to Expand Covert Assistance to Syrian Opposition", <http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/david-ignatius-obama-appears-ready-to-expand-covert-assistance-to->

MANPADS have been used to shoot down civilian airliners before, and there is a significant risk that the rebels may use them against such targets, or transfer them to nefarious groups which might do so themselves.⁶⁶ While the potential blowback of such a move should not immediately discredit this strategy, policy-makers should carefully study historical precedents before making a final decision. The Iran-Iraq War case proves that adding more weapons to a conflict in pursuit of strategic gains rarely grants the desired results.

syrian-opposition/2014/03/27/06717e6a-b5ff-11e3-8020-b2d790b3c9e1_story.html *Washington Post*, 27 March 2014

⁶⁶“MANPADS: Combating the Threat to Global Aviation from Man-Portable Air Defense Systems”, Department of State, <http://www.state.gov/t/pm/rls/fs/169139.htm>

Works Cited

- Cordesman, Anthony H., N. *The Iran-Iraq War and Western Security*. London: Jane's Publishing, 1987. Print.
- Crile, George. *Charlie Wilson's War*. New York: Grove Press, 2003.
- Hiro, Dilip. *The Longest War: the Iran-Iraq Military Conflict*. Psychology Press, 1989
- Khan, Sabahat. *Iranian Mining of the Strait of Hormuz: Plausibility and Key Considerations*. (Institute of Near East and Gulf Military Analysis, 2010), 4
- Ignatius, David. "Obama Appears Ready to Expand Covert Assistance to Syrian Opposition." Washington Post. http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/david-ignatius-obama-appears-ready-to-expand-covert-assistance-to-syrian-opposition/2014/03/27/06717e6a-b5ff-11e3-8020-b2d790b3c9e1_story.html (accessed April 5, 2014).
- "Iran Chamber Society." http://www.iranchamber.com/history/iran_iraq_war/iran_iraq_war3.php
- Karsh, Efraim. *The Iran-Iraq War: Impact and Implications*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Macmillan in Association with the Jaffee Center for Strategic Studies, Tel-Aviv University, 1987. Print.
- National Security Archive*. George Washington University, n.d. Web.
- O'Rourke, Ronald. "The Tanker War." In *United States Naval Institute Proceedings*, vol. 114, no. 5/1023. 1988.
- Parsi, Trita. *Treacherous Alliance: The Secret Dealings of Israel, Iran, and the United States*. New Haven: Yale UP, 2007. Print.
- Personal Notes of Donald Rumsfeld. Dec. 1983.
- Potter, Lawrence G., and Gary G. Sick, eds. *Iran, Iraq, and the legacies of war*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.
- Presidential Finding 1-17*. 26 Nov. 1985. Regarding Early Iran-Contra Affairs.
- Rajaei, Farhang, ed. *Iranian Perspectives on the Iran-Iraq War*. University Press of Florida, 1997.
- Reagan, Ronald. *An American Life*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1990. Print.
- Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger Personal Diary. 7 Dec. 1985.
- Selby, Michael W. *Without Clear Objectives: Operation Earnest Will*. Naval War College, Newport RI. Joint Military Operations Department, 1997.
- Timmerman, Kenneth R. *The Death Lobby: How the West Armed Iraq*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1991. Print.

Tyler, Patrick. "Officers Say U.S. Aided Iraq in War Despite Use of Gas ." *New York Times*, 8 18, 2002. (accessed March 17, 2013).

United States of America. White House. *National Security Strategy 1987*. Ronald Reagan Presidential Library, n.d. Web.

U.S. Cable from William Eagleton. 22 Feb. 1984. "Iraqi Warning re Iranian Offensive."

U.S. Department of State, Accessed March 10, 2013. <http://history.state.gov/countries/iraq>.

U.S. Department of State, Accessed March 10, 2013. <http://countrystudies.us/iraq/82.htm>

U.S. Department of State. "MANPADS: Combating the Threat to Global Aviation from Man-Portable Air Defense Systems." <http://www.state.gov/t/pm/rls/fs/169139.htm> (accessed March 21, 2014).

Shorter Works

In this issue, we inaugurate a new section of the journal, featuring shorter works. Since the majority of the papers we have published have been capstone papers, the editors have wanted to extend the journal's range, and to display papers that represent the range of assignments our students complete. Most history courses at OU require shorter papers, and so we publish two of the best such works we received.



Strangers in Their Own Land

How Moorish Occupation Conditioned Spanish Views of the New World

Nicholas Eckenrode
12-12-2013

The Spaniards watched with bated breath. The dust, having been kicked up by hundreds of natives who had just arrived, had yet to settle making visibility difficult. The cause of all this commotion was the arrival of the great Cacique, Atabalipa, who had come in a great show of force. For weeks he had been searching for the “Christians” as the Spaniards had become known. In response, Captain Francisco Pizarro, leader of the Spanish expedition, had eagerly sought out Atabalipa in hopes to avoid any conflict.¹

A peaceful conquest was always desired over one by the sword. Such actions only delay the inevitable. All the more reason to seek friendly terms with the Cacique of this land now. Prior to his arrival, the Spanish had preached their desire to be at peace with Atabalipa to all they encountered. As Christians, they professed their love for Atabalipa and swore to aid him through an alliance. Now that he sat before them in his palanquin, surrounded by hundreds of loyal followers, a heavy silence plagued the audience they had sought after for weeks. For a brief moment it seemed no one would move.

Finally a priest, travelling with the Spaniards to spread the word of God, burst forth from the lines. He begins preaching to Atabalipa about the greatness of the Christian God. Promising that they are his friends and that they love him very much, he insists that the Cacique should come to see Captain Pizarro in his house up the road. During all this the priest held a crucifix in one hand and the Bible in the other. When it seemed the priest had finally stopped, Atabalipa gestured that he would like to see the book.

