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Thomas M. Campbell Award

Beginning with Volumes 6/7, the Florida Conference of Historians has presented the Thomas M. Campbell Award for the best paper published in the Annual Proceedings (now Annals) of that year.

Thomas M. (Tom) Campbell was the driving force behind the creation of the Florida Conference of Historians, at that time called The Florida College Teachers of History, over 40 years ago. It was his personality and hard work that kept the conference moving forward. Simply put, in those early years he was the conference.

Tom was a professor of U.S. Diplomatic history at Florida State University. The Thomas M. Campbell Award is in his name so that we may recognize and remember his efforts on behalf of the Florida Conference of Historians.

Recipients

2016: Tom Aiello, Gordon State College
2015: Leslie Kemp Poole, Rollins College
2014: Michael D. Brooks, M.A. Candidate, University of Central Florida
2013: Andrew Fede, JD, Independent Scholar
2012: Christopher Williams, Ph.D., University of Warwick
2011: Frank Piccirillo, Florida Gulf Coast University
2010: Amy M. Porter, Ph.D., Georgia Southwestern University
2009: Christine Lutz, Ph.D., Georgia State University
2008: Vincent Intondi, ABD, American University
2007: Steve MacIsaac, Ph.D., Jacksonville University
2006: Dennis P. Halpin and Jared G. Toney, University of South Florida
2005: David Michel, Ph.D., Chicago Theological Seminary
2004: Robert L. Shearer, Ph.D., Florida Institute of Technology
2002-3: J. Calvitt Clarke III, Ph.D., Jacksonville University
2000-1: J. Calvitt Clarke III, Ph.D., Jacksonville University
Blaine T. Browne Award

Beginning with the current volume, the Florida Conference of Historians will present the Blaine T. Browne Award, given to the best paper written by a graduate student who presents at the annual meeting and publishes in the Annals.

Dr. Browne earned a doctorate in American history at the University of Oklahoma in 1985. He subsequently taught at several universities and colleges before joining the faculty at Broward College in 1988. An active participant in the Florida Conference of Historians since 1994, Dr. Browne has presented at annual meetings and published in the Selected Annual Proceedings of the Florida Conference of Historians, the predecessor of the Annals. Now retired from Broward College, in 2014 Dr. Browne generously provided the seed money for this award.

Recipients

2016: Khali I. Navarro, University of Central Florida
2015: Jenny Smith, Valdosta State University

J. Calvitt Clarke III Award

Beginning with volume 20, the Florida Conference of Historians has presented the J. Calvitt Clarke III Award for the best undergraduate research paper published in the Annals.

In 2012, Dr. Clarke, Professor Emeritus at Jacksonville University and a strong supporter of undergraduate research, graciously provided the seed funding for this important award. He is a frequent contributor and the founding editor of the predecessor to the Annals, the Selected Annual Proceedings of the Florida Conference of Historians.

Recipients

2016: Nicole Kana Hummel, New College of Florida
2015: Tyler Campbell, University of Central Florida
2014: Michael Rodriguez, Florida Gulf Coast University
2013: Amy Denise Jackson, Wesleyan College
A Note from the Editor

It is my pleasure to present volume 23 of *FCH Annals*, featuring selected papers presented at the 55th Annual Meeting of the Florida Conference of Historians, which was held at Florida Southern College in Lakeland, Florida, February 13-15, 2015. The main focus of the present volume is topics in U.S. history, but this is purely happenstance, as the call for submissions was open to all fields and topics in history. In addition to the United States, the articles that follow also touch on the history of Europe, Latin America, and the Caribbean. This year’s winner of the Campbell Award, “Jacob De Cordova: Immigrant, Messenger and Prophet,” by Tom Aiello, examines the life of a Jamaican immigrant in nineteenth-century Texas, whose “constant promotion of settlement and economic development . . . greatly contributed to the growth of the state.” The winner of the Browne Award, “‘Forging a New France’: Gustave Le Bon’s Vision of Nationalism and Race, 1881-1931,” by Khali I. Navarro, contextualizes Le Bon’s thought within what Navarro describes as “an entire trend in European intellectual life at the end of the century.” Last but not least, the winner of the Clarke Award for the best submission by an undergraduate, “Chanel No. 5: A Historical Interpretation on a Cultural Staple,” by Nicole Kana Hummel, analyzes the relationship between French and American popular culture as reflected in the unique commercial success, based largely on word of mouth, of this iconic scent. Many of the ten remaining articles in this volume also have an international component, serving as a reminder of the many global ties evident throughout much of American history.

Michael S. Cole
13 May 2016
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Southerners are Very Territorial:
Dueling and Territorial Politics in the Nineteenth Century South

Matthew Byron
Young Harris College

During the first half of the nineteenth century, territorial politics displayed a very competitive and violent nature. Across the south, young ambitious politicians ventured to the newly created territories of Louisiana, Missouri, Arkansas, and Florida. These men brought their elite lineage, their desire for public office, and, most importantly, their pistols. This combination of values, emotions and weaponry created volatile situations when mixed with political competition, creating a number of high-profile duels. Dueling had existed in the United States since the earliest days of colonial settlement, but it was the early part of the nineteenth century that saw an explosion in the number and frequency of duels across the states. In the newly created territories of the South, the culture of dueling emerged and was validated by the earliest duelists. Territorial governors and secretaries, delegates to Congress, and superior court judges all found it necessary to defend their honor and their position of power. In many of these instances, their defense resulted in duels. This essay will illustrate the violent nature of territorial politics beginning with Louisiana, Missouri and Arkansas and the pattern these territories set for territorial violence elsewhere. Florida continued the trend with several violent encounters involving the most powerful men of the territory. Thus, dueling had an overwhelming influence on the political development of many states within the Union.

Sanctioned by the Louisiana Purchase of 1803, Americans flooded into the land west of the Mississippi River. The opening of the wilderness welcomed the traditional frontiersman—a rough and tumble, adventurous man, quick to use the knife or gun to defend himself. Yet this frontiersman was not alone. Almost as quickly as the frontiersman arrived, so too did young lawyers and politicians seeking to stake a claim to the political world of the newly-created Louisiana Territory. Like their rougher counterparts, these lawyers and politicians would rely heavily on their knives and guns to defend themselves. Within a year of establishing the territorial government in New Orleans, honor culture made its presence felt.

In 1805, Robert Sterrey, a writer for the Gazette in New Orleans, lambasted Territorial Governor William C.C. Claiborne for attending “festivities” so soon after the death of his wife. Although Claiborne’s reputation was under attack, he refused to challenge Sterrey. Instead, Micajah Green Lewis, Claiborne’s brother-in-law and personal secretary (and brother of the deceased wife) issued a challenge.
On 13 February, Lewis and Sterrey exchanged two shots. On the second fire, Lewis was shot through the heart and died moments later.\(^1\) Despite Claiborne’s refusal to duel and his assertion to President Thomas Jefferson that he would have stopped the affair had he been apprised of it, Claiborne was not opposed to dueling.\(^2\) Two years after his brother-in-law died defending his (Claiborne’s) honor, Claiborne chose to fight his own affair of honor. According to one source, the affair stemmed from charges made by Daniel Clark that Claiborne had “demonstrated incompetence by abdicating responsibilities during the Burr Conspiracy.”\(^3\) Still believing his official position prevented him from becoming involved in an affair of honor, Claiborne resigned his position as territorial governor and traveled into Spanish Florida to fight Clark.\(^4\) The duel did little to jeopardize Claiborne’s political career, for in 1812 Claiborne was elected the first governor of the state of Louisiana.

A year after the Claiborne-Clark duel, Louisiana witnessed another major politician take to the field of honor. John Ward Gurley was appointed U.S. attorney-general for the Orleans Territory in 1803. He served alongside William C.C. Claiborne, and the two men continuously faced opposition from Edward Livingston and Daniel Clark. Although he would involve himself “in a prolonged epistolary affair of honor with attorney Edward Livingston” between 1804 and 1806, the two would reconcile peacefully.\(^5\) In 1808, however, Gurley found himself on the field of honor facing another political opponent, Philip L. Jones. The two men exchanged one shot. Jones was wounded in the thigh, while Gurley was killed instantly.\(^6\) The death of the attorney-general of the Orleans Territory highlighted the fact that defending one’s honor in Louisiana had become imperative to holding high political office.

---

\(^1\) On the first shot, it appears Lewis fired early to no effect and Sterrey threw away his shot. In the immediate aftermath Claiborne sent a letter to President Thomas Jefferson proclaiming that had he known a challenge had been issued, he would have intervened and stopped it. Claiborne’s own participation in a duel two years later makes this assertion highly questionable. Gazette (Louisiana), 15 February 1805; The Monthly Mirror, vol. XX, (London, 1805), 72; Lewis, Genealogy of the Lewis Family in America: From the Middle of the Seventeenth Century Down to the Present Time (Louisville: Courier-Journal Job Print. Co, 1893), 81; “Governor Claiborne to the President, 17 February 1805,” in Territorial Papers of the United States ed. Clarence Edwin Carter (Washington, DC: U.S. Govt. Print. Off., 1934), 393; Buddy Stall, Buddy Stall’ s New Orleans, 100; French Quarter, 145-146.

\(^2\) Governor Claiborne to the President, 17 February 1805, Carter, Territorial Papers of the United States, 393.

\(^3\) The Burr Conspiracy references the alleged attempt by Aaron Burr and General James Wilkinson to invade Mexico without authorization from President Jefferson. The goal of the expedition is highly debated between those who believed Burr was attempting to create his own empire using land from the Louisiana Territory and Mexico and those who believed Burr was attempting to regain his national prominence after killing Alexander Hamilton, by seizing western lands for the United States. In 1805, Burr traveled to Louisiana and met with Daniel Clark to strategize: Junius P. Rodriguez, The Louisiana Purchase: A Historical and Geographical Encyclopedia, 70; Benjamin F. Shearer, The Uniting States: Louisiana to Ohio, 500.

\(^4\) Claiborne was wounded in the right thigh on the first fire. Stuart Landry, Duelling in Old New Orleans, 11.


As Louisiana transitioned from territory to statehood, the political proving ground for young politicians shifted northward to the developing region of St. Louis and Cape Girardeau, Missouri. As these two locales became the political centers of the newly-created Missouri Territory, so too did they become the dueling centers for elite men. Yet even before Louisiana chose its boundaries and declared for statehood, dueling had crept into the wilderness of Missouri.

In 1807, the very same year that Claiborne ventured into Spanish Florida with Daniel Clark, dueling made its way into what would become the state of Missouri. That year, Captain William Ogle, a man of considerable prestige in the Cape Girardeau community and proprietor of a recently granted tavern, challenged Joseph McFerron to a duel. McFerron, the clerk for the county court, was accused of leaving disparaging remarks about Ogle in the official records pertaining to Ogle’s tavern license. McFerron’s motives remain somewhat unclear, but it has been suggested that the affair emerged over Ogle’s womanizing. The two men met on Cypress Island, where Ogle was killed on the first shot. Although the affair was not politically driven, its aftermath was highly politicized. In the wake of Ogle’s death McFerron resigned his position as county clerk, however, the people of Cape Girardeau immediately re-elected him.

Four years after the McFerron-Ogle duel, there was another duel involving esteemed men seeking political power. On 1 October 1811, Thomas T. Crittenden and Dr. Walter Fenwick met on Moreau’s Island. Crittenden belonged to the famous Crittenden political family of Kentucky. As his brother, John J. Crittenden, was already politically established in Kentucky, both Thomas and his brother Robert (discussed later) ventured into the Missouri Territory to seek their political fortunes. For Thomas Crittenden, his 1810 appointment as attorney-general of the Louisiana Territory brought him to the Missouri region. After Crittenden made a zealous prosecutorial attack, Walter Fenwick issued a challenge to the attorney-general. Using pistols made by John Smith T.’s gunsmith, the two men exchanged one shot, whereby Fenwick was mortally wounded. According to historian Dick

---

7 The court ordered McFerron to strike a statement questioning Ogle’s character. Instead of completely erasing the statement, McFerron chose to draw a single line through the statement and noted that the court had ordered it stricken from the record. On other such matters McFerron completely erased stricken statements from the record. Thus, Ogle believed McFerron purposefully left the statement legible for use by Ogle’s political opponents. Houck, *A History of Missouri from the Earliest Explorations*, vol. 3, 75; Bulletin of Cape Girardeau County Genealogical Society, June 1991.


9 Cypress Island was a sandbar located near Cape Girardeau. On the first shot, McFerron’s bullet struck Ogle in the head, killing him instantly. Houck, *A History of Missouri from the Earliest Explorations*, vol. 3, 75.

10 Moreau’s Island is located just below St. Genevieve, Missouri. Foley, *The Genesis of Missouri*, 186.

11 Governor Benjamin Howard appointed Crittenden as Attorney-General. Robert Crittenden would travel to the region of Arkansas as the Territorial Secretary. Steward, *Duels and the Roots of Violence in Missouri*, 34.

12 The attacked was actually made against Ezekiel Fenwick, Walter’s brother.

13 John Smith T. was known to be involved in some capacity in several affairs of honor before fighting his own duel in 1819. Houck, *A History of Missouri from the Earliest Explorations*, 3: 76-79; Recorder (Boston), 24 April 1824; Conard, *Encyclopedia of the History of Missouri*, 329-330; Foley, *The Genesis of Missouri*, 186.
Steward, “duels of this nature attracted considerable attention, and each duelist, to enhance his own social status, invited notable individuals to serve as seconds and surgeons. John Scott, for example, the territorial delegate to the U.S. Congress and later Missouri’s first congressman, served as Crittenden’s second. Henry Dodge, the sheriff of the district of Ste. Genevieve, a general in the War of 1812, and later a U.S. senator from Wisconsin, was the second for Fenwick.”

The most notorious example of men using the duel as a political weapon in Missouri came in 1817. That year, Thomas Hart Benton, the future political powerhouse of Missouri, faced the aristocratic Charles Lucas. According to Dick Steward, “each man stood as the champion of his respective factions, and each man, in the prime of life, appeared destined for greatness.” Raised in the aristocratic society of St. Louis, Lucas was taught a disdain for upstart lawyers of low birth, the type Thomas Hart Benton represented. Although a lawyer himself, Lucas held himself above the “frontier coarseness” found in men like Benton. In August, the two men’s animosity for one another led to a duel on the famous “Bloody Island.” Using smoothbore pistols, Benton was able to wound Lucas. Not satisfied with the outcome, the two men agreed to meet again in September. On 27 September 1817, Charles Lucas was mortally wounded at the hands of Thomas Hart Benton. Killing a member of the aristocratic elite did little damage to Benton’s political career as he would ascend to the highest levels of political power, serving as U.S. senator from Missouri from 1821 to 1851.

As Missouri transitioned into statehood between 1818 and 1821, dueling found its way into the developing territory labeled the Arkansas Territory. Left out of both Louisiana’s and Missouri’s boundaries, Arkansas Territory was a dense, forested swamp filled with various Native groups. On 3 March 1819, President James Monroe signed into being the Arkansas Territory. As the populations of both Louisiana and Missouri grew, so too did the population of Arkansas Territory’s leading settlement: Little Rock. It was at Little Rock that the first duel in Arkansas occurred in 1820.

In 1819, a young, brash, upstart lawyer named Robert Oden relocated to Little Rock from Kentucky and took up residency at the local boarding house. While staying at the boarding house, Oden came in frequent contact with General William Allen, the leader of the militia for Arkansas Territory. The two men often shared a table for breakfast or dinner. On one such occasion in 1820, the two men became embroiled in an argument over Allen’s involvement in the debate for

---

14 Steward, Duels and the Roots of Violence in Missouri, 34.
15 Ibid., 58.
16 Ibid., 66.
17 Bloody Island earned its nickname from the number of duels fought on it. The island was located across from St. Louis, closer to the Illinois side of the Mississippi River. At least a dozen duels were held on the island during the nineteenth century.
18 For more details see Houck, A History of Missouri from the Earliest Expeditions, 3: 79; Steward, Duels and the Roots of Violence in Missouri, 58-78.
choosing the official territorial capitol.\textsuperscript{19} As a result of the heated argument, Oden struck Allen with a cane. Several days later the two men met outside of Little Rock. On the first exchange Allen was mortally wounded.\textsuperscript{20} Killing the head of the territory’s militia did little to stop Oden’s political career. After joining forces with Robert Crittenden, territorial secretary, Oden was elected to the local assembly and eventually ran for delegate to Congress.

Four years later another duel occurred in Arkansas between prominent men. During a high-stakes card game, Andrew Scott and Joseph Selden argued over Selden’s behavior at the table, in front of several “esteemed” ladies.\textsuperscript{21} The two men nearly came to blows that night, but others intervened to stop the fight. For the next several months, the two men sat next to each other while presiding as judges on the Superior Court, Arkansas Territory’s highest ranking court. Finally, the two men could stand the tension no longer and chose to meet on the field of honor. On the first shot Selden was struck and died moments later.\textsuperscript{22} The death of a judge at the hands of another judge demonstrated the power of honor and the persistence of dueling in territorial culture. In the wake of Selden’s death, Andrew Scott continued to serve as territorial judge and never was indicted for killing Selden.\textsuperscript{23}

The period following the Scott-Selden duel in 1824 witnessed a new element of the emerging Southern society in Arkansas: the duel as a political tool. If the Allen-Oden duel in 1820 represented the arrival of Southern gentility to Arkansas and the Scott-Selden duel in 1824 represented the legal system’s reliance on honor culture, the Newton-Sevier duel in 1827 marked the point when the duel became a weapon to eliminate political opposition.

The volatility of 1827, which resulted in two duels, was a product of the frontier’s lack of political cohesion in the form of national party politics. “Politics on the Arkansas frontier,” according to John Hallum, “was then a very robust and vigorous institution, and one method of proving loyal adhesion to party creed and stern devotion to personal honor was by resort to the \textit{code duello}.”\textsuperscript{24} The two major

\textsuperscript{19} Oddly enough, both men were in favor of the capitol remaining in Little Rock, however, Oden believed that Allen’s speech in favor of Little Rock was poorly given and inadvertently provided support for the Little Rock’s rival town, Cadron.

\textsuperscript{20} Allen’s bullet first struck Oden in the chest knocking him down; however, the bullet merely glanced off a button of Oden’s jacket and did no damage. Yet, in being knocked down, Oden’s gun changed its trajectory and his bullet struck Allen directly between the eyes, killing him instantly. According to the testimony given during the criminal proceedings following the duel, it was confirmed that the duel took place “on an island in the Arkansas river, about one and half miles above the village of Arkansas.” \textit{Arkansas Gazette}, 1 July 1820. According to another version, the Allen-Oden duel occurred “on the bank of the Arkansas River, on the opposite side from Arkansas Post.” Goodspeed’s \textit{Biographical and Historical Memoirs of Central Arkansas}, 400. See also Pope, \textit{Early Days in Arkansas}, 34.

\textsuperscript{21} The names of the women were purposefully omitted from the newspaper accounts of the affair, but some accounts have suggested the women may have been prostitutes.

\textsuperscript{22} \textit{Arkansas Gazette}, 1 June 1824. In the 15 June 1824 issue of the \textit{Gazette}, it was reported that Selden “expired in about three minutes, without speaking one word.”

\textsuperscript{23} Scott would continue to serve as a judge until 1827 when he became collateral damage in the political war involving President John Quincy Adams, the man charged with appointing territorial judges.

\textsuperscript{24} Hallum, \textit{Biographical and Pictorial History of Arkansas}, 141.
factions in 1827 centered on the leadership of Robert Crittenden and Henry W. Conway. Robert Crittenden was the dominant political figure from the earliest days of Arkansas Territory serving as territorial secretary and, on various occasions, acting governor; however, the arrival of Conway and his family relations brought new competition to Arkansas. By 1827, Crittenden’s foundation of power was starting to show signs of weakness as the Conway faction garnered more and more political spoils from Washington, D.C. as a result of Conway serving as territorial delegate to Congress. Thus, the election for delegate to Congress would prove to be a violent one for Arkansas Territory.

As the November 1827 election neared, the Conway faction hosted a barbeque to rally support for their candidates. It was common practice for politicians in the United States to host gatherings and barbeques in an attempt to win or buy votes. This was especially true in Arkansas. “It is expected of a candidate,” noted Hiram Abiff Whittington, “that they are to treat all their friends as often as they see them from now until election, find them in segars [sic], tobacco, etc.”

Among those gathered to campaign was Ambrose H. Sevier. Coming off his successful campaign for re-election to the House of Representatives, in which he was also selected as Speaker of the House, Sevier was rallying for his cousin, Henry W. Conway, in his re-election bid for territorial delegate to Congress. At some point during the outing, the topic turned to a recent letter published in the Arkansas Gazette that criticized Conway. Sevier openly expressed his disgust with the letter and his desire to confront its unknown author so as to defend the reputation of the Conway “Dynasty.” Sevier then circulated the letter around the crowd at the barbeque in an attempt to identify its author. Soon it became apparent that the author was Thomas W. Newton.

After the barbeque, someone who was present to hear Sevier approached Newton and repeated Sevier’s challenge to fight. Learning of Sevier’s comments, Newton “avowed himself to be the author of the piece,” knowing full well that a confrontation would ensue. Newton’s actions would demonstrate to Crittenden that he was a loyal follower and worthy of political office and support from the

25 Henry Wharton Conway was elected in 1823 and served as delegate to Congress until his death in 1827.
26 This barbeque would lead to another conflict in 1828. According to William F. Pope, an argument erupted between Edmund Hogan and Andrew Scott in which Hogan blamed Scott for writing a report claiming Sevier was using the barbeque to influence Arkansas voters. See Lonnie White, Politics on the Southwestern Frontier: Arkansas Territory 1819-1836 (Memphis: Memphis State University Press, 1964), 86.
28 Hallum, Biographical and Pictorial History of Arkansas, 37, 141. See also Hempstead, A Pictorial History of Arkansas, 210, 215. This was not the first time the cousins had worked together. In 1825 Governor George Izard appointed Conway and Sevier lieutenant colonels in the local militia to aide him in reorganizing the territorial militia. White, Politics on the Southwestern Frontier, 56.
29 The letter was presumably from “A Citizen of the Territory” printed in the 6 February 1827 issue of the Arkansas Gazette.
30 Herndon, Centennial History of Arkansas, vol. 1, 980.
31 That person most likely found Newton in the streets of Little Rock when he repeated Sevier’s words. Hempstead, A Pictorial History of Arkansas, 213.
Crittenden faction. The two men met approximately sixty miles north of Little Rock at a place called Point Remove (Indian Territory) on 4 September 1827. After exchanging one shot to no effect, the two men shook hands and returned to Arkansas as friends. In the aftermath of the duel Newton was chosen to deliver Arkansas’s statehood application to the U.S. Congress and Ambrose Sevier was elected the first U.S. senator from the state of Arkansas.

The Newton-Sevier duel was only the beginning of political animosity in the 1827 election year. Soon the two most powerful politicians and leaders of their respective factions squared off over the election for territorial delegate to Congress. According to Judge William F. Pope’s recollections, “during the canvass much bad feeling had been engendered on both sides, and many bitter articles had appeared in the rival newspapers denunciatory of Mr. Crittenden on the one side and Mr. Conway on the other.”

Their fight was the epitome of political dueling: two men who utilized the duel in an attempt to remove their opponent. On 29 October 1827 Conway and Crittenden agreed to meet on an island located in the Mississippi River opposite the mouth of the White River. With the word being given the two men fired. Instantly “lint flew from the breast of Mr. Crittenden” as Conway’s bullet hit the lapel of Crittenden’s coat. Believing Crittenden to be mortally wounded, Benjamin Desha (Crittenden’s second) rushed to his side “with great anxiety,” but found Crittenden unhurt. Conway’s bullet had merely passed through the lapel without inflicting damage. Crittenden reported to Desha that he was not injured but feared Conway was no so lucky.

Scanning across the field, Crittenden and Desha saw Conway lying on the ground, blood oozing from his side. As the men approached they were informed that Crittenden’s bullet had struck Conway under his right arm, between the fifth and sixth rib. One source recorded that Crittenden’s shot hit Conway “six or eight inches below the top of his shoulders.” The bullet “struck a tooth brush, and broke a rib; the ball and part of the brush then fell downwards.” Unlike the previous duels in Arkansas Territory, the Conway-Crittenden duel did not propel Crittenden to higher office, instead it did the opposite. Crittenden was no longer the leading politician in Arkansas. Instead, the Dynasty led by Conway’s family and supporters had emerged as the political victors from the duel and the results of the special election proved this change. When the votes were tallied, Ambrose H. Sevier came out on top.

---

34 The most famous instance of men trying to remove their political rival was the Burr-Hamilton duel in 1804.
37 *Arkansas Gazette*, 6 November 1827.
38 Why Conway carried a toothbrush in his pocket is still a mystery. White, *Politics on the Southwestern Frontier*, 79.
The violent trend of dueling in the territories of the United States emerged in Florida at nearly the same time as it did in Arkansas Territory. With the acquisition of Florida and the creation of the Florida Territory, Americans began to flock into the region. Included amongst these immigrants were ambitious men who took their personal honor very seriously. Beginning in 1821, Florida Territory recorded several duels, the first of which occurred under the governorship of Andrew Jackson (a coincidence?). That year, two officers under Jackson’s command, Hull and Randall, were allowed to duel near Pensacola. Hull was killed, while Randall went unprosecuted. Although seemingly sanctioned by the authoritative powers within Florida, dueling was slow to catch on. It would be another five years before Florida Territory recorded another duel.

In 1826, Achille Murat lost a finger on his right hand in a duel with Judge David B. Macomb at Mannington near the state line of Georgia. Two years later William McRea received a bullet in his leg from Algernon S. Thurston in Tallahassee’s Capitol Square. Although dueling was seemingly sporadic – three duels over the course of seven years – it appeared to be gaining popularity and in 1829, Florida Territory witnessed three duels, two of which were quite sensationalized. The first of the “sensationalized” duels of 1829 involved Colonel George Walton, territorial secretary of Florida. The two men fought near Pensacola’s city limits. Neither man appears to have been injured from the affair. Walton’s powerful position as secretary, along with his fame for being a signer of the Declaration of Independence, brought instant attention to dueling in territorial Florida. However, it was an affair between Charles E. Hawkins and William McRea that drew the ire of anti-duelists. In February, Hawkins caught McRea climbing out of Hawkins’s bedroom window after a tryst with Hawkins’s wife. The two met days later and both men were wounded. It appeared as though the affair was settled. However, in May, Hawkins spied McRea on Whitehead Street in Tallahassee, approached him, and shot McRea in the back with his shotgun. McRea died two hours later. Although initially arrested for murder, Hawkins was acquitted when his lawyers secured a “change of venue” to St. Augustine, Florida, where a sympathetic jury sided with Hawkins.

The lawless shooting in the streets of Tallahassee coupled with the duel involving the territorial secretary, convinced legislators that a dueling law was necessary. In 1829, therefore, the Legislative Council made dueling illegal in the Florida Territory and prescribed a punishment for the duelists and their seconds of a monetary fine or potential jail time, along with disqualification from holding public office. The law appears to have had some success as there was no recorded duel in the territory for nearly three years, until the duel in 1832 between Thomas

---

40 The territorial secretary was second in command behind the territorial governor. When the governor was away, the secretary served as acting governor.
Baltzell and James D. Westcott, another territorial secretary. Rumor had it that Westcott was appointed territorial secretary by President Andrew Jackson as a result of “taking a challenge for Jackson.” The two men met 25 September 1832 near the Alabama-Florida line. They exchanged one shot and Westcott received a minor wound. Upon returning home, Baltzell and the two seconds were indicted under the 1829 dueling law. Westcott, for reasons unknown, was not indicted (perhaps because he was territorial secretary or because he was the wounded party in the duel). The other three men were eventually found not guilty and released.

Over the next seven years, Florida Territory witnessed six recorded duels, including a duel involving the death of the attorney-general. In 1833 Attorney-General John Campbell and George Hamlin fought over an unknown reason. Meeting at Mannington, Florida, the two men exchanged fire and Campbell fell, mortally wounded. Fearful of prosecution, Hamlin fled to the Florida Keys and was never brought to trial.

The early territorial and statehood years of much of the Louisiana Purchase land and Florida witnessed a full display of the power of honor culture. The large number of duels amongst prominent men highlighted the arrival of elite society to the territorial frontier and established a precedent for honor violence that would last throughout the nineteenth century. The frontier was indeed a wild and dangerous place and those who chose to lead it had to be bathed in the culture of honor before voters would bestow the highest positions of power upon them.

---

41 Doherty, Code Duello in Florida, 246.
Dedicating his life to the welfare of children, Dr. J. Calvitt Clarke (1887-1970) was one of the twentieth century’s most successful charitable fund raisers. The organizations he founded or helped found provided — and continue to provide — life-sustaining help to millions of children. His central contribution was to create in 1938, China’s Children Fund, which later became Christian Children’s Fund, and today is called ChildFund International. Clarke had gotten his start in charitable fund raising twenty years before, during and after the Great War, when he worked with the American Committee for Armenian and Syrian Relief (ACASR). Concerned Americans had formed ACASR during the First World War to ease the sufferings of Armenians at Turkish hands.¹

Clarke’s Introduction to Near East Relief

While finishing seminary and pastoring two Presbyterian churches in Pennsylvania, Clarke saw an advertisement in the Presbyterian Banner magazine asking for volunteers to secure county chairmen.² Enticed, he became a cog in ACASR’s work by organizing county committees in Pennsylvania. For example, he went to Indiana, Pennsylvania in October 1918, where he created a permanent committee to take charge of a house-to-house canvass that would cover the county in January 1919. His was but one small slice of a nationwide campaign to raise $30 million for Armenian and Syrian Relief.³

Rev. Clarke left this work in early 1919 to work for the YMCA among Russian troops stranded in France during the Great War.⁴ Home after three months overseas, in August 1919 Rev. Clarke went to the office of a friend, who promised to help him in his search for a church to pastor. The friend also reminded Clarke of his earlier volunteer service for ACASR and suggested that he return to organizational work for its successor, Near East Relief (NER).⁵

The peoples of the Near East — Greeks, Turks, Armenians, Georgians, Russians — after the Great War, continued to face horrific conditions. How could Americans help them? The Near East — the Holy Land — seemed an obvious place to encourage social progress, and NER promoted international Progressive reform — an International Social Gospel — in the Middle East. In this fusion of Protestantism, missionary ideology, Wilsonian Progressivism, paternalism, and modern humanitarian work, NER prized expert social work as a way to remake — to democratize and Americanize — the Middle East.6

Near East Relief Director for Central Pennsylvania

Inspired by his friend’s advice, Clarke accepted an appointment with NER as director for Central Pennsylvania and assistant director for the whole state, and he went to work in late 1919 in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania. This was to have been a temporary job, but he never returned to the pastorate.8

From meetings with other NER representatives, Rev. Clarke began to learn the graphic rhythms and cadences of charity fund raising. In mid-September 1919, he was in Lebanon and a week later in Gettysburg, both in Pennsylvania, preparing for a fund raising campaign to take place in February 1920. To anyone who would listen, Clarke explained that the Great War was over, but formerly oppressed peoples still needed help. Specifically, the funds he raised would help support orphans and destitute Armenians, Syrians, Greeks, and other peoples of the Near East. Railing against “Turkish Butchery!” Clarke lamented that at least 700,000 Armenians and others in the Caucasus were starving and that it was already too late to save 200,000 from death in the coming winter. Little children were tearing and devouring the raw flesh of animals dead in the streets. Human flesh, too. Authorities had found one woman, crazed by hunger, with the body of her dead baby roasting in her oven. Yet, “by hard, faithful service,” 500,000 lives could still be saved.11

As part of a nationwide effort, in the autumn of 1920 Clarke helped organize “Bundle Day” — a collection of old clothes — for Near East Relief. In preparation, Clarke reassured Pennsylvanians that the Armenians were Christians, and he

---

10 See, e.g., Biddeford Journal, 29 May 1920.
eloquently described their needs in the severe cold of Armenia’s mountainous climate. With the help of workers such as Clarke, Pennsylvania won NER’s special praise for its successful campaign.\footnote{Patriot, 15 Sept. 1920; The New Near East 6 (Feb. 1921): 27; 6 (Mar. 1921): 10; 6 (Apr. 1921): 9. The issue, 6 (May 1921): esp. 1-4, 14-15, dealt with Bundle Day. For Clarke’s various talks, see Patriot, 20, 21 Jan. 1921 and 29 Feb. 1921.}

Early 1921 marked an especially busy season for Clarke. After speaking to educators and school children about the terrible suffering of the Armenians,\footnote{Patriot, 7, 10, 24 Jan. 1921.} he stood before the Steelton Ministerial Association. He told a moving story, typical of his style, of an Armenian mother of five. They had trudged many miles, hoping to get to an orphanage where they could find food. She had dragged herself and her children the last few, and arriving at the orphanage, the mother collapsed. When she awoke, she told her tale and begged to have her five children admitted. Tears flowing down her cheeks, she received the sad news that there was room in the home only for two. When asked to choose, the mother wailed: “If I pick two, I’ll be condemning the other three to death, along with myself.” The NER nurse selected two and the mother and the remaining three left. Only a few hours later, death ended their agony. Clarke pressed the point home. Near East Relief had undertaken a big task in Asia Minor, but, even with its extensive relief work, it could not take care of more than a fifth of the people in need. Conditions, he said, had worsened, because just before harvest time, Turkish Nationalists and Bolsheviks had each invaded and driven the Armenian population into barren areas.\footnote{Patriot, 11 Jan. 1921. The following day, Clarke appealed to pharmacists. Patriot, 12 Jan. 1921.}

In mid-January 1921, Rev. Clarke spoke to the girls at Central High School in Harrisburg. In his “stirring talk,” he revealed the “intolerable conditions among the homeless starving refugees,” and in terms typical for NER speakers, he explained the debt Americans owed the Armenians. Most importantly, they were among the first defenders of Christianity, a religion “not of particular creeds or church doctrines,” but one which, among other things, “teaches all to respect womanhood.” The Armenians had stood as “the bulwark against the degradation of Mohammedan teaching and . . . made it possible for us to enjoy the decencies of present-day civilization.” Americans owed a second debt. Although an Ottoman subject nation and “commanded to fight on the side of the Central Powers,” Armenia had refused and had taken up the Allied cause, fighting side-by-side with the Russians until the Tsarist Empire had collapsed. “They fought on and on, though they were outnumbered ten to one and frequently, when there was but one gun for each seven men.” Because Armenia had kept the Turks and the Germans out of the oil regions at Baku in Northern Armenia, they had shaved months off the war and thus had saved many American lives.\footnote{Patriot, 13 Jan. 1921.}
Throughout his fund raising career, Clarke took similar lines of argument. Altruistic pleas for the sake of humanity were never enough. In addition, he also stressed the self-interested need for Americans to repay debts owed to another people for services rendered against a common enemy. During World War II, for example, he spoke of China in the same way.

Clarke had more arrows in his quiver. As a suffragist and a man of decent concern for others, sexual exploitation of young girls always troubled him, and in raising funds he willingly delved into the lurid. He told a group in Steelton that there were 200,000 Armenian girls held in Turkish harems, where their masters branded them with hot irons or tattoos. “The girls will carry the brand mark to their graves.” Even if freed, the Turks would cast the girls into the streets to starve or perish from exposure — or face even greater harm from roving bands of hungry bandits. There was hope, but hope had a price. Near East Relief needed money to provide “rescue Homes” to save these girls and provide them with food and clothing.16

Investigation Tour of Armenia and Georgia for Near East Relief

Rev. Clarke’s hard work and diligent optimism raised his profile, and sometime in 1921, NER chose him as Pennsylvania’s representative for a commission detailed to study famine conditions in the Russian Caucasus, Armenia, Greece, and Turkey.17 Clarke kept a daily journal of his adventure, which he began on 30 June when he embarked in New York on the American-flagged steamship, the SS Acropolis.

That very night he confided to his journal that he already missed his beloved wife. In fact, one of the dominant themes in his journal was his love for Helen — “the dear old sweet monkey”18 — and his wish to get home to see her again. Over the next sixty-eight days that covered his trip, he nostalgically wrote her name forty-two times. Typifying his sentiments, the night before arriving in Greece, he wrote, “Talk on Athens . . . how Helen would enjoy it but am so miserable without her tonight. Dear sweetheart I simply don’t live when I haven’t you.”19 After passing by Malta and Sicily, he mooned for Helen, “it was so fine of you to give me that last picture of you smiling at me from the train — dear old sweetheart — How happy I’ll be when you and I are reading this together — I do love you so — It is so miserable without you. . . . I do love, love, love you dear

16 Patriot, 14 Jan. 1921. For more on his fund raising, see Patriot, 7 Mar. 1921; Buffalo Morning Express, 26 Apr. 1921.
19 Ibid., 19 July 1921.
Platea, Silver Golden Princess.”20 While sailing home, he wrote, “just laid around today, lazy like and because I’m on my way home now for the first time I have let myself think of home and Helen — I look at her picture and feel so happy to know I am soon to have her again . . . O, Helen — when we read this together. . . .”21 On another occasion: “I wish so Helen were here — It is hard not to hear from her but suppose no news is good news — I’m glad that every day brings the time nearer when I’ll see her again — I love her so.”22

Almost as an afterthought, he added, “Wonder how Jeanne and Calvitt are —.”23 Oddly, in his diary he speculated about Jeanne, his five-year-old daughter, by name only five times and his not-yet one-year-old son and namesake, Calvitt, only once — although he did allude to both once or twice more, including in mid-July, “I find myself wondering about how much bigger that baby will seem.”24

On a further personal note, the epicurean in Rev. Clarke often commented on the food he was eating and his appetite — both good and less so — and his weight. As a youth and young man, Clarke had been underweight and his health often worried him. In a letter during the trip, he promised his mother, “I was really worried about myself this spring but I feel a great deal better already. I am going to try and build up my health as much as possible. . . . I hope to get fat before I return.”25 He credited good meals, salt air, and rest to his improved health. Not until the last decade or so of his life, did he have to reverse course and try to lose pounds.26

During his inspection tour, getting from place to place consumed huge amounts of time. In fact, he spent more than half of his twenty-four-hour days completely in travel, with partial travel days consuming even more time. Consequently, members of the group had to find ways to entertain themselves. The third night out from New York on the excruciatingly slow Acropolis — it took two weeks to get to Gibraltar27 — Clarke commented, “Received news of Dempsey fight by wireless phone 400 miles out.”28 He was referring to Jack Dempsey’s defense of his heavyweight boxing title against the French war hero, Georges Carpentier. Shrewdly promoted, the contest took place before a crowd of 91,000 and produced the first million-dollar gate in boxing history. The Radio Corporation of America arranged for live coverage, making the event the first national radio broadcast. It even reached ships, such as the Acropolis, far at sea. Near instant communication and its communal nature were shattering in their implications and clearly excited

20 Ibid., 18 July 1921. Helen’s family had lived Platea, PA.
21 Ibid., 13 Aug. 1921.
22 Ibid., 11 July 1921.
23 Ibid., 11 July 1921.
24 Ibid., 15 July 1921.
25 Ibid., Clarke to E. Clarke, postmarked, 12 July 1921; also see 1, 7, 11, 20, 30 July 1921; 12 Aug. 1921.
28 Ibid., 2 July 1921.
Clarke, also a fan of boxing. In several of his later novels, he commented favorably on his protagonist’s boxing skills, and one short story featured a boxer as the hero.29

Any group thrown together for long-term travel includes all kinds of individuals — some petty and irritating, others substantial and pleasing; with luck, some never to be met again, and with even greater luck, others to become lifelong friends and colleagues. Of course, almost all enjoy gossiping about others, a sport that Clarke was not above. Clarke praised John R. Voris, the Associate General Secretary of the Near East Relief in Yonkers, NY, who led an evening service, which later had led to interesting debate. Clarke and Voris later formed a creative and productive collaboration that included helping to found in 1932 Save the Children in the United States. Clarke praised John W. Mace, a national field director for NER, for being of “fairly good stuff.”30 Clarke enjoyed the sermons and lectures by Dr. S. L. Divine, pastor of the First Presbyterian Church and head of Near East Relief work in the northwest and Alaska.31 On the other hand, Clarke had little respect for Charles V. Vickrey for being “a very small fish” and acting “like an old woman.”32 Vickrey was NER’s General Secretary and Clarke’s ultimate boss. Presumably Clarke overcame his initial distaste, because he continued to work successfully with NER for the rest of the decade. For the reverend, faith was too important to be left to the religious fanatic, and he disliked one of his companions for being one.33

Without denying his seriousness of purpose on his journey, the thirty-four-year-old Clarke also found time to play the vacationing tourist. While on ship, he did the normal things beyond gossiping, such as playing shuffleboard, reading, talking, loafing, sleeping, taking pictures, and complaining about the accommodations. He was properly excited when he saw two whales, flying fish, other freighters, and then Gibraltar. He even found time to be silly, one morning wheeling one of his companions, dressed in pajamas and a bathrobe, around the deck in a baby carriage.34 In Athens and Constantinople, he saw the requisite tourist sites and took photographs. He shopped, and visited cabarets and red-light districts — the latter presumably as part of his official NER investigational duties. Seeing the Queen of Greece — the wife of King Constantine I and a younger sister of Wilhelm II, the former German Emperor — was worth his comment. Favorably comparing Athens to Paris, as many a tourist before and since, he also criticized the lack of water for baths and the poor toilet facilities. He enjoyed eating his first fresh fig,35 a special treat for a kid who had loved fig bars.

31 Ibid., 17, 19, 20, 31 July 1921.
32 Ibid., 17 July 1921.
33 Ibid., 17 31 July 1921.
34 Ibid., 5, 7, 10, 11, 12, 13 July 1921; Ibid., Clarke to E. Clarke, c. 12 July 1921.
Three long weeks after setting out, early on the morning of 23 July the Acropolis finally arrived in Constantinople. The city was then living under British, French, and Italian occupation—a result of the Ottoman’s imperial defeat and dismemberment during the First World War. At last able to begin his work, that same day he visited several orphanages, a hospital, and a “miserable” refugee camp. The next day he visited the Greek and Armenian patriarchs. Reeling from recent massacres of Greeks, His All-Holiness Patriarch Meletius IV wanted Turkish prisoners to be held as hostages against future butcheries of Christians. For his part, the Armenian Patriarch, Zaven I Der Yeghiayan, warned that cholera was spreading throughout the Caucasus region.\textsuperscript{36}

About 5:00 p.m. on the 25th, Clarke and his party boarded a boat and sailed to Derince,\textsuperscript{37} a seaport on the Sea of Marmora. The next morning, they visited a warehouse full of American flour. Other German-built warehouses housed orphans from the interior. Wrapped in blankets provided by NER, they slept in long rows on cobblestones and wooden planks from sunset to early morning, when swarms of flies woke them. Barbed wire enclosed the camp, and at least some of the Turkish guards, Clarke imagined, had joined in the Armenian massacres. As he will throughout his career visiting similar orphanages, he noted that the children were hard-up for toys. And as will also happen hundreds of times to Clarke throughout his life, orphans serenaded the group.\textsuperscript{38}

The next day, 27 July, Clarke and his group set off by automobile to Ismid at the head of the Sea of Marmora. On the five-mile trip, they met many Turkish soldiers, who gave Clarke some concern, but they passed by. The blowout of a tire gave the group a chance to visit a damaged Greek monastery that had served as a prison for English soldiers. They at last arrived at the Ismid Orphanage with its 350 girls, none of whom workers allowed off the grounds—danger surrounded the home. One girl, marked with tattoos, told a harrowing story of how Turks had sold her and her mother to Arabs—“a story of lust which seems incredible in connection with a 12 or 13-year-old girl.”\textsuperscript{39} Another explained that she had lived with her parents, three brothers, and a sister, “the Turks took my father away. I saw a Turk kill my mother; my sister was carried off screaming. My brothers were sold to an Arab, so was I, but I ran away. I was caught by another Turk but finally managed to get away and was told of this orphanage, and I have been here three months now, and I never want to go away.” Clarke opined, “The stories are so much the same, one comes to take them as a matter of course, but now their tragedies are at an end, at least they are safe in the orphanage.”\textsuperscript{40} Such tales, already a part of his rhetoric,

\textsuperscript{36} Ibid., 23, 24, 25 July 1921.
\textsuperscript{37} At least this seems the likely destination. In his journal, Clarke gave two names, Terindze and Dierindzi. Ibid., 25, 26, 27 July 1921.
\textsuperscript{38} Ibid., 26 July 1921.
\textsuperscript{39} Patriot, 19 Aug. 1921.
\textsuperscript{40} Patriot, 19 Aug. 1921; “Rev. Clarke’s Journal,” 27 July 1921.
became a staple in Clarke’s fund-raising repertoire for years to come. First the tragedy and then a solution: “The orphanages were teaching the girls sewing and to sing songs in English.” Everything was “very neat and clean.” 41

That same hot, July day, the NER group visited Trachoma Hospital, 42 which rested on a hill above Ismid. At one time, it had been a Turkish hospital, later a British and then a Greek barracks. With unscreened windows, its seventy-five beds were “black with flies.” Among the patients the hospital was caring for were some Turkish soldiers, starving babies and children, and one youngster without any fingers. 43 The deserted city below the hospital had suffered 23,000 executions, and many refugees were living in terrible conditions in the surrounding hills. Trying to give some sense of security, an American destroyer stood off the port, 44 but military protection had its limitations.

Visiting such pestilent places put NER’s investigators at risk, and Rev. Clarke picked up an infection that almost cost him his vision and impaired his hearing. 45 Others got sick as well, but some blamed their illnesses on Clarke, as he later explained. In “the Russian Caucasus, I tried to raise a beard. It came out red. I shaved it off for one of the members of the Commission who told me, “Champ,” using Clarke’s nickname, “for heaven’s sake, get rid of the red spinach. It is causing all the stomach troubles we are all having.”

Seen off by the children, the NER group left Dierindzi by boat in the afternoon and arrived in Constantinople about 8:00 p.m. Officials, however, did not allow them to land — boats had to be in by 3:00 p.m. or wait until morning. Rev. Clarke spent the evening with a stomachache. 46

After going ashore the next day, Clarke visited NER’s office, and at noon he called on Admiral Mark Bristol, the American High Commissioner in Constantinople. Bristol insisted that none of the peoples in the region were less guilty than the rest. Specifically, the Armenians were no better than were the Turks — they had perpetrated massacres too. After eating at the mess, the NER group visited a hospital founded by Turkish Armenians and its accompanying orphanage. 47

The next morning, NER’s representatives visited the Sultan’s Topkapi Palace and in the afternoon, a red-light district. Clarke and another from the group that evening went to Le Petit Champs with its European-style hotels and great city views. They saw a show that he thought “very poor.” Returning to the boat, he confided to his journal, “It’s a darn poor country, I’ll say.” 48 Driving that point

42 Clarke wrote “Trachina,” but he was a bad speller and even worse with transliterations. Likely, he was referring to a Trachoma Hospital. Trachoma is a contagious, bacterial disease of the eye that can cause blindness.
45 Richmond Times-Dispatch, 1 June 1941.
47 Ibid., 28 July 1921.
48 Ibid., 29 July 1921.
home, bedbugs, roaches, fleas, and poor food on the boat tormented him. The boat left the dock at 8:00 in the morning but anchored in harbor until noon for passport inspection. Always a little homesick, Clarke confessed in his journal, “I would be much happier and have more enjoyment at home than on this tub — but I expected as much before I came — and I am glad I came, for it will help one a lot I am sure. Soon I’ll be back with Helen and the family.”

After a languid day at sea, on 1 August, the ship stopped for a couple of hours at Trebizjond, a port in the historic Trebizond Empire on the south shore of Black Sea. Made wealthy as a stop along the Silk Road, the region had remained mostly Christian into the seventeenth century, well after the rest of Anatolia had converted to Islam. Clarke was not with Vickrey, who went ashore to meet the local relief workers and to inspect refugees working a farm. In Trebizjond, hundreds of Greek families were destitute and the town itself was dead — closed shops and filthy streets. Clarke was soon seeing problems with NER itself. Its local workers were indignantly denouncing decreased funding and were demanding that Vickrey “put up or shut up.” Further, NER was planning to remove children in danger zones to Constantinople, but as Clarke noted, we “can’t even get Americans out without difficulty.” With the disparaging and depressed Clarke on board, the vessel resumed its voyage, and about 10:30 p.m., it anchored at Batum, a Georgian seaport at the eastern end of the Black Sea.

The next morning, the NER group left the ship and followed a beautiful parkway to NER’s Personnel House. Later, Clarke went for a delightful swim in the sea, hardly bothered by a woman who, only seventy-feet from him, stripped for her own dip into the water. Afterward, he walked around Batum, a “very dead” place with most shops closed, and the few open ones had few goods. He noted the stark contrast between the beauty of the Black Sea on the one hand and the poverty-stricken town and nearby refugee camp, huge and appalling, on the other.

Clarke’s party left Batum by train, their Red guards leaving them when the train left the station. While traveling, some girls came into his “simply terrible” compartment. “Owens & White get wine — a very unusual nite. Owens, after a dispute with Soviet representative, took in woman with a child. Interesting ride.” After a little sleep, the party arrived in Tiflis about 10:30, on 3 August. They drove into the mountains, eventually to the Kakheti region, which was part of the independent Democratic Republic of Georgia. Clarke and his friends visited orphanages along the way.

49 Ibid., 30 July 1921.
50 Ibid., 31 July 1921. Trebisjond, today is called Trabzon.
51 Ibid., 1 Aug. 1921.
52 Ibid., 1 Aug. 1921.
53 Ibid., 2 Aug. 1921.
54 George E. White?
In a disturbing contrast with the starvation around them, Soviet officials treated the group well: “dinner at Soviet headquarters about 8 or 9 courses — very unusual Russian meal . . . attractive ice cream served in water melon basket. All high officials of Soviet or Georgian Republic present — Speeches lasted until 1:30 a.m.”\(^56\) Later back in Tiflis, Clarke met “some very interesting youngsters in park at Tiflis — all four living on American bread and wearing American clothes.” Further noting that the Georgians were often exchanging donated American clothes to feed their children, Clarke rejoiced when he saw Georgian youngsters, who “look like and act like Amer. children.”\(^57\) Two days later while in Soviet Armenia’s capital of Yerevan, he drove home the contrast — for himself and officialdom — that would have held true almost everywhere in his inspection tour. “Men work for 3 loaves of bread per day and families — Russians are living on this. . . . High officials fare better. Very hot here today. Dine in private dining car — excellent meals while children outside die for food.”\(^58\)

On 5 August, after a rough train ride, the NER group arrived in Alexandropol in western Armenia. Clarke realized that the Turks were not alone responsible for the destitution around them. “The country is extremely miserable. Soviets confiscate everything — fine looking hotel confiscated — shops practically empty — rich have homes taken from them and poor live in them. Bring their furniture into palaces — spread wash line thru parlors with clothes hanging in state.”\(^59\) For the rest of his life, Clarke saw Communism through this searing lens of hunger, destitution, expropriation, and murder.

By the next morning, Clarke and his friends were in Yerevan, the largest city of Armenia and among the world’s oldest, continuously inhabited towns. An excited Clarke exclaimed to his journal, “about the first thing I saw in the morning was Mount Ararat — really impressive — 40 miles from here — looks about 5.” Steeped in religion, the Biblical landing spot of Noah’s Ark fired his imagination. The city, however, was something else. “Erivan [Yerevan] the worse we have seen yet. Armenians miserable people — city is too miserable to discuss. Children almost naked”\(^60\) and there were too many for NER’s orphanage to take in everyone. The stores were empty and the Soviets were shooting their political enemies.

What Clarke had witnessed staggered him, and he conveyed his horror to Christian Americans by connecting them to Christian Armenians through the iconography of Mt. Ararat and then slammed them with visions of impoverished Armenians. Developing an image he would use throughout his life in his fund raising, he told Americans that only a mixture of dried grasshoppers and pounded tree bark stood between Armenians and starvation. “One who has never witnessed

\(^{56}\) Ibid., 4 Aug. 1921.
\(^{57}\) Ibid., 4 Aug. 1921.
\(^{58}\) Ibid., 6 Aug. 1921.
\(^{59}\) Ibid., 5 Aug. 1921.
\(^{60}\) Ibid., 6 Aug. 1921.
a famine cannot imagine the horror of my journey around Mt. Ararat, in the Russian
Caucasus, and down almost to the Iranian border. Little children with legs like pipe
stems and stomachs bloated and swollen by just such food; children lying or sitting
on the ground so weak from hunger that they made no effort to brush away the flies
that crawled over their eyeballs; the dead lying in the streets."61

On 7 August, the group went to Etchmiadzin by automobile and met George
V, the head of the Armenian Apostolic Church. The churchman denounced the
government for taking over church buildings and shooting antirevolutionaries. The
Soviets were even refusing to allow children to enter orphanages.62

A Soviet band, officials, and swarms of flies met Clarke and his group, when
they arrived at the Alexandrople train station the next day. Clarke thought that
conditions were better than they had been and certainly better than in Yerevan.
Still the Georgian Soviet held "power of life or death."63 NER was caring for
thousands of orphans, many of whom were injured or sick with trachoma, scabies,
and malaria.64

On 11 August Clarke returned to Tiflis, where he bought amber and some
diamonds.65 The next day, he went to Batum, where he boarded the American
destroyer Overton, which set sail that evening for Constantinople. A pleasant trip,66
on the 14th, he arrived in Constantinople and did more shopping.67

Despite difficulties in getting a passport but content with receiving his seventh
letter from his wife while on his inspection tour, Clarke boarded a train — the
famous Orient Express — in Constantinople on 16 August. With John W. McCrae
from NER’s office in New York as his compartment mate, Clarke enjoyed the
comfortable train and a good supper. Impatient with the slow-moving train, he
went to bed early — “Glad to be on way west — always getting nearer Helen.”68

From the train window and brief stops, Clarke drew his impressions of the
Balkans. A half-hour stroll about the station in Sofia convinced him that Bulgaria
was a “much better country than Turkey — Orderly, industrious.” As the train
crossed into Serbia, Clarke met the Sofia correspondent for The London Times,
and with some pride, Clarke recorded the journalist’s opinion that NER was
“doing [the] most staple piece of work in [the] Near East.”69 The train stopped
for about two hours in Belgrade, the capital of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and
Slovenes — Yugoslavia. Clarke took the time to go into the city, which impressed
him as “clean and attractive.” Suffering, however, as many tourists do, merchants

---
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refused to accept any of the five different kinds of money he was carrying. Even on his train, people no longer would take his Turkish money.70

On the train, Clarke read Halcyone by Elinor Glyn,71 a British novelist, who popularized romantic fiction. While her scandalous books influenced early-twentieth-century popular culture, and even though Clarke himself would soon be writing his own risqué, romantic fiction, he thought poorly of her novel. While the train was passing through Croatia, Clarke nostalgically confided to his journal, “7 weeks today since left Helen. 3 more anyway and I’ll see her again. It’s getting near — thank God. Her letters are so full of love — it makes me so homesick for her.”72

While on the train in Austria, Clarke also read Henry Van Dyke’s Camp-Fires and Guide-Posts.73 Inspired by the author’s example, Clarke declared himself a meliorist. Meliorism holds that human action can better the world beyond what natural processes can. The philosophy lies at the foundation of the ideas of liberal democracy, human rights, and the American Pragmatic tradition. Here is a key to Clarke’s pastoral teaching and philosophy behind his good works.74

By 19 August, Clarke’s train was traveling through northern Italy,75 and on the following day, it bore him through the Alps into Switzerland and then France. He did not arrive in Paris until nearly 4:00 in the afternoon. Glad to be in the city again and doubtless restless from his long train trip, that evening he went to the Folies Bergère76 cabaret music hall, famous for its barely-clad women.77

Continuing his tourist adventure, Clarke visited Notre Dame, the Louvre, and the Champs-Élysées, and, again, the Folies Bergère. Finding out at the last minute that he had to get a visa on his passport, he had to stay another day in Paris. Finally, on the twenty-third, he took a night train to the coast and happily boarded an English ship across the channel.78 Clarke enjoyed his brief stay in London, despite not being able to get into a half dozen places before finally settling into the Cosmo Hotel. After a couple of days sightseeing and shopping, on 27 August he took the train to Liverpool, where he boarded his ship about 5:00 in the afternoon.79

Spending his time reading, talking, and thinking about returning to his wife, Clarke’s sea voyage home was uneventful. On 3 September, he landed in Québec, where he had little trouble with customs. He saw a little of the city, went to a dancehall, and then left by train for New York City at 7:00 in the evening of 4

70 Ibid., 18 Aug. 1921.
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September. He detrained in Pittsburgh at 7:30, the next morning and then traveled by automobile the last 100 miles to Williamsburg, PA, “and home and HELEN.” Clarke ended his journal here.

On 19 August 1921, the Patriot of Harrisburg, Pennsylvania published excerpts from a letter Clarke had written from Constantinople to his regional director in Pennsylvania, George S. Silloway. Conditions in Constantinople were bad, he wrote, and Armenian, Russian, and Greek refugees were filling the city’s five crowded refugee camps. He described the men, women, and children sleeping in the streets. Racked by inflation, they had few possessions and little food, shelter, or work — all of which men fought over, “like savage animals.”

For Clarke, however, despair was never absolute. There was always hope, “the allied control, British, French, and Italian, together with the wonderfully efficient work of the Near East Relief is bringing order out of even this most difficult of situations.” He described some of that progress, such as moving Greek refugees to Thrace, where they would receive farms with NER paying the rent for the first year. This would allow these good farmers “to get on their feet again” and would relieve matters around Constantinople. Clarke also described his visits to about fifteen or twenty orphanages run directly by or with the help of by Near East Relief. Their “new arrivals, thin poor little things who look frightened as we approach them.” They offered harrowing stories, full of pathos, but at the orphanages, they would become “chubby, happy children.”

This was the stuff to open hearts and wallets as Clarke well understood. Ameliorating conditions was possible only if Americans would send funds: they “simply cannot quit now in the middle of . . . [their] relief task and lose all the results of the money they already expended.” NER’s aid was also redounding to America’s benefit: “The new Armenia will have been made possible, and the oldest Christian nation of the world will have been preserved because of America. All over this country over here — above the refugee camps, the hospitals, and the orphanages of Near East Relief flies ‘Old Glory.’ God forbid that we should haul it down and close up this work of mercy. Well, I just know we won’t.” For Clarke, humanitarianism and American patriotism always went hand-in-hand.

One interesting by-product of this trip did not involve Rev. Clarke. Part of his group on 12 August 1921 had split to form “The Russian Commission of the Near East Relief.” Led by John R. Voris, it left Tiflis, Socialist Soviet Republic of Georgia, on 16 August and returned to the same point on 12 September, twenty-seven days later. It produced an important report that revealed to many Americans
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the desperate strait that the citizens of the new Soviet states were in — conditions similar to those Clarke found in his own travels.85

**Return to Fund Raising**

Returning to America, Rev. Clarke began to rise in NER’s ranks. First, he became the assistant regional director of Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, District of Columbia, and West Virginia.86 Only the beginning, Clarke helped organize NER activities, including its offshoot, Golden Rule Sunday, from upper New York to Wisconsin, until 1927, when he moved to Richmond, Virginia, where he became NER’s southern regional director. He stayed with the organization, until it morphed into the Near East Foundation in 1930.

Clarke now left the organization to do other work. But while with Near East Relief, he had learned much, and NER helped form his vision for his future charitable work, how to do that work, and the skills necessary to turn a vision into reality. His trip to the Near East in 1921 stayed with him throughout his life, and its memory was always there to remind him of the desperate needs that his charity work helped ameliorate.
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The Real “Wolf of Wall Street”:
David Lamar and German Labor Agitation in the U.S. in 1915

Heribert von Feilitzsch
Independent Scholar

A well-known Wall Street operator for the first decades of the twentieth century, David Lamar’s colorful history became briefly intertwined with the German clandestine activities to prevent American arms and munitions from reaching the Entente powers in 1915. Lamar’s involvement with German secret agent Franz Rintelen thus marked a departure from his well-known Wall Street manipulations and political agitation against the large railroad and oil trusts of Rockefeller and Morgan. Instead, his brainchild, an American labor union financed by the Imperial German Navy, created what was one of the largest series of strikes in the history of the United States. The labor agitation that Lamar and the leaders of the Labor’s National Peace Council promoted in the summer of 1915 brought industrial production in the rustbelt to a virtual standstill. The U.S. government correctly perceived these activities as a threat to national security. American courts successfully tried and convicted Lamar, Rintelen, and other conspirators in the following years, while American workers benefitted from the introduction of the eight-hour workday, as well as higher wages, and other concessions a number of large manufacturers had to make in 1915 in order to quell the strikes.

David Lamar’s background and history remain dotted with question marks and unsolved mysteries to this day. U.S. agents, who had the task of shadowing him, described the Wall Street scoundrel as “about 5 feet 10, weighs probably 180, and is always dressed in the extreme of fashion, with a decided preference for coats with wide skirts and silk hats. His skin is swarthy, his nose prominent and his hair, which he brushes straight back from his forehead, is as black as a raven’s wing. His mustache would do credit to a policeman of the old school.”¹ In 1913, Lamar told Senator Lee S. Overman of North Carolina that his last name was an alias and that his past was his to guard.² Rumors as to his family background included the possibility that his father was an important industrialist or Wall Street mover-and-shaker. Others thought that he was the black sheep of the prominent Lamar family of Ruckersville, Georgia. Supreme Court Justice Joseph Rucker Lamar emphatically denied in 1914 that the “Wolf of Wall Street” had any relation to his family.³

Just like the German agent Franz Rintelen, who told anyone in the United States willing to listen that he was related to the Hohenzollern family and that his father was “Imperial Minister of Finance,” Lamar was also an imposter.\(^4\) The Bureau of Investigations case file characterized Lamar as being endowed by nature with a fascinating personality and with a brilliant mind which he had enriched by study, a man capable of great things, he was possessed by that strange perversity which often afflicts men of exceptional cleverness—he would rather make one dollar by adroit crookedness than a million by unexciting honesty. Perhaps his origin affected his character—he admitted, sometimes boasted, that he was the illegitimate son of a Spanish Jewess and a Gentile banker whose name is a household word in America and the world over.\(^5\)

While he stirred the rumor mill about his supposed high class background, the truth might have been the opposite. His background may well have been lower class, if manners and education are any indication. Lamar’s real name was David M. Lewis, as people in New York who had known him in Omaha, Nebraska in the 1890s identified him.\(^6\) David Lamar appeared in New York in 1899, just as the listing for David M. Lewis disappeared in Omaha. His rise to stardom in New York’s financial circles became legendary. He made millions with his bear raid attacks on Wall Street. The 1910 census listed him as living in Manhattan with his first wife Marie and two Irish immigrant servants.\(^7\) He had one daughter with his first wife.\(^8\)

Lamar’s financial specialty was bear raids. He would buy especially cheap stocks and talk them up. Then he would get investors to join him. The value would go up further. He would dump his holdings at the highest point. The stock would slump as a consequence and investors ended up sitting on piles of worthless paper. Lamar’s enemy list and shady reputation extended from the Rockefellers, whose scion John junior he helped relieve of a million dollars,\(^9\) to the Morgans, whose U.S. Steel Corporation he actively tried to destroy.\(^10\)

\(^4\) “RE: Franz Rintelen,” undated, miscellaneous file 8000-174, FBI Case Files, Record Group (hereafter RG) 65, National Archives and Records Administration (hereafter NARA).

\(^5\) Ibid.

\(^6\) Lamar worked for the Law Office of Gregory, Day and Day in Omaha, Nebraska in the early 1890s. The city directory listed a “David M. Lewis, clerk” in Omaha between 1894 and 1899. His last name Lewis seems to have been derived from Levy. His age is disputed. U.S. prison records in 1916 noted his age as fifty-two (birth year 1864). Census data in 1910 list him as having been born in 1870. Obituaries in 1934 gave his birth year as 1868, which seems the most accurate estimate. The Reading Eagle (Pa.) reported in Lamar’s obituary on 14 Jan. 1934, “he refused to give his real name to authorities, but his brother Henry signed his name to a legal document as Henry M. Levy.”

\(^7\) U.S. Census 1910, Manhattan Ward 22, District 1319.


Lamar was convinced that the Morgan-owned U.S. Steel Corporation had given preferential prices to Great Northern and Northern Pacific railroads, in which J.P. Morgan had a financial interest.\textsuperscript{11} The unfair trade advantage ruined stock prices in railroad companies in which Lamar had invested. Subsequent lawsuits failed, mainly because Lamar brought false witnesses to court who were quickly exposed.\textsuperscript{12} He tried everything in his power to draw attention to this issue, but the Morgan lobby in Washington proved more powerful than his. Lamar boasted to investigators in 1915, that he actually had written the Stanley Resolution of 1909. The act initiated an investigation into the affairs of U.S. Steel Corporation.\textsuperscript{13} In the course of the fight between Lamar and J.P. Morgan, the Senate Lobby Investigating Committee attempted to call one of Lamar’s associates to testify. Lamar impersonated then-Representative A. Mitchell Palmer in a phone call to sabotage the effort.\textsuperscript{14}

The episode earned the Wall Street scoundrel a highly publicized Senate investigation, trial, and conviction on impersonating a U.S. official. His senate testimony in 1913 crowned the headlines of American dailies for weeks. *Investor’s Monthly Magazine* commented, “the amazing audacity of Mr. Lamar’s testimony in Washington, in which he admitted everything that had been charged against him and boasted of his malign influence in Washington, makes Baron Maunchausen [sic] look like an amateur besides him.”\textsuperscript{15} U.S. Secret Service agents finally caught up with Lamar in the Waldorf Astoria in New York in November 1914, after he had eluded capture for months.\textsuperscript{16} When Rintelen met him in May 1915, the “Wolf,” who had meanwhile appealed his conviction, had posted $10,000 bail ($210,000 in today’s dollars), lost virtually all his customers, was so bankrupt that he borrowed single digit dollar amounts from friends, and was fighting to stay out of prison.\textsuperscript{17}

The idea of infiltrating labor and nationalistic movements around the world with the stated purpose of “hurting the enemy”\textsuperscript{18} became a priority for German war planners immediately at the onset of the war. In the United States, various connections to Irish, Indian, and Jewish minorities provided fertile ground to co-opt their aspirations for the war effort. The German military attaché in the United States, Franz von Papen, in particular, was obsessed with the thought that German-Americans and German citizens produced weapons for the Allies. As soon as the Entente began buying significant amounts of munitions in the United States, von Papen asked regional German consulates to assemble lists of German and

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{11} "Steel Trust Heads Face Criminal Trial," *New York Times*, 7 Jun. 1911.
  \item \textsuperscript{12} "Wolf of Wall Street’ Dies," *Reading Eagle* (Pa.), 13 Jan. 1934.
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German-American workers in factories that produced war material for the Allies. In April 1915, the military attaché sent out a circular to the German consulates and to German citizens who had been identified as working “for the enemy,” and threatened them with prosecution in Germany. The effort extended to propaganda articles in the German language press that pronounced any German citizen supporting the Entente war effort a traitor.

Berlin realized, however, that the removal of German or German-American labor from war production industries would not have a significant effect on production output in the United States. The Imperial War Department decided to send the Naval Intelligence Agent Franz Rintelen to the United States in the spring of 1915 in order to attempt larger scale disruptions of industrial production. Ambassador Count Johann Heinrich von Bernstorff and the propaganda chief in the United States, Bernhard Dernburg, had long worked on building contacts to the American Federation of Labor president Samuel Gompers, as well as leaders of various minority groups in the United States such as Jeremiah O’Leary, John Devoy, and Har Dayal. While the German efforts yielded some sympathy with a few of the union leaders, there was no measurable effect on war production. On orders of the War Ministry in Berlin, Rintelen took over the labor project in May 1915. Rather than focusing on minorities, he targeted American union workers in general with the aim of disrupting deliveries to Europe and building enough political pressure to create an export embargo in the process.

The key contact for this endeavor was Thomas C. Hall, an American theology professor. Hall, an avowed socialist, had studied in Germany and headed the Union Theological Seminary in New York. At the onset of the war he also joined the German University League and became one of the outspoken intellectuals who publicly supported the German cause. His links to the German propaganda organization brought him close to Bernhard Dernburg and the rest of the Secret War Council (an organization of German agents in the United States). He contributed dozens of articles to Sylvester Viereck’s Fatherland. He co-authored the book Germany’s Just Cause together with Bernhard Dernburg and William Bayard Hale in the fall of 1914. Hale, himself a seminarian, and his wife, engaged very energetically in the American peace movement. Hall joined in the cause with a number of intellectuals and scholars. As a member of the Intercollegiate Socialist Society, Hall established important connections to the IWW (International Workers of the World), as well as important union leaders, including Samuel Gompers, the founder and president of the American Federation of Labor.
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While the German officials in New York and Washington D.C. had a variety of contacts in labor and peace movements, Rintelen needed political connections to realize an audacious plan: Infiltrate peace and labor movements in order to instigate strikes in the munitions industries. Hall suggested an acquaintance who had political connections and whose public persona was large enough to allow Rintelen to hide in its shadows. David Lamar was not a sympathizer, nor did he have any documented interest in the German cause. He came to Rintelen following the scent of easy money and for a chance to hurt his nemesis, the U.S. Steel Corporation. George Plochmann of the Transatlantic Trust Company, Rintelen’s banker in New York, warned the German agent about using Lamar: “I said to him that he was the last person I would have anything at all to do with.” Lamar was a crook of the first order with a reputation in and around Wall Street that should have raised a forest of flags for Rintelen and his superiors in New York and Berlin. Plochmann testified:

Lamar was then in desperate straits. Bad luck had followed him in the Street for two years, and had crowned his misfortunes with this expensive trial [for impersonating A. Mitchell Palmer] and threatened imprisonment. He owed money everywhere for personal expenses; the merchants with whom he traded had stopped his credit; he had descended to borrowing from his friends in sums as small as two dollars at a time. Then he met Rintelen, who was on fire with a passion that blinded him to consequences and who flourished before the eyes of the famished Wolf a half million dollars of real money. He was manna fallen from heaven.

Everyone knew from numerous newspaper exposes that Lamar had a host of American politicians in his pocket. Maybe it was the political access that attracted Rintelen to the notorious “Wolf of Wall Street,” or a deeper sense of kindred souls, as both men seemed to be cut from the same cloth. Thomas Hall introduced Lamar to Rintelen in the beginning of May. The meeting allegedly occurred in the offices of Frederico Stallforth, who shared his space with railroad investor Andrew D. Meloy. The group discussed ways to promote a munitions boycott. Lamar thought he could finagle the introduction of a bill in Congress, and buy the votes to pass it. He also thought that a Supreme Court judge could be bribed into challenging the legal basis on which America traded with the enemy. Finally, the Wall Street juggler proposed to found a union and place politicians with a labor constituency on its board. Years later Plochmann testified that “Rintelen, talking of him, would say that he was a man of a great deal of push and force. In fact, I
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was under the impression that David Lamar, to hear Rintelen talk, was stronger than the United States Government, or any government on the face of the globe, for that matter.”

Rintelen was ecstatic and acted with “an eagerness too great for caution.”

The greatest frustration of the military planners in Germany as well as the Secret War Council in New York was the fact that the Imperial Foreign Office, and Ambassador Count Bernstorff in particular, had not been able to influence Congress to pass an arms embargo against the Allies. It was not for lack of effort on the part of the German ambassador. Count Bernstorff tried to enlist German-American senators and congressmen for a legislative effort to stop American munitions shipments. The German-American press and German propaganda chimed in with the chorus of the genuine American peace movement, led by prominent American politicians including Secretary of State William Jennings Bryan, to produce a groundswell of popular support for an embargo. The proposal had a very limited chance of success from the onset. Labor leaders, especially Samuel Gompers, preferred full employment to the recession of the previous fall and winter. German-American politicians feared for their re-elections if they attracted attention for pro-German agitation. Despite the efforts of the German-friendly press, including the Hearst papers, the *Fatherland*, the *New Yorker Staats-Zeitung*, and Bernhard Dernburg’s press mailings, the effort lacked popular support and political will.

Lamar’s proposals to Rintelen had a slightly different bent. What was missing in the effort, according to the Wolf of Wall Street, was a measure of corruption to turn the tide for an embargo. Everybody had a price and, in Lamar’s opinion, that included American Federation of Labor president Samuel Gompers, other labor leaders, and especially politicians. According to Lamar, Congress could be bought to pass legislation that curbed exports of arms and munitions to Europe. Communication between the Imperial War Department and Rintelen or his superior, German Naval Attaché Karl Boy-Ed, does not reveal an authorization to move ahead with the political effort that in all fairness was Count Bernstorff’s domain. However, Rintelen maintained that he received a green light. The claim appears plausible, although the go-ahead probably came through Karl Boy-Ed around 15 May 1915, and not directly from Berlin. After the war Count Bernstorff steadfastly denied having had any knowledge of the effort, however, it is possible that he and Boy-Ed conferred on the issue and decided to let Rintelen move ahead. Arguing
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Rintelen had dinner at the Yacht Club in New York with Boy-Ed that day. Two days later he took Thomas C. Hall, the man who connected Rintelen with Lamar, to the Yacht Club.
against the ambassador’s involvement is the fact that Rintelen’s mission overrode the arguably slower and ineffective diplomatic effort of the German ambassador to influence American politics, as well as Bernhard Dernburg’s effort to dabble in American labor relations. Lamar made it sound easy: it was just a question of money. That, the “Wolf” learned from the “Dark Invader” Franz Rintelen, was not a problem.33 “Lamar told Rintelen that Congressman Frank Buchanan [of the Seventh District of Illinois – Northern Chicago] was the most available man to be used; that he could be bought for $12,500”34 ($260,000 in today’s dollars).

Buchanan had been president of the International Association of Bridge and Iron Workers for several years.35 He was one of a group of politicians who, together with Lamar, had fought large American trusts since 1900. A preeminent labor representative in Congress and prominent member of one of David Lamar’s creations, the Anti-Trust League, he also had supported Lamar in the past in his effort to pass legislation against the interests of the U.S. Steel Corporation. Another member of Congress, Representative Henry B. Martin of the 15th District of New York, was also in the pocket of Lamar. Born in Fillmore County, Minnesota, in 1858, Martin grew up on the frontier. After becoming a house painter and moving to Iowa, he rose through the ranks of the Knights of Labor to become a member of the executive board and editor of its paper.36 He moved to New York in 1894, and became a key political ally for Lamar against American steel trusts. As national secretary and main agitator of Lamar’s Anti-Trust League, Martin represented the league in Congress starting in 1902.37 As a representative from New York he was Lamar’s main warrior in the battles against J.P. Morgan, William Randolph Hearst, and John D. Rockefeller.38 Martin had been the intermediary between Lamar and Representative Augustus O. Stanley of Kentucky in writing and passing the Stanley Resolution of 1909.39 Stanley subsequently led an anti-trust investigation against Morgan’s U.S. Steel Corporation.

According to Bureau of Investigation detectives it only took an initial bribe of $5,000 in “five $1,000 bills” from Martin to get Buchanan’s attention.40 Martin also was supposed to enlist American Federation of Labor (AFL) president Samuel Gompers in the organization, but Martin ran afoul of the AFL in a spat over policy
in 1897.\textsuperscript{41} Thus, unbeknownst to Rintelen, Martin’s relations with Gompers were strained at best. A third member of Lamar’s core group was Representative Hiram Robert Fowler of the 24th District of Illinois. The trained lawyer and longtime member of the Illinois State Legislature ran for national office on a Democratic ticket in 1910.\textsuperscript{42} A member of the Claims Committee, he only served two terms in Congress. In the 1914 election Fowler lost his re-election bid and “out of a job... [is] trying to connect with someone.”\textsuperscript{43} That someone turned out to be David Lamar.