Whether or not he knew it was the Bible, and what it meant to the Spaniards, is cause for debate. In either case, once he had hold of it, he promptly discarded the Bible over his shoulder. The priest was horrified. While the translator ran to retrieve the Bible, the priest in fury turned

¹ *The Conquest of Peru*, trans. J. H. Sinclair (New York: New York Public Library, 1929).

back towards the homes, where the brunt of the Spaniards force was concealed, and cried out “Come out, come out, Christians, and attend to these unfriendly dogs who do not care for the things of God. That Cacique has thrown on the ground the book of our sacred law.”² What followed was nothing short of a massacre. The Spaniards mowed down the immediate party of Atabalipa with a volley from their cannons and muskets. They then charged their ranks with their swords and spears killing and maiming all in their path.

Once the initial party was decimated, and Atabalipa a prisoner, they then charged in to the plain where thousands of Indians were retreating. Without remorse they slaughtered them until the field was littered with bodies of “six or seven thousands Indians not counting the many others who had their arms cut off and other wounds...”³ Why did it go so wrong? Why were scenes like this happening across the New World? More importantly, why were the Conquistadors, identifying themselves as Christians and pious men of God, displaying such a violent nature in their conquest of the New World and conversion of its native people?

To write this off as simply an unfortunate period of jingoism by the Spaniards would be, in my opinion, a huge disservice to Spain and undermine any real attempt to understand the actions of these men. One needs to take in to account that Spain was coming off the success of the Reconquista ending centuries of Moorish rule in the Iberian Peninsula. Numerous authors have written on this explosive topic that led to centuries of violence and religious paranoia.⁴

² *The Conquest*, 32.

³ *The Conquest*, 33.

⁴ Joseph F. O’Callaghan, *A History of Medieval Spain* (Cornell University Press, 1975), 6, 98-105, 127-130, 669; Richard Fletcher, *Moorish Spain* (New York: Herry Holt and Company, 1992), 1-38, 49-94; Inga Clendinnen, *Ambivalent Conquests: Maya and Spaniard in Yucatan, 1517-1570* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 48-53, 70-80, 184-6; Thomas F. Glick, *Islamic and Christian Spain in the Early Middle Ages* (Brill Academic Publishers, 2005), 22-24, 211, 394; Camilla Townsend, *Malintzin’s Choices: An Indian Woman in the Conquest of Mexico* (University of New Mexico Press, 2006), 61, 89-199, 211; James H. Sweet, *Recreating Africa* (University of North Carolina Press, 2006), 87-96, 246; Teofilo F. Ruiz, *Spain’s Centuries of Crisis: 1300-1474* (Blackwell Publishing, 2007), 150-163; Stuart B. Schwartz, *All Can Be Saved* (Yale University, 2008), 62-3, 79-80.

The Moorish occupation had very dire consequences that would span centuries after it ended, and I argue that the Moors inadvertently conditioned the Spaniards to become the conquistadors as we know them today. The loss of land, culture, and identifying religion at the hands of the Moors led directly to the development of radical Christianity that emerged from Spain. This development started a wave of violence that began with the Reconquista, led to the Spanish Inquisition and would eventually lead to the rape and devastation of the New World.

It should be mentioned that my examination of this will be from the subjective view of the Spaniards. Atrocities occurred on both sides of the Reconquista and later in the New World. To argue morality or justification for any one side would be a tiresome exercise in regards to what we're really interested in. Rather, I seek to understand the mind of the 15th century Spaniard. What must it have been like to develop a nation's identity after years of oppression to the Moors? How did that affect their behavior towards outside cultures? Through examination of several episodes in both the Reconquista and conquest of the Americas, it is clear that a hereditary anger at Muslim oppression is at the core of the shocking religious violence the Spaniards inflicted on the native people. That will be the focus of this paper.

Let us briefly discuss the events that led to the Moors domination of the Iberian Peninsula. In the early 8th century, the peninsula was a collection of Visigothic kingdoms. While they shared a culture, they were in no way united. Perhaps this was recognized by the Moors in their initial raids along the coast. For what was initially sporadic raids quickly turned into a full scale invasion. By 720 all Visigothic lands had been pacified.

While the size of the invading force was quite low compared to the conquered, they wasted no time in asserting their control. Most of the peninsula was under Moorish control with

the exception of the small kingdom of Asturias in the north. The country the Visigoths had known changed before their very eyes. Borders of kingdoms were demolished and redrawn into communities called Caliphates. Within each city was assigned a Qadi, an appointed official who ensured Islamic law and religious standards was maintained regardless of what God you believed in.⁵ The crux of the problem was not only that the Spaniards had been conquered but were now losing their entire culture in the process.⁶ Christians quickly became second class citizens. Where there was a large Jewish population they found themselves even lower. The Jewish population was accommodating to their new masters. So much so that the time of Moorish occupation was considered the “Golden Age” for the Jewish population. By embracing Islamic culture, to include their dress, they were no longer regularly targeted for religious persecution. Because they were more willing to assimilate, Jews were integrated into the new society more smoothly than their Christian counterparts. This meant more opportunities of employment, trade and administrative offices. This didn’t go unnoticed by the Christian minority and only furthered their suspicion and mistrust of both Islam and Judaism. While Islamic law did allow for “religious freedom” for People of the Book, both Christians and Jews, it was a begrudging tolerance at best.

Assurances early on that other religions would be allowed to continue practicing were conflicted frequently by the actions of the Moor ruling class. Christian churches were routinely destroyed or converted into mosques. One of the most harrowing examples of this was by the dictator Almanzor who set out on a *jihad*, or holy war, against the Christians in early spring of 997. In addition to murder, rape, and pillaging of the country side, one of his most infamous acts concerned the church of Santiago de Compostela. This church was built on what was rumored to

⁵ *Moorish*, 6-7, 36-38.

⁶ While the term Spaniards is not accurate at this point in history, for sake of fluidity I will refer to them as such for the remainder of this paper.

be the resting site of St. James, the patron saint of Spain, and a frequented pilgrimage site for European Christians.⁷

Not only did Almanzor sack the surrounding town but also razed the church, took its wooden doors for ship building and confiscated the bells for the great mosque in Cordoba. The devastating blow to Christian morale was summed up by one anonymous author: “At that time in Spain divine worship perished; all the glory of the Christian people was destroyed...”⁸ Was nothing sacred? The Christians were promised that they would be allowed to practice their faith. They paid a hefty tax to do so under Islamic law. What good was this payment though if frequent atrocities were being waged against them? Even if they had been left in peace they didn't have a proper church to seek solace in. If a Christian church wasn't destroyed it was often converted into a mosque to accommodate the growing number of Muslim worshipers. Back alley taverns were becoming ad hoc churches considering the worsening conditions for their religion. They could be Christians but the preference was not to be seen acting as such.