Lamar’s plan went into immediate action. Armed with funds from Rintelen, the Wolf sent Buchanan to talk to Samuel Gompers and get his endorsement for a national labor organization promoting world peace through an arms embargo. Gompers declined. Lamar then sent Congressman Martin with an offer of $50,000 ($1 Million in today’s dollars).\textsuperscript{44} Apart from the unwise choice of messenger, the bribe did not sway the labor leader either. Instead Gompers felt that the money behind the proposed labor organization had its origins in Germany, a suspicion he immediately disclosed publicly.

With Gompers out of the equation the group now tried to go around the AFL. Proposing a new union, the “Labor’s National Peace Council,” Buchanan, Fowler, Martin, and other organizers enlisted labor activists in the various peace organizations all across the nation for their organization.\textsuperscript{45} The new union planned a large event in Washington D.C. in the end of July 1915 that was to include a meeting with representatives of the Wilson administration. For that purpose Lamar’s puppets offered an all-expense-paid trip to the capital for anyone who wanted to attend. Although the offer sounded too good to be true, the membership drive showed initial results. Gompers, who now publicly discredited the new organization, stood by helplessly as Buchanan organized several large events to promote his new peace organization.

Buchanan addressed a national peace conference at Carnegie Hall in New York on 19 June with the former secretary of state and peace activist William Jennings Bryan, who had just resigned his office in protest over the latest \textit{Lusitania} note.\textsuperscript{46} The event lent tremendous legitimacy to Buchanan’s efforts. Hannis Taylor, as one of Bryan’s old friends, was probably instrumental in securing his appearance.\textsuperscript{47} In a unanimous vote the conference passed a call for a general strike.\textsuperscript{48} Three days later, on 22 June, the Labor’s National Peace Council formally appeared as a new
force on the American political horizon. The logo of a handshake had a “Three Musketeer” tagline: “An injury to one is the concern of all.”

A delegation of the union led by its president Frank Buchanan requested a meeting with President Wilson the next day. The president politely declined but offered the group a meeting with Secretary of State Robert Lansing, who had just taken over for William Jennings Bryan. Lansing saw the delegation on 6 July and accepted their petition urging the U.S. government not to allow ships laden with munitions to “clear port.” Major dailies, including the New York Times, immediately fingered David Lamar as the force behind the new organization.

The membership drive now went into high gear. Lamar’s agitators attended an AFL meeting in St. Louis on 30 June. The group, this time including Franz Rintelen, who stayed in the background, invited union members in Baltimore on 7 and 14 July for a meeting in Washington, D.C. later that month. Also on 14 July, Labor’s National Peace Council organizers pressed union members in New Orleans to pass an embargo resolution. Former Ohio Attorney General Frank Monett spoke at an AFL meeting in Cleveland the next day, on 15 July, while Frank Buchanan went to Bridgeport, Connecticut in the same week to verbally ignite a volatile situation in the munitions industry. The large orders for munitions and supplies had precipitated a virtual explosion of demand for manufacturing capacity. Shortages of labor fueled competition for workers between manufacturers. Women, even children, joined the workforce. Work conditions in factories bursting at the seams with order backlogs worsened by the day. But despite virtually full employment, wages remained low. Union efforts to organize thousands of non-union workers triggered an immediate, violent response from management. The AFL by in large refused to support local unions’ efforts to confront low wages, long work hours, and unsafe working conditions. Dissatisfaction among the workforce simmered at dangerous levels. All that was needed was a lit match.

Three weeks after the founding of the Labor’s National Peace Council on 15 July, and at the height of the efforts to sign up supporters, the Chicago Day Book reported on a strike in Bridgeport, Connecticut, in an article with the headline “Militia Held in Readiness in Bridgeport Arms Strike.” Most notably, the strike occurred without the authorization of the AFL, in accord with a policy set by Buchanan and Lamar after Gompers’s refusal to join.
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coast artillery, with headquarters here, awaited the call today to take charge of the situation. About 300 men were on strike today, mostly millwrights and hod carriers, working on the new addition to the Remington plant. At a secret meeting of the central labor union [sic] last night the advisability of calling out the 18 branches of the allied metal trades’ was considered.53

It was not just the strike alone that prompted Gompers to rush to Connecticut, but also the presence of Frank Buchanan on the ground, whose “advent on the scene was marked by an immediate turn for the worse in the situation.”54 The strike escalated in the next days, quickly threatening a complete shutdown of Remington Arms Company, and a host of Bridgeport’s munitions and supply factories. The machinists’ union, with which Frank Buchanan in his previous union jobs had been closely aligned, joined the truckers, garment workers, and brick layers. Some 20,000 workers, including several thousand women, had walked out across the Northeastern manufacturing belt, the heart of America’s export industries, by 17 July.55 The strikes expanded from Connecticut to New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania, and included five plants in Bridgeport, the Tidewater Oil Company factory (belonging to Standard Oil) in Bayonne, New Jersey, the General Chemical Company in Hackensack, New Jersey, the Baldwin Locomotive Works in Eddystone, Pennsylvania, and a host of smaller outfits.56 The strike also turned violent. In Bridgeport the police clashed with picketing workers on 21 July, and in Bayonne three workers died a few days later when panicked plant guards shot into the crowd.57 The strikers demanded eight hour workdays, better work conditions, overtime pay, and higher wages. Ominous newspaper reports gave voice to the worst fears of the government and industrialists, as in an article in the Chicago Day Book with the headline “All Arms Factories May Be Closed by Strike”:

Bridgeport, Conn., July 17.- - Bridgeport was quiet today. Union leaders, directing the proposed strike that may tie up the great Remington arms and munitions factories, said It was the lull before the storm that will break early next week unless the company agrees to let the millwrights work in “its shops under machinists’ union rules.” Every factory in Bridgeport must grant the eight-hour day also, they said. “The machinists will strike the first of the week unless the companies capitulate,” said J. J. Keppler, international vice president of the machinists’ union, today. “That is final.”58

53 Millet Held in Readiness in Bridgeport Arms Strike,” Day Book (Chicago), 15 July 1915.
54 German Agents Incite Trouble,” Washington Herald, 18 July 1915.
57 Three Killed in Oil Strike Riots in New Jersey,” Virginia Enterprise (Virginia, Minnesota), 23 July 1915.
58 All Arms Factories May Be Closed By Strike,” Day Book (Chicago), 17 July 1915.
Frank Morrison, one of Gompers’s lieutenants, immediately accused the strikers of being infiltrated by German agents. “It was to be expected that German agents would attempt to interrupt the manufacture of munitions in this country,” he argued in an interview.59 Gompers clearly identified the Labor’s National Peace Council as the force behind the strikes:

Mr. Gompers by strong inference served notice, in his statement, on Frank Buchanan, of Illinois, and his labor peace council, that organized labor as a body not only is not in favor of his propaganda ostensibly for the promotion of peace, [but] actually to prevent shipments of arms to Great Britain, France and Russia, but that he regards Mr. Buchanan’s activities with suspicion and the purpose of the organization with distrust.60

Within days, however, pushed to the sidelines by Buchanan, the AFL grudgingly and publicly voiced support for the strikers no matter “whether German gold started the Bridgeport strike.”61 Gompers, who Bureau of Investigations agents were shadowing, quickly disappeared from the list of instigators of the massive strikes.62

While workers picketed all over the American Northeast, and while U.S. investigators desperately tried to find the source of the sudden unrest, the American Embargo Conference in Washington, with the attendance of former Secretary of State William Jennings Bryan, attracted 200 men and women on 24 July 1915. Again the organizers attempted to speak with President Wilson, who declined. Congressman Buchanan, emboldened by the success of his agitation in Bridgeport, publicly accused Wilson of being under the influence of “big business” interests. This did not sit well with the administration.63 The leaders of the Labor’s National Peace Council also called for the resignation of New York Collector of the Port Dudley Field Malone, threatened law suits against British shipping giant Cunard and others to mandate a stop to munitions shipments, lobbied for investigations into the Federal Reserve for allegedly financing the war effort of the Entente, and demanded the nationalization of all U.S. munitions factories.64 None of these proposals had much chance of garnering political support but they ensured that the Peace Council remained in the national headlines through July and August 1915. In part because of the sudden and noticeable increase in disposable income for the Council’s organizers, in part because of the attacks on the Wilson administration, but mostly because of the widespread outbreak of labor unrest, all governmental eyes became fixed on the financial backing of this new labor movement. In addition,
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the backlash from the attacks of the Peace Council showed immediate results. Gompers and the AFL discouraged any associated labor leader from supporting the Peace Council, suggesting correctly that German money was behind the effort.

A relatively small group of only fifty people came to the long-anticipated meeting in Washington D.C. on 30 July. Buchanan and Fowler, in the face of a miserable recruitment result, hyped the support base of the Peace Council for public consumption. The *New York Sun* reported on 2 August that the union claimed “to speak for at least 1,000,000 labor voters, 4,600,000 farmers and a large number of businesses and civic organizations.” In reality, the president had refused to see the Peace Council’s delegation, the membership drive and huge publicity effort had yielded fifty delegates, and, to top off the bad news, the Peace Council’s vice-president, Milton Snelling, resigned a week before the meeting under protest, claiming that he was made the tool of German propagandists. Snelling’s resignation, the lackluster support of labor, and the powerful opposition of the AFL leadership and the Wilson administration guaranteed that the organizing effort fizzled. The Dark Invader Franz Rintelen decided to flee the United States on 3 August 1915, as he was about to be discovered, but was arrested by British agents on his way to Germany. Reports all over the national papers that German money was behind the organization sealed the Peace Council’s fate.

Despite serious efforts by Department of Labor mediators, and negotiations between the labor unions and management representatives, the strikes continued until the end of August and into September. President Wilson had to insert himself personally in the situation on 13 September, and threatened serious repercussions for “lawless and faithless employees.” Rather than further escalating the situation, management in the end had to give in to virtually all the demands of the unions. Workers received the coveted eight-hour work day, higher wages, overtime pay, better working conditions, and guaranteed rights to organize. It is difficult to conclude whether the strikes constituted a German plot or legitimate labor agitation. As can be seen from the available sources, it was probably both. The strikes could have been a resounding success for Frank Buchanan, a vindication for his efforts to establish a competitor to the powerful AFL. But by the end of the strikes, publication of his involvement with Franz Rintelen and David Lamar had surfaced. Within weeks the extent of German financial involvement in the plot became apparent. Buchanan resigned his position with the Peace Council and
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attempted to stem the tide of public outrage at his activities. After all, he was an elected official in the legislative branch.

A grand jury handed down indictments to the conspirators Rintelen, Lamar, Buchanan, Fowler, Martin, Schulteis, Monett, and Jacob C. Taylor on 27 December 1915 for violating the Sherman Anti-Trust Act.\textsuperscript{70} Legal troubles, incarceration, and bad publicity dogged the accused for years. After Rintelen came back to New York under extradition orders in 1917, the organizers of one of the largest industrial strikes in the history of the United States were convicted. Despite the serious implications for the participants, the German backers of the unrest should have been content with the results. The strikes effectively disrupted shipments of war supplies to the Allies for months. As a result of the resounding success for the unions, sporadic strikes in Bridgeport and other industrial centers continued throughout the neutrality period of the war. Additionally, after the strikers settled for increased pay, supplies had become more expensive for the European belligerents, another stated goal of the German war strategy.

Without a doubt David Lamar and Franz Rintelen’s brainchild had little political impact on the surface. A few naïve politicians, with William Jennings Bryan as their standard-bearer, rose to the occasion and spoke out in favor of this concocted peace movement. For a brief two months Buchanan and Fowler, who craved public attention, basked in the limelight of national headlines. However, the Labor’s National Peace Council never gained enough political clout to push through an arms embargo against the Entente. Virtually all of the American labor leaders supported the status quo of a neutral United States that benefitted from the tremendous windfall of Allied industrial orders. It is no surprise that Lamar and his cronies failed to sign up Samuel Gompers and the other major labor leaders in the United States. While German propaganda portrayed Gompers as a tool of the British (he was actually born and raised in London), he not only immediately recognized the likely backers of the movement, but also maintained that supporting an embargo was not in the interest of the American worker or its union representatives. Gompers testified in court in 1917, “labor in this country had been greatly benefited [from the munitions industry], because the days of unemployment during the early part of the war had been followed by a time of full employment.”\textsuperscript{71} What the labor leader failed to recognize, however, was the fact that the war situation had empowered the labor movement to make a quick and successful push for the eight hour day. Separating the AFL from the rogue strikes, and branding the strikers as tools of German agitation, cost the union’s reputation dearly. In one of the greatest achievements of organized labor in the annals of the


United States, the introduction of the eight hour workday, Gompers and his labor leaders briefly stood on the wrong side of history.

It is unlikely that Lamar, Rintelen, Buchanan, and the others ever considered an arms embargo achievable. Rather, the true mission of the organization was twofold: first, gain maximum publicity with scandalous attacks on the Wilson administration, which hopefully would rally the existing but fragmented peace movement led by William Jennings Bryan. The second goal was to exploit the chaos the explosion of war production had caused in the Northeast. German officials in New York knew all about the labor market in Bridgeport. Rintelen’s effort coincided with the successful German attempts to hire workers away from Remington Arms and others for the new, German-owned Bridgeport Projectile Company, in the process raising wages to inflate prices for Entente war supplies.

The overall effect of Rintelen and Lamar’s effort on the strikes in the major industrial centers in the Northeast that summer is virtually impossible to gauge. Unrest was certainly a likely outcome of war profiteering that largely benefitted big corporations, while workers suffered under long shifts, mediocre pay, and horrid working conditions. Giving inflammatory speeches to the workers, as Buchanan undoubtedly had done in Bridgeport, and supplying cash in support of strikes, accounts for the timing of their occurrence. Evaluating the Peace Council project together with the German purchase and the construction of the Bridgeport Projectile Company leaves little doubt that Germany’s attack on American labor relations delivered a serious blow to the Allied supply effort. The U.S. Secret Service concluded in August 1918, “the strikes at the Remington Arms plant, Bridgeport, was [sic] probably caused by Rintelen. He attempted to bring about a strike on the Atlantic Coast through the Longshoreman’s Union. He is mentioned in connection with strikes at the Remington Arms, Ilion, N.Y.; the General Electric at Schenectady, N.Y.; the Keystone Watch Case, N.Y.; etc.”

After the First World War and on-going brushes with the law, the fifty-seven year old Lamar divorced in 1924 and re-married Edna French, a twenty-one year old Broadway dancer a few months later. He died, alone and broke, of a heart attack on 13 January 1934 in a New York Hotel. By then he was so down and out that it took days for anyone to even claim his body.

---

This is a story of the intersection of economics, boosterism, and cross-cultural links. There were, obviously, multiple and long-term economic factors that contributed to the success of the United States. A good case can be made for immigration being one of the most important of these. When most people think of immigrants’ impact on American development in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, they think of the millions who streamed into the country in the six decades after the American Civil War. Most of these immigrants settled along the Eastern seaboard or in the Midwest. The argument can be made, however, that the prewar immigrants, particularly those in the South and West, made an outsized and significant contribution to economic development in those parts of the country. These people seized the opportunities afforded them by an open and undeveloped frontier and encouraged others to follow them.

Because of the transfer of a cotton culture from the American South to Texas, its culture, especially its urban culture, developed differently from northern counterparts, because the South as a region was unique. The study of Southern urbanism requires the alteration of accepted views of the rural-urban relationship. Three features dominated the history and development of the Southern region’s rural lifestyle: staple agriculture, race, and a colonial economy. This proved to be the case in Texas, first as an independent nation, and then as part of the United States. The growth of the international cotton trade was key to developments in Texas.

This period involved two complimentary economies. From 1820 to 1860, 50 percent of American exports went to Great Britain while 40 percent of its imports came from there. Of the foreign tonnage entering U.S. ports in 1860, 80 percent was British. The most important element of this trade was textiles, which, according to Professor R.G. Albion “towered above all else in the world commerce of the day.” In the middle of this period, after Texas independence in 1836, Southern planters and their slaves moved to Texas in large numbers, settling in the fertile land of the Brazos, Trinity, Colorado, and Red Rivers. For the next two decades American newspapers described the enormous fortunes to be made in Texas cotton and encouraged what came to be known as “Texas Fever.” Thousands of cotton planters caught the fever, selling their lands and moving to a new cotton frontier. In the process cotton molded both the cultural and economic future of Texas. Much of the success in eventually linking Texas to the international cotton trade, and fueling the fever, was due to the early effort of boosters who touted the possibilities
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of economic development in Texas. This was part of a national trend to promote frontier agricultural settlement as a means to fulfill the Manifest Destiny idea of the journalist John L. O’ Sullivan. Boards of trade, chambers of commerce, town councils and journalists like O’ Sullivan, all made up the class of people known as boosters who saw it as their mission to promote the spread of civilization and the economic development that went along with it.

In the case of promoting the settlement of Texas, one individual stands out, Jacob Raphael De Cordova. He was born in Spanish Town, Jamaica, in June 1808, the youngest of three sons born to Judith and Raphael De Cordova. His mother died at his birth and his father Raphael, a Jamaican coffee grower and export merchant, shipped him off to an English aunt. While in England he received a good education, becoming fluent in English, Spanish, Hebrew, French and German, as well as possessing talents as a writer and public speaker. When his father emigrated to Philadelphia in 1820 young Jacob joined him there. In addition to continuing in the export trade Raphael De Cordova became president of Philadelphia’s Congregation Israel. Eight years later, Jacob, now twenty years old, married Rebecca Sterling, the daughter of a successful printer. This seemed a natural fit. De Cordova’s ancestors were printers and a sixteenth century Spanish ancestor published Álvar Nuñez Cabeza de Vaca’s travels in Texas. He proceeded to learn the printing trade under his father-in-law’s tutelage and in 1834 struck out on his own by moving back to Kingston, Jamaica. There he and his brother Joshua started a newspaper, the Daily Gleaner. Its first publication was a four-page weekly newspaper, first issued on Saturday, 13 September 1834.2

Two years later, attracted by the business opportunity the Texas War for Independence offered an enterprising young man, Jacob De Cordova moved to New Orleans and entered the shipping trade. He profited by sending cargoes to Galveston to support the cause of Texas independence. After the Texans’ victory at San Jacinto, he visited the new nation and by 1839 decided to become part of it and migrated to Galveston. His move was part of a handful of Jews who typified the entrepreneurial adventurers moving to Texas both before and after its independence. While most were from central Europe, almost all spent time in commercial hubs like Baltimore, Charleston, New Orleans and New York before arriving in Texas.3 He was quite possibly one of the first Jews to settle there. A Jew named Michael Seeligson was there in that year; Lewis A. Levy came between 1837 and 1842, and Henry Wiener, Isaac Coleman, and Maurice Levy arrived in

---

the early 1840s. Like most of these other people De Cordova married a Christian woman, as was common in frontier settings, and neither practiced the Jewish faith openly nor self-identified as a Jew. This also reflected the wider trend of willingly abandoning or concealing one’s Jewish origins.

After a few months there he moved on to Houston where, in the next three years, he created a business and political empire. De Cordova’s business acumen served him well in the decade of the 1840s. He established the De Cordova Land and Collecting Company in Austin. This company collected taxes on land for the state, recorded and perfected titles, collected debts in western Texas, prosecuted claims against the former government of Texas, and sold land for taxes redeemed. De Cordova eventually amassed over one million acres in landholdings. Some of it he put into cotton production, some into ranching, and the rest he either sold to new immigrants or kept as an investment in the future of Texas.

He benefitted from both the land grant system under the Republic of Texas and the subsequent system under the state. The Texas legislature set up a system of land grants to encourage immigration to the new nation after independence from Mexico. For those who arrived in the country prior to 1 October 1837, the government awarded all heads of families 1,280 acres and all single men 640 acres. Heads of families or single males who arrived after that date and before 1 January 1840 received 640 acres and 320 acres respectively. All of these grants were conditioned upon remaining on the land for a minimum of three years. The conditions on the Texas frontier were harsh and much of this land was of marginal quality. Many of the people who arrived to take it did not have the economic wherewithal to cover the start-up costs involved in establishing a successful farm. Jacob De Cordova, already a successful merchant and publisher, now possessed the capital to buy numerous tracts from people who failed to make a go of it.

The laws, however, did not prevent speculation and fraud. Re-sales were common and speculators bought land before immigrants arrived. De Cordova
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undoubtedly was aware of these practices and may have participated in them to amass his holdings. He was in competition with other promoters like W. S. Peters and Associates, Charles F. Mercer, Fisher and Miller, as well as Count Henri de Castro of France. All of these companies encouraged settlement and all became embroiled with the state government over their business practices and were involved in numerous lawsuits over disputed land titles.9

Economic power led to political prominence for this successful entrepreneur. De Cordova served as the Harris County representative to the Second Legislature of Texas. While serving he continued to amass landholdings and became extremely influential, first in the politics of the Republic, and later in state politics.10 During this period De Cordova settled in Seguin. He created Wanderer’s Retreat, his estate on the old New Braunfels-Seguin road in northwestern Guadalupe County. He then surveyed the eleven-league grant of Antonio Esnaurrizar, divided the lands into several hundred farms, and superintended their sale. His estate supposedly received the name Wanderer’s Retreat because De Cordova welcomed adventurers, many of whom stayed on as cowboys.11 He was also instrumental in building the first cotton mill in Texas at New Braunfels and secured the spinners, weavers and machinery for that mill, which operated for a number of years.

De Cordova hired a German immigrant named Charles William Pressler to begin accurately mapping the Republic of Texas. Pressler, a surveyor and cartographer, was born in 1823, at Kendelbrück in Thuringia, Prussia. Upon graduation from the Luthergymnasium in Eisleben 1841, he entered a surveyor’s school at Weisseensee and passed the surveyor’s examination in 1844, when he entered the Prussian state service. Dissatisfied with political and religious conditions, he left Prussia in 1845 as a member of the Adelsverein and landed in Galveston, Texas, at the beginning of February 1846. Pressler headed survey expeditions in 1846 and 1847 that checked the details of De Cordova’s first map of Texas. In March 1848, Pressler surveyed in Guadalupe County before returning to Germany that summer where he married Clara Johanna Doerk. He returned to Texas with his new bride and purchased a farm near New Ulm in Austin County. After moving to Austin in December 1850 he became a draftsman in the General Land Office.12

Jacob De Cordova was then joined by his half-brother Phineas to assist him in his business ventures. Phineas was one of the first well-known Jewish settlers
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in Austin. Phineas De Cordova was born in Philadelphia and arrived in Texas sometime after 1848 with his wife, Jemimina Delgado. After a brief time in Galveston and Houston, he joined his Brother Jacob’s land company and opened a newspaper publishing business with him as well. He then settled in Austin at the request of Governor P.H. Bell in 1850. Phineas De Cordova used his newspaper, as well as his brother’s business connections, as a springboard to a successful business and political career. He became one of only seven notary publics in Texas, serving in Travis County, and eventually rose to the office of commissioner for the U.S. Court of Claims in the state.

Both brothers followed in a long national tradition of selling the idea of the settlement of the North American frontier. Since American independence both state governments and private individuals used proclamations, newspaper ads and pamphlets to proclaim affordable land awaiting prospective settlers. This proved to be a gradual process up until the 1840s when technological advances like the railroad, steamships, and the telegraph quickened the pace of communication and settlement. All of these advances combined to ensure the rapid growth of Texas between 1840 and 1860.

Also at the this time Jacob De Cordova was in the process of founding the City of Waco, about one hundred miles north of the capitol in Austin. He laid out that city in 1849 and donated the land for a city park, several churches and offered city lots for sale at remarkably low prices. While he was founding Waco De Cordova commissioned the first accurate map of the state. He hired Robert Creuzbaur, an associate of Pressler’s and an employee of the Texas General Land Office, to compile this map from that agency’s records and the work of Pressler. The result was a very accurate and detailed map. Creuzbaur followed Stephen F. Austin’s format and used an inset to show the western part of the state. This map was issued in 1849, and the first revision came the following year. With each new edition or issue, the map makers adjusted for the continuing change in Texas development, but the format remained generally the same over the years. The importance of the map for attracting both immigrants and economic development cannot be overstated: “Sam Houston delivered a speech praising the map on the floor of the U.S. Senate . . . that it was ‘the most correct and authentic map of Texas ever compiled.’” It served as a snapshot of the state’s development and:
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was important to Texas geography as a whole . . . providing a valuable record of the social and political evolution of the state during the crucial years when much of its territory was first settled by a population of European origin.  

In 1850 De Cordova played a key role in Texas’s part in the Compromise of 1850. At the urging of Governor Peter H. Bell, he used his newspaper the *Austin Southwestern American* to encourage public support for the compromise. As a result of its passage by the U.S. Congress, Texas reaped a $10 million payment from the federal government for adjustments to its borders after annexation. The adjustments were largely based on De Cordova’s accurate map of the state produced a year earlier.

De Cordova made numerous trips to England where he encouraged immigration to Texas, promoting land for ranching and farming that was plentiful and cheap. As part of these efforts he began publishing promotional material about his adopted state. He published his map in *Texas, Her Resources and Public Men*. His research for this book entailed using his political and economic connections to ask for contributions from over two dozen prominent Texans including Sam Houston. To his business partner William R. Baker of Houston, he wrote:

> will you give me a full account of the History of the Town of Houston, its rise, progress. . . . I am preparing a work on Texas that will benefit our interests in Milam District—that is indeed my main object— but to do it genteelly.  

Obviously, his penchant for promoting his adopted home also served the economic interests of both he and his business associates. In February 1852 De Cordova published a series of articles under the name of “Leaves from the Notebook of the Wanderer.” The articles were mostly descriptions of the various counties in which he owned land. No date was given on the publication, but this book is probably the “old book” De Cordova was referring to in 1856 when he wrote to his brother:

> I am publishing the Texian Immigrant and Travelers Guide Book to retail at 30 cts. each without the map. This Guide Book will be a re-hash of my old Book with considerable additional material. I intend to print of the first edition but a single thousand for I shall enlarge it very much the second edition.

This new work, published in Austin, is considered the first comprehensive almanac of the state. In it, De Cordova assembled a vast amount of information from his
previous publications and research. His geographical emphasis, unsurprisingly, was in the area of Texas — the upper waters of the Brazos, Colorado, Guadalupe, and Red rivers — where he owned the most land. He believed that the agricultural future of the state lay in the cultivation of wheat which he contended would become more valuable than either cotton or sugar cane. The author sought to recruit mostly farmers but also called for hard-working merchants, professionals, and skilled laborers who could contribute to the state’s growth. He proffered advice to all of these classes, telling Northeasters to take a ship to Texas, and farmers in the South and West to come by land with their wagons.\textsuperscript{21}

De Cordova also espoused the prevalent view regarding slavery in Texas. He explained that “by a wise provision of our State Constitution . . . the institution of slavery has been guaranteed to Texas.” He asserted his fellow Texans were “jealous of this right and will not allow any intermeddling with the subject.” Personally, De Cordova wanted it known that “my feelings and education have always been pro-slavery.” It was fine to hold contrary views, he informed his audience, and any non-slaveholder would be welcome in Texas provided that “he shall pursue the even tenor of his way, mind his own business, and leave his neighbors to attend to theirs.”\textsuperscript{22} Born and raised in Jamaica and familiar with some of the worst conditions for slaves in the Americas, what he cared most about was the commercial development of his state. If slavery provided a means to that end, then that was a small price to pay for that end. While many people recognized the dim long-term prospects for monoculture based on cotton and servile labor, the idea of emancipating slaves in the state was a non-starter largely for economic reasons. In 1860, a year prior to the outbreak of the Civil War, the economic value of all slaves in the state stood at almost $107 million. This represented twenty percent more than the value of all the farmland in the state.\textsuperscript{23}

By 1858, Jacob De Cordova was the recognized authority on Texas. In the spring of that year he delivered several lectures up and down the East Coast of the United States promoting the future of the state. He appeared in Philadelphia, Newark, and Mount Holly, N.Y. His last stop was in New York City at the annual meeting of the New York Geographical Society. De Cordova repeated the themes in his previous publications. His talk covered the past, present and future of the state. At this meeting he laid out for his audience what he viewed as the “rare inducements offered in Texas to our Northern fellow-citizens to immigrate to that State with the view of making it their future home.”\textsuperscript{24} After describing his experiences over the previous two decades De Cordova told his audience of the tremendous population
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growth since Texas independence, “the increase has been immense. In September 1836, the whole number of voters within the state was 5,704 while in 1857 there were 57,718. . . . we may safely assume the present population of Texas to be 550,000.”25

Ever the master salesman, he lauded the Texas legislature for advancing the cause of civilization in the state by asserting that “one-tenth of the gross revenue of the state is dedicated to educational purposes and . . . has added to the Educational fund over two millions and a half of acres of land.” With 221,400 acres set aside for a special endowment, De Cordova confidently predicted the construction of a state university was imminent. At the same time, he enumerated the already extant private schools with Baylor University topping a list of eight institutions of higher education.26

While extolling the possibilities that higher education afforded people, De Cordova also addressed teachers who might consider moving to Texas telling them that for “both male and female who are competent to teach what they profess, there are many openings. Texans are alive to the advantages of a sound practical system of education.” Later, he seemingly contradicted himself: “but as yet there are not many professors needed; what she wants is a body of intelligent teachers who are able to impart the rudiments of an English education.” For De Cordova, there would have been no conflict in holding both views simultaneously. The development of higher education would be ongoing but for the present what was needed most was basic education for the teeming masses of immigrants he hoped to see come to Texas.27

This emphasis on education paid dividends to the state. In 1860 there were seventy-one Texas newspapers with a circulation of around 100,000. Ninety-five percent of the white population could read and write, a figure that most of the rest of the country, or the leading European powers of the day, could scarcely have matched. Though taxing residents for educational purposes ran counter to the Texas constitution, beginning in 1854 the state reimbursed parents sixty-two cents per student enrolled in any type of school. A year later, the legislature more than doubled the amount to $1.50.28

De Cordova then went on to proclaim that immigrant success in Texas was almost guaranteed, “that no man of sober habits and sound moral principles need labor long for others, since he can soon acquire an interest in the soil of the country.” In addition, the state provided constitutional protections against financial ruin, “two hundred acres of land, your tools of trade, your horse and saddle, one
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year’s provision for your family, together with a reasonable amount of household furniture are exempt from execution.”

De Cordova advised potential settlers that “the most suitable regions for the immigrant are the upper waters of the Brazos, Colorado, Guadalupe or Red Rivers, where the country is rolling, the water pure, the atmosphere salubrious and invigorating.” Once again, as in his previously writings on Texas, De Cordova remained mindful of his own economic interests. Those regions, not coincidently, comprised most of his vast landholdings that he would have been happy to sell to immigrants.

As De Cordova identified in his talks and numerous publications, one of the most important limiting factors in the state’s economic development was the lack of a developed transportation infrastructure. At the time most roads were unworthy of the name, but represented only well-worn paths used by immense wagons drawn by mules and carrying up to 7,000 lbs. in goods. All of these were subject to bad weather, highwaymen, and Indian attack, thus ensuring that freight rates remained high and retarded economic development. Most of the state’s leaders saw the remedy to these problems in the creation of an extensive railroad network in the state. The state government provided sixteen sections of land to any railroad company for each mile of track laid. When it came to the development of the railroads, De Cordova weighed in. He connected this potential to the development of the Southern Pacific Railroad, stating that “a large portion of this cotton growing country is situated east of the Brazos River, and will consequently be tributary to this great railroad.” He also predicated his prediction of a great future for wheat and other grain production in the state on the development of the railroads, noting that “the value of the country west of the river Brazos that will be serviced by the Southern Pacific Railroad, as grain-producing country, is incalculable.”

De Cordova also observed that the untapped potential in cotton production “will be of a large number as soon as our railroads penetrate the wheat growing regions of the State.” Indeed, his vision of the future was not limited to Texas or North America. He believed Texas would be part of a global economy when he wrote that the completion of the Southern Pacific railroad would “connect Europe and Texas, by the shortest passage to China, Japan, and the all-important gold district of Australia.” He contended that completion of the railroad was “absolutely necessary to the commerce of the world, and the leading minds of statesmen and merchants are directed to this end.” His optimism was unbounded as was his hyperbole, when he maintained that “immense as this trade is now, what must it be by the time the road is completed?” A number of factors, however, slowed
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the progress of railroads — a lack of investment capital in Texas as well as in the surrounding region, the vast distances involved, native resistance, and a suspicion of financiers in general — all acted as a brake on railroad construction. It would not be until after the Civil War that such construction started in earnest and began fulfilling De Cordova’s vision.33

The fact that yeoman farmers made up almost half of Texas settlement explains De Cordova’s recurrent emphasis on attracting more of these people to the state. This immigration was part of the expansion of the American South and over half of the white immigrants came from Alabama and Tennessee searching for cheap land or a new start. When compared to the rest of the South, however, a much larger proportion of these immigrants came from outside the country. By 1860 43,422 Texans were foreign born, approximately 12,000 from Mexico, with the balance being from Europe.34

As most of these people were to be farmers, De Cordova described the wonders awaiting them, a place where “within the limits of our State are millions of acres of as rich lands as can be found in the world — the Delta of the Nile not excepted.” In these lands he foresaw that the cultivation of sugar and wheat had the potential to displace cotton as the most profitable crops, stating that “the day is not far distant when the production of wheat will be of far greater importance than that of either sugar or cotton, and, in all probability, of both articles combined.”35 At that time the cultivation of cotton was becoming paramount in Texas. De Cordova, more so than any other economic leader of the time, connected Texas cotton to transatlantic trade. He asserted that cotton was one of “the most important articles produced by Texas at this time.” De Cordova went on to proclaim the superiority of Texas in cotton production when he averred that “we can plant cotton earlier in the greater portion of our State than is usual in other cotton growing districts. It is not subject to casualties as that of other States, and comes to perfection much earlier.”36 He, like many other economic boosters, would repeat this theme of the profits to be made in cotton cultivation. De Cordova, also like many others at that time in the American South, promoted the idea of bypassing Northern financial interests to establish a direct link with Europe. When it came to cotton he asserted that “the universal consumption of this article, and the heavy charges attendant upon its re-shipment, demand that we should forward it ourselves without the aid of Northern merchants.”37 And while he promoted the idea of crop diversification, especially that of wheat, it was the profits to be made in cotton that resonated most with his audiences. De Cordova noted, a point also made by many others on both sides of the Atlantic, that “it must be conceded that Texas has unoccupied more cotton-land
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within her limits than half the Southern States combined, capable of producing a
larger quantity of cotton than is at present raised in the whole world.”38

Finally, De Cordova sought to assuage possible settlers’ anxiety regarding Native
Americans and any threat they might pose. After describing the major tribes like
the Apache and Comanche he dismissed the threat by commenting that “one may
live in Texas for years, and never come in contact with the aboriginal inhabitants,
except business or pleasure calls him to the frontier.”39 Notwithstanding his
discounting the historical evidence to the contrary, he employed anecdotes to show
the passivity of the natives and that the land he would be selling to immigrants was
safe. This was a dubious proposition at best, as many frontier Texas farmers could
have attested to at the time and for the previous three decades.

Despite De Cordova’s assurances of a quiescent frontier, Texas homesteads
frequently came under attack. In 1849 at least one hundred forty-nine settlers, men,
women, and children alike, died at the hands of hostile natives on the northwest
Texas frontier. In September of that year the Texas State Gazette printed a piece
decrying the situation in which an individual stated, “I see that the Comanche
are still continuing their forays upon the Texas border murdering and carrying
off defenseless frontier settlers.”40 Even a decade later, in 1858, when many of
the tribes had been pacified by being herded onto reservations, there were almost
constant and violent native raids and counter raids by whites against native
settlements.

Jacob De Cordova now emerged as a pioneer in forging links between
Great Britain and Texas. At the invitation of the Cotton Supply Association of
Manchester he traveled to England in late September 1858 to present his lecture,
“The Cultivation of Cotton in Texas,” at Manchester’s Town Hall. De Cordova
saw the future of Texas growth in increasing the transatlantic bond between his
state and Europe. And while he predicted that wheat and sugar production were
keys to that growth, by the late 1850s he was promoting cotton as the real key to
forging mutually beneficial transatlantic economic links. He repeated what he had
already told American audiences, “one of the most important articles produced by
Texas at this time, but one which will grow to a larger number . . . is cotton.”41 His
presentation proved so popular he stayed over for another two weeks and presented
again in mid-October. De Cordova later returned to talk to other English audiences
about prospects in Texas. He emphasized the opportunities in the state, while at
the same time downplaying his proslavery sentiments. An astute businessman, he
realized those sentiments would not play well with an English audience. Largely
as a result of these talks, British mills started buying ninety percent of the cotton
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grown in Texas. This proved to be a precursor for post-Civil War development in North Texas, especially in Dallas where both city boosters and the members of the cotton trade cultivated a transatlantic connection.42

While De Cordova was making his own transatlantic connections the Texas population grew from 212,592 to 604,215 between 1850 and 1860, representing a 184 percent increase during the decade. Cotton production in the state during the same period rose from 58,161 bales to 431,463 bales, making for an astounding 642 percent increase.43 This increase, however, only represented a small portion of the country’s total production, the center of which still lay in the black fertile soil, known as the Black Belt of the American Southeast. Still de Cordova’s exhortations to his compatriots, and dealing directly with Great Britain and the rest of Europe while cutting out Northern interests seemed to have an effect just prior to the American Civil War. In 1856 the port of Galveston handled 41,244 cotton bales. Of those, 1,222 went to Great Britain and 398 were shipped to the Continent. A year later, in 1857, the port shipped 54,956 bales with 11,472 going to Great Britain and 1,027 going to the Continent.44 This represented an 839 percent increase in cotton shipments from Texas to Great Britain and a 1,573 percent increase in cotton going to the Continent. The figures also reflect an almost six-fold increase in the share of Texas cotton going to Europe as opposed to Northern textile mills. By 1857 almost 23 percent of Texas cotton now flowed across the Atlantic as opposed to 4 percent the previous year. This trend would come to a halt when war broke out in 1861, but resumed in ever greater volume at the conclusion of the conflict in 1865.