Making matters worse was that the number of Christians was dropping at an alarming rate. While some of this is attributed to migration, casualties in the *jihads*, and executing those who spoke out against Islam publicly, these were all very small compared to the real reason: conversion. American historian Richard W. Bulliet noted that in the 9th century the number of Islamic names was rising dramatically in archival records.⁹ As stated before, the number of Muslims who actually came to Spain was relatively low. Furthermore, by 800 only 8% of the indigenous population in al-Andalus, as Spain was known, had become Muslims. How then could Islamic rates rise at such an exponential rate?

⁷ *Medieval Spain*, 127-130.

⁸ *Historia Silense*, trans. Justo Perez de Urbel and Atilano Gonzalez (Ruiz-Zorrilla Madrid, 1960).

⁹ Richard W. Bulliet, *Conversion to Islam in the Medieval Period: An Essay in Quantitative History* (Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1979).

Bulliet confirmed that it was conversion to Islam on several fronts. By tracing backwards through time he noted the years that families jumped from traditionally Christian names to Islamic ones. The rate at which this occurred couldn't have been from reproduction nor was there enough immigration at this point to cause it either. He compared these records with those of the expansion of mosques in rural communities. While it can be argued that major mosques were expanded for outward signs of strength and status at times, what need would there be for the smaller ones? The answer is simply to accommodate the growing number of worshippers. By 900, 25% of the indigenous population had converted and by 950 that number had doubled. By 1000 the number peaked at 75%.

The numbers themselves are startling. Especially if you visualize it from a Christian Spaniards point of view. As a Christian you were considered less than. You were now outnumbered. You were barred from participating in certain businesses or holding certain political offices. Arabic was even infiltrating your language in words connected with agriculture, trading, crafts, and civil administration. To this day, the majority of these words are either present, or closely resembled, in the Spanish language. The very culture that developed around you dictated that in order to live a meaningful life, to make ends meet, you needed to convert to Islam.

Conversion not only meant a new God and religious book in the Koran. It meant a new dietary regimen. New clothing dictated by Islamic law for both men and women. Even hygiene had to be considered. It wasn't a simple choice for anyone then nor would it be now. This is why several of the Christians migrated north to Asturias in order to avoid these dramatic changes. For the Christians, they had become strangers in their own land. This was the tipping point for Spain. The occupation had spanned several centuries. One that had built to an unbearable point. Spain had "sacrificed" herself for the rest of Europe. She alone was under the

rule of the Moors. The rest of Europe had profited and flourished from their misfortune. As bitterness took hold of their collective conscience, from it stemmed a national myth that would lead to a legacy of intolerance and massive xenophobia.

Ushered in by the clerics, and embraced by the Catholic royal and aristocratic elites, the notion of the Reconquista came to light. “A sacred patriotic struggle to wrest power from alien hands and restore Christian dominion.”¹⁰ Outsiders had forced them to convert, to migrate, to change the very essence of their identity. Their lives had been destroyed. From this point forward they were determined to never be the victim again. Xenophobia would be embraced and justified by any means in order to protect Spain.

United by their faith and similar cultures the Spaniards waged war for hundreds of years against the Moors. All the while their zeal for their cause and their God grew to epic proportions. Literature of the day became a key way in which to strengthen the resolve of the common Spaniard. In Alfonso X’s *Estoria De España*, a collection of Spain’s history, he states his reason for having the compilation written: “We did this so that the beginning of the Spaniards might be known...; how the Christians later began to recover the land...; and afterward how God reunited her.”¹¹ Alfonso’s writing, setting the bar for historians and writers after him, purposely wrote in a manner that would include biblical, classical and clerical texts. In this manner he effectively compared the struggle of Catholic Spain’s fall, rise and restoration to that of Christianity’s own growth, crises, and transformation.¹² This comparison, once embraced by a population and then employed via warfare, formed a tidal wave that the Moors had no hope of stopping.

¹⁰ *Moorish*, 7

¹¹ Alfonso X, *Primera crónica general de España* in Roberto J. González-Casanovas, ed. *Imperial Histories from Alfonso X to Inca Garcilaso: Revisionist Myths of Reconquest and Conquest* (Scripta Humanistica, 1997) 47.

¹² *Imperial Histories*, 47.

To further this cause the Spaniards needed a hero to rally around. Alfonso reached back through history and latched on to one of the earliest successes against the Moors - Prince Pelayo and the Battle of Covadonga. It was the first significant victory of a Christian force against the Moorish tide racing across Iberia. Fought in 722, Pelayo and a small force defeated a large Muslim army in the mountains of northern Spain. This victory led to the emergence of the kingdom of Asturias. As this would later become the safe haven for all Christians fleeing Islamic authority, this battle is widely considered the beginning of the Reconquista. “..Not wishing to forget his mercy, remembered his grace, and wished therefore to keep Prince Pelayo in his countenance, just as a small spark from which later might arise light in the land...so that the light of Christianity and of his servants might not entirely be extinguished in Spain.”¹³ Wishing to keep the biblical theme, Alfonso paints Pelayo as not only a savior of the Spanish people but also a biblical judge. If the Spanish were worthy, Pelayo would triumph and allow their country to live on. More importantly, the light of Christianity wouldn't flicker out under the heavy hand of Islam. How else could such an improbable victory be explained if not the work of God Himself?

This idea that God willed the Spaniards to rise and reclaim their land birthed a national mindset that they had been chosen for a special purpose. This is evident when you consider Bartolomé de Las Casas' comments on his mission with Columbus to the New World: “God... granted [Columbus] the keys to this awesome sea... By this can be seen how much the empire and principality of Jesus Christ will be extended, how much his Holy Church will spread, how expanded will be the frontiers of the Christian religion. ..”¹⁴ Not only were the Spaniards high on themselves with the development of their military strength, but now also viewed themselves

¹³ *Primera crónica*, 28

¹⁴ Bartolomé de Las Casas, *Historia de las Indias in Imperial Histories*, 130.

as the true nation of Jesus Christ. Destined to expand and reclaim souls for the Church after so many had been lost to the Reformation and the constant expansion of Islam. Whatever the New World provided, it would be for the greater glory of the Emperors of Catholic Spain and for God.