Textile exports comprised 60 percent of the value of all British exports at that time. The cotton trade made New York the pre-Civil War apex of the famous cotton triangle and was responsible for Liverpool’s economic pre-eminence in Atlantic trade for the bulk of the nineteenth century. Cotton goods salesmen from the Lancashire District established themselves as export-import merchants in New York and “took the chief hand in shaping the pattern of transatlantic commerce and shipping.”45 Something similar was happening at the same time in Texas. As already stated, however, this trend would be interrupted by war.

At the time of the outbreak of the American Civil War in 1861 the proportion of the raw material imported from the United States into Great Britain stood at eighty percent. In that same year the United States produced two-thirds of the world’s cotton and supplied more than three-quarters of all the raw material in the world trade system. Total cotton imports in Europe reached 4.84 million 400-lb. bales, an average of 93,000 per week, of which the United States supplied 4.01 million bales, or 84 percent of the total. A year later, after the start of the War, only 102,000
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American bales reached Europe, accounting for only 7 percent of total European cotton imports. This collapse of the trade, while it wrought economic havoc in Texas and the rest of the American South, would set the stage for Texas to enter the Atlantic world in greater force in the postwar era.

As for so many others in Texas, the war and its aftermath did not treat de Cordova well. He had previously espoused the potential of the state’s rivers for providing hydraulic power for industry and the growth of the cotton milling industry. In the 1860s he attempted to tie the two together and emulate developments in New England with a power project on the Brazos River in Bosque County. He wanted to power textile mills to spin Texas cotton. This unsuccessful project, as well as the effect of the War on the Texas economy, led to severe financial reverses for de Cordova.

He lived to see the defeat of the southern cause and died three years after the end of the War, in January 1868. He was survived by five children. Later the De Cordova Bend on the Brazos River south of Fort Worth, and the De Cordova Bend Dam at Lake Granbury, were both named for him. Both he and his wife were buried in Kimball. In 1935 both were moved to the Texas State Cemetery. This was a signal honor for de Cordova. This cemetery, set up by the Fourth State Legislature in 1854, was only about twenty-two acres in area, and located in the eastern part of Austin. With such limited space only the most prominent contributors to the history of the state are buried there. The fact that de Cordova and his wife found their final resting place there eight decades after their death is indicative of the man’s impact and his significance in the history of the Republic of Texas and the State of Texas.

After the war the worldwide flow of cotton resumed, but not without major changes in the market. Cotton farmers now flocked to the Texas frontier with production sweeping westward across the Grand Prairie, the Cross Timbers, and on to the Rolling Plains in North Texas. While De Cordova lived only long enough to see the beginning of this process, his earlier work greatly contributed to what followed. By 1890 Texas led the nation in cotton production. This production remained the major development in the Texas economy from the end of the Civil War to 1914. By 1900, Texas produced one-third of the nation’s crop and Galveston captured the lead as the nation’s number-one cotton port.

The historian of the American South C. Vann Woodward contends that foreign immigrants to the South played a role out of all proportion to their relatively limited numbers when compared with Northern urban centers. The life and career of Jacob De Cordova represents an example that supports the truth of Woodward’s
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argument. He achieved vast wealth and political influence in the Republic of Texas and then carried that over after the annexation of Texas by the United States. His constant promotion of settlement and economic development, along with that of others, greatly contributed to the growth of the State. From a population of approximately 50,000 at the time of Texas Independence in 1836, the population soared to 212,592 in 1850, and 604,215 in 1860, just prior to the outbreak of the Civil War. These figures represent a 325 percent population increase in the fourteen years following independence and an astounding 1,108 percent increase in the two and one-half decades from 1836 to 1860.

De Cordova’s promotional efforts are also a fine example of the differences between the dynamic stability in Old World boosterism versus the dynamic instability with endemic competition that marked boosterism in the United States. A confluence of transportation and communication advances, along with systematic marketing of the frontier, allowed Texas to grow at a phenomenal pace up until the outbreak of the American Civil War. De Cordova’s constant promotion of Texas frontier settlement led him to accumulate vast wealth, as well as long-lasting political influence in Texas. His untiring efforts to promote settlement and economic development, along with those of others, greatly contributed to the growth of the state. Foreign immigrants like De Cordova, along with his half-brother Phineas, and people like the German immigrant cartographers Robert Creuzbaur and Charles W. Pressler, did indeed make significant and outsized contributions to this growth. Jacob De Cordova was an immigrant who amassed great landholdings, founded the City of Waco, promoted the settlement of Texas, helped orient its cotton trade toward Great Britain, played an important role in shaping Texas values, and helped guide the state into a future that he prophesized.
Ambassadors of Race: The Role of Sports Personalities in Breaking the Color Barrier in American Comics

Christopher J. Hayton
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Reflecting the real world, in searches for the beginnings of desegregation in comic book universes, black sportsmen feature prominently. Although Renford Reese claims that “the movement to integrate sport and the movement to integrate society in America were two separate phenomena,”1 the current study argues otherwise. It posits that some black sportsmen made conscious connections between their roles in integrating sport, and the wider integration of society and movement for racial equality, and that this is reflected in mid-twentieth century comic book portrayals of black athletes. Among the very first respectfully portrayed black characters in comic books, boxers such as Joe Louis, baseball players like Jackie Robinson, and basketball maestros The Harlem Globetrotters, had their life stories and sporting exploits immortalized in sequential art. Often actually presented as representatives of their race, these real-life sporting heroes’ own struggles for acceptance opened the door for more inclusive representations of American diversity in the comics. As comic books were a widely-consumed form of media at that time, positive representations of black athletes in their four-color pages had the potential to influence public attitudes on issues related to race.

The Sports Genre in Comics

Sports personalities can be found in the earliest comic books of the late 1930s, but the 1940s through early 1950s was the period during which the sports genre peaked, reprising in the early 1990s, with sporadic revivals to the present. Historic black sportsmen continue to surface in comics, but it is those published while the desegregation of society, and of the comic book medium, was beginning to take place, that are discussed in this paper. It is the Golden Age (1938-1956) in which sports comics were more significant in their contribution to the desegregation of the medium.

The significance of real-life black sports personalities in Golden Age comic books lies in the fact that they were generally portrayed very respectfully. Examples of harmful racial stereotyping are found simultaneously throughout the medium. Alternatively, we see an American society devoid of diversity, the black population invisible and unrepresented. This reflects the actual roles those sportsmen played in society. While the country was still deeply segregated and overtly racist, among the first black individuals to gain some level of respect and acceptance by the white majority, and certainly the most prominent in the public eye, were top black athletes.

sportsmen. If, despite color bars and pervasive racist attitudes, a black sportsman achieved at the highest level in a field recognized and admired by the white majority, then the theory of black biological inferiority was undone for all to see. Whether they wanted it or not, these black sportsmen had the extremely difficult and sometimes treacherous role of racial representative or ambassador cast upon them.

**Method**

As a starting point for this study, the Grand Comics Database (GCD) was searched using “character” and entering the name of a prominent black sports personality from the era, the results sorted by date. Working from the lists compiled for those sportsmen for whom representation in comics was identified, attempts were made to access the specific issues in which they were featured (note: no representations of female black athletes were found). The world’s premier online resource for digitalized Golden Age comics, the Digital Comic Museum (DCM), houses a number of key examples of the sports genre, as well as multiple other comics sought for their identified black sports personality content. The DCM includes comics that are public domain, therefore excluding titles owned by extant companies such as DC and Marvel. Most material being sought was not published by these two, but Golden Age DC comics did feature some sports-related factual fillers, and in the late 1950s ads with pictures of Joe Louis. Examples of these were provided to the author by comic book archivists. Overall, access to a good representative sample of the material that exists pertinent to this study was obtained. The comics thus acquired were then read, and observations made regarding content, particularly in connection to the image of race relations that they projected to the reader. These images are discussed below in the context of the actual history of the sports personalities in question and their known roles in race relations in mid-twentieth century America.

**Comics Featuring Black Athletes**

The lists of comics featuring black sportsmen obtained from searches in the GCD reveals that sports comics constituted a distinct genre of stories and comic series, but made up only a relatively small component of the total material published. Nevertheless, even with the limited range of American comics featuring sports personalities, the impact of those comics would not be insignificant, although in America other genres such as superhero, western, crime, horror, or romance dominated the comic book market during the period under scrutiny.

One may discover a comic that has a short, factual, filler of part or all of a page or two devoted to sports, or an actual short story as a feature in the comic. A sports feature might be part of a comic of the non-fiction genre, or could be found in a book that presented multiple genres. Some publishers ventured one-
shot comic books or series of comics dedicated solely to sports, the sports genre proper, although these series tended to be short-lived, an exception being Street and Smith Publications’ long-running non-fiction series *Sport Comics/True Sport Picture Stories*. Charlton’s *Hot Rods and Racing Cars*, initially a mixture of fiction and non-fiction, was in print from 1951-1973 for a total of 120 issues. During the period under discussion, advertisements featuring sports personalities were also found in comic books. Occasionally real sports personalities were used in fictional comic book stories, but more commonly fictional sporting characters were the main protagonists in their own stories or comics. The most prominent example of the latter was *Joe Palooka*, which was both a long-running syndicated newspaper strip as well as a comic book that ran from 1942-1961, for 122 issues. An example of a fictional sports character featured within a multi-genre comic book was Kayo Kirby of Fiction House’s *Fight Comics*, found in the first 81 issues of the series (1940-1952).

**Factual Features in Comics**

Comics of any genre could become the home for a feature about a famous sports personality. For example, Avon’s 1953 one-shot, the unnumbered *Last of the Comanches*, contains a six-page back-up feature titled “The Brown Bomber,” essentially a brief biography of Joe Louis, the long-reigning heavyweight boxing champion of the thirties and forties. In the last panel, in finishing its description of Louis’s career, the text reads, “time will not erase the esteem the world has for this inspiring personality! Because he is, above all, a credit to his race . . . the human race!” Even such a veiled comment on the state of race relations in the United States at the time is unusual. As we shall see from further analysis, the tendency in comics of the time was to avoid presenting the ugly truth about racism in the United States, even though such biographical accounts seem to be otherwise accurate as they present the facts about the life and career of the celebrity, while ignoring or downplaying issues of race. In the context of the current discussion, this reverence shown to Joe Louis, who in the comics viewed for this study is always presented as a man of great integrity, seems typical generally of the publicly-displayed attitude of a portion of the white population towards prominent black athletes during those decades.

Further instances of black athletes receiving reverential and respectful treatment in comics can be found in 1950s issues of the educational Catholic comic book series, *Treasure Chest of Fun and Fact*, which ran from 1946 through 1972. The 23 May 1957 issue, for example, provides a short history of the Harlem Globetrotters, but starts by detailing the visit made by the team to see the Pope on 2 August 1952. From the Catholic reader’s perspective, the feature suggests very strong
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endorsement of the Globetrotters by the Pope, particularly when he is depicted saying, “I have heard so much about the Globetrotters and the good work they are doing.” Publishers could, with relative confidence, feature real black sports personalities in their comics reasonably expecting that they would be accepted by the readership, since the actual sportsmen were recognized within the white majority as admirable achievers, this interest reflecting the widespread popularity and respect associated with black athletes in the forties and fifties. With the Catholic comics, and comics from mainstream publishers, one has to acknowledge that this was also a form of propaganda promoting improvement in race relations by praising the accomplishments and character of black athletes.

Issue #6 of *Picture News in Color and Action*, published in June 1946, offers an unusual twist on the non-fiction genre, with its five-page analysis of the then upcoming Joe Louis vs. Billy Conn return fight. The comic predicted Louis would win by the 11th round. Apparently the writer knew boxing, because Louis went on to win by a knock-out in the 8th round. While probably not intending to be malicious, the picture of Louis on the cover illustrates him with the large pink lips reminiscent of early twentieth-century stereotypes of blacks. On page 3 of the feature, the narrative calmly states, “Negroes are not “old” pugilistically at 32. This is particularly true of Louis, who has always kept himself in the best possible condition.” This is the only occasion on which attention is drawn to race, as the feature briefly goes on to mention Jack Johnson who, at the age of thirty-two defeated Jim Jeffries. The underlying division of society based on race is, nevertheless, apparent to the discerning reader. For example, amongst a total of 93 faces of people commenting on the outcome of the fight on the splash page, or just looking interested or excited, only one is black. Overall, though, this comic mirrors its sports genre contemporaries in that it depicts a well-known and admired black sports personality without acknowledging the racist divisions prevalent in society at the time, or the associated prejudice and discrimination experienced by most Americans of color.

**Factual Comics about Sports Personalities**

Publishers also clearly felt confident at times that they could achieve success with comics purely about sports, and black sportsmen also turn up in sports comics containing features on a variety of sports. A typical example of this type is *True*
Sport Picture Stories Vol. 4 No. 12, with a cover date of March-April 1949. The first story is about the Phillips 66 Oilers basketball team. The next story details the achievements of baseball legend Connie Mack. Another baseball story follows that. The fourth story is about black heavyweight contender for the title, Ezzard Charles, tipping him to become the successor to Joe Louis, after analyzing his career to date. More of the national pastime fills the next story, followed by one-and two-page fillers through to the end of the book. The feature about Charles gives details of his life and career, praising both his skill and character, the latter highlighted by the boxer’s response to the death of one of his opponents in the ring.

Some sports comics focused on just one sport, featuring stars from that arena, typical representatives being Ziff-Davis’s Baseball Thrills (1951, 3 issues) and Football Thrills (1951-1952, 2 issues). Black baseball players can be found in those comics focused solely on that sport. For example, Satchel Paige and Larry Doby are included in a roster of the Cleveland Indians in a story about the origins of that team in Baseball Thrills #3.

Rather than simply feature a black sportsman in a comic, at the beginning of the 1950s Fawcett Comics promoted racial equality by publishing several titles named after famous black athletes. This helped to improve the accuracy of representation of minorities in comics. Mostly highlighting baseball players, either black or otherwise, these comics gave factual accounts of the lives and accomplishments of prominent sportsmen, including detailed events from specific games or, in the case of Joe Louis, boxing matches. They were, however, short-lived, and did not survive far into the 1950s. Eastern Color (Famous Funnies) weighed in with their one-shot The Amazing Willie Mays in 1954, which begins with an eight page story about how Mays got started in baseball, followed by seven pages detailing his prowess on the ball park. A five page feature reports the story of how Mays helped a former Major League scout who was down on his luck. Next is a one-page filler, “Willie’s Tips to You,” and then five more pages describing Mays’s “super-plays.” Amongst these are other one-page fillers and some ads. Published early in Mays’s career, the comic accurately predicts he will become one of the greatest baseball players of all time.

Comics (1949-1950, 2 issues), and Marvel’s Sports Action (1950-1952, 13 issues), covered a range of different sports and might include a black sports personality.
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Something that did not manifest on the American market at that time, but that was tried successfully elsewhere, was a sports series in which each issue was about a different famous star. In Mexico, beginning in the mid-1960s, the Organización Editorial Novaro, S.A., began publishing the long-running series Estrellas del Deporte (Stars of Sport), some early issues focusing on black American sports stars. The Grand Comics Database describes the Joe Louis issue (# 8, Joe Louis: El Bombadero de Detroit) as containing a “biography of Joe Louis, concentrating on his youth and two bouts with Max Schmeling,” stating that it was drawn by Ruben Lara.15 Had Fawcett tried something similar they might have gotten more mileage out of their sports comics, especially since non-fiction comics did not garner ire from the anti-comic crusades that led to the introduction of the Comics Code. Fawcett’s comics presented events as if race was not as big an issue as it was. While the Negro Leagues are mentioned, the fact that they were a testament to Jim Crow and segregation is completely downplayed, if not erased completely.

**Real Events in Fictional Stories**

In some cases an otherwise completely fictional story might be given a touch of realism by adding a convincing reference to a real life sporting event. In the October 1942 issue of Boy Comics, Crimebuster uses newsreel footage of Joe Louis defeating Max Schmeling to prove to a Nazi spy that Hitler has been lying to the German people.16 Muhammad Ali’s bout with George Foreman in Zaire is referenced as Ali gives Superman a few pointers on the basics of his boxing technique in DC’s Superman vs. Muhammad Ali of 1978.17 If one considers Ali himself to be an ongoing real world event, then that entire comic uses him to connect our real world with the fictional world of Clark Kent and Metropolis in the DC Universe.

**Fictional Appearances of Real Sports Personalities**

The most famous fictional appearance of a real black sports personality in a fictional comic probably is the celebrated DC All-New Collectors’ Edition #C-56 Superman vs Muhammad Ali, mentioned above. However, a much earlier example of a real boxer being introduced into a fictional comic book story is found in the regular feature Kayo Ward in MLJ Magazines’ pre-Archie Pep Comics of 1940. Kayo Ward is a fictional boxer who, by Pep Comics #6, is preparing to fight Joe Louis for the heavyweight title.18 A notorious gambler bets heavily on Louis to win, then to secure his investment, he kidnaps Kayo, replacing him with a double, who will ensure Louis wins.19 Kayo escapes, and just as the match is about to start
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he uncovers the imposter and takes his rightful place in the ring. The fight is on in *Pep Comics* #7, but despite his bravery, Kayo is losing badly, and Joe Louis asks the referee to stop the fight for the injured Kayo’s sake. Kayo Ward was another example of a fictional sports character found in a multi-genre comic, in this case the first 28 issues of *Pep Comics* (1940-1942). Joe Louis also makes a brief appearance in a single panel mock-up on the inside front cover of Harvey’s *Joe Palooka* #19. Palooka is drawn shaking the hand of Joe Louis (in a photo), with a photo of Palooka’s creator, Ham Fisher, introducing the two.

After a two-issue try-out in *Hanna Barbera Fun-in* #s 8 and 10, a twelve-issue fictional comic book series based on real life members of the Harlem Globetrotters was published by Gold Key and Whitman in the early 1970s. These comics were adaptations of the popular Hanna-Barbera TV cartoon show. Although from a visual point of view, players such as Meadowlark, Curly, and Geese were depicted somewhat accurately in the comics, they had a fictional old white lady called Granny as their manager, and a dog mascot called Dribbles. Granny’s whiteness mirrored the team’s actual situation of being an all-black team with a white manager. Like the cartoons, the comic book stories reflect the Globetrotters’s modus operandi of traveling the country and the world, arranging games with local teams and earning a split of the proceeds, although events and stories were entirely fictional and not just focused on basketball.

### Photos and Ads in Comics

Attesting to the widespread popularity and appeal of individual black sportsmen in the 1950s, some athletes were used in ads in comics to promote products. For example, featured in comics published between July 1956 and March 1959 by Charlton, DC, Marvel, Quality, and Ziff-Davis was a one page ad built around a photo of Joe Louis stating, “I’ll ripple your body with muscles and load T-N-T in your fists.” Between May and July 1954, Dell ran an ad that featured baseball star Roy Campanella convincing young readers to “Spark up . . . pick off a base runner” by eating Wheaties for breakfast, on the back covers of their comics.

The ad consists of a six-panel comic with Campanella demonstrating a snap-throw in the first four. In panel five he explains to a little leaguer that eating Wheaties gives him the spark needed for the snap-throw. In the final picture we see the boy getting an opponent out with his throw, and attributing his success to having had Wheaties.
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for breakfast. About one quarter of the page is taken up with a collectable signed photograph of Roy Campanella.

Both of the ads described above were published in a decade in which segregation deeply divided the American people, with many still opposed to integration. People continued to be killed for being black or for supporting or sympathizing with blacks. Yet both these ads use black sportsmen to sell products to a predominantly white audience, highlighting a shocking paradox that existed in mid-century America with respect to black sportsmen and the black community. The former received recognition for achieving in fields of activity that the majority whites respected as indicative of prowess and excellence, demonstrative of human superlative, even worthy of adulation. The communities those same athletes came from were, by some, still looked upon with scorn and revulsion, their inhabitants considered inferior by virtue of their race, and their access to the full benefits of citizenship curtailed accordingly in an alleged democracy.

Roles of Black Athletes in Mid-Century America

The sports and their black athletes that tended to be featured in comics during the desegregation transition in American comic books had differing roles in that same process in real society. To the black community, successful black athletes generally demonstrate the power of sport to bestow upward social mobility.26 This concept dates back to the first black boxer to challenge, albeit unsuccessfully, for the heavyweight title, Tom Molineaux, a hundred years before Jack Johnson. Originally a slave, Molineaux was manumitted for winning a match that netted his master $100,000.27 The story is recounted in Hillman’s All-Sports Comics #3.28

Boxing

Boxing, being an international sport, has a global reach, and by the mid-twentieth century had already been at the forefront of the race debate for some time. One of the greatest title-holders, heavyweight Jack Johnson, was seen by his contemporaries very much as the representative and indeed champion of his race. “Johnson as champion was . . . a threat to social order and whites’ beliefs about their black brethren” such that the “search for a “Great White Hope” ensued.29 Especially in high profile fights like the bout in which he defeated that white hope, James Jeffries, Johnson simultaneously inspired hope amongst blacks and outraged some whites.30 Johnson was continually subjected to racist abuse, while his victories against white opponents were used as evidence in the debate over the
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“myth of black biological inferiority.” Newspaper cartoons in the United States often used extreme racist stereotypes to depict Johnson.29

No mention of racial tension and racist abuse is made, however, in the brief appearance of Johnson in Picture News #6, when the latter analyzes the upcoming skirmish between Joe Louis and Billy Conn in 1946,30 although it is observed by Morgan that Johnson himself would avoid being drawn into the race debate.31 Johnson’s prowess as a boxer is highlighted for two pages in a feature about Stanley Ketchel, who fought and lost against Johnson, in Hillman’s Real Sports Comics #1 published late in 1948, but there is no indication of the racial strife that followed Johnson everywhere.32 Similarly, Johnson’s 4 July 1910 bout against Jeffries is covered on a couple of pages in a twelve-page story about famous boxing promoter Tex Rickard, in Hillman’s All-Time Sports Comics #7 from 1949, but the highly racially charged atmosphere surrounding the fight is not mentioned,33 nor are the race riots that ensued across America following Jeffries’ defeat.34

Joe Louis, unlike Johnson, was somewhat embraced by the white majority, this acceptance solidified by his pivotal second bout with Max Schmeling at Madison Square Garden in 1938. The American media held up Louis as, in Schmeling’s own words, the “symbol of freedom and equal rights of all men against the Nazi threat.”35 Referred to by many as The Fight of the Century, with Louis “representing democracy and freedom, and Schmeling, fascism and racial bondage,” Americans were united behind their champion and the outcome of this one bout had massive repercussions politically and culturally.36 While Johnson could be attacked for his somewhat profligate lifestyle outside the ring,37 Louis was unimpeachable, having been prepared for the public spotlight by white advisors from all quarters.38 He joined the military in the country’s hour of need and was every bit the respectable American.39 Schmeling, however, did not deserve the Nazi label he was given, but as the German champion it was inevitable it would be cast upon him in the politically-charged world of the late 1930s.40 In Fawcett’s Joe Louis #2, however, it is implied otherwise, when a reporter is depicted telling Louis that “Schmeling
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says you’re ducking him! He says that no colored man is as good a fighter as a German Aryan!”

In the same story Louis is shown listening to a radio broadcaster reporting that Schmeling had claimed he would “bring back the heavyweight title as a trophy for Adolf Hitler.”

Louis’s popularity at home was by no means universal, however, particularly in the South, where he was still subjected to frequent racist ridicule, while even the syndicated northern press was not averse to describing Louis in terms of well-established negative stereotypes that served to maintain the notion of white supremacy. Johnson had literally muscled his way into an integrated version of what was an unofficially segregated sport, with white champions refusing to combat black contenders.

Acceptance of black boxers by the white majority was established by Louis, who was viewed as a “Race Hero.”

Louis had been seen as such by the black community, but Louis genuinely promoted the concept of racial equality by simultaneously excelling at his craft and leading an exemplary American life outside of the ring.

Louis publicly acknowledged his role as a representative of the black community, vowing he would not “do anything which would discredit his people.”

Louis functioned in a consumer culture in which bodily attributes and pugilistic skill made him a commercially valuable commodity capable of generating “fame, recognition, national influence, and racial esteem.”

Louis accepted this heavy burden, donating the proceeds of his 1942 fight against Max Baer, for the time an incredible $100,000 (approximately), to “victims of the Pearl Harbor bombing,” while risking his title, the event becoming linked with the progress of racial reforms.

Louis was an active participant in promoting better race relations in the United States through sport, and his own belief is demonstrated by his efforts to achieve equal opportunity in golf following his retirement from the ring.

Once famous, neither Louis nor any of the other illustrious black pugilists escaped the “burden of socio-political responsibility,” even if, as was Louis, they were “interpellated as ‘Americans’” enabling “them to momentarily render inconsequential the racism of their society.”
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A fictional comic book character based on a combination of Jack Johnson and Joe Louis, although predominantly the latter, is Jackie Johnson, a soldier in DC’s Easy Co. in their premiere war title *Our Army at War*. The November 1965 issue features one of the most outstanding anti-racist stories in 1960s comics, in which Johnson, a former heavyweight boxing champ, meets on the battlefield the Nazi who took the title from him before the war started.\(^{55}\) Jackie Johnson’s fight with Uhlan, who insists that Johnson admit that the color of his blood is black, is all about ridiculing the master race theory and, simultaneously, the American “one drop of blood” rule. The story has clear parallels to some of the actual facts in the lives of Joe Louis and Max Schmeling, with Uhlan depicted as a paratrooper, and the fight seen by the Nazis as a foregone conclusion, reaffirming Aryan racial supremacy. Jackie takes a beating early on, but as the tide turns, a powerful left begins the onslaught that takes down the Nazi, the narration stating: “A scream tore from deep inside the Nazi champion’s throat, as Jackie hit him with a fist that must have felt as if it was wrapped around with all the iron chains that had tortured oppressed people all over the world.”\(^{56}\) Such outspoken opposition to racism was extremely rare in comics of the Golden and Silver Ages of comics, and largely limited to fictional genres.\(^{57}\)

**The Olympic Games**

Jesse Owens, by winning gold at the 1936 Olympics held in Nazi Germany in front of Adolf Hitler and thousands of sieg-heiling Germans, ridiculed the social Darwinist notions of Aryan supremacy and the Master Race, “even as America’s armed forces were divided along racial lines and the country’s segregation policies disturbingly echoed Hitler’s strict ethnic categories.”\(^{58}\) Owens later became “relegated to carnival-like exhibitions,” suggesting the minstrel stereotype, “in order to fit a white racist image that allowed blacks to entertain them.”\(^{59}\) In the comics, however, Owens remained the heroic figure of the 1936 Olympics, and is described very dramatically as such in a text filler in the winter 1952 issue of Ziff-Davis’s *Bill Stern’s Sports Book*.\(^{60}\) In that text story, and in the 5 June 1952 issue of *Treasure Chest of Fun and Fact*, Owens is reported as having deliberate intent to undermine the Master Race theory at the 1936 Olympics, with the offensive snubbing of Owens’s victory ceremony by the Nazi brass, and his 1951 return to the same stadium to a different reception, both faithfully recorded.\(^{61}\) Years later the
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great Jack Kirby, while working for DC in 1975 on one of their war titles, loosely based a character on Jesse Owens. In the story, Mile-a-Minute Jones is the sole survivor of a Nazi attack on a supply truck which, as in real life World War II, was manned by black soldiers. Jones escapes by virtue of his speed, but is pursued by a Nazi athlete, now paratrooper, whom Jones had raced in the 1936 Olympics prior to the war. The Losers (the heroes of the story) capture the paratrooper and other Nazis, but when the Nazi athlete escapes, Jones is the only one fast enough to give pursuit. As Jones closes in on his quarry, Kirby invokes Jesse Owens’ experience at the 1936 Olympics:

Narration: Hard upon Bruno’s heels, Henry Jones presses closer . . . . He seems to be following a long white line . . . . Why shouldn’t it be there? He’s on the track isn’t he? That’s where he belongs . . . . with the roar of the crowd in his swimming brain. For a fleeting second, Henry Jones can actually see the stadium . . . . the other runners . . . . that bright day in Berlin. He’s passing the box where the frowning little man with the small clipped moustache eyes him like a cobra.

Jones: “I’ll show him! I’ll show him how a black man can win!!”

Kirby’s story highlights the paradox of a segregated, racist America fighting an anti-racist war.

Integration of Baseball

The emergence of baseball from the Jim Crow era is well-documented, and when comics of the 1940s featured black baseball players, particularly Jackie Robinson, they called upon this history. As Fawcett’s *Jackie Robinson #2* aptly puts it, “the baseball world watched his every move with bated breath, for he was the first Negro star in big league ball.” Whereas boxing could be labeled a world sport, baseball’s sphere of influence was more confined, and so the effect of desegregation of the game was greatest at home in the United States. In American comics, though, there was little difference between the two (boxing and baseball). Both demonstrated to readers that their world was changing, that different races could live together equally and respect each other, and that it was right to do so. Every time a young American read a comic revering a black athlete, the potential was there for positive change to be effected.

These comic book stories were written seemingly with the assumption that the reader was either fully aware of the racist status quo, and so it did not need mentioning, or, more likely, that the truth was too much of an indictment of America to be acknowledged publicly in the media. Erasure of the actual oppression of the
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black community and of the true intensity of the racism faced by black athletes takes place in all of the non-fiction comics examined. Yet, the underlying and unpleasant truth of a racially divided America sometimes came through as the lives of black athletes were recounted in comic books for general consumption.

An example of tacit recognition of the racial divide is found in the excellent biography of another baseball legend, Satchel Paige, in the 23 April 1953 issue of Treasure Chest of Fun and Fact. After detailing Paige’s rise from humble beginnings, his illustrious career, and exemplary character, the last page finishes with an anecdote from Paige’s later years, when a black woman approached him outside the ball park and said, “Mr. Paige, there’s something I want to tell you. I want to thank you for all the glory and prestige you’ve brought our race.” Paige replies, “Thank you. I’m a lucky man.”65 The implications are manifold. From the perspective of an outside inquirer hoping to learn about American society of the period, it seems that the black race had to account for itself, in fact in ways that the white majority did not. Entry into the Eurocentric mainstream was at least partially obtainable, but required the individual to excel in a field recognized by that mainstream as a permissible area of achievement for blacks. As the example of Joe Louis demonstrated, black sports personalities had also to be seen as possessing high moral stature from the perspective of American values, and Satchel Paige fit the bill in all these areas. Comic books thus provide a source of social history that is usually very muffled or muted with respect to controversial issues related to race, because they were written, drawn, and published mainly by and for the white mainstream, albeit an often sympathetic component of that population.

The reality for black baseball players was far, far less comfortable than the sanitized version depicted in the comics. As Swaine writes, “following the trail blazed by Jackie Robinson, the first generation of black baseball stars” had to endure “the prejudice and hostility of teammates and fans, dodging beanballs fired at their heads and flashing spikes aimed for their shins,” suffering “the indignities of Jim Crow laws, racial slurs, and threats against their lives.”66 The Negro leagues from whence those pioneer players came, like many areas of black achievement, have been overlooked until recently, perhaps because they constituted “a blot on America’s conscience.”67 Typically, Negro League teams were black-owned, “the earliest teams” traveling the country engaging “in barnstorming sport,” playing against both black and white opposition, and often adding some kind of
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“showmanship . . . to boost attendance.”68 Ironically, in their interactions with the white leagues during the thirties and forties, the Negro leagues provided the same “challenge to white supremacist beliefs” in the United States as Jesse Owens and Joe Louis did against their master race Nazi opponents on the track and in the ring, and this logically unacceptable state of affairs did not go unheralded in the press.69 The black newspaper, “the Pittsburgh Courier, was particularly famous for its ‘Double V’ (double victory) campaign, which insisted that a victory abroad must be accompanied by a victory at home.”70 Comics rarely went as far as bringing up this very sordid issue during the forties and fifties, although it was not unheard of.71 Black sportsmen themselves openly subscribed to the double victory as the goal of World War II, Satchel Paige and Joe Louis being self-declared proponents.72

Harlem Globetrotters

The Chicago-based Harlem Globetrotters basketball team eventually was engaged by the U.S. government to promote a false image of harmonious race relations in the United States to representatives and communities of other countries. This was done to counter communist propaganda highlighting the hypocrisy of racial discrimination in the showcase democracy of the United States.73 A beautifully illustrated biography of the Globetrotters presented in the unnumbered Winter 1952 issue of Ziff-Davis’s Bill Stern’s Sports Book explains that the team had already established foreign tours as an expanded version of their U.S. barnstorming program, before the government got involved. In 1951 they visited Germany, and when requested by the high commissioner of the U.S. Occupation Zone, used their act to upstage a communist youth rally scheduled at the same time. At half-time this event also included the highly emotional return of Jesse Owens to the Berlin stadium in which he had been insulted by the Nazis in 1936, only this time to a standing ovation and a public apology.74 It was because “the Globetrotters have proven themselves ambassadors of extraordinary good will wherever they have gone” that the State Department wrote them after the 1951 tour, offering its continued support.75

This relationship with the State Department continued with black sports personalities into the 1970s. The Department supported the 1970 tour of Africa by
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black tennis star Arthur Ashe, which reaped the desired results in terms of defusing “global criticism of racism in the USA.” However, the failure the next year of the uncooperative “NBA stars Kareem Abdul-Jabbar and Oscar Robertson . . . accelerated the end of utilizing star black athletes as cultural ambassadors.”

The Globetrotters, whose name, The Harlem Globetrotters, was chosen “so people will know we’re a negro team,” benefitted from this ambassadorial role by being able to promote their brand of entertainment worldwide. In doing so, however, they acquiesced to racist traditions by adopting a minstrel stereotype image in the comedic component of their performance. They maintained an all-black roster, counter to the gathering momentum of moves to eliminate race-based hiring. But despite the team being all black, their owner and manager Abe Saperstein was white, demonstrating the status quo in integrated baseball as well, and sport generally, which was that although the teams may have included black players because they wanted to hire based on ability, the owners, “head coaches, front office” staff, “and senior administration” were still white and it was they who retained power.

Accuracy in the Depictions of Black Sportsmen in Comics

In order to assess the accuracy of portrayals of black sportsmen in comics of desegregating America in the mid-twentieth century, the accounts in the purportedly non-fiction comic books have to be compared with historical texts. It is important, however, to first remind the reader that artistic license has a significant role in comic book stories grounded in fact, the incidental dialogue clearly having to be largely contrived. The influence of the author on the version of history portrayed also has to be acknowledged.

On a superficial level, simple details of an athlete’s career achievements, or of those from a specific season or game, were so well-known to the public at the time that their accuracy is not really in question. An example here would be the account of the 1955 Dodgers’ season found in the Catholic comic, Treasure Chest. Blow-by-blow sequences of events from key games, the contributions of individual players, including Campanella, Newcombe, and Robinson, batting averages and other statistics, are infused throughout the story, but it is not about race at all.
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It is about an extremely memorable season for Dodgers fans, and baseball fans generally, with the writer focusing on great baseball. In the case of Joe Louis, in real life the racism and discrimination that his character and achievements countered was downplayed in favor of a profile that made him the symbol of black “heroism, patriotic values, and black military significance.” In the comics only Nazi racism is given acknowledgement, with the racist reality of American society significantly muted. The comic book’s role as an instrument of propaganda is highlighted by the following dialog from Fawcett’s Joe Louis #2:

Reporter: “Do you really think Louis will be gunshy of your right hand?”

Schmeling: “He knows I’m his master! He knows as well as I do no member of an inferior race can beat a true Aryan!”

Narration: On June 22, 1938, a grim Joe Louis waited for his biggest test!

Trainer: “I’ve never seen you so serious, Chappie!”

Louis: “I want to stay that way until I get into the ring! Like any good American, I don’t like the Nazis—and this is my chance to show how I feel about it!”

Published in 1950, this propaganda retroactively reinforces the righteousness of American involvement in World War II, perhaps as part of an ongoing appeal to society and especially the black community to maintain faith in democracy in the face of the communist threat. But as a historical document it is flawed. It fails to recognize Schmeling’s disinclination to being seen by the Nazis as their harbinger of white supremacy, and instead repeats the false reporting of the press, particularly the black newspapers such as the Pittsburgh Courier, in claiming Schmeling spouted racist rhetoric ahead of the Madison Square Garden bout. Schmeling’s own account of the previous 19 June 1936 contest in the Yankee Stadium, in which he defeated Louis, seems surprisingly lacking in bigoted language in light of these later accusations, supporting the notion that American journalists were contriving a negative image of Schmeling as a racist to support their own agenda. Schmeling always denied making such statements, and amply demonstrated his ideological stance by refusing to join the Nazi party (for which he was made to join the paratroopers) and by fraternizing with Jews, famously rescuing two Jewish children from “the Kristallnacht Pogrom of November 1938.” Schmeling and Louis later became friends, and the former provided financial assistance to Joe’s
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widow after the latter’s death in 1981. The comics, therefore, only portray the false image promoted of Schmeling in the 1930s press, yet this was reality as far as the public were concerned at that time, because of media influence. Comic book portrayals of Louis as an upstanding American seem correct both in terms of the propaganda image of him promoted by the U.S. government and the media, as well as of the man himself. The comics play into the policy of a government “unwilling to press for structural change” that would alleviate the oppression of the black community, believing “that the use of black cultural symbols could reconcile the escalating ‘Negro problem’ with official pronouncements of American egalitarianism.” Black sportsmen of the time, in real life and in the comics, were held up as examples of this. The comics are also true to the popular image of Louis as the champion of democracy rather than just of his race, the latter becoming a natural consequence of the former. Again, from Fawcett’s Joe Louis #2, comes the following:

Louis: “This is it! America’s behind me in this fight . . .!”

Narration: “There was an avenging fury in Joe’s tiger-like attack, for he was fighting for the democracy he held so sacred, yet the crafty Teuton still eluded real punishment! At last, Louis saw an opening in the German’s guard! He swiftly hammered a right hand answer to Nazi arrogance!”

Then, after the fight, amidst placards saying, “what happened to the master race?” “Adolph Hitler is sorry now!” and “Our Joe took care of that Nazi man!”:

Man: “You’re really the champ now! Everybody in the crowd is rooting for you, Chappie!”

Louis: “I’ll try never to let them down! The way I see it, all of us won that fight! We proved that those Nazis aren’t any master race!”

Overall, non-fiction comic book accounts of Louis appear faithful to the actual timeline of events in his life, and this seems true of all non-fiction sports comics and the personalities they honor, but the coverage of these events is selective. The role of Louis as a “race uplift icon” is portrayed in a limited way, but the huge public celebrations of the black man beating the white oppressor within the black community that followed his victories are not in evidence in the comics.
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In the case of those comics that provide basic details of the life of a player or the history of a team, the facts they present are easily verifiable by cross-referencing with written, recorded, or film accounts, and for games or seasons, would be well-known to fans. An example of a comic that presents an account that remains at this level of detail is the one-shot Fawcett comic that tells the “Thrilling True Story of the Baseball Giants.”93 The comic gives a blow-by-blow account of the Giants’ legendary 1951 season, in the process recognizing the contributions of black players Monte Irvin and Willie Mays. An example of a historical account of a famous black athlete is that of early twentieth century boxer Sam Langford, whose long and successful career never included a shot at the world title, thanks to the color bar, and reigning champion Jack Johnson’s refusal to fight him. Langford almost defeated Johnson prior to the latter becoming champ.94 Such one-shot accounts appear to be historically accurate and are typical of features on individuals in both multi-genre and sports genre comics. Entire comics about an individual athlete offer more detailed accounts of their lives. Detailing statistical records, Don Newcombe’s childhood and his battle with pneumonia, the steps he took from obscurity through to greatness as a top professional, and the development of his skills along the way, Fawcett’s one-shot book about the Dodgers star typifies this type of comic.95 Again, all such accounts can be compared with written historical material, the latter probably being the source of information for the comic books in the first place.

The Messages in Sports Comics with Black Athletes

While the realities of racial tension, Jim Crow, segregation, and prejudice were minimized by the sports comics of the mid-twentieth century, racism was not ignored completely. Some acknowledgement of the struggles the black athletes who broke the color barrier experienced can be found by careful reading of the comics. Jackie Robinson’s difficulties gaining acceptance in the Major Leagues is referred to directly in a story about a wayward youngster that Robinson took under his wing. As he tries to encourage the white boy from a lower socioeconomic background, Jackie says, “I made the World Series and had two strikes against me from the start because I’m a negro!”96 From a neutral, outsider perspective, this appears as a major indictment of American society, but at the time the fact that such a statement could be found in a comic book is an indicator that positive change was taking place. Nevertheless, it is just a small hint at the enormity of the racist abuse that black athletes faced,97 a tiny tip of the iceberg that remained
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hidden from view in the pages of the comics. Comic book stories about Jackie Robinson, for example, fail to mention the relentless barrage of verbal insults, the deliberate attempts to cause him injury, and even the death threats that he had to endure, without retaliating, “to prove that a Negro could make it in the major leagues.”

While black sports personalities are depicted as great achievers in their comic book portrayals, there is still evidence of the underlying racial stratification of American society to be found in the subtexts of these presentations. Sports features in comics often have a narrator, presenter, or host, who is invariably white. For example, the feature on boxer Sugar Ray Robinson, a friend and colleague of Joe Louis, as with other stories in the comic in which it appears, is narrated by famous sportscaster Bill Stern. Similarly, the biography of Jesse Owens in the Catholic multi-genre comic, Treasure Chest of Fun and Fact, was narrated by Chicago Tribune sports editor Arch Ward. A similar biography of Joe Louis, again narrated by Ward begins: “Joe Louis’ rise from the Alabama cotton fields to the heavyweight champion of the world is the story of a man who has probably done more for the sport than has any other boxer and more for the negro people than has any other athlete in the history of the race.”

Non-fiction comic books that described the lives of black sportsmen contributed to the eventual establishment of a pluralistic national heritage and the strengthening of African American identity. One cannot dismiss the desegregation of sports as being inconsequential to Civil Rights. Similarly, respectful portrayals of black sportsmen in comics of the forties and fifties paved the way for the initially-lacking accurate and non-offensive representations of diversity in American society in the comics.

It is because the comics analyzed for this study come from a transitional period in American history that they are both incomplete in their presentation of the facts, as well as carrying racist subtexts, these latter often being quite subtle. In their study of early 1970s television cartoons, Mendelson and Young noted that “all figures of authority, or sources of information . . . are white.” They discovered, however, that black characters most commonly had positive traits, while white characters tended to have a mixture of both positive and negative traits. In assessing the humorous Globetrotters cartoon series they observed that the relationship between the team and their white manager, Granny, while being
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one of mutual affection, was also one of mild condescension on Granny’s part, and as with other cartoon series of that time featuring black protagonists, most of the Globetrotters’ interactions are with white characters.105 This state of affairs is accurately transferred to the Gold Key/Whitman *Harlem Globetrotters* comic book series discussed earlier, and seems to suggest that famous black personalities can traverse the color barrier into mainstream Eurocentric society if they have a white sponsor, and they will then be interacting with whites rather than the majority of the black community, who remain on the other side of the tracks. In some ways this is true of the real Harlem Globetrotters and their white manager, although, at least early on, they certainly interacted with minority communities as well as white, with their early-twentieth-century Chicago roots.106 Yet even in this regard, when in the 1930s the Globetrotters competed on the barnstorming circuit with the “Chinese American . . . Hong Wah Kues . . ., the white Bearded Aces and the Native American Sioux Travelers-Warriors,” they participated in a “fantasy of equality against the context of saturating society with essentialized and consumerist versions of race” that supported white supremacy.107

Typically, and where appropriate, comic book accounts of the lives and achievements of black sports stars accentuate any displays of exemplary compassion, integrity, generosity, and altruism on the part of that personality that would likely gain the reader’s admiration. However, depictions in comics of prominent black athletes accepted by the white majority, such as the internationally renowned Joe Louis and Jesse Owens, accurately reflect the fact that “they were careful to follow whites’ prescription for black behavior . . . . They were compliant . . . but they also represented American might and superiority.”108 This is the aspect of the story of the early integration of sport most faithfully reported by non-fiction comics to their predominantly white readers, judging by the comics examined for this study. While the underlying racial stratification of society is evident from sub-texts but rarely acknowledged overtly, respectful portrayals of black sportsmen in comics of the forties and fifties paved the way for an accurate and non-offensive representation of diversity in American society in the comics.
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Eastern Airlines: Deregulation, Labor Wars, and Bankruptcy
Rhonda Cifone
Florida Atlantic University

The late 1970s was a time of transformation for the airline industry in the United States; turbulence in the air took a back seat to the instability on the ground created by deregulation of the industry. The main goal of airline deregulation was to produce lower ticket prices for the consumer. Several airlines, including United and Delta, took advantage of this new system by making sound business decisions, allowing the growth and strengthening of their companies, while others, including Eastern Airlines, faltered and eventually failed. Eastern’s financial problems began long before deregulation. Customer service and fleet issues, the oil embargo led by the Organization of the Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC), economic recessions, and contentious relationships between management and labor unions created a landscape ripe for the eventual collapse of EAL. The complexity of Eastern’s labor relations, magnified by the changes in the industry created by deregulation, led to the final destruction of one of America’s legacy airlines in early 1991.¹

Eastern Airlines final day of operations, 18 January 1991, brought many emotions to the surface for employees. Past employees have compared the decline and “death” of Eastern Airlines (EAL) to a family member fighting cancer and losing the battle. “Eastern was a family and many of us that had the privilege to work for the company still consider it the best time of our lives. Working for Eastern was glamorous and the best job I have ever had. That is not to say that the tension between management and employees was not substantial and at times overwhelming. Shirley Guerrero remembers joining her dad on the picket lines yelling ‘Hey Hey Ho Ho Frank Lorenzo has to go.’”² The personal vendetta between the labor unions and Frank Lorenzo (EAL management) continued to grow and it became evident that no one was going to win this battle. The joyous memories of working for Eastern combined with the anger and sense of loss were overwhelming that dreadful January day and Thompson was emphatic stating, “I wished we would have worked harder to save Eastern and our jobs.”³

Scholarship on the demise of Eastern Airlines has covered a wide variety of topics from many different perspectives. Many of the early studies, found in trade

and business journals, focused on the Airline Deregulation Act of 1978 (ADA) and its effects on the airline industry at large, rather than on any particular airline. In 1983 William N. Leonard explained the structure and goals of the ADA and explored the connection, if any, between deregulation and the financial instability of several airlines, including Eastern. Leonard argued, “There is no nonstop connection between deregulation and financial loss. The analyst must take into account the length and severity of the recession, which cut sharply into both business and pleasure travel, as well as the inflation of costs.”4 This article opened the door for further studies shifting the trend in research from focusing strictly on airline deregulation to individual airlines and their specific problems.5

The Eastern Airlines mechanics decision to strike in 1989 brought labor issues within the airline industry to the forefront of the discussion. Robert B. McKersie published an overview of EAL’s union-management relationship tensions, comparing the hostility between parties to a bitter divorce battle. Kenneth Jennings continued this trend, arguing that the animosity between Eastern’s chapter of the International Association of Machinists (IAM) and Frank Borman in 1985 helped push the airline into Frank Lorenzo’s control. Both scholars agreed that personalities and “contests of wills” involved in the EAL labor disputes created an insurmountable impasse that led to the downfall of Eastern Airlines.6 While a great deal of literature exists on this topic it was not until the failure of Eastern Airlines in 1991 that scholars began writing monographs on the subject. EAL’s failure sparked a new interest in the influence of deregulation and other possible factors that created the financial woes of Eastern. Scholars in economics, political science, law, and history produced more detailed studies using multidisciplinary approaches to the topic.7

**Early History of Eastern Airlines**

Eastern Airlines, one of the “Big Four Airlines,” began in 1927 as Pitcairn Aviation, a carrier created to aid the United States Postal Service with mail delivery. Economist Jack Robinson contends, “The Air Mail Scandal or ‘Spoils Conference’ changed the airline industry’s focus away from mail service and toward passenger service creating new opportunities for airlines.”8 Renamed Eastern Air Transport after General Motors purchased Pitcairn Aviation, the carrier began passenger service between New York and Richmond on 18 August 1930. Eastern Air Transport continued to expand its services and flourished as a result of
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the Air Mail Act of 1934. In 1935 Eastern Air Transport became Eastern Airlines and Eddie Rickenbacker, the newly named general manager, made immediate changes to move the airline into the future. He not only moved most of the airline operations to Miami, Florida, he also updated Eastern’s fleet, solidifying the company’s emphasis on passenger service within the eastern corridor. In 1938, with General Motors’s sale of EAL, Rickenbacker became president, taking control of the airline’s operations.9

The next several years brought great changes for the airline industry with the United States involvement in World War II. Rickenbacker, a staunch supporter of the war effort, promised EAL equipment and personnel for use during the war; the airline transported 47,000 military passengers and 14 million tons of cargo over the course of the war. During this same period most airlines moved away from mail service and began focusing on passenger travel. In an effort to stay ahead of other carriers Rickenbacker added the newest most advanced planes to Eastern’s fleet, including the Douglas DC-4, DC-6, and DC-7. The Civil Aeronautics Board (CAB) decided to award new routes in 1944 creating more competition in the market; to Rickenbacker’s displeasure both National Airlines and Delta Airlines benefitted greatly, receiving the more lucrative Jacksonville- New York and Chicago-Miami routes respectively. Historian David Russell argues, “although the CAB awarded Eastern the St. Louis-Washington and Boston-New York routes Delta Airlines became prime competition for EAL after 1944.”10 Eastern remained the most profitable airline during the war years and with Eddie Rickenbacker’s desire to expand into Canada, South America, and the Caribbean the future looked bright for the airline.11

The Move into the Jet Age

Eastern Airlines entered the 1950s, otherwise known as the Golden Years of aviation, economically sound, with an unmatched safety record, maintaining a virtual monopoly serving the Eastern Seaboard. However, Rickenbacker’s indifference regarding customer service gave EAL the reputation as the airline with the worst customer service. Eastern was the only airline that ever had passengers who formed an organization dedicated to publicly criticizing and harassing the company. David Russell argued that this attitude caused customers to switch carriers, eventually damaging the company’s economic position in the industry. Eastern’s poor decision-making in regard to fleet development further damaged the company’s status. Rickenbacker’s reluctance to purchase jetliners, while Eastern’s competitors invested heavily in jets, allowed Delta Airlines to dominate markets

---

9 Robinson, Freefall; Russell, Eastern Airlines: A History. The Big Four Airlines consisted of Eastern, Pan Am, United, and American.
shared by both airlines. This eventually led the airline to replace Rickenbacker with Malcolm MacIntyre as President.12

Moving into the 1960s Eastern continued to decline under MacIntyre, who knew little about running an airline. Economist Thomas Derdak claims the poor economic climate in the industry, the effect of Rickenbacker’s continued meddling (as Chairman of the Board), and the CAB’s opposition to long haul monopolies, posed major problems for Eastern. MacIntyre worked hard to regain consumer confidence by improving customer service, lowering costs, and including the Boeing 727 in Eastern’s fleet. He was also responsible for the successful air shuttle service linking Boston, New York, and Washington D.C.; however, several airline crashes and three labor strikes eventually led to MacIntyre’s downfall.13

In 1963, with the dismissal of Malcolm MacIntyre and the retirement of Eddie Rickenbacker, Eastern experienced major changes in upper management. Rickenbacker approached Floyd Hall, formally of Trans World Airways (TWA), as his possible successor in hopes that Hall would revitalize EAL as he had successfully done at TWA. Hall viewed this job as the “chance of a lifetime,” an opportunity to prove that his success at TWA was not a stroke of luck. When he took over Eastern it had over $70 million dollars in debt and very little customer support. He immediately set his plan, Operation Bootstrap, into action with proposals to generate revenue, improve on-time performance, and improve customer service, producing a $30 million profit by 1965. Unfortunately for Hall this success was short lived; Eastern found itself heading toward bankruptcy in 1967. Top heavy management and severe tensions between the New York and Miami offices, along with the International Association of Machinists (IAM) strike (8 July 1966) that shut down Eastern and four other major airlines during a peak travel season, created a dire financial situation for Floyd Hall and EAL. Things continued to deteriorate into the late sixties; between continued issues with the CAB’s control over routes and Hall’s eventual disengagement due to internal conflicts in management, Operation Bootstrap was no longer effective. Hall hoped that Walt Disney World naming Eastern Airlines as its official airline carrier would revive it; however, because of the depth of the financial issues within the company, even this could not save the airline from financial misfortune, eventually leading to Hall recruit Frank Borman in 1968.14

The Borman Years

In 1969 Frank Borman accepted a position as a consultant and member of the Board of Directors at Eastern Airlines. In response to the Eastern pilots’ work slowdowns Borman’s first responsibility was to negotiate a new contract with the
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Airline Pilots Association (ALPA). His status as a former astronaut earned him respect from the pilots and, although he had no previous experience, Borman successfully negotiated a new contract with ALPA. Unfortunately, this new contract did not help Eastern as it produced the lowest pilot utilization in the history of the airline industry. This along with required pilot training on the new 727 aircraft created a major pilot shortage during the busy winter tourist season, causing more financial distress for EAL. Borman was totally unprepared for the situation he encountered at EAL, stating,

My first impressions of Eastern were dismal. . . . What I found was a plush and structured operation, full of committees and policy groups that met once a month apparently only to argue over whether Miami or New York was right about something. Eastern’s management was a long way from what I was used to at NASA, where the guy who has all the information and knowledge was directly involved in staff meetings, answering questions fast. At Eastern, the man who knew all the answers had to sift his expertise through three levels of management. Eastern seemed to be unable to make decisions rapidly.\(^\text{15}\)

Borman continued to contend with administration issues, along with the excessive perks for EAL executives, including a private jet and elegant company cars, as he quickly climbed the ranks at Eastern.\(^\text{16}\)

Six months after the negotiation of the pilots’ contract Hall named Borman Senior Vice President of the company and he became head of flight operations, engineering and maintenance. During this period Eastern began flying the Lockheed Tri-Star 1011, which proved to be problematic for the airline. Not only did it create financial hardships due to the constant delays and cancellations because of engine problems, it was also the aircraft involved in the 29 December 1972 crash of Flight 401 into the Everglades. Borman himself went to the crash site, gaining further respect from management, employees, and customers for the way he handled the victims and their families in this catastrophe. Eastern managed to finish the year with a $19.7 million profit, but financial problems continued to loom on the horizon for the airline.\(^\text{17}\)

Eastern struggled through 1973, coming close to bankruptcy once again. The addition of Caribair in May 1973 helped Eastern secure its market share in the Caribbean but also added $10.4 million to its corporate debt. Nonstop feuding between Floyd Hall and Samuel L. Higginbottom and the labor unions’ continual pressure for wage increases put further burdens on EAL. According to David Russell, “labor costs were a key problem for Eastern, and represented forty percent of total expenditures of the company. Labor unions had pushed the costs upward

\(^{15}\) Serling, From the Captain to the Colonel, 446-447.  
in every contract negotiation to the point where Eastern’s costs were the highest in the industry.”\(^\text{18}\) The most serious blow for Eastern in 1973 was the OPEC oil embargo that started in October. Eastern stumbled through 1973 and the difficulties continued into the next few years.\(^\text{19}\)

The OPEC oil embargo created a crisis for all airlines, raising fuel costs almost 163 percent between October 1973 and the end of 1974. Eastern was initially able to minimize its losses by reducing the number of flights and laying off over 4,000 employees. In a January 1974 Wall Street Journal interview Floyd Hall stated, “U.S. air carriers may need large federal subsidies and face the threat of bankruptcies, nationalization or whatever you want to call it because of sharply soaring jet fuel prices.”\(^\text{20}\) Hall also suggested that Eastern would go in front of the CAB to propose fare increases along with reductions in food, liquor, and other passenger amenities to make up for the increase in the cost of fuel, further suggesting a fuel surcharge if the crisis continued much longer. The jet fuel crisis magnified problems within Eastern’s management and its policies for running the airline.\(^\text{21}\)

With problems seemingly growing, Eastern’s Board of Directors began interviewing many of its managers, including Frank Borman, who responded to questions regarding Eastern’s difficulties unequivocally, stating,

[Eastern] is still a polarized company. The guys from New York have the attitude that everyone from Miami is just hired help, that New York has all the brains and should do all the thinking. Miami’s where the real action is and that’s where corporate headquarters should be. There is too much rancor among the executives. Around here it’s as if management’s style is to pit people against each other and see who survives.\(^\text{22}\)

On 27 May 1975, Eastern’s Board named Frank Borman president and chief operating officer. Unfortunately with Floyd Hall remaining on as chairman and chief executive officer, Borman experienced a rough road filled with conflicts over everything from jacket colors on customer service staff to personnel decisions.\(^\text{23}\)

Once again tragedy stuck EAL shortly after Borman became president. On 24 June 1975, Eastern Flight 66 from New Orleans to John F. Kennedy airport in New York crashed, killing all but 12 on board. Borman responded as he did with the Flight 401 catastrophe and was elected CEO in December of the same year. With Hall’s retirement from Eastern a year later, Borman was ready to make the

\(^{18}\) Ibid., p. 152-3.

\(^{19}\) Serling, *From the Captain to the Colonel*, 476-80. On 6 October 1972 Syria and Egypt launched a surprise attack on Israel, and the United States supported Israel by supplying arms. This caused OPEC to announce an oil embargo against the U.S. which immediately drove up oil and gas prices. The embargo ended in March of 1974, but by that time the damage to the airline industry was already done.


\(^{21}\) Ibid.


changes necessary to turn around the fourth largest airline in the United States. The financial burdens created by a high debt load and fleet problems were compounded by the low productivity and low morale of Eastern’s 32,000 employees. Borman began immediately by relocating all but ten of the New York office employees to Miami, and he cut many of the perks Eastern executives enjoyed, including high end company cars and membership in elite social clubs. Within his first year Borman had eliminated twenty four high level executives, stating “the hardest part was the head-chopping. Only a sadist would get pleasure out of firing anybody and I hated having to tell employees they were finished.” This was only the beginning of the changes at Eastern under Borman’s leadership.

Borman continued by tackling Eastern’s debt and the short term loans that banks were ready to call in. In an attempt to save EAL from possible bankruptcy he went to the banks, along with Charlie Simmons, senior vice president of finance, requesting an extension on the loans. The banks denied the extension request based on inadequate savings predictions, leaving Borman only one option, to ask the employees for concessions. Although this was a longshot, Borman traveled around the country to talk to employees and give them the bleak but realistic story, “Eastern was not going to survive if the employees did not accept the wage freeze he was requesting.” He incorporated stock options and profit sharing into his future plans for employees, creating a sense of cooperation between management and employees. Reluctantly the unions agreed to support the salary modification program, including pay freezes in 1976 to prevent default on loans, saving the airline for the time being. A spokesman for ALPA stated, “union cooperation . . . occurred because Mr. Borman, unlike other Eastern officials, preferred to solicit opinions instead of dictating conditions.” The management of Eastern successfully cleared this hurdle and looked forward to success in the future.

The airline made progress over the next few years. Eastern showed a $45 million profit at the end of 1976, the highest in the company’s history. Borman continued his cuts of middle management in 1977, reducing the payroll by over $9 million annually, and the company continued to show profits through 1978, but these actions gave Borman a reputation for being cold-blooded and heartless. Ignoring his new reputation, Borman focused on improving customer service and tackling the problems with Eastern’s aging fleet. With a new public relations slogan, “we have to earn our wings every day,” EAL moved from last in customer service to second in the CAB ratings. Borman was pleased with this progress and he switched his focus to updating Eastern’s fleet. He decided to completely overhaul
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the older fuel-guzzling fleet by purchasing the Airbus 300, incurring a heavy debt load. Finally Eastern seemed to be on the right track, until 24 October 1978.²⁹

**Airline Deregulation**

The $3 million debt incurred with purchase of new aircraft, combined with airline deregulation, would prove disastrous for Borman. On 24 October 1978, President Jimmy Carter signed the Airline Deregulation Act (ADA) into law, radically changing the airline industry overnight. Deregulation promised the end of rate and route restrictions, creating more competition between airlines. The increased competition would benefit the consumer by reducing fares and offering more choices. Most airlines did not see this as a positive direction; United was the only company that supported deregulation. Borman did not support the bill at all. Addressing Congress, he warned of instability in the industry and loss of service to smaller, less profitable routes. He expressed his concerns in a 1980 interview with Ken Gepfert of the Los Angeles Times, stating “I see a great crunch coming in the middle of the 1980’s.”³⁰ The introduction of new startup airlines, offering greatly reduced rates, affected the profitability of the major airlines by enticing the casual traveler away from the major carriers. This had a devastating effect because Eastern relied on the vacation-tourist market from the northeast to Florida. According to Thomas Derdak, “Eastern struggled to adapt . . . to the reduced revenue and shrinking market share, a result of increased competition after deregulation.”³¹ Eastern found itself struggling, posting losses of over $200 million between 1979 and 1983, and forcing Frank Borman to go to both employees and creditors for concessions in order to avoid bankruptcy.³²

All three labor unions agreed to major wage concessions (including reductions in vacation pay) in 1984, and in return received stock and four seats on Eastern’s Board of Directors. Ironically Charles Bryan, president of the International Association of Machinists (IAM), who would later become Frank Borman’s enemy, agreed with these concessions stating, “The concessions were necessary in order to have long term health for the company and most importantly peace of mind with employees in the workforce.”³³ Borman and Bryan developed an apparent respect for one another while traveling together to address both EAL employees and the public on the new era of Eastern Airlines. The cooperation of the unions allowed Eastern to reduce its losses in 1984, primarily due to the wage concessions. In an attempt to avoid a two-front war Borman also decided to halt Eastern’s loss-ridden operation in Houston, to focus on the profitable East Coast routes. Securities
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analyst Gail Beltram viewed this as a positive move for the airline.\textsuperscript{34} According to Gary Cohn of the Wall Street Journal, “Eastern [expected] an annual profit, the first since 1979, for this year [1985] estimated by analysts at close to $90 million. Despite its recent turnaround, Eastern was far weaker financially than the industry giants.”\textsuperscript{35} In response to the dramatic improvement, yet not totally confident in the airline’s long-term strength, Borman made critical decisions that would lead to his final downfall at the airline.\textsuperscript{36}

Borman decided to approach the unions for further wage concessions in 1985, angering all three labor unions. IAM president Charles Bryan responded, “This treacherous act by Frank Borman represents a total absence of credibility and the ultimate betrayal of the trust of our members and your union leaders.”\textsuperscript{37} It was at this point that the problems between the unions and Eastern management became personal. The respect and trust given to Frank Borman in the past was gone and it seemed as if his downfall was eminent. Borman recalled a conversation with his wife warning him that Charles Bryan was a potential enemy of both Borman and Eastern. She warned her husband, “He’s [Bryan] obsessed with the idea that he is in the same arena as Frank Borman. . . . You don’t even know him, he is a little guy who’s suddenly been given a lot of power. He doesn’t give a damn about Eastern.”\textsuperscript{38} Borman was now beginning to understand the difficulties he had in front of him dealing with the unions.\textsuperscript{39}

Borman insisted that the new concessions were necessary and gave the unions an ultimatum: if they refused to accept he would either sell the airline or take it into bankruptcy. Although ALPA and Transport Workers Union (TWU) reluctantly agreed, Charles Bryan and the IAM refused the concessions, countering with an offer of a 15 percent concession in exchange for Borman’s resignation. Eastern’s board of directors called Bryan’s bluff announcing the sale of Eastern to union buster Frank Lorenzo’s Texas Air. Bryan and the IAM played a very influential role in the demise of Eastern by pushing it into the hands of Frank Lorenzo.\textsuperscript{40}

**Frank Lorenzo and the End of Eastern Airlines**

The final era of Eastern Airlines began under Frank Lorenzo in 1986. Lorenzo, the president of Texas Air, previously brought Continental Airlines from the brink of failure by breaking the unions and transforming the airline into a low-cost carrier. Under Borman and deregulation, Eastern suffered more than other airlines and many hoped that Lorenzo would be the one to turn it around. Charles
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Bryan expressed his cautious optimism: “I’ve reached the point where I don’t think we can do a lot worse than we’ve been doing. [Lorenzo] is a businessman; we’ll probably be able to work together.”\textsuperscript{41} He could not have been more wrong. Shortly after Borman’s resignation Eastern announced 1,500 layoffs and Lorenzo pushed management to discipline and fire employees, voicing concerns over previously negotiated salaries that were too high for the future success of Eastern. Taking it one step further, Lorenzo awarded jet engine repair contracts to the manufacturers, causing over 300 mechanics to lose their jobs. These practices sent a firm message to the unions: Frank Lorenzo would not play their game. Lorenzo went as far as saying, “the attitude of the IAM members is intolerable.”\textsuperscript{42} The relationship between labor unions and Eastern’s management continued to deteriorate under Lorenzo.\textsuperscript{43} 

Eastern’s labor expenses were the third highest among major carriers in 1987, behind only Delta and United, totaling 36 percent of operating costs, and Lorenzo was pushing the machinists union for cuts of up to 40 percent. He did not stop with the machinists, pushing both ALPA and TWU for major cuts, to the point that the president of ALPA stated, “he gave us no hope for the future.”\textsuperscript{44} With the threat of a machinist’s strike on the horizon Lorenzo tried to subcontract outside pilots to cross the picket lines if Eastern pilots honored the machinist’s strike. Judge John Pratt of the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia thwarted this move, ruling that unilateral transfer of employees was a violation of the Railway Labor Act. But this ruling did not stop Lorenzo, who insisted he would continue to take extreme measures to save Eastern.\textsuperscript{45} 

The new management at Eastern followed by attacking the route structure at EAL, canceling the Miami-London route and dropping over seventy five percent of the flights out of Charlotte, North Carolina. Many, including Charles Bryan, suspected that Lorenzo’s intentions were to have Continental take these routes over, further weakening Eastern. Lorenzo continued this trend, selling the most profitable pieces of the company; the Eastern shuttle to Donald Trump and EAL’s advanced computerized reservation system to Texas Air. The unions viewed these moves as an attempt to strip the company of assets before a possible strike. Although Lorenzo denied this, a memo from Eastern official Guy Uddenberg confirmed Lorenzo’s intentions, clearly stating Lorenzo’s plans for Eastern: 

When we are on the same footing as [Continental on a cost and revenue basis, five years from now], we will be one airline. If we can’t cut our costs our aircraft will go to Continental….The differences this year are that we have
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\textsuperscript{45} Jennings, “Union Management Tumult,” 23. In 1987 the highest-paid baggage handler at Eastern earned $80,216, while the average wage of a baggage handler at the other major airlines was $47,000 (\textit{Aviation Daily}, 16 March 1988.
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the cash by selling things — to prevent a strike…We will not quit until we do what is right…no need for war with [machinists] as we have enough cash to bid out to hire people.\textsuperscript{46}

The unions filed a lawsuit on 30 March 1988 to block these sales, but were unsuccessful. There seemed to be no possible solution for the hostility between Lorenzo and the unions.\textsuperscript{47}

Negotiations between the unions and management were at an impasse and the IAM went into 1989 without a contract. The unions requested that the National Mediation Board get involved in the negotiations but they refused, and the AFL-CIO responded by launching a national campaign against Texas Air. These actions only created more tensions and on 9 March 1989, the machinists went on strike against Eastern, eventually forcing EAL into bankruptcy. The pilots and flight attendants originally supported the strike, basically grounding the airline, however by November they voted to return to work, giving the airline a glimmer of hope. In December Lorenzo continued breaking down EAL by selling the Latin American routes to generate cash, but this did not help solve Eastern’s cash crisis. High fuel costs and reduced passenger loads forced management to cut over 600 jobs and cut the pay of 20,000 other workers. Under these conditions Eastern seemed destined for failure.\textsuperscript{48}

Lorenzo continued his deceitful ways, backing away from prior debt repayment plans. Creditors responded by taking their concerns to bankruptcy court, and Judge Burton Lifland took control of Eastern away from Lorenzo, giving full control to airline executive Martin Shurgrue. According to John Schwartz of Newsweek, “this ruling marked the beginning of the end for one of the most bitter labor management struggles in airline history.”\textsuperscript{49} There was a sense of hope that under Shurgrue Eastern would be able to survive. Unfortunately, problems in the Middle East produced another major hurdle for EAL.\textsuperscript{50}

Tensions in the Middle East escalated in January 1991 when the United States began Operation Desert Storm, entering the conflict between Iraq and Kuwait. The resulting high oil prices and economic instability hurt the airline industry as a whole and proved disastrous for Eastern. This would be the final blow, and at midnight on 18 January 1991, Eastern Airlines shut down all operations permanently.\textsuperscript{51}
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Conclusion

Eastern Airlines exhibits the most turbulent history among the carriers of the Big Four Airlines, with its problems beginning long before the arrival of Frank Borman, Frank Lorenzo, or deregulation. The issues go back as far back as the 1940’s, beginning with Eddie Rickenbacker’s indifference to customer service and his unwillingness to join the jet age. The CAB’s route structure, and labor issues into the 1950s also played key roles in EAL’s early financial struggles, making it challenging for the airline to remain stable. The issues multiplied over time and it became more complicated for Eastern to recover. Bridget O’Brien may have said it best: “[Eastern was] finally battered into a shutdown by a succession of problems including monumental debt, labor strife, bankruptcy, [several] changes in management, and the Persian Gulf crisis.”52 Tensions grew as management changed and became more focused on concessions from labor, and under Borman the fight between unions and management became personal, creating an irreparable wedge between management and labor. Frank Lorenzo’s union busting tactics made things exponentially worse. Charles Bryan declared, “we are at war, and if we [machinists] go down so will Eastern.”53 It was this war that would finally seal EAL’s fate. Deregulation did not singlehandedly destroy EAL; many of the changes in the industry made it more difficult for Eastern to rebound from prior bad decisions and circumstances.54

Early on the morning of Tuesday, 29 September 1896, a powerful Category 3 hurricane struck Lake City, Florida. The storm caused severe damage to the downtown area. It destroyed many residences and places of business, and it damaged public buildings. The campus of Florida Agricultural College – which later became the University of Florida after its move to Gainesville in 1906 – suffered damage as well. Perhaps worst of all, the storm damaged the thriving industries in the area – timber, turpentine stills, and farms – as well as the railroad infrastructure that served North Central Florida. The casualty count also was significant: a total of nine local deaths were part of the 114 nationwide. One of the worst storms of its era, it caused over $100 million in damages. Over the years, scholars have described this hurricane as the first major storm to hit Florida during the telegraphic era when hurricanes first were tracked and plotted across space and time. A later scholarly account noted that this storm has been “classified as one of Florida’s great hurricanes.”

Much attention has been devoted to the storm’s impact on Cedar Key, a coastal town southwest of Lake City. The storm devastated the town and its recovery dominated the local media for several weeks. Little attention, however, has been paid to the impact of the storm on Lake City. The Columbia County recovery effort was less intensive than that of Cedar Key but it received the most press attention of any affected area in Florida. By the 1890s, Lake City had emerged from Reconstruction as a railroad and telegraph hub, a statewide leader in the timber industry, and also as the home of Florida Agricultural College. As the biggest town in North Central Florida, Lake City in 1896 had between 2,000 and 4,000 residents. It had a bustling downtown anchored by the railroad on the north end, the courthouse and City Hall on the shore of Lake Desoto midway down Marion Street, and the campus of Florida Agricultural College on the south end of Marion. The storm was a setback for the town but ultimately Lake City emerged more physically connected to its surrounding counties. After the initial storm trauma its residents, particularly some African Americans within the city limits, realized better living conditions as a result of the relief efforts. The town’s recovery from
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the storm was augmented by a fundraising drive publicized in the Jacksonville newspapers. Meanwhile, Florida Agricultural College made repairs but then began a ten-year decline culminating in its ultimate move to Gainesville a decade later.

1896 was a busy year for hurricanes in the Atlantic. Three destructive storms had formed in 1895 and a total of four were noted in 1896. A total of fifty Weather Bureau reporting stations tracked three storms in 1896, two of which veered out towards the North Atlantic. A July 1896 storm hit the Panhandle with some coastal damage. The fourth storm of that year would prove disastrous for the state of Florida.

On 22 September 1896 several Caribbean weather stations began tracking a storm that was moving westward from the Windward Islands towards Jamaica. Receiving updates by telegraph, Floridians stayed informed of these developments but may have thought little of them since storms rarely hit the state and certainly had never caused serious damage inland. In a report after the storm, the National Weather Service admitted that the storm did not attract immediate attention. Unfortunately, the storm “was not near enough to any of our stations to give any intimation of its violent character.” Telegraph stations in the region reported “only light to fresh winds . . . from that region during its passage.”

The storm entered the Gulf of Mexico on 27 September and continued on a northeastern track toward Florida. Once the storm hit the coast of Florida, the National Weather Service noted a change that rendered it much more destructive. “It contracted in area,” noted a weather service report, “and [it] developed almost tornadic force, causing great destruction along its path.” The area that first experienced the storm was Cedar Key, on Florida’s Gulf Coast.

Residents of Cedar Key first noticed the changing weather on Monday 28 September. A hard offshore wind had been blowing since the weekend. One local man recalled that “there were plenty of fish, but they acted crazy which was unusual.” As the sun set that night, another resident recalled that the sky “seemed like something that we had never seen before.” A gale began blowing around midnight, and residents noted a “screaming wind” starting at around 3:00 a.m. The wind increased beyond forty miles per hour and trees began to fall in the next few hours. “When the storm began,” a turpentine distiller noted in a key eyewitness account later published in the Florida Times-Union, “the clouds seemed to lie near the earth, and rolling like a huge cylinder. The light of day was almost obliterated.” For two hours the storm pounded Cedar Key, and the distiller concluded that “the
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dreadful suspense of those two mortal hours may be fully imagined, but never described.”

The town of Cedar Key was inundated by a storm surge of around ten feet. Many residents were killed and the coastal areas were cut off from civilization for several weeks. A national call went out for relief for Cedar Key. The town as it is known today was rebuilt, basically from scratch, after the 1896 hurricane. The late September storm happened to pass directly over the small town and unleashed its fury across an unusually small path. The narrow band of destruction was one of the “peculiarities that have not been seen in the few heavy blows of the kind that have been experienced in this State.”

Moving northeast away from Cedar Key at about thirty miles per hour, with sustained winds of about 125 miles per hour, the storm damaged rural areas until the eye wall hit downtown Lake City at about 7:00 a.m. A swath of damage fifty miles wide cut from the Gulf through Lake City and then on to the northeast to Savannah, which also was hit badly. Casualties and damage were reported as far north as Washington, D.C.

In Lake City at dawn on 29 September, a strong wind blew for about one hour, “doing vast damage” according to the Times-Union. The center of the storm hit downtown Lake City about an hour later, which produced a calm that lasted for five to ten minutes. As the eye passed over, “a number of persons noted the presence and passage of hot air, giving almost a sensation of steam.” Then a west wind began to blow, “with increased fury,” for another half hour, “doing even more damage than from the east.” So despite winds hitting the Lake City area only for about two hours, the damage reports were startling. “The dead are in some respects better than the living,” concluded the Times-Union.

Early reports of damage noted tremendous numbers of downed trees. “During the early parts of the storm the trees were torn up by the roots,” noted a Weather Bureau report written immediately after the storm. “But as the force of the wind increased they were broken and twisted off and thrown forward in a confused mass.” After a few hours of rain, “the weather rapidly cleared and the afternoon was a fine one. But the scene throughout the town and along the streets beggars description.” Lake City’s many oak trees which lined Marion Street and the downtown area “were piled fore and aft in all directions, and many of the streets were completely mattressed with the tangled debris.”
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The physical destruction in town was described in great detail by the Florida Times-Union on Friday 2 October 1896. Although no photographs exist of the damage from the storm, an examination of the 1895 Sanborn map of downtown Lake City gives a visual record of many of the significant structures that later were damaged. The Times-Union article went block by block down Lake City’s main thoroughfare, Marion Street, and assessed the damage. On the north end of downtown, “in front of E.G. Flowers’ store, near the [railroad] depot, a large tree fell upon a small building occupied by a colored family by the name of Jackson.” The structure was crushed and a young boy was killed, while two others in the immediate area were injured. There was a cluster of primitive structures near the railroad tracks on the 1895 map labeled “Negro Shanties.” It seems certain that this is where the damage and unfortunate fatality occurred. One positive outcome of the storm was that the next Sanborn Map (completed in 1900) had no record of the “Negro Shanties.” So these shacks were removed during the storm cleanup, and brought about better conditions for the city’s African American population.