Las Casas reaffirmed this mindset stating, “By means of the temporal riches and treasure [of the Indies] all Christendom would be made stronger...so that the enemies of our Catholic faith might not as before dare to challenge it...; Spain alone, with God’s help with the sinews of war, which are the monies drawn from our Indies, could defeat and subject them.” The line was drawn. All were aware, even the priests, of what these new lands were meant for. Profits that are made would strengthen the crown and what peoples they encountered would be converted. Christianity had spent too long at the bottom. Now that they had risen to the top they would do everything in their power to remain there.

To the great misfortune of the New World population, this meant zero tolerance from the Spaniards. As the Reconquista had shown them, religious toleration was no longer practicable, and for that matter dangerous, when the amount of non-Christians was greater than the ruling class. “The unity and integrity of the state seemed to demand the end of religious diversity.”¹⁵ The Spanish had reason to fear other religions. The Moors, while initially small, swelled to overwhelming numbers in Spain forcing Christian exile. Within this swell was the flourish of the Jewish population seeming unaffected by their Muslim rulers. Even elements of the new Protestantism were prodding at the borders of northern Spain. Small numbers of religious factions could be just as damaging as large ones. The only solution was the one in which Catholic Spain embraced. Eliminate all other religions. This policy was in full effect the moment the Spaniards hit the shores of the Americas.

¹⁵ *Medieval Spain*, 669.

Consider Father Diego de Landa, Bishop of Yucatan 1571-79, and the manner in which he approached the natives. After being shown a collection of books, both religious and educational, he stated “they contained nothing in which there was not to be seen superstition and lies of the devil, we burned them all.”¹⁶ What is striking here is that Landa had all the books burned regardless of religious connotation. The fact that it was an outsider interpretation of their world was danger enough. This is on par with the edict by Philip II in 1567 who imposed a series of laws catered to destroying all remnants of Arabic culture. This included many things such as the use of Arabic, burning of books in that language and use of Moorish names, ceremonials and customs.¹⁷ Xenophobic acts like this would repeat widespread across the New World.

While it was clear that the conquistadors had discovered great civilizations in their own right, the fact that it wasn't Spanish made them hostile towards it. Human sacrifice, a regular practice of the Aztecs, was one of the glaring differences they cited. In 1518, Licenciado Alonso Suazo was sent to the New World to investigate reports of mistreatment of the indigenous people. While his report initially credits the Mexicans on being far more sophisticated than given credit for his tone shifts suddenly upon viewing the sacrifice of a human. He reassures himself, and the crown via his report, that “these people were, after all, barbarians, in desperate need of Spain's humanizing influence.”¹⁸ This “humanizing” influence must have seemed anything but from the standpoint of the natives. During negotiations for peace with Cortes in Mexico, the Mexican chief Xicontenatl sent fifty messengers to Cortes with terms. Cortes blatantly stated, “I took all fifty and cut off their hands and sent them to tell their chief...they

¹⁶ Diego de Landa, *Landa's Relación de Las Cosas de Yucatan in Ambivalent Conquests*, 70.

¹⁷ *All can be saved*, 63.

¹⁸ *Malintzins*, 127.

would see who we were.”¹⁹ Presumably Cortes tortured most of them even more before this atrocious act occurred. However, this was a routine practice in European warfare as a way to extract information. Perhaps in this context the conquistadors weren’t unique. One could surmise that had it not been the conquistadors committing these acts, any other European country could be just as guilty. During the most savage times of the Reconquista, atrocities such as these were the norm. So much so that the coat of arms for Alcanadre depicted the severed heads of Moors. The savagery of warfare by “civilized” nations well practiced before it ever arrived in the New World. It’s only natural to expect that it would travel with the Spaniards.

Early on it was clear that the conquest would be in the Spaniards favor. With colonization a foregone conclusion, plans were made to firmly take hold of this New World. The Americas provided not only a chance at fortune and glory, but a chance to increase the ranks of Catholicism that had been decimated by the Reformation and onslaught of Islam. This meant the full scale conversion efforts of the Catholic Church. In an effort to proselytize in mass, the Spaniards made it clear that their God was the only option left to the natives. After all, this was the same God that had saved them from the oppressive regime of the Moors.

In their eyes, since God had saved them it was their duty to save these natives as well. Bernal Diaz, one of Cortes’ trusted captains during the conquest of Mexico, remembers one of his first encounters with the natives stating: “...for we told them then that we were Christians and worshipped one true and only God, named Jesus Christ... That we believe in Him and worship Him, but that those whom they look upon as gods are not so, but are devils, which are evil things...”²⁰ The Spaniards were committed to erasing the native’s ceremonies and customs

¹⁹ *Malintzin*, 61.

²⁰ Bernal Díaz del Castillo, *The True History of the Conquest of New Spain* Stuart B. Schwartz, ed. *Victors and Vanquished, Spanish and Nahua Views of the Conquest of Mexico* (Boston and New York: Bedford/St. Martin’s, 2000) 138-139.

from their daily lives that in those early days “teaching focused more on training in correct external behavior than on the transference of knowledge.”²¹ In short, even if the natives didn’t know what they were doing, the Spaniards found a solace in them attempting to acclimate to Catholicism. Effort could be accepted. However, lack of assimilation or open hostility to the conversion effort, as the Moors did before and after Granada, was met with a very different approach.

During his time as Provincial, Bishop Landa launched his own Inquisition in the Yucatan and ordered many more throughout the new world under the concessionary Papal Bull.²² It had been discovered that several of the natives in the Yucatan had been returning to their own religious practices. In addition, reports from Peru stated that several of their natives were practicing their religions in the confines of the forest at night. Even more disturbing were reports from Portuguese Brazil that their slaves were bringing forms of Islam that they had practiced prior to their capture in Africa.²³ With threats appearing both internally and externally, every effort needed to be made to control the situation.