Significant structures in town suffered major damage in the storm. The Central Hotel, an anchor of downtown, “narrowly escaped being crushed” by debris and by tree matter. “From there to the public square was a complete tangle,” noted the newspaper. “At the corner of the public square, a large oak was thrown on the corner of . . . Hunter’s drug store.” Across Marion Street sat the courthouse, rebuilt in 1874 after a fire. This two-story wood building was a proud landmark to all Lake Citians. The 1896 Hurricane severely damaged it. “Nearly all the glass in the second story of the courthouse was broken out and the building flooded by water.”

In town, much of the damage was not from water but from downed trees. The stretch of Marion Street between the courthouse square southward to the college campus was described in vivid detail by the Times-Union. “The well-known oaks all along the route were uprooted at frequent intervals and thrown in both directions from either side of the street in a cross-tangle, in some cases, the trees splitting and falling half one way and the other.” Many residences were demolished, and a school was damaged but no casualties were reported in this area.

Moving south on Marion to the college campus revealed more damage. The immediate damage to Florida Agricultural College was severe. “The main building of the . . . College was entirely unroofed and flooded from top to bottom,” noted the Times-Union, “and many of the windows blown in, including nearly all on the second and third stories of the west side.” Extensive damage also was reported around “the director’s [college president’s] residence, [and] the wire fencing and
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the debris driven against it, made a tangled mess.” Fences and grounds would prove expensive and time-consuming to repair. The newspaper concluded that none of the other college buildings were seriously damaged and that fall classes, set to begin the following week, “will open . . . without postponement.”

For the next few weeks the Jacksonville newspapers would drum up sales by featuring tales of woe from the rural areas surrounding Lake City. For example, the headline in the 2 October 1896 issue of the Times-Union blared, “WORST EVER KNOWN.” The immediate impact of the story was the unparalleled severity of the storm. “The oldest citizens say such a storm has never visited [this] section during their memory.” The newspaper went on to apologize for a lack of coverage earlier in the week, as their expanded coverage was appearing on Friday 2 October—four days after the storm made landfall. Times-Union editors blamed a number of broken telegraph lines for the interruption in coverage. Damage from the storm had been “unprecedented in the history of telegraphic news associations,” noted the article. “The fury of the storm was much more widespread than at first supposed, and although every available agency has been brought to bear to promptly repair the damage done in the telegraph lines, the job has proven a Herculean one.” Descriptions of damage to North Central Florida, concluded the article, “will be of absorbing interest” to its readers. Over the next few weeks tales of damage were strategically reported to encourage donations for relief. Coverage of the College, on the other hand, was overwhelmingly positive.

On 3 October 1896, a small headline appeared on the front page of the Times-Union: “LAKE CITY COLLEGE ALL RIGHT.” The paper reported that the college had suffered “slight damage from the storm,” and that it would open as usual for fall classes on the following Monday, 5 October. In fact, Florida Agricultural College did incur damages that were financially as well as physically significant. College records show that much of the damage was not dealt with for several weeks, and that the fiscal year 1896-1897 was devastating for the small institution. The damage affected the morale of at least one faculty member.

In a letter from early October 1896, Agriculture Professor P.H. Rolfs told a colleague that “my department was swamped by the late hurricane and things got a pounding.” In response to a request, Rolfs replied that “work is going on as rapidly as possible but I’ll not be able to do much until about [October] 15.” Rolfs noted that the work stoppage and the damage to the campus “does make me feel blue.” Rolfs’ correspondence also contained a storm-related answer to a financial inquiry. Replying to a “Miss Waldron,” who had recently been hired to work at

---

21 Florida Times-Union, 2 October 1896.
22 Ibid.
23 Jacksonville Times-Union, 3 October 1896
the College, Rolfs assured her that “there is an abundance of work to be done in my department but I cannot get allowance herewith to do it.” Rolfs went directly to College president Oscar Clute, and then Rolfs relayed this meeting to Miss Waldron in his letter. “I have just had a short talk with Dr. Clute and can give you no estimates at present. Of course you cannot afford to work for nothing any more than the rest of us.” Rolfs concluded his letter with an assurance that he had found some money to pay some of her debt until the full amount could be procured.25

Despite the damage, President Clute gave an address on Wednesday 7 October to welcome new students to the college. A favorable story appeared in print the following day. The strong student turnout at the speech was described as “gratifying” by the *Times-Union* newspaper, which continued in an optimistic tone. Clute welcomed over 150 students to the college, which the article erroneously noted as being “more than last year.” The enrollment had gone down slightly from 203 to 197, and Clute later would report that the storm negatively affected overall student enrollment. Immediately after the storm, some students were delayed by the storm but the *Times-Union* assured its readers that students were arriving safely. The newspaper also noted that transportation in the area was beginning to improve. “New students continue to arrive by every train,” concluded the article on Clute’s speech. “And the outlook is bright for a big attendance and fine work for the coming year.” In the opinion of the anonymous reporter, Clute’s speech was “a fine one.”26

Despite President Clute’s optimism, the college spent considerable money on repairs. Anxieties over the costs of these repairs may have hastened college officials to recruit students who would continue to enroll and pay their tuition. The money was desperately needed. According to college records, On 1 July 1896 the total college fund balance was $3,571.41. The October 1896 financial ledger was especially noteworthy even as it left many things obscure. The college spent money on small projects, called “incidentals” in the college financial records. These projects often were un-specified, and seemed to be paid in cash directly to the workers or supervisors involved. For example, in October 1896 a total of $555 was spent on “incidentals.” Expenditures in October and November—no doubt directly related to the hurricane—totaled $4,239.95, and another $3,753.09 was spent in December.27
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26 *Florida Times-Union*, 7 October 1896. Actual enrollments for the college were 203 for 1895-96 with a slight drop to 197 for 1896-97. Oscar Klute, “The Florida Agricultural College, Lake City, Florida. Report of the President. 1896-1897” Deland: E.O. Painter and Co. 1897, 3-4. Like most articles in the *Times-Union*, the author of the article was anonymous.
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The College spent a total of $419.16 on “fences, grounds, and buildings” in October 1896—its highest expenditure for that entire month, including salaries. So the damage was fairly severe, in contrast to the portrayal in the Jacksonville press. Another $36 was spent on this same category in November 1896. Significant additional repairs were required well after the storm, as another $334.88 was spent on “fences, grounds, and buildings” in December. The damage may have appeared to be fairly minor, but repairs continued to incur costs for many weeks after the storm. Professor Rolfs had very good reason for feeling blue.

The College was perhaps best known for its Agricultural Experiment Station, later re-named the Institute for Food and Agricultural Sciences or IFAS. Founded in 1888, it featured a modern set of classroom buildings and greenhouses for tests on various plants. Its finances were recorded separately from the college and they provide a clearer picture of the storm-related damage and repairs. In October 1896, “labor” charges for repairs totaled $611.31. So the college spent considerable money on various small repair projects. About 5 percent of this amount was spent on “fences and buildings.” The rest was spent on various small projects, paid in cash, to keep the Station operational.

The highest expense for the Research Station, a unit within the College itself, in October 1896 was “LABOR,” totaling $555. This amount was 50 percent higher than the Agricultural Research Station director’s salary, one of the most prominent staff positions at the College. An additional $30.77 was spent on “fences and buildings” that month. Repairs continued to mount for weeks after the storm hit. Initial optimism about the survival of the college turned bleak as financial reality set in.

In response to this financial crisis, President Clute authorized the Board of Trustees to request money from the State of Florida. At the 17 December 1896 Board of Trustees meeting an appropriation of $2,500 from the state comptroller to the College was welcomed, and it would be deposited on 1 January 1897. The comptroller indicated that the funds would be used “for repairs, expenditures and other expenses of the college.” Small expenses continued to pour in however, and the closing balance on 30 June 1897 was $1,702.90—less than half from the beginning of the financial year. The College, then, spent mostly public money to patch up roofs and windows. Students trickled in, but the financial situation was grim. Meanwhile, Columbia County benefitted from a Jacksonville newspaper campaign to raise donations for storm victims.
The destruction of Lake City’s famed oak trees meant clogged roads and damaged buildings both in town and on the College campus. The loss of pine trees in rural areas around Lake City destroyed one of the town’s most profitable enterprises. As the nineteenth century drew to a close, Florida was producing nearly one million board feet of lumber, “mostly yellow pine,” and the state provided about one third of all American lumber in 1900.33 In the October 1896 *Monthly Weather Review*, a report noted the “unusually violent winds” from the storm. The report concluded with an assessment of the extensive damage: “the destruction of pine timber was enormous, the monetary loss from that source alone being estimated at $1,500,000.”34 The Savannah *Morning News*, in addition to reports of the damage to its own local structures, described the significant tree loss in Columbia County: “Lake City had almost every tree in town blown down and for two days the streets were impassible,” the newspaper noted. North Central Florida had “great lumber interests,” but unfortunately “half of the yellow pine timber was blown down and lumber and turpentine men lost thousands of dollars as the timber is badly splintered and will soon be attacked by worms.”35 Finally, a lumber company executive told the Atlanta *Constitution* that 5,000 square miles, or over three million acres of timber, had been destroyed by the storm.36

A related industry in Columbia County was turpentine. A 1900 survey revealed that 24 million of the 35 million acres contained within the state of Florida were forested. The state’s turpentine and rosin naval stores industry was lucrative.37 Turpentine workers who harvested the rosin in clustered areas of trees mostly lived nearby in rough villages. Related enterprises sprung up near these turpentine camps, and all suffered greatly after the storm. The Cedar Key distiller who had given such a vivid eyewitness account of the storm’s impact noted the displacement of local “homesteaders, turpentine operators, and . . . business owners.”38 Another contemporary report noted the destruction of the turpentine industry as a result of the storm in the area between Cedar Key and Lake City. Previously, twenty-two distilleries had dotted the area—but “not one of these will ever run another charge.”39 The Savannah Morning News confirmed that “the turpentine districts are wrecked.”40

Along with the losses of trees, of course, were the jobs and wages that had been blown away by the storm. The numbers were shocking: Lake City only had about 3,000 residents while the entire region counted perhaps 25,000 over several rural
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counties. From Cedar Key to North Central Florida a later report counted 12,000 homeless as a result of the storm.\textsuperscript{41} An immediate report after the storm estimated that “fully 2,000 men are out of employment.”\textsuperscript{42}

The \textit{Daily Florida Citizen}, a Jacksonville business newspaper, described the harsh economic realities facing rural residents after the storm. “One must see the results of Tuesday’s storm before he can realize what it means to Columbia County people,” noted a story on 4 October. The area from Lake City south to the county line, and on into its southern neighbor Alachua County, “is a mass of logs strewn in all directions.” Lumber areas, noted the article, “are ‘completely ruined’ and “what turpentine is left cannot be gotten at cheaply enough to work it at all.” This confirmed what had been reported in the \textit{Times-Union}, but the \textit{Citizen} continued with a deep analysis of the local economy. A reporter interviewed a local foreman, who noted “that the men were ruined, and that the [field] hands had left; that the mules were tied up, and that they were now going to follow the hands and get out.” Human and financial capital simply left the area. As the article concluded at length:

in many cases there are obligations to meet and debts to cancel, and nothing to do it with, for in very few cases only were the crops gathered and sold. The prospect for the incoming year is appalling under the circumstances. The merchants all over the county are in a very serious plight. . . . The people simply have not got the money to redeem their obligations.\textsuperscript{43}

On the same day as College President Clute’s speech, 7 October, a letter appeared in the \textit{Times-Union} that demonstrated the emotional toll the storm had taken on the pious people of the backwoods regions of Columbia County. In “An Appeal from Columbia County,” Rev. S.M. Gibbs, a local pastor, noted the “dreadful scene” in the areas around Lake City. Travel away from downtown, “and you will find very few people with one shingle to shelter them. Cattle and other stock suffered severely.” Gibbs described local people who had been badly injured and small communities where nearly every home had been destroyed. He sought to generate aid from the people in Jacksonville, and they responded vigorously. “God knows that if the government does not do something for the poor people starvation [and] death will be the consequence.” The pastor did not know “what evil we have done that God should visit us with such a severe storm. Still, I am satisfied with what God does. Pray for us, and send us some aid.”\textsuperscript{44}

In 1896, federal relief was practically non-existent. Such modern institutions as the Federal Emergency Management Agency and extensive property insurance could not help the desperate situation in North Central Florida. So the Florida \textit{Times-Union} led the effort to provide relief from private donors, which would
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be distributed to local officials. Immediately after the storm, the newspaper’s coverage had been delayed. But now the newspaper’s telegraph lines were repaired and its writers seized on a story that would be ongoing as well as uplifting—storm relief. On October 5—six days after the storm hit—the newspaper featured a story prominently on its local pages. An anonymous editorial informed city readers that “immediate relief is necessary for those who have been rendered homeless and destitute. . . . The people of Jacksonville and the people of Florida generally should not hesitate in responding to this urgent call for aid.”

On the night of 5 October a group of prominent Jacksonville citizens met downtown “to devise ways and means for the relief of the sufferers from the damage done by the hurricane last week.” Several members had already been collecting money and the as-yet nameless organization accepted $661 in donations. That night the group officially formalized itself as the Jacksonville Storm Relief Association (hereafter JSRA) and promoted relief efforts throughout the Jacksonville area. Coverage of JSRA meetings and of their impact in Lake City dominated the newspaper over the next several weeks.

On 7 October another appeal for aid ran in the Times-Union. The editors thanked all who had donated, “but the probabilities are strong that there is much distress prevailing not yet learned of.” The editors urged local residents to donate as much as possible to those in the affected areas. “The sufferers are our own people,” they concluded, “and their need is dire.” Eyewitness reports continued to pour in from the area. On 8 October the newspaper ran an extensive report from a man who had traveled through North Central Florida. “No one who has not been over the path of the storm can conceive any idea of the disaster,” he noted. “The pitiful conditions of the people in that section” were particularly disturbing. “Homes, crops, barns livestock and occupation . . . [were] swept away in a single day.” The report had a purpose—relief. “They deserve help,” he continued. “They must have it or starve.” The eyewitness concurred with the dire needs of the rural areas outside of Lake City. “The most damage appeared to have been in Levy, Baker, Lafayette and Columbia Counties,” he confirmed in his report. So the JSRA offered help to the county commissions from each of those counties in the amount of $300 each. The generous people of Jacksonville already had contributed non-perishable items in addition to cash. The JSRA noted, through the Times-Union, donations such as flour, a mattress, “one keg nails . . . one sack Irish potatoes” and “one box knickknack biscuit.”

With immediate food needs being addressed, a combination of private donations and state funds soon would be allocated to county commissions. The Columbia County commission was preparing to meet when the state government announced
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more help for the area. On 11 October the *Times-Union* published a statement from Governor Henry L. Mitchell that promised aid to storm sufferers. $200 was allocated to Columbia County and to each of four other affected counties, “to be distributed where and how [the money would be] most needed to meet the distress which comes to [Gov. Mitchell] from so many sections and with so much urgency.”

Further relief meetings were held in Tallahassee and Gainesville; on 12 October the JSRA even reported money coming in from Georgia. A long letter in the *Times-Union* that day from a High Springs man, dated 10 October, suggested that the residents of the affected areas should be employed and not just given money, “thereby giving them the means of supplying their needs, at the same time giving a lasting benefit to the community.” The High Springs man implored that the people should not be made “dependents,” but that the JSRA and the state government should “place the subjects under such conditions as they will be able to provide for themselves.”

The JSRA and Columbia County Commissioners certainly adopted this approach.

At a meeting on 12 October 1896, the Columbia County commissioners divided the affected local area into districts and then apportioned $300 “to the storm sufferers in Columbia County.” Money was apportioned to each chairman, to spend as he saw fit. Raymond Wilson was chair of the relief committee and he received $125; Guy Gillen of Lake City received $50; T.P. Jordan of Fort White received $75; A.F. Rumph of the community of Hagen, about ten miles south of Lake City, received $50. The Commissioners resolved “that if convenient the general relief committee [could] send some axes, axe handles, nails etc. to each of said places that they be specifically requested.” If these materials were not available, the commissioners requested that the chairmen “use their best judgment in sending what they can.” The Commissioners concluded the meeting by expressing “thanks on behalf of the distressed people to those who have or may hereafter render aid.” So the county commissioners were careful not to give out cash directly to people. They focused on material items to help with the fallen trees and the re-building of structures.

The JSRA met on the same night–12 October–and looked forward to receiving communications from local county commissioners. They praised the commissioners in all affected counties for looking after the “indigent poor of their counties” and the JSRA also issued a warning to all charity organizations. In Jacksonville, “parties had already come to the city asking aid for themselves that were frauds.” So they urged all local officials to “only . . . [give] contributions . . . through local committees,” and those offerings should be tools and food whenever possible.
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“MORE MONEY SENT TO BAKER AND COLUMBIA COUNTIES,” noted a Times-Union headline on 15 October. B.T. Boozer, chairman of the Columbia County Board of County Commissioners, sent the newspaper a “harrowing tale of the suffering” in his area, “and he requested additional aid. Boozer described people in the Lake City area living in “destitute circumstances, caused by the recent storm, with nothing but hunger and . . . cold and exposure staring them in the face.” Many structures had been damaged and significant agricultural resources were lost—“cotton, corn, and sugar all blown down and scattered about.” The residents of Columbia County were in desperate need of supplies as well as cash. Boozer thanked the JSRA for the $300 but noted that “$5,000 more of supplies could be easily used.” The JSRA was pleased to report that Suwannee County, which had suffered light damage, returned some of its money. So $700 more was given to its neighbor Columbia County. More tales of the storm were described, surely a source of titillation for newspaper readers. In an un-specified location, a shingle was driven through a telegraph pole. In Duval County, a heavy wagon wheel was wrapped around a pine tree by the strong winds. Finally, Baker County requested axes from the JSRA. “Gentlemen,” concluded a member of the JSRA, “when a storm blows all the axes out of a county, it is a right respectable sort of a hurricane.”

On 17 October an acknowledgement of donations—likely the $700 generously sent by the commission, from Suwannee County’s returned funds—was sent from Lake City. But the JSRA warned that this might not happen again, despite the dire conditions described by Commissioner Boozer: “the Association had made it a rule to send supplies to relieve actual suffering,” intoned the JSRA, “instead of money.” This request was taken to heart by Columbia County as it prepared its next statement for the JSRA.

Within a week the physical needs of residents were being addressed by the JSRA, which presented an inventory of supplies sent to Columbia County. The list, published on 24 October, included items such as kegs of nails, hand saws, axes, hatchets, and axe halves. Food items included boxes of bacon; Lake City alone received half a ton of bacon from the committee. Many barrels of flour also were sent. The regions of Lake City, Hagen, and Fort White all noted receipt of these items. A new area was mentioned here for the first time—“Drew,” a sawmill community between Lake City and Fort White, near present-day Columbia City. “Besides the above, the association has sent considerable donations of clothing and other supplies received from private individuals.” The JSRA also noted that it was giving out some cash donations, but only “to relieve the immediate necessities of those in distress.”
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The storm had caused tremendous damage to local roads, railroad tracks, and bridges. At the end of the week in which the storm hit, a group traveled by train from Ocala to Lake City. They noted several spots in which travel was impossible. “There was rubbish and limbs, and such on the track,” they reported, “and we would all have to get out and help move the stuff, so that the train could go on.”

Back on 11 October Columbia County Commissioner Boozer had reported to the Jacksonville press that local roads were “impassible.” To illustrate this, he mentioned that “a doctor who lived three miles from a patient was a half day in going and returning.” These tales resonated with local residents. Finally, at the end of the following week the Savannah newspaper reported that “all the roads are blocked, and it will require two weeks of hard work to open the way to Lake City.” Road and bridge work began with small projects, paid in cash—similar to the repairs done to Florida Agricultural College. As a result of the storm several new pathways and crossings were built.

Road repair was a significant long-term concern for the Columbia County commissioners. At the 12 October meeting the commissioners requested that all public roads be surveyed for damage. At that point, “this Board shall be more fully advised as to what shall be done.” The commissioners learned of significant destruction to bridges in the area. In keeping with the JSRA’s request, money was only given after specific repairs were done. They were done on a project-by-project basis. For example, at the 2 November 1896 meeting a payment was made to A.F. Hudson “for repairing the White Springs bridge” north of town and about twice as much was paid to Moses Raulerson “for repair on Roberts Bridge.” A small amount was paid to another laborer for “working on a public road.”

Projects continued in late 1896 and into early January 1897. “Work and lumber for Big Creek Bridge” was paid for early in December. Later that month, another man was paid $20.80 for “road work.” An eventful meeting was held on 5 January 1897–nearly four months after the storm. Both private and state funds were being disbursed for various projects. The county commissioners paid small amounts for “work on Falling Creek Bridge” and for “hauling dirt on Big Creek Road,” north of town. Another item was “repairing Court House Fence.” In the south part of the county, heavy rain and winds had washed out some of the roads. So three citizens were appointed “to mark out and view the public road known as the Wilson Road so as to change and view said road.” The storm hastened earlier observations of the roads which led to new decisions about road routes. At an early January meeting the commissioners resolved to “make change in public road from Lake City to
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Lower Springs,” and citizens were charged “to view and mark out said road.” The road finally was finished on 1 February 1898 and it likely followed a path to the Ichetucknee area. Finally, a request was made to extend southeast to Union County as planners sought to “change, view, and work out [a] new road from Providence to Lake City.” Supervision of all of these projects would be provided by “Road Commissioners” – three men in each of five districts who would serve one year and make recommendations on repairs and improvements.61 Repairs to roads damaged in the storm continued into the summer of 1897.62

Looking back on the impact of the storm, Florida Agricultural College President Oscar Clute noted in 1897 that the storm affected College enrollment. Florida Agricultural College had 205 students in 1894-1895 and 203 students in 1895-1896. But 1896 had seen a drop in enrollment to 197, and Clute noted several factors to explain the 3 percent drop: “the great devastation wrought by the storm of last September [1896] have made the attendance at the college this year smaller than it would otherwise have been.”63 The storm and its related headaches may very well have started the College on a slow period of decline that ultimately ended in its move to Gainesville a decade later. The city of Lake City, however, served as a gateway to Florida at the dawn of the twentieth century.
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For nearly fifty years, Wendell Phillips was one of the most prominent orators and activists in America, a force to be reckoned with by allies and enemies alike. A white man from a prominent, wealthy family, Phillips used his rhetorical skills to advocate for immediate emancipation of all slaves, as well as for racial equality and a variety of other radical causes. In an era when moderation was repeatedly urged on matters of freedom, Phillips rejected moderation with remarkable consistency and strongly favored freedom and equality even at the expense of national unity and adherence to the law.

Wendell Phillips became involved in abolitionism in the 1830s. As a child growing up in Boston he shared the typical racial views of white Americans in the 1800s, being taught that his race and gender justly gave him privilege. Eventually, however, several factors prompted his shift in favor of racial equality. The first was the emergence of the radical abolitionist movement, led by newspaper editor William Lloyd Garrison. Garrison’s American Anti-Slavery Society called for an immediate end to slavery throughout the United States as well as for racial equality. Slowly, Wendell Phillips became increasingly involved in the Society. The second factor was his marriage to Ann Terry Greene. Greene had already embraced radical abolitionism, and as Phillips fell in love with her, he became influenced by her views. The third factor was the death of Elijah Lovejoy in 1837. Lovejoy was an antislavery minister who had moved from the Northeast to Alton, Illinois and been killed by a proslavery mob. While Lovejoy’s views had been more moderate than the abolitionism of Garrison and his followers, Garrisonian abolitionists immediately viewed Lovejoy as a martyr and hero. It was Phillips’s speech at Faneuil Hall, rebutting Massachusetts Attorney General James T. Austin’s speech in defense of the mob, that solidified his participation in the abolitionist movement.

Even at the time that he delivered the Faneuil Hall speech, Wendell Phillips was not fully the radical that he would be within a few years. At first, Phillips may well have opposed slavery predominantly because he saw it as a threat to American republicanism. According to James Brewer Stewart, “he [Phillips] feared that the power of slavery was running rampant through all the nation’s institutions, that the institution was increasing its strength by spreading violence, social degradation, and tyranny.” But Phillips’s motivation quickly changed. Certainly, throughout
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his life, he believed that chattel slavery would destroy republicanism, and he was very willing to try and enlist white audience members to the abolitionist cause by playing on their selfishness and making the case that slavery hurt them. However, as he became acquainted with black abolitionists like Frederick Douglass and William Nell, Phillips began to oppose slavery chiefly because of how the institution harmed blacks, not because of how the institution harmed whites. Indeed, he came to believe that abolition must be achieved even if it threatened national unity or led to the dissolution of the Union. In an 1857 speech arguing that the North should secede and form a republic free of slavery, he proclaimed that he supported secession, “first and primarily, to protect the slave. My second motive is, to protect the white race . . . . No man deserves the name of an Abolitionist who, in arguing the slave question, sets out with the assumption that any human institution is to be saved at all hazards, come what may of the slave.”5 When he changed his views on secession a few years later and supported the Union side during the Civil War, he wrote in an essay for the New York Times, “In a word, the slave’s cause led us to disunion, when disunion seemed the only way within our reach to free him. Now we cling to the Union for the same reason. We can uphold it without dishonor — and it has become the strongest weapon in the slave’s behalf — the shortest path to his liberty.”6 In other words, he supported the Union because he was an advocate for African Americans.

In this respect as well as in many others, Phillips differed markedly from Abraham Lincoln and most other white Northerners. Historian Bell Irvin Wiley once estimated that only about ten percent of white Union soldiers fought to free the slaves.7 In 1861, the United States Congress overwhelmingly passed a resolution asserting that the North was not fighting the war to interfere with “established institutions” of the South.8 In 1862, Abraham Lincoln wrote that while he wished to see slavery end everywhere, his priority was preserving the Union and that he would be willing to leave every slave in bondage if it was conducive to winning the war.9 Clearly, the fact that the South had seceded to protect slavery did not mean that ending slavery was the North’s main reason for stopping secession. While most abolitionists adhered to Phillips’s priorities, even a few leaders in the abolitionist movement espoused the views of most fellow Northern whites. During the war, Gerrit Smith, a New York abolitionist, friend of Frederick Douglass, and former donor for John Brown, declared that “if a man cannot be a patriot whilst yet
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an abolitionist, he should cease to be an abolitionist.” It is very hard to imagine Phillips ever making such a statement. The fact that such a statement came from Smith probably shocked many other abolitionists. Yet Smith had long eschewed the anti-Constitution rhetoric of the Garrisonian abolitionists, instead arguing that the Constitution was an antislavery document. By being able to avoid criticizing the Constitution and thereby striking a somewhat conservative note compared to more fiery New England abolitionists, Smith had perhaps found himself on a slippery slope that eventually led him to at least publicly place love of country over love of freedom. Phillips, however, had thrown down the gauntlet against the American political establishment a long time ago and therefore was in the ideal position to continue prioritizing liberty over patriotism. A favorite slogan of Phillips’s was “Peace if possible — Justice at any rate!” and he lived up to this slogan quite consistently.

Early on, Phillips embraced the principle of racial equality as a corollary to the abolition of slavery. As early as 1839, he sponsored a petition to the Massachusetts legislature to repeal the state’s anti-black laws, including the ban on interracial marriage. Due to the work of Wendell Phillips and other abolitionists, white and black, interracial marriage was legalized in Massachusetts in 1843, 124 years before the Supreme Court legalized it nationwide. In the 1840s, Phillips and William Nell would attempt to ride segregated train cars on the New England railroads as a way of protesting Massachusetts’s system of Jim Crow. Phillips was also at the forefront of efforts by abolitionists to desegregate the public schools of Massachusetts. By the time the Civil War began, Massachusetts not only continued to allow black men to vote but had also legalized interracial marriage and desegregated both its public school system and its railroads. In a speech that could be seen as including elements of patronization but still showed a belief in the inherent equality of the races, Phillips argued that successful African Americans should be used to assert “that the colored race has a right to a place side by side and equal with the white.” To refute the idea of white superiority held by most white Northerners and Southerners in the 1800s, Phillips reminded his audience that every race had been enslaved at some point, in some part of the world. However, as demonstrated by the case of Haiti, it was only blacks who had ever freed themselves through revolt. In a later speech delivered during the Civil War, Phillips declared his vision for a future in which interracial marriage would
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help bring about equality in America. “Remember this, the youngest of you: that on the 4th day of July, 1863, you heard a man say, that in the light of all history, in virtue of every page he ever read, he was an amalgamationist, to the utmost extent. I have no hope for the future . . . but in that sublime mingling of races, which is God’s own method of civilizing and elevating the world. Not that amalgamation of licentiousness, born of slavery — the ruin of both races — but that gradual and harmonizing union, in honorable marriage, which has mingled all other races, and from which springs the present phase of European and Northern civilization.”  

For Phillips, interracial marriage was not just morally neutral. In time to come, it would improve America.

After the Civil War, Phillips assumed leadership of the American Anti-Slavery Society and worked for the passage of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments to the U.S. Constitution, which declared that all Americans were citizens with equal rights and gave black men the right to vote. Regrettably, the Fourteenth Amendment was not as far-reaching as Phillips had hoped. He had originally advocated that it read: “No state shall make any distinction in civil rights and privileges . . . on account of race, color, or descent.” Had it been passed, this version of the amendment would have nullified every Jim Crow law in the country. As scholar Randall Kennedy writes, however, the Fourteenth Amendment, “promulgated a provision that enjoins states to offer all persons the ‘equal protection of the laws’ — a standard that is famously ambiguous and malleable.”

Until the Civil Rights Movement, states successfully argued that laws banning interracial marriage and mandating comprehensive “separate but equal” segregation were constitutional — after all, these laws theoretically applied equally to whites and blacks. Had Phillips’s proposed amendment been passed instead, real legal equality might have come much sooner for African Americans, as Southern states would have been hard pressed to claim that Jim Crow laws were in any way constitutional.

In Phillips’s view, legal equality was necessary but not, by itself, a sufficient remedy for generations of oppression. Reparations were also necessary. In the 1860s, he advocated confiscating Southern plantations and giving them to former slaves. Such a policy was, “naked justice to the former slave,” who had “brought the land into cultivation,” and had their “sweat and toil mixed with it forever.”

Phillips’s advice went unheeded. Andrew Johnson, the man who succeeded Lincoln as president and whose attitude toward blacks verged on racial hatred, gave ex-Confederates nearly all of their confiscated land back. Congress passed a Southern Homestead Act, but the land it provided was of low quality, and buying

it required venture capital that most ex-slaves simply did not have.\(^{20}\) The result was the emergence of sharecropping, in which many emancipated blacks rented and worked on land owned by their former masters and as a result, remained economically dependent on them and unable to assert their freedom. When Rutherford B. Hayes promised to withdraw federal troops from the South, thereby ending Reconstruction and leaving blacks at the mercy of white supremacists in exchange for Congress deciding the contested presidential election in his favor, Phillips vehemently criticized him: “The whole soil of the South,” he fumed, “is hidden by successive layers of broken promises. To trust a Southern promise would be fair evidence of insanity.” The withdrawal of federal troops was “no experiment, but a treacherous bargain.”\(^ {21}\) His pessimistic prediction about the fate of Southern blacks turned out, of course, to be correct. Within twenty years or so, most of the legal gains that former slaves had made under the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments had been rolled back. While many former abolitionists continued to be concerned about racial justice, the majority of white Northerners, for various reasons that included racism, apathy, hopelessness, and political calculations, showed little interest in combatting Jim Crow.

In addition to racial equality, another issue on which Wendell Phillips defended individual freedom was capital punishment. Like many other abolitionists, he believed that executions were a relic of barbarism. In 1855, he declared that government had no right to put people to death. He pointed out that individuals were forbidden from committing suicide and that the state of Massachusetts “has no rights except what the people have given them. The people have no right to take their own lives, and of course they cannot give you the right to take their lives.”\(^ {22}\) In other words, government could not be given a power that was denied to individuals. Phillips went on to reference a black man who had recently been executed by the Commonwealth and argued that he and other people who had been sentenced to death had previously been “cast off” from society all of their lives.\(^ {23}\) Therefore, society bore a share of the responsibility for crime. After the Civil War, while Phillips favored treating the South as a conquered territory in order to give ex-slaves equal rights and lift them out of poverty, he opposed calls to execute Confederate leaders. In an appeal to pragmatism, he warned that executions had the effect of creating martyrs. He also pointed out that there were a thousand men who ought to be considered leaders of the Confederacy. “We cannot hang them all . . . . We cannot sicken the nineteenth century with such a sight,” warned Phillips. “It would sink our civilization to the level of Southern barbarism. It would
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forfeit our every right to supersede the Southern system, which right is based on ours being better than theirs.” While Phillips and other abolitionists, along with antislavery Radical Republicans, are often portrayed as inflicting capricious vengeance on the South during Reconstruction, they were in fact some of the chief opponents of sentencing Confederate leaders to death. Even when dealing with his greatest enemies, Phillips believed that human rights had to be upheld.

Wendell Phillips’ heritage was thoroughly Puritan. The Phillips family was one of Boston’s so-called “First Families,” (the term obviously excluded people from Massachusetts’s Native American tribes). One of Wendell’s ancestors had loaned money to John Winthrop, the first governor of the Massachusetts Bay Colony. Wendell Phillips certainly rejected his family’s conservatism. In fact, his family attempted to have him committed to an asylum after he became an abolitionist. However, he did not see himself as rejecting Puritanism. After his fellow abolitionist John Brown was executed for attempting to take up arms against the government, Phillips delivered a speech describing Brown as being part of a long and noble Puritan tradition. Arguably, Phillips could be called a Neo-Puritan. Given the authoritarian social conservatism of Puritan culture, complete with slavery, strict patriarchy, and eventually conquest of indigenous tribes, how could Phillips dream of a society in which “I see old and young, learned and ignorant, rich and poor, native and foreign, Pagan, Christian, Jew, black and white in one grand, harmonious procession”? How could a man who strongly admired Oliver Cromwell, a seventeenth-century Puritan leader who at one point engaged in a brutal conquest of Ireland, have “argued for the cause of Ireland against England”? Indeed, why did not only Phillips but also other descendants of Puritans become abolitionists and supporters of racial equality, and why does the United Church of Christ, the closest thing to a denomination descended from colonial Puritanism, ordain gay and female ministers and perform same-sex weddings? Puritanism had its origins in rebellion against the established church, and as Phillips mentioned in his speech, Puritans in the 1600s had taken up arms against the English government. Because Puritanism had anti-establishment origins, the slow but steady development of an outlaw culture among future generations was possible. Southern Anglicans, by contrast, were largely in harmony with the Church of England, and most of the wealthy Anglican planters favored slavery.

Furthermore, while Puritanism had originally been on the side of rigid racial and gender hierarchies, Phillips admired its resistance to unjust laws. Speaking of Puritans in the English Civil War, Phillips stated, “Men still slumbered in submission to law. They tore off the semblance of law; they revealed despotism.”30 So had John Brown, and that was a large part of why Phillips admired him. As referenced earlier, Phillips participated in precursors to the Freedom Rides of the 1960s. Yet his resistance to laws was hardly limited to that specific activity. For Phillips and other followers of William Lloyd Garrison, the United States Constitution was the dragon guarding the throne of slavery. In 1845, he wrote *The Constitution a Proslavery Compact*, defending his stance that the Constitution supported slavery. He even quoted a boast from James Madison that the Constitution gave slaveholders new legal protection that they had not formerly enjoyed.31 One of the main Constitutional clauses boasted of by Madison and eviscerated by Phillips was Article 4, Section 2, Clause 3, which read, “No person held to service or labour in one state, under the laws thereof, escaping into another, shall, in consequence of any law or regulation therein, be discharged from such service or labour, but shall be delivered up on claim of the party to whom such service or labour may be due.”32 This clause meant, in part, that slaves who escaped from states such as Virginia where slavery was legal, to states such as Massachusetts where it was illegal, were still legally slaves and had to be returned to their masters.

In a strange occurrence that doubtless frustrated pro-Constitution, antislavery Americans like Frederick Douglass and Charles Sumner, Phillips and other anti-Constitution abolitionists agreed with many advocates of slavery, in the sense that both camps asserted that slavery was protected by the Constitution and that people who insisted otherwise were either misunderstanding or deliberately misrepresenting the document. Yet while people such as Jefferson Davis and Robert Rhett argued that the Constitution was a glorious document that had to be obeyed, particularly in regard to slavery, abolitionists like Garrison and Phillips argued that the Constitution was an evil document that had to be jettisoned. According to Phillips, individuals ought to treat evil laws as invalid. Furthermore, he argued that judges charged to enforce these laws ought to resign their position so that they could also disregard these laws.33 After the Fugitive Slave Act, signed in 1850, made it increasingly difficult for runaway slaves who escaped to the North to avoid recapture, Phillips helped form a “vigilance committee” designed to thwart slave-catchers. The committee did have some success, such as in the case of the escaped

32 U.S. Const. art. IV, § 2, cl. 3.
Georgia slaves William and Ellen Craft, who fled to Massachusetts and were able to avoid recapture thanks to local abolitionists.\textsuperscript{34}

Another instance in which Phillips endorsed breaking the law was in the case of Native Americans. In the 1860s, Phillips remarked that Native Americans who were having their land and resources plundered were lucky not to be citizens. As the case of blacks in the South illustrated, being a citizen did not mean that the federal government would respect one’s rights. Because Native Americans were not citizens, they had what Phillips considered an enviable right: “the right to make war” in order to resist government oppression. He praised the interference by Native Americans with the railroad being built in the West. Phillips advised chiefs, “lay down your gun, but allow no rail to lie between Omaha and the mountains,” and to “haunt that road with such dangers that none will dare use it.”\textsuperscript{35} As with slaves, Phillips believed that Native Americans were no more obligated to respond lawfully to oppression than the American colonists under Great Britain had been.

Perhaps due to his marriage to the politically conscientious Ann, Phillips extended much of his liberalism on race to the issue of women’s rights. In 1850, for example, he attended a convention on women’s rights in Worcester, Massachusetts.\textsuperscript{36} As reported by Phillips, the convention put forth resolutions calling for allowing women to vote and hold public office, removing the word “male” from all state constitutions, and granting equal property rights for husbands and wives.\textsuperscript{37} At the following year’s convention, he referred to the denial of rights to women as “the injustice which has brooded over the character and the destiny of one half of the human race.”\textsuperscript{38} Phillips never stopped supporting women’s suffrage, but it was clear that the cause of African Americans was the one dearest to his heart, and this could sometimes hamper his ability to be a strong ally to women. For instance, as the momentum shifted toward the North in the Civil War, and slavery appeared to be living on borrowed time, the issue of black voting rights became more prominent. This created a conflict among abolitionists who also supported women’s suffrage. Should abolitionists refuse to support a voting rights amendment that did not enfranchise women? Or should they focus exclusively on black male suffrage for the time being? In the first camp were abolitionists like Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Parker Pillsbury, Sojourner Truth, Susan B. Anthony, and Robert Purvis. In the second camp were abolitionists like Frederick Douglass, Lydia Maria Child,
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Abby Kelley Foster, and both Wendell and Ann Phillips. Frustrating many of his longtime allies, Wendell declared that “it is the negro’s hour.”

Yet it would be a mistake to suggest that Phillips permanently abandoned the cause of women’s rights. In 1881, he asserted that a prime indicator of a civilized society was whether or not the rights of women were respected. He also predicted, with too much optimism, that the movement for women’s suffrage was on the verge of victory. In reality it would be almost forty years before women’s suffrage was enacted nationwide.

Yet Phillips did not entirely abandon the social authoritarianism of his Puritan forebears. He was a staunch supporter of the prohibition of alcohol, giving a speech in defense of this stance to the Massachusetts legislature in 1865. Simply urging the public to practice temperance was insufficient to Phillips. The force of law was needed. For a man who was in many ways a civil libertarian, this seems like a surprising stance. Yet support for Prohibition was a very common stance among abolitionists, including William Lloyd Garrison. Justice for blacks and the elimination of alcohol were both seen as part of a future utopia, a new Golden Age in America. At times it appears easier to list the abolitionists who did not support Prohibition, with John Stuart Mill, a British political theorist who supported the international abolitionist movement, being one of the few examples.

Another of Phillips’s views far less accepted in the twenty-first century than his views on slavery, race, and women’s rights is his view of capitalism. At first Phillips was a firm believer in capitalism as practiced in nineteenth-century New England. Northern wage workers, Phillips said in 1847, were “neither wronged nor oppressed.” Even if workers were mistreated, Phillips believed that they needed “only to stay at home . . . and soon diminished supply would bring the remedy.” Eventually, however, he not only began to defend labor unions but also began to advocate for the abolition of capitalism itself. Approximately a quarter century after he denied that wage workers were oppressed by big business, Phillips wrote a platform for the Labor Reform Convention in Worcester, Massachusetts. The platform read that “we affirm, as a fundamental principle, that labor, the creator of wealth, is entitled to all it creates. Affirming this, we avow ourselves willing

---

39 Michael Anthony Lawrence, Radicals in their Own Time: Four Hundred Years of Struggle for Liberty and Equal Justice in America (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 155-156.
43 Ibid.
to accept the final results of a principle so radical — such as the overthrow of the whole profit-making system, the extinction of all monopolies, the abolition of privileged classes . . . and best and grandest of all, the final obliteration of that foul stigma upon our so-called Christian civilization, the poverty of the masses.”

At times, Phillips’s social progressivism could come into conflict with his socialism. For instance, as early as 1853, he defended the rights of Chinese immigrants, hoping for a future in which they would intermarry with whites and serve in the government of the United States. However, within the labor movement there was much opposition to immigration. A large part of this was due to the fact that corporations tended to hire immigrants for low wages, arguably weakening the power of unions and putting the jobs of American-born workers at risk. Thus, in 1870, while asserting, “let every man who wishes to change his residence come, we welcome all;” and that the Chinese “will be a welcome and valuable addition to the mosaic of our nationality,” Phillips also warned that “immigration of labor is an unmixed good. Importation of human freight is an unmitigated evil.” In other words, corporations could not be permitted to influence the process of immigration by importing foreigners as a source of cheap labor.

Despite his current obscurity, Wendell Phillips was quite famous for a lengthy period of time after his death. Theodore Roosevelt, a moderate Republican on the issue of justice for blacks in much the way that Abraham Lincoln had been, considered Wendell Phillips vastly inferior to the sixteenth president: “Ultraradicalism,” warned Roosevelt, “may be as hostile to real progress now as it was in Lincoln’s day. Lincoln was a radical compared to Buchanan and Fillmore; he was a conservative compared to John Brown and Wendell Phillips; and he was right in both positions.” To the “Rough Rider,” abolitionists and proslavery Democrats had represented two sides of the same destructive, extremist coin. Others judged Phillips more favorably. When giving the eulogy at Wendell Phillips’s funeral, Frederick Douglass asserted, “the cause of the slave had many advocates; many of them very able and very eloquent; but it had only one Wendell Phillips.” That same year, W.E.B. DuBois delivered a commencement speech at his high school in honor of Wendell Phillips, and he continued to praise him fifty years later. Wendell Phillips Stafford, a white New Englander who had been named for Wendell Phillips and served as both a Republican judge, appointed ironically by Theodore Roosevelt, and as a member of the National Association
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for the Advancement of Colored People, once proclaimed, “in every charge we make against the forces of oppression, we have a right to feel that Garrison and Phillips . . . are riding at our side.”

Reverdy Ransom, a minister and radical activist, complimentarily referred to Phillips as an “agitator” and approvingly quoted one of his speeches in order to rally listeners against Jim Crow.

Even after the deaths of those who had been born before, during, or shortly after the Civil War, Phillips’s memory initially remained more prominent than it is today. In 1948, left-wing historian Richard Hofstadter wrote a book entitled *The American Political Tradition* and the Men Who Made It. While criticizing the Founding Fathers, Andrew Jackson, Theodore Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson, and even Abraham Lincoln, Hofstadter devoted a chapter to praising Phillips. He acknowledged that “the historical reputation of Phillips stands very low.” Yet he lamented that conventional historians in condemning men like Phillips have used a double standard of political morality. Scholars know that the processes of politics normally involve exaggeration, mythmaking, and fierce animosities. In the pursuit of their ends the abolitionists were hardly more guilty of these things than the more conventional politicians were in theirs. Somehow the same historians who have been indulgent with men who exaggerated because they wanted to be elected have been extremely severe with men who exaggerated because they wanted to free the slaves.

Even in the 1960s, some Americans still looked to Wendell Phillips as a model for the Civil Rights Movement. In articles written in 1964 and 1968 for Ebony magazine, executive editor and scholar Lerone Bennett, Jr. described Phillips as “the Boston blue blood who gave up place and position and dedicated himself heart and soul to the struggle for Negro rights,” and a “brilliant agitator.” To Bennett, Phillips was a man Americans of all races should admire, in contrast to Abraham Lincoln, whom the editor harshly labeled “a conservative white supremacist.”

Also in 1964, historian, civil rights activist, and former Spellman College professor Howard Zinn compared the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee, of which he was a member, to the abolitionists, and approvingly quoted Phillips as saying that “the reformer is careless of numbers, disregards popularity, and deals
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only with ideas, conscience, and common sense . . . he neither expects, nor is overanxious for immediate success.”

Most of the leadership of the Civil Rights Movement, however, avoided referencing Phillips. Perhaps it was because by the 1950s and 1960s, the abolitionist orator was generally remembered only by history aficionados. Or perhaps leaders like Martin Luther King, Jr. understandably feared that referencing Wendell Phillips favorably would engender even more hatred from segregationists. Yet although Wendell Phillips has been mostly forgotten, his influence on America has been extraordinary, and he must be given some degree of credit for most of the civil rights reforms this country has experienced over the past 150 years.

“Forging a New France”:
Gustave Le Bon’s Vision of Nationalism and Race, 1881-1931
Khali I. Navarro
University of Central Florida

In 1881, French anthropologist and social psychologist Gustave Le Bon (1841-1931) wrote, “man may hide his bloody sentiments behind sonorous words, but no matter what he does, his instincts remain terribly alive.” His work represents an entire trend in European intellectual life at the end of the century. Intellectuals turned away from rationalism and positivism toward subjective, instinctive, and metaphysical thought. Indeed, Le Bon argued that humanity was essentially irrational and that to guide them, one had to use subconscious influence. Yet Le Bon’s career was long and varied, revealing the general transition of thought in the late nineteenth century. He began his work in the 1860s, in the era of positivism. This philosophy advocated an empirical social science based on the natural sciences that would resolve the “revolutionary crisis” of modern society. In his early career, Le Bon studied physiological difference in order to establish a social order based on intellectual inequality. By the end of the century, he followed the intellectual trends of the era and theorized a new form of solidarity: an idea of a racial “soul” that formed through generations, uniting people into an organic whole.

Le Bon’s work is important for several reasons. It was widely popular and it influenced political leaders, psychological theory, and historical studies. The length of his career, which spanned five decades from the 1860s to 1931, illustrates the changing thought of his era and how ideas interacted. His work illustrates a central problem of the century: the emergence of modern society. A range of intellectuals
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and commentators viewed modernization as undermining stability or cohesion. Le Bon sought a new form of solidarity, a way to reconcile change with tradition, and the individual with the collective, and found several solutions: positivism, nationalism, and ultimately a theory of progress. I analyze the continuity in his thought, and also view his work as a coherent system of ideas. I examine how disparate issues of race, gender, and class formed a total image of modern society and its development. I discuss how he saw colonial education, women’s education, and socialism as representing aspects of a greater problem: revolutionary change. He used the legacy of the French Revolution as a way to understand the changes in his own time, contrasting abstract and theoretical change with a natural, gradual development.

Finally, I analyze how he understood his own time, not in isolation, but as part of a longer progression, forming a theory of history. He viewed his time as one of decline, but I argue that he also consistently held a theory of progress as an uneven process. He viewed science and technology as advancing, but human nature and morality as remaining behind. Le Bon’s theory demonstrates how the idea of progress influenced even so pessimistic a thinker, how it could demonstrate uneasiness about modernity, and how its legacy persisted despite the end of the positivist era. This article demonstrates the importance of the idea, and an aspect that requires further study: its multiplicity. His theory of progress as double illustrates one way of conceiving of modernity: as a revolution, a transitional stage, and a time of crisis. I analyze this concept in three sections, one discussing his early anthropological work, the second his psychological and historical work, and the final one his work on the First World War and the post-war era.

**Early Work, 1879-1894**

Le Bon followed the century-long formation of racial and sexual science, which reached a peak in his early career. Beginning in the eighteenth century, racial
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science had taken increasingly systematic forms, from the monogenism of the
eighteenth century, which viewed humanity as singular, and difference as based
on setting,11 to the early nineteenth-century development of a fixed idea of racial
difference,12 to the positivist anthropology of the mid-nineteenth century, which
used craniological studies to determine human inequality.13 Sexual science followed
a similar arc, with ideas of sexual difference increasing in the eighteenth century,14
after the Revolution,15 and in the wake of Darwinism.16 The result, in both cases,
was a theory of human development as increasing inequality. Scientists viewed
women and non-European people as atavistic representatives of the past, and white
men as the superior products of human progress.17 As this summary suggests,
development of this hierarchical thought came in stages, corresponding to
major eras of change. Indeed, historians have argued that moments of dramatic
intellectual, political, and social change have influenced the formation of harsher
ideas of hierarchy. When change undermined ideas of hierarchy, intellectuals built
up new ones.18 Le Bon followed in this tradition, using positivist science to divide
society into levels of mental ability, translating social strata into natural inequality.
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What did positivism mean in Le Bon’s time? Its founder, Auguste Comte, had rejected racial explanation and outlined a theory of humanity as social in nature.19 After his death, the philosophy changed, favoring racial and imperialist thought.20 The Société d’anthropologie de Paris was a leader in this trend.21 Le Bon entered the Society at the end of the 1870s, when positivist thought had become integral to the republican tradition.22 The philosophy had become the domain of the left under the Second Empire (1852-1870), and it influenced the new generation of republicans that came into office under the Third Republic (1870-1940).23 Le Bon adopted the prominent theories of his time, craniology and social evolutionism, but added an innovation.24 He argued for studying the disparity within each population rather than the average size of skulls.25 This meant, first, that he identified progress with growing inequality. He concluded that “totally inferior races” had more homogeneous skull sizes, but that the progress of “the races most advanced in civilization” meant the development of “inequality.”26 This happened as “the educated man” improved mentally, leaving what Le Bon viewed as the inferior sections of society, women and peasants, behind.27 Consequently, “what
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truly constitutes the superiority of one race over another is that the superior race contains many more of the voluminous skulls than the inferior race.”

This study had a range of implications, rejecting the revolutionary ideal of equality, establishing social inequality on a natural basis, and identifying European society with the existence of a superior elite.

Le Bon viewed this science as having a practical effect. He argued against equal education and the Enlightenment ideal of universal equality. He argued that the races and sexes had totally different psychologies and could never think alike.

In summary, Le Bon adopted the positivist science of the society, but took it to a greater extreme. The other anthropologists in the Society, though they supported racial inequality, rejected his theory of society in totally biological, deterministic terms, and he left the society in 1888. He differed from them in another way as well. By the time of his departure he had adopted another strain of racial thought, in contrast with the Society’s empiricism: a theory of cultural race based on language and national identity. In *Lois psychologiques de l’évolution des peuples* (1894), he wrote that “each people possesses a mental constitution as fixed as its anatomical character, from which its thought, its beliefs, and its arts derive.”

Le Bon applied this idea to the colonial setting and argued against the civilizing mission. He argued that one could not change another “less advanced” people’s development. Each society had to develop gradually, passing through stages, on a fixed course. Attempting to spread civilization would result in disaster, turning the colonized people against the colonizers. His immediate target was the civilizing mission, but his views had much greater implications for the development of French society. Le Bon viewed the metropole and colonies as settings for a greater struggle over hierarchy and equality.

For Le Bon, the rise of egalitarian thought was the cause of modern crises. He viewed progress as developing a superior elite, but some tried to topple this...
in several ways: colonial education, women’s education, and socialism. He viewed the latter as an attempt to recreate primitive society. To him, they all implicitly represented the breakdown of the very elite social structure that defined an advanced people’s superiority. He viewed these threats as linked. He argued that the idea of educating people in the colonies led to the attempt to educate French women, which he predicted would be disastrous for women and society as a whole. He argued that women had a particular nature, caring and altruistic, but also simple-minded, irrational, and amoral, similar to animals. He argued for education that would “prepare them to be excellent wives.” Trying to educate them the same as men would render them unhappy and unsatisfied, making them “déclassées, thunderous rebels, enemies of men, of whom they see themselves as equal, and of the social order, of which they pretend to be victims.” Le Bon’s theories set up an opposition between two forces, equality and hierarchy, which stood for order and disorder.

Le Bon believed that society had a natural, normal state, and attempting to break from it would lead to chaos. He argued that there were two forms of racial difference, one physiological, and the other cultural. It developed through generations, forming a people’s “national character” and integrating the single person into something greater. He viewed the individual as a component in a greater whole, formed by heredity and existing as “the representative of his race.” He argued that “each individual of a race has . . . a personal life and a collective life.” Le Bon’s theory thus identified the basis for a new stability for society, remaining fixed through the tumult of modernity. Yet he also viewed this structure as weak and endangered. He wrote that “peoples perish as soon as the qualities which form the foundation of their soul change and these qualities change when their civilization and intelligence grow.” Here was the crux of the modern crisis. Progress advanced society while dissolving its foundation, leaving modern people without the stability and solidarity of the past.
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Like the philosophes of the eighteenth century, Le Bon used the example of other cultures to challenge European civilization and its values. He argued that the West was more progressive, but also unstable, with its old beliefs and institutions under assault from modern thought. He argued that science and rationality advanced, but destroyed traditional structures. Science replaced religion, but people still needed religion, thus they turned to destructive revolutionary ideology. Rationality ruined morality, leading to egoism. Progress was destructive and incomplete. He argued that people remained in a primitive, violent state. Meanwhile, the East maintained its stability, coherent values, and “ardor and youth.” Le Bon feared that these societies would soon rise up and economically surpass Western civilization. He rejected the eighteenth-century idea of progress as the development of knowledge and viewed “sentiments” and “character” as the most important historical factors. Yet he retained the Enlightenment belief in progress. He argued that, in time, humanity would become something new, with a totally moralized nature. National lines would break down and a global community would form. Even rationality could become constructive, and an empirical idea of heredity could found a religion based on the passing of generations. Was this a contradiction? Did he reinforce ideas of linear progress and Western superiority or reject them?

Le Bon viewed progress as not just singular, but double. The first form of progress involved scientific and technological change, and the second involved the “character” of a people. Each moved forward, but at different rates; while science rapidly advanced, morality remained behind. There was a fundamental conflict, in that science was breaking down the moral order while there was nothing to replace it. In the future, humanity could attain a synthesis in which the moral and the intellectual would come into accord, but for the moment society remained in a state of transitional crisis, not yet ready to advance. The historiography of the
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idea of progress has tended to focus upon several key moments: the development of optimistic views of history in the seventeenth century, the Quarrel of the Ancients and the Moderns, in which intellectuals argued for culture as improving over classical thought, and the Enlightenment. Eighteenth-century philosopher Marquis de Condorcet is perhaps at the peak of this trend. He viewed progress as both intellectual and moral improvement, leading to a perfected society and humanity. In the nineteenth century, Comte, founder of the philosophy of positivism, took up this idea and established a theory of scientific progress. He too viewed progress as a single development of human nature, including both moral and intellectual qualities. This was the high point of modern optimism, viewing scientific change as straightforward improvement, before the destruction of the World Wars showed the destructive and dehumanizing side of modern advancements.

Despite Condorcet’s optimism, the belief in progress was never unequivocal. Historian Peter Gay argues that some eighteenth-century philosophers viewed progress as uneven, with science moving forward but morality remaining behind. Comte also expressed doubts. He viewed the human race as becoming more intellectual and less emotional, and viewed the intellect as a moralizing force, but he viewed excessive intellectualism as dangerous. Later in his career he established a secular religion to ameliorate society, making the emotions dominant and integrating the individual into the collective. By the end of the century the ambivalent view of modernity and progress became more prominent. Early sociologists such as Émile Durkheim viewed modernity as a destructive force,
causing excessive change and threatening to dissolve the foundations of society. Le Bon’s career is thus a key link in this history, inheriting an optimistic vision of history, but working at the time when the underlying ambivalence reached the surface and became a major idea.

**Psychological and Historical Work, 1895-1912**

By the 1890s, the republican leadership had established a government that would endure for the next five decades, but developments in the political, social, and intellectual planes raised fears of instability. The Boulanger movement heralded the start of a new populist and nationalist right wing. The labor movement adopted a revolutionary program and staged a series of strikes. In the intellectual sphere, psychological theory posited subconscious forces that influenced the individual, which Deborah Silverman argues “[called] into question the Enlightenment legacy of self and social mastery.” Artists and intellectuals brought greater attention to subjective and unconscious thought. Le Bon, following the popular ideas of the times, synthesized the new psychology and the problem of mass politics to herald the rise of a new force: the crowd. He argued that a democratic system was replacing the elite power structure. This was a problematic development. He viewed the masses as irrational and uncivilized. He argued that the individual in the crowd, no matter who he was, “[descended] several degrees on the scale of civilization.” He viewed modernity as in fact leading to equality, but a mediocre equality. He argued that in modern politics, “the vote of forty academics is no better than that of forty water carriers.” Nevertheless, Le Bon argued for accepting the new political situation and using psychological influence to control the masses.
His lesson was that “crowds are like the sphinx of ancient fable; one must know how to resolve the problem of their psychology or be resigned to be devoured by them.” Le Bon thus stood at the forefront of the new politics, drawing together seemingly contradictory ideas from disparate sources, including laissez-faire liberalism, nationalism, progress and decline, secularism as well as a belief in religion’s importance, positivism as well as irrationalist thought. The result is a synthesis of modern and traditionalist thought, balancing the positivist tradition with the traditionalist right’s vision of society. He was thus representative of the transformative nature of the politics of his era, in which the moderate left adopted a socially oriented liberalism and the right adopted nationalism and scientific thought.

Le Bon’s work on the crowd reflected the pessimism of the fin-de-siècle. For someone who had divided society and the world between unequal sexes, classes, and races, the idea of the crowd as an all-consuming, undifferentiated mass represented the greatest vision of decline. He argued that each group began as a “crowd,” then developed over time, forming a civilization, before finally losing its beliefs and declining. The current era, the “ERA OF CROWDS,” thus appeared to be a return to an undeveloped state, like the socialist movement’s goal of returning to an original, egalitarian society. He did not abandon his earlier theory of natural elites. He still argued that society tended toward greater mental inequality and that “superior brains” created progress. Yet he also viewed psychological forces as driving history. He argued that “each race carries within its mental constitution the laws of its destiny.”
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Emphasis in the original. Ibid., 3.

Le Bon, L’Homme, 181-182.


Le Bon, Foules, 103.
to the modern socialist movement. He viewed “Statism” as the universal basis for politics, the “national religion of the Latin peoples.” This development was destructive, and the development of the state undermined the economy and weakened the people’s autonomy. It would “completely destroy among the citizens the sentiments of initiative and responsibility of which they already possess so little.”

Le Bon argued that irrational forces drove history. The Revolution released “ancestral savagery.” Socialism followed “barbarous instincts.” His theory posited history as a struggle between two forces, one progressive and elitist, the other irrational and egalitarian. He attempted to discredit revolutionary ideas of equality, but also theorized society’s progress as leading to greater equality. The result was a theory of history as once again double, in which the progress of society undermined society’s modern state. Le Bon’s vision was not entirely fatalist. He did describe society as tending toward a general decline, but the ultimate point was to support a Social Darwinist vision of universal struggle. He viewed the classes as being in conflict, a clash would expand, involving “racial struggles.” He argued for the importance of “force” and patriotism, and that “love of the patrie” and “will” were the key to a nation’s strength. Overall, his idea of history was a struggle in which “those who deserve to live must remain the strongest.”

Le Bon thus adopted both traditional and modern thought, incorporating Social Darwinism as well as ideas of tradition. Despite his criticism of the modern era he still believed in an idea of progress. The advent of the First World War, far from dampening this optimism, reinforced it.

Later Work, 1915-1931

During the war, Le Bon once again divided his vision of the modern nation into two. He viewed the war as granting France a new unity. It ended the Belle Époque

He viewed this state power as developing through the Old Regime, the French Revolution, and into socialism. Le Bon, Lois psychologiques, 85-86. He viewed Louis XIV as the predecessor of the modern belief in the state. Le Bon, Politique, 68-69.

“Intransigents, radicals, monarchists, socialists, in a word defenders of the most diverse doctrines pursue with dissimilar approaches a single goal: the absorption of the individual by the state.” Le Bon, Lois psychologiques, 84. For the term “Statism,” Le Bon, Politique, 68.
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He argued that “each time that in a society any class sees by any motive its influence grow, it tends to soon become preponderant and enslave the others.” Le Bon, Politique, 290.
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“I love of the patrie forms the veritable social cement capable of maintaining the power of a people.” Ibid., 323. He wrote, “if modern history shows us nations advancing each day while others remain stationary or decline, the reason is found in the variable qualities of will that each nation possesses.”(327).
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decadence and discredited rationalism as well as socialism. At the same time, it recreated the French population into something new, creating greater national unity and solidarity. Le Bon described the war as achieving the aspiration of equality. It had discredited class hierarchy and proved the value of the common person. Women had demonstrated their abilities and would subsequently gain new rights and status. In his view, the war had succeeded where the French Revolution and the feminist movement had failed in creating equality. This seems a dramatic transformation in this anti-egalitarian thinker’s work. In fact, it follows from his earlier vision of progress. He had maintained that material and moral progress were split, and that humanity could one day become something new. He viewed the war as creating the necessary transformation of society. He argued that it created a new French population, bringing forth “new beings” and “forging a new France.” He had previously believed in the possibility of revolution, but denied that political revolution could bring it about. He wrote that the only “great revolutions are those of norms and thoughts.” He apparently viewed the Great War as creating true change in society. In contrast, he projected the dark side of modernity onto the German nation. He argued that it was split into modern and archaic elements. He argued that Germans followed a false, rationalist nationalism, similar to the socialist idea. Germans believed in the domination of the state at the expense of liberty and individualism. They were advanced in industry, but they also followed archaic ideas of domination and militarism. Le Bon thus split the idea of modernity into a positive vision of unity and solidarity and a negative vision of domination and conformity. He viewed the war as expressing brutality and “racial hatred” as well as national unity, altruism, and courage.

After the war, Le Bon returned to his more pessimistic vision. He once again highlighted the themes of irrationality and conflict. Writing in 1924, he argued that society was in disarray. The war had fomented greater irrationalism. The socialist movement had become more radical, seeking to impose strong government and
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level hierarchy. He argued that communism and socialism opposed “the inequalities of intelligence and fortune which nature obstinately persists in creating.” Ibid., 74-79. For the quotation, see ibid., 75. He predicted the development of an authoritarian socialism (178-184).
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Conclusion

By the time of Le Bon’s death in 1931, the era of science in which he had begun his career had drawn to a close. The war had undermined the Enlightenment and positivist vision of progress, and anthropologists had discredited social evolutionary theory and craniology. Yet Le Bon was part of a new development in thought, the foundation of the nationalist far right. Le Bon’s ideas of cultural nationalism and revival took several forms in subsequent years: the extreme right’s ideas of cultural regeneration, Vichy’s racial nationalism, and the post-World War II right’s
anti-immigration rhetoric.\textsuperscript{137} The latter rejected the old racialism and viewed each culture as a distinct, coherent whole, and argued for maintaining that difference.\textsuperscript{138} Le Bon is a transitional thinker in this history. He linked the disparate schools of positivism and the traditionalist right with the new, anti-rationalist and nationalist right of the \textit{fin-de-siècle}. His theory of progress, which he maintained throughout his career, represented a continuing problem: the question of modernity. How could one reconcile the past with the present, tradition with change, and the individual with the modern collective? His answer varied, but he formed a consistent idea of modernity as a time of transformation, in which forces of change threatened society, yet were inevitable. His theory of history was that of both irrationality and also a steady, unchanging course, which exemplified the tumultuous intellectual atmosphere of his era and its ambivalence about the modern world.


\textsuperscript{138} The National Front and the post-World War II right adopted an idea of cultural race, similar to that of Le Bon, and viewed each society as a distinct, coherent whole that must remain apart. Le Pen argued that people are equal, but essentially different. He argued that attempting to integrate them would be harmful. It would threaten the nation as well as the foreign culture. For Le Pen and postwar racism, see Macmaster, \textit{Racism in Europe}, 169-191. Todorov views Le Bon and others as originating this cultural idea of race. \textit{On Human Diversity}, 153-157.
Clipped Wings:
The Truman Administration and the First Attempt at a Bilateral Air Transport Agreement with Mexico, 1945-1947
Erik D. Carlson  
Florida Gulf Coast University

World War II was both a global catastrophe and a watershed event that transformed the world and the United States. From a technological perspective one of the indispensable elements that forged Allied victory over fascism was the airplane. For eight years all-metal and high-speed airplanes revolutionized combat over the battlefields of Europe and the Pacific. Aircraft helped to win the war through reconnaissance, close air support, air superiority, strategic, and tactical bombing missions in every theater of combat.¹

In addition to its dominance in combat roles, the airplane was also used for transport missions linking distant theaters of war. After the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor in December of 1941, U.S. airlines (sixteen domestic and one international) provided air service throughout the world on a contractual basis for the U.S. military. Civilian air carriers provided vital expertise (flight and maintenance training) during the first two years of the war for an American military establishment that had little experience with multi-engine transport aircraft.²

The indispensable role of the airplane in the Allied victory (logistics and combat) was apparent to officials in the Departments of War, Navy, State and Commerce, and to corporate executives in the commercial airline industry. Ultimately U.S. government officials and businessmen were determined to take advantage of America’s aeronautical preeminence in the post-1945 period.³

Before World War II ended in September of 1945, the United States sponsored an international aviation conference. More than fifty nations attended a meeting held in November of 1944 at the Stevens Hotel in Chicago, Illinois. The Franklin D. Roosevelt administration wanted to pave a clear path for U.S. airlines to prosper in the post-war era with their emerging technological superiority. Roosevelt believed

³ Jeffrey A. Engel, Cold War at 30,000 Feet: The Anglo-American Fight for Aviation Supremacy (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2007) emphasizes cold war diplomatic issues as the key to understanding America’s international aviation policy. Engle argues that U.S. aeronautical supremacy served as a bulwark against communism in the post-1945 world. Recently Jenifer Van Vleck, Empire of the Air: Aviation and the American Ascendancy (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2013) stresses Pan American Airway’s efforts to create an “American Century in the air” – U.S. economic and cultural dominance through commercial aviation. No doubt all three factors, business opportunities, cold war issues, and the drive for American global preeminence, were interwoven in American diplomatic efforts to establish a bilateral air transport treaty with Mexico. State Department official’s priority; however, centered on first opening the Mexican travel market to allow stronger U.S. air carriers to flourish providing a solid foundation for all other post-1945 American aims.
that through civil aviation, the war-torn world could be rebuilt and thriving national economies generated through the peaceful use of the airplane. For Roosevelt “freedom of the air” or “open skies,” should be the foundation of international aviation. The open skies policy favored modern U.S. airlines emerging from the wreckage of World War II with fleets of new four-engine aircraft (Douglas DC-4s and Lockheed L-049 Constellations), and the support of the U.S. government through regulated competition administered by the Civil Aeronautics Board (CAB).4

At the Chicago Air Conference, Assistant Secretary of State Adolph Berle read a keynote address from the desk of Franklin D. Roosevelt calling for the peaceful commercial use of the airplane in the post-war world. Like Roosevelt, Berle advocated an open skies concept which favored American carriers. He also gave his own talk to a plenary session expressing his hope that the agreements hammered out in Chicago over the upcoming weeks would be based upon the idea of open skies. Berle suggested to the Chicago delegates that they should draft a multi-lateral air transport treaty that could be used as a boilerplate for nations negotiating air agreements. This air agreement would be based upon agreed international technical standards. He also wanted nations to select provisional routes during the meeting. Berle wanted a one-size-fits-all template treaty based upon open skies which favored a strong U.S. airline industry. Finally, Berle called for the establishment of an international aviation organization to govern the decisions forged at the Chicago Conference.5 Berle, however, miscalculated on the mapping of provisional routes at the Chicago meeting. Routes would have to be hammered out on a bilateral basis between nations. This would take diplomatic effort and time.

The key nations shaping these air transit agreements at the Chicago Conference were the United States, Great Britain, and Canada. Because of U.S. dominance in commercial aviation, American officials wanted the most liberal access possible to foreign nations. Great Britain, also an air minded country, believed in freedom of the air, but wanted to reduce the dominance of U.S. airlines to protect British airlines through careful diplomacy. These divergence political and economic desires resulted in an impasse during the conference. During heated meetings between the American and British delegations, the Canadian team attempted to smooth over the problems with the call for specific freedoms of the air.6 The Canadians proposed five reciprocal freedoms. Freedom One: the right to fly across a country without landing; Freedom Two: the right to land in another nation for non-traffic purposes

6 Ibid., 12.
(mechanical problems and refueling; Freedom Three: the right land in another nation and discharge passengers, mail, and cargo; Freedom Four: the right to pick up passenger traffic and cargo from a country and return to the nation of origin; Freedom Five: the right to pick up traffic, cargo, and mail in a country from a third nation. The Five Freedoms of the Air was accepted by the United States, Canada and many Latin American nations including Mexico.7

The British agreed in principle with the Five Freedoms, but wanted to limit the amount of traffic and frequency of flights to offset the colossus of American commercial aviation through bilateral negotiations between nations. To overcome the British reluctance for an unfettered Five Freedoms, two separate agreements were created: the International Air Services Transit Agreement (Freedoms 1-2) and the International Air Transport Agreement (Freedoms 1-5). A nation could sign one or both agreements.8

The problems encountered at Chicago between the Americans and the British led to (with the help of Canada) the formation of explicit freedoms of the air. This paved the way for nations to establish air transit agreements through a bilateral process. Ultimately, for the United States this diplomatic evolution was acceptable as long as nations accepted all five freedoms. After the Chicago Conference, U.S. government officials believed that bilateral air transport agreements could be negotiated promptly to initiate the American century in the skies around the world.9

The British walked out of the Chicago Conference balking at the notion of an unencumbered Fifth Freedom. The British wanted to harness the Fifth Freedom with traffic and flight frequency limits between nations negotiated through a bilateral process. A year later in the Caribbean on the island of Bermuda the United States and Great Britain settled their differences. The British accepted the Fifth Freedom and the United States agreed to limit traffic and flight frequency by American air carriers between the United States and Great Britain. The Bermuda Agreement of 1946 finally put the two largest western democracies on the same heading concerning the foundation of post-war international aviation.10

For the United States, bilateral air transport agreements with close geographical neighbors, for example, Mexico, made economic sense. From a U.S. perspective, American aviation preeminence would prevail and help both nations with trade and tourism. With the Mexican government’s acceptance of both air agreements created at the Chicago Air Conference U.S. State Department officials assumed that an air transport treaty with Mexico would be secured within a matter of weeks after the war. Mexican officials, however, worried about the overwhelming assets,
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expertize and deep pockets of U.S. air carriers and the expected change in U.S. international aviation policy.

In 1945 U.S. international aviation policy was still the *chosen instrument* of Pan American Airways holding a monopoly on international aviation. In Mexico, Pan American Airways and its subsidiary Mexican-flag airlines controlled commercial aviation. During World War II, the U.S. military contracted with the sixteen domestic carriers (regulated by the CAB) to help fly troop and cargo missions throughout the world. The success of these operations convinced the owners of the domestic airlines that they should share in the unlimited future of post-war international aviation. After the end of World War II, the Civil Aeronautics Board allowed the domestic airlines to apply for international routes. The CAB divided the applications into a series of geographic route cases; for example, the North Atlantic Route Case and the Latin America Route Case. Each case centered on whether to maintain the *chosen instrument* idea or allow competition: multiple airlines entry into the field. The Board’s judgment in these seminal decisions would set post-war international aviation policy.  

On 1 June 1945 the Civil Aeronautics Board announced the North Atlantic Route Case. The CAB decided in favor of regulated competition ending the twenty year *chosen instrument* policy in U.S. international aviation policy. The CAB decision allowed for competition on flights to Great Britain and Northern Europe. Pan American Airways’s monopoly on international air travel was now over, which reflected the many new global economic realities wrought by the end of the War (World War II was over in Europe in May of 1945). The CAB allowed American Airlines (American purchased Export Airlines and renamed the carrier American Overseas Airline) and Transcontinental & Western Air (renamed Trans World Airlines in 1950) to join Pan American Airways providing commercial airline service to Great Britain and Europe.

The first official bilateral air transport negotiations were held between Mexico and the United States in Washington D.C. In October of 1945, Mexican delegates arrived in the American capital. The Mexican delegation was led by Charge d’Affaires of the Mexican Embassy Rafael de La Colina. Accompanying Colina were General Alberto Salina Carranza of the Mexican Air Force; and Hebolledo Clement and Hernandez Vergo, both of the Mexican Ministry of Communications and Public Works.

The American delegation consisted of Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, L. Welch Pogue; Stokley W. Morgan, Chief of the Aviation Division in

---

the State Department; and John W. Chriagan, Chief of the Division of Mexican Affairs, Department of State. During these initial high-level talks the two countries reconfirmed the Five Freedoms principle set forth in the Chicago agreements. The delegations continued their talks about routes between the United States and Mexico. Conversations centered on specific city-pairs and the airlines that would fly them; however, these conversations produced growing friction. After several weeks of talks they could not find common ground.\(^{14}\) The bilateral negotiations were put on hold, and any new talks would be based in part upon the pending Latin American Route Case before the Civil Aeronautics Board.