Through their own Inquisition, Landa and his fellow friars engaged in an aggressive campaign of torture in order to identify all those that could threaten their cause. Their justification being that the natives, “...had returned to their ancient and evil customs, worshipping idols and sacrificing to them publicly and in secret.”²⁴ So severe were the punishments that fear preceded the friars where ever they went. For whatever group they fell upon would inevitably face “the hoist,” a popular torture tool of the friars where one was hung by his wrist and then weighed down by heavy stones from his ankles. So painful was this

²¹ *Ambivalent Conquests*, 47.

²² *Ambivalent Conquests*, 74-75,

²³ *Peru’s People*, 39; *Recreating Africa*, 87-89.

²⁴ Landa, *Relación*, 81.

practice that several of the natives would falsely confess to worshipping idols just to end the pain.

Originally it had been the conquistadors themselves who had abused their powers to the point where relations seemed ready to collapse. Now that the friars themselves had been gripped by religious zeal, much like their counter parts conducting the Inquisition back in Spain, these two forces working in tandem were doing more harm than good. While the natives had been conquered, they wouldn't remain pacified with such behavior.

Such abuse of power prompted one of the more notable speeches conducted by Fray Anton de Motesion and his denunciation of his peers: "You are all in mortal sin...for the cruelty and tyranny you show these innocent people... Tell me: By what right and justice do you hold these Indians in such cruel and horrible servitude? Are you not obliged to love them as yourselves? Do you not understand this? Do you not feel this? ... You can be certain that in the state you are in, you can no more be saved than [the] Moors or Turks who lack or reject the faith of Jesus Christ."²⁵ One of the greater insults against a fellow Spaniard at the time was to compare him to a Moore. Motesion purposely does so here to illustrate how far they had fallen. Their practices against the natives people in no way resembled the noble cause of Christianity that they promoted at every turn. Giving in to the generations long hatred of foreign cultures, the Spanish looked anything but a country championing God and His Christian teachings.

The massacre at the hands of Pizarro and his men is the epitome of hypocrisy for today's reader. The image of a priest ordering a slaughter, for the throwing of a Bible no less, is not readily acceptable to most people. What one needs to take into account is the fact that Pizarro, his men, and the writer of this account found it perfectly acceptable to commit such violence.

²⁵ *Imperial Histories*, 131.

After our examination of Spanish history, we now know that their atrocities against the native population was fueled by centuries of religious war with the Moors. With each success, the myth that God willed a Spanish victory over Islam grew. This myth evolved into their national identity and bolstered the notion that their actions were prompted and justified by God. To dismiss the Spaniards in the New World as simply another chapter of imperialism would completely hinder our ability to understand these men. One isn't born with mass slaughter and torture ingrained in them. They arrive at this point through conditioning of the world around them. For the Spanish, this conditioning led to a radical and violent form of Christianity that permanently altered the lives of the New World natives, much like the Moors had for them centuries before.

Navigating the Revolution

Daniel Carney

University of Oklahoma

Contemporary Japan

“I believe that, regrettable though it is, our defeat in war is imminent and inevitable.”¹ –

Prince Konoe

By February 14th, 1945 the Japanese war position had become untenable. The Japanese military had been suffering unsustainable losses since the Battle of Midway, Allied forces were steadily advancing in the Pacific, and American B-29 bombers operated with near impunity in the Japanese skies. On that day, Prince Fumimaru Konoe dropped a bombshell of his own. Realizing the precariousness of the situation, and fearing for the continuity of the government and potential communist machinations, Konoe called upon the Emperor to end the war before it was too late.² He was ignored, and Yoshida Shigeru, former ambassador to Great Britain and future Japanese face of the occupation era, was imprisoned for aiding in the drafting of the statement. As war continued, and Japan’s cities were reduced to ash the inevitability of Japan’s defeat became all too apparent, particularly to the Allied Powers. The Allies realized that they were in a perfect position to dictate terms of surrender. On July 26th, they did just that with the Potsdam Declaration. No conditions were to be accepted from Japan in surrender. On August 6th, Japan would become the first and only nation to ever suffer the terrible havoc of the atomic bomb. Nine days later on August 15th, Japan capitulated. Konoe’s worst fears seemed realized. The total defeat of Japan meant that nothing was safe. Not the Government, not the Japanese way of life, not even the Emperor.

¹ Fumimaru Konoe “The Konoe Memorial, February 14th, 1945” in *Sources in Modern East Asian History and Politics*, ed. Theodore McNelly (New York: Meredith Corp 1967), p. 162

² Fumimaru Konoe “The Konoe Memorial, February 14th, 1945” in *Sources in Modern East Asian History and Politics*, ed. Theodore McNelly (New York: Meredith Corp 1967), p. 163

Yet out of ambiguous beginnings a clearer picture of the future would form. The Americans arrived not as conquering savages but as men on a mission to impose a “revolution from above” designed to remake a nation and a people.³ However, the Americans carried with them a bias and an ignorance that would in some ways make their job impossible. Their lack of knowledge would allow a certain degree of input and obfuscation from the Japanese at all levels of society. Ultimately, American misconceptions and lack of expertise would lead to different results than may otherwise have occurred had they been more knowledgeable.

The time between the surrender of Japan and the beginning of the Allied occupation is really the tale of two perspectives, one of cavalier confidence, and one of intimidated insecurity. On the Western end of the Pacific as The Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers(SCAP) was being formulated decisions were made regarding the personnel lineup that would have significant consequences for both the direction and efficacy of the occupation. An internal conflict between East Asian specialists within the government largely drawn along faction lines between the more liberally inclined “China Crowd” and the old conservative “Japan Hands” was brewing. The existing Japan experts were largely conservative in nature, experienced primarily in dealings with similarly conservative Japanese leaders. They largely believed that the Japanese citizenry were an “obedient herd” incapable of self-governance.⁴ These men, however, with their cozy prewar relationships with Japanese businessmen and politicians, would end up the losers in this debate and ousted from the occupation. This decision would eliminate a significant

³ John Dower, *Embracing Defeat: Japan in the wake of World War II* (New York: W. W. Norton and Company Inc, 2000), p. 69

⁴ John Dower, *Embracing Defeat: Japan in the wake of World War II* (New York: W. W. Norton and Company Inc, 2000), p. 217-18

source of expertise on Japan from the equation, and it would not be replaced. Remaining, however, would be a white supremacist tinged view of the Japanese. This is depicted in the training film “Our Job in Japan” in which the Japanese brain is described as a blank slate to be filled with democratic values.⁵ Neither MacArthur nor his subordinates would have much opportunity, or inclination, to correct this misconception. They showed little interest in the culture that they were attempting to refashion, as evidenced by MacArthur’s willfully limited experience in the host country.⁶ As a result of the loss of expertise, it became both necessary and agreeable to keep certain extant institutions in place, namely the Emperor and the bureaucracy.

On the Japanese side fear persisted, but also a certain self-assurance. In addition to the equivocal nature of the coming occupation, as the Konoe Memorial mentioned previously illustrates, Japanese civilian leadership were already apprehensive regarding a communist coup even before the occupation began. As Dower explains, conservatives feared revolutions from three directions, from the masses below, sideways from a foreign power, particularly Russia, and from above as the exigencies of war forced the militarist faction to nationalize more and more the means of production.⁷ The fear of a revolution from above would seem realized in the coming years, and would color the majority of their actions during the occupation. This can be seen in the alacrity with which they turned on the militarists, as well as their opposition to the various SCAP initiatives imposed upon them. Additionally, while greatly fearful for the future of the Emperor,

⁵ John Dower, *Embracing Defeat: Japan in the wake of World War II* (New York: W. W. Norton and Company Inc, 2000), p. 215

⁶ John Dower, *Embracing Defeat: Japan in the wake of World War II* (New York: W. W. Norton and Company Inc, 2000), p 223

⁷ John Dower, *Empire and Aftermath: Yoshida Shigeru and the Japanese Experience, 1878-1954* (Cambridge: Harvard Press, 1988), p. 281-2

they're self-assurance was derived from their confidence in their ability to Japanize whatever SCAP attempted to do, and their strong belief, shared by a now freed Yoshida Shigeru, that the antecedent national structure was still valid. The war and the reign of the militarists was a perversion of what was still fundamentally a sound system of governance. In their minds, the war had just been a "historic stumble."⁸ This was a view that would clash with SCAP's prevailing attitude that an entire overhaul of the national structure was necessary.

The Japanese conservative's fear of revolution from below would quickly prove to be far from baseless. When SCAP purged the old militarist regime, the old mechanisms of control and suppression suddenly vanished. Americans preached democratic consensus, individuality and active participation, and the Japanese public able, arguably for the first time, to have their voices heard answered in a thunderous fashion. Laborers organized, massive protests were carried out, and new political movements initiated. Of course, the conservatives had not been incorrect in fearing leftist stirrings from the deep. Many of these actions were socialistic in nature, something SCAP would never have intentionally allowed, and indeed would eventually quash. Still they were given an opening and, for a time, thrived due in part to the bias and ignorance of the American forces. It is reasonable to assume that American anticipation of the Japanese as a docile "follow the leader" populace led them to underestimate the extent to which the Japanese might express themselves after the restrictions that had impeded them were removed. Unfortunately for the protestors, it was a very bad time to be a socialist.

⁸ John Dower, *Empire and Aftermath: Yoshida Shigeru and the Japanese Experience, 1878-1954* (Cambridge: Harvard Press, 1988), p. 277-8

MacArthur and the majority of SCAP likely had little sympathy for communist thought before this time, but the post-World War II environment had paved the way for the Cold War, and sensibilities were far rawer than they had been even a few years previously. The planned mass strike of February 1947 proved to be the turning point, with MacArthur shutting it down and SCAP policies making a sharp turn on Labor.⁹

Still, the legacy of the political left that was allowed to blossom under the occupation is significant. Examples such as Teramoto Kosaku, ironically a member of the thought police under the previous regime, more or less authoring the 1947 Labor Standards Law with SCAP merely rubberstamping it prove the incredible opportunity that the Japanese public had to shape their world going forward. The proliferation of political protests in the years immediately following the country's capitulation provide further evidence of the Japanese public's willingness and opportunity to take part in the remaking of Japan. While these movements were met with initially open arms as expressions of democratic zeal, it is unlikely that they'd have been allowed a space to operate had SCAP not ridden into town on a horse of racial stereotypes. Their belief that the Japanese were not capable of political expression without guidance led them to underestimate the agency of the Japanese citizenry. That so many of these movements were leftist in nature is another indication that the occupation forces couldn't have imagined such an outpouring of participation, as SCAP, while certainly having its fair share of liberals and New Dealers, was hardly a left wing organization. Given the added irritation of the Cold War, it is unlikely that SCAP would have intentionally opened a

⁹ John Dower, *Embracing Defeat: Japan in the wake of World War II* (New York: W. W. Norton and Company Inc, 2000), p. 269-70

door for socialist ideas to enter the public discourse, much less the formation of a Socialist Party cabinet as briefly happened 1948. The cancellation of the strike and the leftist purge later in the occupation are good indicators of where SCAP's sympathies ultimately resided.

Another area in which American misconceptions and lack of knowledge allowed for substantial Japanese input is to be found in the handling of the Emperor. While an attitude prevailed in Washington that the Emperor was to be tried for war crimes, MacArthur and other top SCAP officials had different ideas. They were determined that the Emperor would prove more useful as a tool in the maintenance of public order and the efficacy of the reforms that they intended to implement. MacArthur's strong desire to see the Emperor retained can be seen in his letter to President Eisenhower, in which he states: "Destroy him and the nation will disintegrate."¹⁰ This, however was counter to a study conducted by field analysts. They concluded that post-surrender Japanese were more concerned with food than royalty, stating "The Allies are unduly apprehensive of the effect on the Japanese if the Emperor were removed."¹¹ That MacArthur and Co. deeply misunderstood both the importance and the function of the Emperor would be seen in how they chose to reform his position. The Emperor was to become human.

The Allied forces were right in viewing the Emperor as a deistic figure, but as Dower notes, the idea of the Emperor cult was really a fairly recent invention.¹² This is not to say that the conservative Japanese politicians were in any rush to embrace his

¹⁰ Douglas MacArthur, "Emperor Not Guilty of War Crimes, 1946," *In Japan a Documentary History*, ed. David J. Lu. (Armonk: M. E. Sharpe, Inc, 1997), p. 468

¹¹ John Dower, *Embracing Defeat: Japan in the wake of World War II* (New York: W. W. Norton and Company Inc, 2000), p. 305

¹² John Dower, *Embracing Defeat: Japan in the wake of World War II* (New York: W. W. Norton and Company Inc, 2000), p. 312

humanization. The man was still their sovereign after all, and more importantly, a symbol of the status quo they so desperately sought to preserve. They used various tactics to shield the Emperor. They took advantage of the Americans' attraction to pomp.¹³ They clung to older conventions such as the Meiji Charter Oath in order to argue that the existing system was one that was already sufficiently democratic without significant revision. They also shifted focus away from the Emperor's renunciation of divinity in order to ground the "New Japan" in tradition.¹⁴ To accomplish this last feat they employed linguistic and rhetorical gymnastics in order to obfuscate the renunciation, and place the Emperor in a theistic grey area, which can be best be seen in the Imperial rescript renouncing divinity.

Examining the Imperial rescript in which the Emperor disavowed his divinity, it is readily apparent that there were many cooks in the kitchen. Throughout the course of the short statement it manages to satisfy the requirements of SCAP by renouncing divinity and embracing pacifism, address the fears of conservative politicians by warning against "radical tendencies," and hearken back to tradition by referencing the Meiji Charter Oath.¹⁵ The most significant aspects of the rescript, however, cannot be found in translation. In order to attenuate the renunciation of divinity, the royalists resorted to linguistic obfuscation. Relying on antiquated terms such as "*Akitsuikami*," an archaic word unfamiliar to even most highly educated Japanese and meaning "visible exalted deity." made the renunciation far more obscure in the original Japanese than in English.¹⁶

¹³ John Dower, *Embracing Defeat: Japan in the wake of World War II* (New York: W. W. Norton and Company Inc, 2000), p. 301

¹⁴ John Dower, *Embracing Defeat: Japan in the wake of World War II* (New York: W. W. Norton and Company Inc, 2000), p. 313

¹⁵ Maeda Tamon, "Emperor Hirohito's Rescript disavowing his Own Divinity, 1946" In *Japan a Documentary History*, ed. David J. Lu. (Armonk: M. E. Sharpe, Inc, 1997), p. 466-7

¹⁶ John Dower, *Embracing Defeat: Japan in the wake of World War II* (New York: W. W. Norton and Company Inc, 2000), p. 317

Tricks such as this helped the Emperor to skirt the issue of divinity and deistic lineage and avoid any straight forward renunciation of divinity by relying on the ignorance of the Americans.

In all of this several things become clear. The Americans greatly overestimated the significance of, and the difficulty of removing the emperor. It is likely that their view of Japanese society as a primitive feudalistic culture guided them to these conclusions by blinding them to the agency of the Japanese. This allowed the monarchy to continue, albeit in a new, more accessible form, when a clearer understanding might otherwise have seen Hirohito replaced, or the entire monarchy abolished. This was a clear victory for the conservative politicians who sought to preserve the traditions that they could in order to arrest the spread of new, and in their opinion, dangerous ideologies that might seek to fill the void. That they were able to do so right under the nose of SCAP by using obscure linguistics is a stunning example of how unequipped the occupation forces really were.

In a symposium of Japanese views on the occupation published in 1952, a wide array of Japanese intellectuals gave brief treatment to “What [Japan] had gained, and what it had lost.”¹⁷ Opinions varied widely, ranging from glowing reviews of the occupation, to bitter critiques, and wait and see attitudes. Salient to the conversation at hand, however, is that none of the responders cited the Emperor’s divinity as a loss, and several posit advances in labor rights as something gained. To be sure they cite many

¹⁷ Victor Otake, Douglass G. Haring “Japan Looks Back on the Occupation” *Far Eastern Survey* 22, No 3 (Feb. 25, 1953) accessed March 29, 2012, [Http://www.jstor.org/stable/3024127](http://www.jstor.org/stable/3024127)

other things, for Japan in 1952 was a very different nation than it had been seven years before but it illustrates the broad spectrum of thought and opinion and agency of the Japanese. While more often than not, what SCAP wanted to happen, did happen, with land reform, women's suffrage, and education reform, being just a small set of examples. What this paper shows, however, was that it was not merely a "revolution from above" with the Americans dictating policy to the passive Japanese. Rather, the occupation was a revolution from every conceivable direction, with different reforms embraced or rejected by differing groups who had the ability to participate in the process if they so chose. It was a revolution that was somewhat ameliorated by a hapless bloc of conservatives who at the end of the day just wanted everything to be the way it once was. Finally it was a revolution in which a space for these groups to participate and ameliorate was created by the occupier's racist sentiments of superiority, and the subsequent misunderstandings and underestimations that followed. In this way did SCAP remain insufficiently knowledgeable to completely attain their goals, and the Japanese were allowed to, at least partially, chart the course of the revolution.

- Dower, John. "Empire and Aftermath: Yoshida Shigeru and the Japanese Experience" 1878-1954, Cambridge: Harvard Press, 1988
- Dower, John. "Embracing Defeat: Japan in the Wake of World War II" New York: W. W. Norton and Company Inc, 2000.
- Konoe, Fumimaru. "Konoe Memorial, February 14th, 1945" In Sources in Modern East Asian History and Politics, ed. Theodore McNelly. New York: Meredith Corp 1967.
- MacArthur, Douglass. "Emperor Not Guilty of War Crimes, 1946." In *Japan a Documentary History*, ed. David J. Lu. Armonk: M. E. Sharpe, Inc 1997.
- Otake Victor, Haring Douglass. "Japan Looks Back on the Occupation" Far Eastern Survey 22, No 3 (Feb. 25, 1953) accessed March 29, 2012, [Http://www.jstor.org/stable/3024127](http://www.jstor.org/stable/3024127) (26-32)
- Tamon, Maeda. "Emperor Hirohito's Rescript Disavowing His Own Divinity, 1946" In *Japan a Documentary History*, ed. David J. Lu. Armonk: M. E. Sharpe, Inc 1997.

Review of Books

Monique Rodriguez

May 5, 2014

An Ambivalent Revolution: A Review of Capitalism, God, and a Good Cigar

Any analysis of postrevolutionary Cuba, the first socialist republic to rise in Latin America, is inherently political. The volatile and lively debates surrounding the island nation's successes and failures spark up with new vigor each time a study is published, like a flame fed gasoline. Lydia Chávez, a professor at the University of California, brought a group of journalism students to Cuba to teach them how to report on foreign affairs in 2001.¹ This visit became the basis for this book. It portrays Cuba as still in the midst of a transition that should have been concluded soon after the end of the revolution in 1959. To merely say Cuba is between capitalism and socialism would not quite capture the complex reality on the ground. Socialism developed unevenly in the decades following the revolution; aspects of capitalism disappeared and reappeared in new forms as the US embargo and fall of the USSR took its toll on the country. Chávez sees this uneven development best embodied in her memory of poor children with eyeglasses begging for dollars.² People who are starving still receive other types of healthcare. Cuba is full of seeming contradictions. This book, a collection of impressions of Cuban society written by her students, has much to contribute to the debate but falls short of providing a complete view of Cuban society in the twentieth century.

The book is divided into four sections, entitled “Inventing,” “Breathing,” “Surviving,” and “Searching.” The first describes the inventive ways in which people live and even thrive in limiting circumstances. Juliana Barbassa's article, “The New Cuban Capitalist,” eloquently

1 Linda Chávez, ed., *Capitalism, God, and a Good Cigar: Cuba Enters the Twenty-first Century* (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2005), 1.

2 Chávez, *Capitalism*, 3.

situates the every day lives of Cubans in a larger sociopolitical context. She notes that while Castro's Cuba is indeed different from the one under Batista, tourism, private enterprise, and the US dollar have slowly become accepted in the postrevolutionary society as what Castro calls “necessary evils.”³ While socialism has utterly transformed Cuban society, the legacy of underdevelopment and imperialism stunts even now the progression of the revolution. People have invented new forms of capitalism as a means of survival. The government's policies toward small, capitalist ventures has done pendulum swings over the years. *Paladares*, tiny illicit restaurants sometimes run in people's backyards, were shut down for a mere few weeks in 1994 only to become legalized the next year.⁴ These private enterprises are necessary when government rations are uncertain and the dollar is king. Cuba is in a strange state in which capitalism is reviled, but tolerated. One interviewee, a sociology professor who ran an illicit bed-and-breakfast at her home, states that small, illegal businesses in Cuba are not part of the black market—they are the market.⁵ Barbassa explores the realities of Cuban capitalists who make sense of their place in a socialist republic. Most thought-provoking in this section is Alicia Roca's article, “Four Women Survive Manzanillo.” She provides written snapshots of four women engaged in the struggle to endure. In a particularly striking moment, an old, eighty-pound old woman known only as Rosa lovingly reminisces about the early years of the revolution as she toasts bread with watered-down fuel and sweetens her coffee with sugar from a jar swarming with ants.⁶ The revolution was indeed beautiful. However, it remains incomplete. Cuba still remains economically dependent on other countries—most apparent in the Cubans' coveting of the US dollar—though politically sovereign.

3 Chávez, *Capitalism*, 17.

4 Ibid., 20.

5 Ibid., 24-25.

6 Ibid., 33-34.

A weaker section is “Breathing.” Ezequiel Minaya's “Authors Who Knew or Know the Limits” had the potential for greatness, but fails to examine the issues of censorship beyond a simple analysis. Minaya seeks answers about the exiled poet Herberto Padilla from the elusive author Pedro Juan Gutiérrez, but he purposely avoids him in fear of “starting trouble.”⁷ The article is eery and full of intrigue. However, it makes no attempt to explain the motivations for and meaning of censorship in postrevolutionary Cuba. The most Minaya implicitly asserts is that artists are persecuted and individual rights are pushed aside—a shallow analysis at best. The Cuban Revolution transformed the role of intellectuals and artists in society. Castro's censorship laws were more than attempts to force these men and women to create pro-revolutionary propaganda. Contextualizing the Herbert Padilla Affair in 1971 in history would have added the dimension this article lacks. The CIA's involvement in propaganda campaigns and covert operations elsewhere in Latin America in the latter half of the twentieth century show that the Cuban government passed these censorship laws in a tense and complex international political environment. Still, “Dancers Who Stretch the Limit” by Ana Campoy redeems the section. Campoy traces the life of ballerina Alicia Alonso to look at the effects of the postrevolutionary government's policies on the Cuban School of Ballet—from Castro's generous grant to the Alonsos to start a ballet company a few months after the ousting of Batista to the period of homosexual persecution in 1966 that forced ten male dancers to defect to France.⁸ She provides a nuanced view of the ways in which the postrevolutionary government both fostered growth and expansion of the arts at the same time it limited artists.

The international community is politically polarized over the case of Cuba. This is why analyzing the problems and achievements of the socialist republic is difficult to do without

7 Chávez, *Capitalism*, 81.

8 *Ibid.*, 98-99.

raising controversy. The most glaring problem of this book is its narrow focus on the ways in which the revolution has failed the people. In some cases, the students come dangerously close to portraying poor Cubans who believe in the revolution as deluded. It is also easy to condemn human rights violations of the Cuban government without considering the egregious corruption under Batista, the legacies of underdevelopment and Cold War politics, or the sad state in which other underdeveloped, capitalist Latin American countries were in the late twentieth century. The inclusion of articles on what have been hailed victories of the revolution, such as the strong Cuban healthcare system and the numerous daycare centers, would vastly improve this book. Nevertheless, *Capitalism, God, and a Good Cigar* has much to contribute to the conversation surrounding Cuba and the tenability of socialism in Latin America. It would greatly compliment and contradict speeches by Vilma Espín, Fidel Castro, and Ernesto “Che” Guevara on the successes and failures of the revolution and be useful for a comparative study of Cuba and other Caribbean countries.