On 17 May 1946 the Civil Aeronautics Board decided in favor of regulated competition in U.S. international aviation in Latin America, ending Pan American Airways’s monopoly in Mexico, Central America, and South America. In the Latin American Route Case the CAB granted four new airlines and Pan American Airways routes into Mexico:

1. Braniff Airways: San Antonio and Laredo, Texas to Monterrey and Mexico City, Mexico.
2. American Airways: Fort Worth and Dallas, Texas to Monterrey and Mexico City, Mexico; and El Paso to Monterrey and Mexico City
3. Western Airlines: Los Angeles and San Diego to La Paz and Mexico City
4. Eastern Airlines: New Orleans to Mexico City
5. Pan American Airways: Houston and New Orleans to Merida; Houston, Corpus Christi and Brownsville to Tampico and Mexico City\(^ {15}\)

In the summer of 1946 a second round of U.S.-Mexican bilateral air transport negotiations resumed with the CAB’s Latin American Route Case as the new foundation of U.S. international aviation policy – regulated competition. The Latin American Route Case also provided American negotiators with a specific set of air routes coveted by U.S. air carriers. This time the talks were held in Mexico City. Armed with new policy on both strategic and tactical levels, six U.S. representatives traveled to Mexico to hammer out a much needed treaty with Mexico.\(^ {16}\)

On 23 June 1946 the U.S. delegation arrived in Mexico City. Representing the United States were Oswald Ryan, Vice-Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board; Joe D. Walstrom, Acting Chief of the Aviation Division, State Department; William McLean, Political Economist, Mexican Division, State Department; George Neel, General Counsel of the CAB; John Sherman, Assistant Chief, Economic Bureau, CAB; and Mildred Ruffin, Secretary, CAB.\(^ {17}\)

---
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When the American team arrived in Mexico City they met with U.S. Ambassador to Mexico, William Thurston. Thurston reemphasized that above all, the United States wanted to secure the routes found in the Latin American Route Case. Thurston would help if necessary during the process, acting as a go-between with the Mexican government.18

The next day talks began with the American delegation immediately focusing on the air routes proposed in the Latin American Route Case. The Mexican government; however, arrived at the meetings with their own set of routes. The routes were:

1. Mexico City to Los Angeles
2. Torreon, Mexico to Nogales, Arizona, and Phoenix to Los Angeles
3. Mexico City and Monterrey to San Antonio and Fort Worth-Dallas
4. Torreon to Houston
5. Monterrey to Houston
6. Mexico City, and San Antonio to Detroit
7. Tampico to Brownsville
8. Mexico City and Tampico to New Orleans and New York City
9. Mexico City to Miami

Soon serious problems emerged. Mexican officials accused the Americans of coming to the meeting with a rigid agenda already established in the Latin American Route Case. The Mexican representatives were offended at the arrogance of the American position. The idea of the United States imposing a policy created by a domestic U.S. regulatory agency (the Civil Aeronautics Board) illustrated an unwillingness to negotiate in good faith. These perceptions of American diplomacy stalled the meetings. In response to this situation, Ambassador Thurston ordered his Senior Economic Advisor, Robert W. Bradbury, to meet with the leadership of both delegations. Bradbury was able to help restart the mired talks.19

During the next two weeks, Mexico accepted all American connections except Route 1. Mexico doubted its smaller air carriers could compete with Braniff Airways. Mexico was more flexible on Route 2 with either Braniff Airways or American Airlines. The U.S. delegation suggested a trial run on Route 2. Mexico agreed with this recommendation. Mexico’s flexibility gave the American delegation hope for a real breakthrough.20

Unfortunately, Mexico’s initial attitude did not last. After two weeks of progress, the talks ground to another halt. A new problem arose in the negotiation process centering on the division of traffic on air routes. Mexico wanted a set division of traffic, passenger capacity, and flight schedules. In the end, the Mexican delegation

18 Ibid.
19 Ibid., 994-996.
20 Ibid.
demanded a 50-50 division of passenger traffic. American officials could not agree with the request.\textsuperscript{21}

With negotiations at another standstill, Ambassador Thurston again stepped in to reset the delicate talks. Thurston visited with the President of Mexico, Manuel Avila Comacho, and tried to clear up any problems. Thurston explained to Comacho that the United States believed that airlines should compete for passengers based upon price and service. Attempts to micro-regulate traffic volume were an unfair business practice and violated the Fifth Freedom mandates agreed upon at the Chicago Conference.\textsuperscript{22} Comacho countered that Mexican air carriers needed protection from American supremacy in civil aviation. Camacho told Thurston that “equality of opportunity could not exist when given the disproportion in existing resources.”\textsuperscript{23} Camacho was correct: U.S. airlines had the money, planes and experience to dominate the skies over Mexico.

The United States, however, refused to accept an uncompetitive division of traffic on routes. Ambassador Thurston met with the American delegation to inform them of Comacho’s outlook. Then, Thurston and the U.S. delegation agreed that the impasse was too great to overcome. Negotiations were postponed for a second time, and on 25 July 1946 the Americans returned to Washington D.C. empty handed.\textsuperscript{24}

In Dallas, Texas, Thomas E. Braniff, owner of Braniff Airways, a company seeking new routes into Mexico, blamed Juan Trippe’s Pan American Airways (PAA owned stock in several Mexican-flag airlines) for influencing the Mexican government to stall diplomatic talks with the United States. In Mexico City, Ambassador Thurston sent the State Department a report on the recent bilateral discussions. He included a set of recommendations to successfully conclude an air transport treaty. Thurston believed that despite an upcoming election in the fall of 1946, there would not be a change in Mexican policy. Indeed, the new president, Miguel Aleman, did not alter his nation’s diplomatic stance. Thurston told the State Department that Washington must convince Mexican leadership that an equal distribution of air traffic was not economically viable or beneficial, and that unfair business practices would result in poor service and the failure of both Mexican and American airlines. He concluded his report indicating that he believed the Truman Administration should take a strong and active role in the new set of talks.\textsuperscript{25}

In July 1947 the White House and the State Department heeded Thurston’s advice. Gary Norton, Assistant Secretary of State, instructed Ambassador Thurston to hand deliver a letter from Harry S. Truman to President Miguel Aleman. In the

\textsuperscript{21} Ibid.
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\textsuperscript{23} Ibid., 995.
\textsuperscript{24} Ibid., 994-996.
letter, Truman asked Aleman to become more involved in the negotiation process, and said that all talks should be based upon fair business practices. Truman recommended that each country should limit the members of the delegation to government officials. Aleman agreed with Truman’s suggestions, but proposed that both nations send only one representative.26

Both the United States and Mexico agreed to the procedural changes and set a new round of talks for August. The State Department tapped Paul Reveley as its representative, and Mexico selected Martin Perez as its diplomat. On 17 August 1947 Reveley and Perez met in the sweltering heat of the Mexican capital. By all indications the conference was proceeding well despite previous obstacles. Martin Perez told Reveley that Mexico accepted all earlier proposed air routes requests except for the New Orleans to Mexico City route. Then, Perez boldly announced that Mexico wanted a monopoly on this city-pair.27 Reveley was surprised by the new demand.

Reveley told Perez that he would inform the State Department of his request, but assured him that the United States would not accept a monopoly by either nation. During the next week Perez and Reveley continued their talks. Perez conceded that President Aleman wanted to secure a bilateral treaty as soon as possible, and that Mexico would not press for a monopoly between Mexico City and New Orleans. Perez told Reveley that though Mexico could show some flexibility on this route, they wanted a monopoly on the Mexico City to Los Angeles run granted to Western Airlines. Perez argued that with American and Western Airlines flying the Los Angeles to Mexico City route, Mexico’s airlines would be crushed. Reveley agreed with Perez, but told him that any request for a monopoly run by one nation was unacceptable to the State Department.28

After a week of heated discussion it was obvious that the problems were insurmountable. For the United States the issue centered around Mexico’s demands for monopolies on specific routes. This request countered prevailing U.S. international aviation policy that forbade the establishment of any monopolies. The two diplomats continued to talk, but the meetings were fruitless.

By mid-October, U.S. officials in Mexico City believed that the American demand for the entry of six air carriers was too aggressive, and the root cause for Mexican monopoly demands. They suggested to superiors in Washington D.C. that the Civil Aeronautics Board should reevaluate the Latin American Route Case.29 The State Department, however, rejected this notion. Secretary of State George
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By the autumn of 1947, all three attempts to negotiate a bilateral air transport treaty between the United States and Mexico had failed. American diplomats blamed Mexican insistence on route monopolies as the main cause of the diplomatic impasse. Many State Department officials believed that Pan American Airways was directly pressuring the Mexican government to delay negotiations. For frustrated American officials this issue seemed insurmountable. Every day without a treaty, U.S. international aviation policy remained dormant in Mexico, weakening the foundation of the Latin American Route Case. American Airlines, Braniff Airways, Eastern Airlines, and Western Airlines lost money. In addition other, terrestrial American (and Mexican) businesses lost valuable opportunities to profit from modern commercial aviation. At the Department of State officials digested all the data from the last round of air transports talks, determined to find a new approach to successfully navigate treacherous diplomatic waters with a stalwart Mexican government.

The major lesson gleaned from two years of fruitless talks was a matter of tactics, not policy. An exasperated Harry S. Truman decided to cut a different diplomatic swath to solve the impasse. Frustrated with the State Department’s lack of success, Truman decided to send his own personal representative to Mexico City to solve the diplomatic stalemate. In 1948 Truman tapped George Brownell, a New York lawyer, to conduct a new round of face to face negotiations. Truman was confident that his own hand-selected envoy would bring back the coveted air transport treaty. Unfortunately for the United States, the Brownell mission to Mexico failed as well. Despite the failure of his trip, Brownell made an important suggestion to American officials for future negotiations. Brownell believed in addition to revising specific economic aspects of the airline agreement, the United States should be willing to link the treaty talks with other issues important to Mexico (such as bank loans for economic development).  

From 1949 to 1953 the Truman Administration restarted air transport discussions with Mexico. New talks included concessions on routes and slight readjustments to U.S. international aviation policy. Changes in American offers did not include any linkage to economic incentives for Mexico to make diplomatic concessions. These efforts during the last years of Truman’s term in the White House, however, yielded more frustration and no results. The Truman Administration’s failure to link the air transport negotiations with economic issues (such as loans) was imprudent and proved problematic.

It would take a new president, Dwight D. Eisenhower, to make the final breakthrough in 1957. Eisenhower’s State Department made several early attempts to negotiate an airline treaty with Mexico, but with no success. By the late 1950s Mexico needed World Bank loans for economic development; for example, expansion of the Mexican railroad system. The United States held the keys to World Bank loan approval. Eisenhower decided to use this as leverage toward finally brokering an air transport treaty.32

Eisenhower’s willingness to both limit U.S. air carriers’ demands – restrictions on flight frequency, traffic division, and the number of U.S. airlines flying into Mexico – and linking negotiations to World Bank loan approval finally ended the Mexican government’s delay tactics. In June of 1957 the United States and Mexico exchanged diplomatic notes forging a long awaited air transport agreement. Though not a treaty, only a short-term executive agreement (two years), the Eisenhower Administration opened the door for U.S.-Mexican commercial aviation to flourish and reach its full potential.33

From 1945 to 1947 all three attempts by the Truman Administration to negotiate an air transport treaty failed for a variety of reasons. One must give credit to the amount of diplomatic effort put into this crucial issue during the years 1945-1953. The Truman White House tried many approaches during this stretch to conclude an aviation treaty with the Mexican government: talks in Washington D.C., meetings in Mexico City, large delegations, personal envoys, and after 1947, new routes proposals and limited economic concessions.

During the first two years of the air transport negotiation process, Truman’s unwillingness to give economic incentives to a much weaker Mexico, in the light of overwhelming dominance of American commercial aviation, was short-sighted. In the final analysis, the Truman Administration must receive poor marks for its failure to reach an air transport treaty with a close neighbor throughout its tenure in Washington D.C.

33 Ibid., 101-103.
“Outline of a Plan for a Self-sustaining Institution for Homeless and Outcast Females”:
Emma Hardinge and Caroline Dall’s Transatlantic Mission to Rescue the Lives of Outcast Women in 1860s Boston

Lisa Howe
Florida International University

This story is about two women of very different backgrounds, Emma Hardinge of London and Caroline Healey Wells Dall of Boston, who worked together in Boston during the early 1860s to establish a home for outcast women and to incorporate training in sustainable agriculture to create pride in their work and themselves. This article demonstrates a transatlantic connection of reform ideas for women, specifically between England and the United States. The actions of Hardinge and Dall reveal a relatively new ideology of compassion for other women as women, and a rehabilitation-minded approach to prostitution.

Emma Hardinge, born 1823 in London, began working within the arena of performance, theater, and music as a young girl of eleven when her father died. She claimed to have no formal education during her childhood, with the exception of music. This allowed her to help support her family following her father’s death.\(^1\) Hardinge and her mother travelled to New York in 1855 on a six-month theater contract with a Broadway company. Not long after Hardinge’s arrival in New York she became acquainted with and was soon a devout follower of American Modern Spiritualism. America, particularly the Northeastern states, was brimming with this relatively new phenomenon that some would call religion, while others would consider it to be entertainment. Her performances at this point moved from the Broadway stage to the lecture podium and the séance table.

Caroline Healey Dall was born in 1822 in Boston to a wealthy family. Dall was highly educated, published articles in religious newspapers as early as her thirteenth year, and engaged in philosophical and political debates as a young woman in the company of the Peabodys, Ralph Waldo Emerson, Margaret Fuller, Henry David Thoreau, and Theodore Parker, among others. She married a Unitarian minister, but she found Transcendentalism more in line with her own ideological thinking.\(^2\)

Scholarship on nineteenth-century social reforms and the women who participated in them has been linked to liberal religious foundations on both sides of the Atlantic, especially nonconformists and dissenters to orthodox religious traditions. Hardinge’s life as a Spiritualist involved primarily her theological writing and lecturing, as well as reform work on several issues, including


women’s rights, abolition, and labor reform, predominantly in the United States. Historical scholarship corroborates the link between Spiritualists and the liberal religious tradition of reform work. James Reardon argues that Spiritualists and other nonconformists and dissenters embodied social reform.³ Ann Braude finds a connection between Spiritualism and radical political activism in America, and it was particularly important to women’s rights because it offered a platform for women and a critique of traditional authority.⁴ Alex Owen, similar to Braude, concludes that Spiritualist women in England were likewise able to successfully subvert culturally-coded feminine norms of Victorian England through mediumship, and adopted leadership roles either in public or private spaces. Despite this subversion these women were often admired and praised for their gifts of mediumship and ability to communicate with spirits.⁵

Scholarship on the history of helping outcast women and prostitutes has predominantly been nation-based. Magdalen Asylums were run by the Church and were based on Christian ideals of morality and moral regulation, not rehabilitation. In England and the United States the major responses to prostitution prior to 1860 were led by the Church or religious institutions. Magdalen Institutions developed in Whitechapel, England in 1758 and led to similar institutions in Ireland by 1767. The first Magdalen Asylum in the United States was the Magdalen Society of Philadelphia, founded in 1800.⁶

Brian Titley’s study of Magdalen asylums in Ireland found that between the 1830s and all the way into the 1990s, thousands of Irish women were incarcerated without due process for sexual behavior in violation of the Catholic Church’s moral code. Nuns operated these asylums in an effort to protect society from these wayward women, and to reform the women through harsh laundry work and devotional rituals. Some adapted and lived a nun-like life with the Sisters, but most simply lived their lives enduring the drudgery. These asylums were not regulated by law and they reveal the hegemonic power of the Church in Ireland.⁷

Frances Finnegan’s work on the Irish Magdalen Asylums reveals that once prostitutes were detained they were often forcibly prevented from leaving for the rest of their lives. Their work was not remunerated and they were subject to harsh discipline. Finnegan argues that the Church used these women as unpaid labor, and when prostitutes could not be found they turned to fallen women such as unwed mothers and abused girls. Some were mentally retarded. Many were even brought

in by their families and priests. These organizations used fallen women as a labor force and they kept them away from society for society’s sake, however, there were some that focused on the women’s plight with a desire to protect and rehabilitate them.

Annemieke van Drenth and Francisca de Haan’s work focuses on the rise of Caring Power in Europe. The idea of Caring Power relates to the context in which women began to feel responsible for other women, and this developed a new sense of collective gender identity, which led to the establishment of all-female organizations. It began with the treatment of female prisoners. Quaker Elizabeth Fry was one of the first to advocate treating prisoners as human beings and to improve the treatment of female prisoners. Her work began as early as 1817 at Newgate Prison in London. Drenth and Haan’s work continues with the study of Caring Power in their focus on Josephine Butler, who became famous in her leadership to repeal the Contagious Diseases Acts in England that were promulgated in 1864. Butler fought for the prostitutes’ rights against the police and doctors who were authorized to pick up any woman who might be a prostitute and have her physically examined.

Wealthy and respectable citizens in New York attempted to begin a Magdalen Society in 1830 with the purpose of the reformation of abandoned females who wished to return to a virtuous life. The public received the publication of this plan with bitter feelings and opposition, and the Society ceased its operations and dissolved. Rev. J.R. McDowall continued his labor alone and published “Magdalen Facts” in 1832. Soon after societies were formed by ladies in his Laight Street and Spring Street congregations, and thereafter several congregations came together and formed the Female Benevolent Society, which by 1834 became the Female Moral Reform Society of the City of New York. The First Annual Report of the Female Moral Reform Society of the City of New York was published in 1835. This institution was church run, exclusively by women. The Christian public of all denominations was called upon to aid in the erection of an organization to help and reform fallen women. These ideas of Caring Power and rehabilitation influenced and inspired Hardinge and Dall in their missions to help outcast women.

In February of 1859 Emma Hardinge lectured on “The Place and Mission of Woman” in Boston. In November of that same year Caroline Dall lectured on
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“Woman’s Right to Labor” in Boston as well. Hardinge gave her lecture at the Melodeon in Boston on Sunday afternoon, 13 February 1859 at 3:30, followed by a lecture on marriage at 7:00 that evening, both lectures attended by very large audiences. In Hardinge’s first lecture of the day she began by addressing the different natures and missions of men and women, and the educational needs for both sexes in order to be a companion to their opposite sex; each sex having its own equal mission in life in combination with its counterpart. Girls, like boys, should be educated in anatomy, physiology and mentality. She then moved on to the exceptions within each sex: “There are those placed above the necessity of laboring, or of becoming the wives of operatives.”

She asked why women cannot be astronomers and navigators, occupations that dealt with the knowledge of science and not physical power. “We can see no limit to the power of woman to enter into the chambers of knowledge,” she asserted, and urged men to open their colleges and schools to women. Hardinge also spoke about the unreasonable expectations that society and husbands placed on wives and mothers to take care of the household labors and then appear cheerful when the husband arrived home from his day of labor; and she spoke about the drudgery jobs that were available, as domestic servants, spinsters and prostitutes. Hardinge spoke to women of all classes and urged them to help themselves, not to sit on a shelf waiting for a man to purchase them. Hardinge looked forward to the day when it would be disgraceful for a woman to have no occupation, when in the evenings husbands and wives would come together on equal terms to speak about their respective days and “treasures of life.”

Caroline Dall’s lectures were later published under the title “Woman’s Right to Labor;” or, Low Wages and Hard Work: In Three Lectures, Delivered in Boston, November, 1859. Many of the themes present in Harding’s lecture in February were repeated in Dall’s words. These included women’s right to education, the choice of vocation, the right to elective franchise, and for women to strive together as one. There were recurrent themes that women act for women as women, and that they save all children as their own. Dall pointed to the degradation of working class women and their working environments. She made the charge that upper class women’s love of dress and morbid disgust with labor exacerbated the ruin of all women. She urged that the reform should begin in the upper classes, whose women should open their own doors and serve their own food. Refusing to do things for themselves made clear to servants that their work was degrading. Dall made reference to helpful articles from the United Kingdom, the Englishwoman’s Journal and The Edinburgh Review, their census results being similar to Dall’s
findings in her article on “Female Industry” in Boston, and their treatments were so similar that she followed their authority on the reforms they sanctioned.16

Near the end of her address Dall broached the subject of prostitution. Women’s inability to have all vocations and job choices open to them meant that “the question which is at this moment before the great body of working women is ‘death or dishonor.’”17 Dall again called on women in society to stand with working women, urging that “ten Beacon Street women, engaged in honorable work, would do more for this cause than all the female artists, all the speech-making and conventions in the world.”18 Dall cited evidence from German, French, English, and Scottish articles and studies on the causes of prostitution, and specifically quoted Duchâtelet, who argued that “in all great towns, none is so active as the want of work, or inadequate remuneration. . . . Compare the price of labor with the price of dishonor, and you will cease to be surprised that women fall.”19 Dall finally referred to Dr. William Sanger of New York and his work with prostitutes. Dr. Sanger performed statistical work on prostitutes in New York City after the middle of the century.20 According to Sanger, one prostitute argued that a whole day’s work only brought a few pennies, but a smile would buy her dinner. He found that of 2,000 prostitutes, 1,800 were brought up to do nothing, and were given no education.21

Emma Hardinge, just five years after arriving in the United States, contacted Caroline Dall in June of 1860 to propose they merge their efforts and work together for the benefit of outcast women. Hardinge’s letter to Dall expressed her gratitude for Dall’s published work on Woman’s Rights to Labor and thanked her as a woman and a reformer. Hardinge suggested that upon her return to Boston they get together to right “these terrible wrongs that our woman’s hearts are already bleeding for.”22

Hardinge devised a plan and Dall, using her Bostonian connections, formed committees to put the plan into action. Hardinge’s ideas for the Home for Outcast Women were based on rehabilitation, gaining or regaining self-respect by learning skills in agriculture, and there was no religious element mentioned in her plan. This attempt occurred in 1860, decades before the Progressive Era flourished between the 1890s and the 1920s. Yet Hardinge’s ideas were progressive, a move away from strict religious control, a move toward rehabilitation and opportunity for outcast women, a recognition of women fighting for the welfare of other women.
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Hardinge continued to lecture on Modern Spiritualism and to solicit funds for the Home for Outcast Women. Her 1860 publication of *Six Lectures on Theology and Nature* was comprised of lectures delivered over the course of three Sundays during October and November 1860 at Kingsbury Hall in Chicago. In the “Preface to the Reader,” Hardinge proclaimed that the funds collected in the sale of her publication would go toward building “the home for the homeless, the shelter for the houseless, whose miserable lot has been one of the stimulants to this publication.”\(^23\) An addendum to the published lectures contained her proposed “Outline of A Plan for a Self-Sustaining Institution for Homeless and Outcast Females, in Which they can be employed and instructed in a Progressive System of Horticulture.” The plan at this point was distributed and available to the public.

The Outline proposed a safe haven for the “benefit of females, who, by misfortune or loss of character, are without homes, friends, protection, or means of sustenance.”\(^24\) The goals were as follows: first, to restore or establish self-respect in these women by offering them a home, employment and a means of sustenance; second, to remove the temptation to commit sin just to be able to eat. But vice was not a necessary qualification for admission, preventing women from turning to a life of vice was just as important. Finally, to instruct the women in the most advanced scientific horticultural knowledge to allow for better employment opportunities instead of low-paying menial work. These vocations would in turn aid in sustaining the Institution. One of the goals was to continue the advancement of horticultural science toward a level of perfection not yet attained.\(^25\) Each day at the Home would begin and end with music and reading in a universal spirit of sisterly equality. Hardinge prescribed Trustees be appointed to administer the finances and running of the Home. She offered her services as a teacher and co-worker, and to continue lecturing around the country to raise funds.

On 26 March 1861, a public meeting was held at the Tremont Temple to consider Hardinge’s plan for Boston’s outcast and homeless women. Emma Hardinge spoke to the audience and excited much interest. On 29 March 1861, the *Boston Daily Advertiser* published a letter addressed to Miss Emma Hardinge and signed by 48 persons, men and women, including Mrs. Dall, all members of the committee of local philanthropists appointed to consider Hardinge’s plan. The letter publicly expressed an interest in the plan and suggested she speak to the citizens of Boston, as she was the best person to explain it. Her lecture was scheduled for 6 April, at 7:00 p.m.\(^26\) This was clearly meant as an advertisement for the public to hear the
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plan again as explained by its author. On 6 April, Hardinge repeated her lecture given on 26 March.

Following Hardinge’s second lecture on her plan, circulars advertised another public meeting to be held on 9 April, and it was decided at this meeting that Hardinge’s plan was “eminently worthy of the attention of those who best appreciate the magnitude of the evil,” and it was resolved to form a committee of eleven persons to further consider the matter in deeper detail and to present a report the following Monday, 16 April.

It was not until 19 April that an official report was finally written, amended, and given to Dall to be sent to press. According to the Report, which was signed 20 April 1861, the committee came to the decision that “however warmly the world’s sympathy may be enlisted in behalf of this unhappy class, we find but little faith in the probability of any efficient reform, and, consequently, but little disposition to aid us.” They went on to state that skepticism was their chief obstacle, but they wanted to find a better, a more hopeful way to deal with the problem. They argued the plan as proposed intended to substitute the past unsuccessful efforts of instituting “unwavering routine needle-work and domestic labor,” with the adoption of training for more suitable livelihoods according to the particular temperaments of the participants, with horticulture to be the main feature. The committee found that the current plan would not be sufficient for the greater interest of fallen women seeking relief from their lives of sin. One institution would not suffice.

Despite their pessimistic opinion regarding the outcome, the committee found that this plan deserved a chance, and considered $10,000 the amount needed through voluntary subscriptions in order to get things started. Following the initial funds, the Home would run on its own labor. Those who wished to reform themselves would have to live by established regulations and agree to work to earn a living and for the support of all. The work would consist of outside agriculture with fruits, vegetables and husbandry, and indoor preparation of the harvests by pickling, preserving, putting up for sale their produce, and making the common garments. A few teachers would train them in these skills at first, until the students became proficient enough in their field to train newcomers. The supervision of the Home would be under the guidance of Trustees and of a nondenominational Christian religious instruction. Religious instruction was the only deviation from Hardinge’s initial plan, as she never mentioned any religious affiliation. The Report made it clear that Hardinge’s plan was a good one, but her being a Spiritualist would have no bearing on the instruction within the Home.

28 Boston Institute for Homeless and Outcast women, Statement of the Committee Appointed to Consider the Institution Proposed by Miss Emma Hardinge for Homeless and Outcast Women (Boston, 1861).
29 Ibid.
30 Ibid.
At the 22 April meeting only a dozen people showed up “because of the excited state of the public feeling concerning” the April 12 attack on Fort Sumter. This meeting was also confused and rushed because many of the members who did show up were in a hurry to attend a meeting regarding the supply and comfort of the Massachusetts regiments. There was an overall sentiment that it was unsuitable to solicit money during the present crisis, and it was agreed to suspend the Soliciting committee until September. Still, 2,500 copies of the Report were to be printed, with 1,000 to be immediately circulated, and the subject was to remain active in the Committee’s mind which would in discreet ways assist in the maturing of the plan. There was a move to erase the words “outcast-women” anywhere they appeared in the Report, to which Hardinge and Dall strenuously objected. Hardinge acquiesced on naming the institution a Female Horticultural Institute because the abandoned women she had already spoken with would recognize that name. Dall and William Copland preferred the word agricultural because it “indicated simpler and less expensive labor” and “was likely to present a truer idea.” At this meeting Hardinge asked, and it was granted, that she be permitted to “begin on a small scale, on her own responsibility, should she find something during the summer.”

Hardinge was eager to get things moving and did not want to be deterred by the escalating war.

Distribution of the Report was discussed at a small meeting of the Standing Committee on 30 April. A larger meeting was held on 3 June. Dall writes that before the formal meeting opened, she read a letter Hardinge wrote to the *Boston Journal* on 1 June 1861, titled “The Home for Outcast Females.” Hardinge mentioned to Dall before the meeting that she felt remorse over not first consulting with the Committee before having the letter published in the newspaper. Dall pasted the letter within the front cover of one of her handwritten journals. This letter was written a month and a half after the American Civil War began. It was reprinted in William Lloyd Garrison’s paper the *Liberator* in June of 1861, and it is evidence of Hardinge’s continued attempts to found and fund the home for outcast women despite the escalating war. Of course no one knew how long this war would last.

Hardinge’s letter expressed regret over asking for space within the *Boston Journal* at a time when it was “imperatively required for a more momentous matter.” However, she acquitted herself to a debt to the citizens that tendered pledges many months before the outbreak of war for their interest in the Home for Outcast Women. She announced that the Committee felt it necessary to suspend further action until next fall, or “such time as the public mind should be free to
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sympathize in such a movement.”36 As we know now, that moment would not come until after four more long years of war.

In this same letter to the editor Hardinge announced her desire to use the funds she had collected thus far to start a small experimental home, because she believed the livelihood of the outcast women would only get worse during a national crisis. It seems that it was with an awfully heavy heart Hardinge asked to explain why this design could not be carried out. She relayed the story of how for six months she and two friends tried in vain to find any sort of housing available. She believed “landlords and proprietors seem to have entered into a league against the admission of the outcast to their dwellings.”37 She came to the conclusion that she could not do this on her own, and that it would be necessary for a company to buy the land and build the home needed for the rehabilitation of outcast women. This matter would have to wait until the Committee reassembled, which it never did.

Hardinge and Dall continued their relentless work throughout their lives for the welfare and betterment of others, especially women. In November of 1861 Dall lectured in a hall in Bromfield about the atrocities of slavery in the South, but also about the horrid conditions outcast women in the North continued to live with, stressing the injustices that prevailed right under their noses. She spoke of Emma Hardinge recently entering a “house of sin and shame” with the guidance of the police, and covering her face with her hands as she left, exclaiming that she was ashamed to live. She called on women in the North not to give up on their unfortunate sisters.38

Emma Hardinge spoke to a large audience on 25 February 1862 in New York’s Dodworth’s Hall, still fighting on behalf of the “wretched female outcasts that throng the streets of our cities by night.”39 Hardinge continued to press for her plan in establishing industrial homes for the “poor Magdalens,” and to effect reform through “cheerful, pleasant and comfortable homes and kindly treatment...leading them back gradually to self-respect and usefulness.”40 Hardinge appropriated all of the proceeds from her lectures to the cause. The New York Times reported that if she did not receive support for this plan in New York, she would return to Boston and continue her struggle there. Hardinge “implored the public to allow no sectarian or other prejudice to interfere.”41 Her plans were discussed in a meeting between the Mayor and other gentlemen on 4 March 1862.42 Hardinge remained in the United States throughout the entire Civil War, and lectured throughout the country for the
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reelection of Abraham Lincoln. She did not return home to England until 1865, a full ten years after her arrival in New York as an actress.

This article has examined the efforts of two like-minded women from different continents, different religious and educational backgrounds, and from different classes, who came together to make a difference in the lives of unfortunate and fallen women in Boston in the early 1860s leading up to the American Civil War. Their work is remarkable because it shows a distinct change in method and strategy toward rehabilitating these women. Prostitutes were seen as women who were never given opportunities for education or the diverse vocational training needed to be successful and self-respecting. This project never did get a start. We will never know if it would have worked, if the citizens of Boston would have given it a chance even if the Civil War had not occurred at this particular moment in time. This idea of women fighting for other women would eventually become a bigger part of reform movements to better the lives of women near the latter part of the nineteenth century.
Special Section
Selected Undergraduate Articles
Chanel No. 5 has been one of the most popular and sought after perfumes since its launch in 1921. Mazzeo in *The Secrets of Chanel No. 5* describes its allure, “Young women wear it to feel rich and sophisticated. Rich and sophisticated women wear it to feel sexy. Sexy women know precisely why Marilyn Monroe made it her signature perfume.”¹ The fragrance, the bottle, and the label all imbue qualities of sophistication and elegance, of modernity and sensuality. From its debut, Chanel No. 5 was seen as the ultimate scent for women. It was the scent that captivated the women of the twentieth century who were increasingly embracing their sexuality. What is interesting is just how Chanel No. 5 became so popular amongst women around the world, as the perfume’s promotion came from word of mouth rather than from advertising. By contextualizing Chanel No. 5 within the historical currents experienced by the perfume industry throughout the nineteenth and twentieth century, I will reveal just how unique the success of Chanel No. 5 was compared to its competitors.

The World of Scents Before Chanel No. 5

The century leading up to the launch of Chanel No. 5 in 1921 established the foundation in which a market for fragrances could flourish. As imperialism instituted greater contact between what Westerners saw as civilized and primitive cultures, cleanliness became a significant indicator of progress and civilization.² The Western world was able to distinguish its progress through the capability of maintaining good hygiene thanks to the technological advances that made soap and water widely available. The preoccupation for Western societies to distinguish themselves from primitive societies through hygiene resulted in what Jackson Lears called a “revulsion against biology.”³ The battle between culture and nature was further promoted through the popularization of germ theory and Social Darwinism. Biology was a threat to life and civilization. Like the “primitive” societies throughout the world, it needed to be conquered. The metropolitan middle and upper classes particularly emphasized the cleanliness ethic as a means to formulate a class identity. In urban centers, people were experiencing upward mobility and there was an emerging middle class. They were engaging in more person-to-person contact so attention to hygiene intensified due to the association

between refinement and progress. As early as the 1830s, advertisers began tapping into the middle and upper class anxieties to win the battle over biology by marketing breath and body perfumes.

Another contributor paving the way for Chanel No. 5’s ultimate success was the modernization of scents. Fragrances, up until the late seventeenth century, had consisted of a single note derived from nature. Beginning in the late 1890s, developments in extracting and mimicking aromas resulted in more abstract and complex scents. Francois Coty, for example, created two classes of perfumes through these modern processes: soft floral sweet and chypre. The creation of new and complex smells contributed to a gendering of scents. With people washing more often due to their increasing anxieties over the maintenance of their hygiene, men no longer used excessive amounts of fragrances to cover up their biological smell. Rather, they preferred to use toilet soap, eau de Cologne, and scented oils for their hair. Women, however, were targeted as the primary consumers of modern scents. Increasingly, women became associated with soft or abstract scents such as sweet floral blends while men became associated with sharp and musky blends. The developments within the world of scents that resulted in the modernization and gendering of smells are arguably the most important factors that contributed to the overwhelming success of Chanel No. 5. Coco Chanel paid particular attention to these elements when creating the iconic scent. Without the advancements in perfume production and the gendering of scents, Chanel No. 5 could not have become the most sexy and modern fragrance of its time.

**Paris in America: Selling the French Mystique**

During the early twentieth century Paris began to be associated as the world center of fashion, art, and luxury. In 1900 the Paris Exhibition Universelle initiated this image of France as the center of innovative creativity by revealing the style of Art Nouveau. This style was characterized by sensuous lines, women with flowing hair, and floral motifs. In 1909 Francis Coty paved the way for creative packaging of perfumes by incorporating this new art form into the designs of his products. He commissioned Rene Lalique to design a daring bottle which was named the dragonfly flacon. He was one of the first to draw attention to the marketing advantages of creating elaborately designed packaging. Many perfumery houses followed suit in adopting the Art Nouveau style into the designs of their products. Labels of perfumes were all in French, sometimes named after streets in Paris, and
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bottles embraced the sensuous curves and floral motifs of the Art Nouveau. Later in 1925 with the Decorative Arts Exhibition in Paris, Art Deco replaced the Art Nouveau in perfume packaging. Art Deco, with mass production in mind, aimed at combining art and industry. Thereafter from the mid-1920s to the 1930s, Art Deco packaging featuring strong saturated colors dominated in the perfume world.

By the mid-nineteenth century, the American fashion market was in place. Fashion magazines like Peterson’s, Harper’s, Godey’s Lady’s Book, and The Home Journal sent emissaries to Paris to learn the latest trends for the sake of distributing fashion news to urban American women. As William R. Leach discussed in Land of Desire, fashion’s intent was to make women feel special. Fashion gave women the “opportunities for playacting, and to lift them into a world of luxury or pseudo-luxury, beyond...the humdrum everyday.” Magazines and department stores were fully aware of the escapist qualities of fashion so through that outlet they fostered a desire for the French Mystique. This desire was forged mainly through advertisements. One of the most sensational innovations within American fashion, the adaptation of the exclusive Paris fashion show for American mass audiences, further invoked the French Mystique. Ehrich Brother, founded by Rebecca Ehrich in 1857, put on this type of show for the first time around 1903. Many large retail stores followed suit, and in the next ten years the structures of American fashion shows were established. Models walked down ramps in store theaters or departments, spotlighted to musical accompaniment and often set around a Parisian theme. This theatrical form of persuasion ingrained the notion that Paris centered on all things fashion and luxury.

Many retailers believed that there was a magical link between Parisian aesthetic and a near guarantee of fashion-minded customers so they imported anything of French device. M.L. Wilson acknowledges this exploitation of French culture in “Why ‘France’ and ‘Perfume’ are Synonymous”:

The “French appeal” definitely took shape in 1909 or 1910, when my associate, Frank Hermes, said to me: “Why wouldn’t it be a good idea for us to put a sentence of French in each Djer-Kiss advertisement?” To which I demurred: “What would be the use of it? Few would understand what we were driving at.” To which he replied: “Well, even if they didn’t they would know that we were referring to something French.”

Such devices implanted the “belief that France was in perfume supreme and that only by following the French fashion and by using a French perfume could mes
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amies Americaines ever hope to be ‘a la mode.’”

This predominant trend of the French appeal sold in both the United States and France would be an advantage for Coco Chanel due to her association as a French designer. This association provided Chanel and the Chanel brand with credentials since she belonged to the world center of fashion and luxury.

**The Launch of Chanel No. 5: Appeals to the Senses and Status**

In 1920 Coco Chanel employed Ernest Beaux, a Russian immigrant who had worked with the House of Rallet in Moscow, to create the iconic fragrance. Though the use of modern scents was nothing new before the launch of Chanel No. 5, Beaux used them in an innovative and appealing way. He used an aldehyde, which is a synthetic that we have come to identify as the smell of “cleanliness” (the smell found in detergent for example), as the top note of the fragrance. Aldehydes fade quickly so Beaux used undertones of costly notes of ylang–ylang, jasmine, rose, and musk–for a long-lasting sensual experience of smell. The innovative and extensive use of aldehydes reflected the cultural current embracing modernity and the cleanliness ethic that manifested the century before. In addition, the sensual appeal of the scent was both culturally and biologically structured. The combination of the culturally constructed appeal of floral smells associated with femininity and the biological sex appeal of musk created the ultimate sensual scent for woman. Furthermore, the costly ingredients of Chanel No. 5 made it the most expensive fragrance of its period. From its debut, it targeted a specific customer. The fragrance imbued idealized sophistication and elegance of the French upper class. Only people of affluence could afford to gain a piece of Chanel. This association would only further promote Chanel No. 5 as the most glamorous fragrance for women.

The packaging of Chanel No. 5 clearly reflected the elements of luxury, sensuality, and modernity expressed by the scent it contained. Coco Chanel diverted from the Art Nouveau and Art Deco standards of her competitors in favor of a more simple and chic design that embodied the Chanel aesthetic. Coco Chanel was well-known for her “male-associated wear to feminine style” fashion lines. Her clothing designs embraced a “boy-girl” style; they suppressed the hips and chest and did not emphasize the waist. No. 5 was packaged in a similar “boy-girl” fashion. The flacon was sharp and rectangular, it was an adaptation on men’s cologne but more elegant. The black and white label simply displayed the name of the product: No. 5. The clear glass flacon was something modern and refreshing, something sophisticated and expensive, just like the scent held within it.
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19 Mazzeo, *The Secret of Chanel No. 5*, 80.
21 Ibid.
What set Chanel No. 5 apart from its competitors was its success tied to a word-of-mouth phenomenon rather than through advertisements. Coco Chanel refused to pay for any kind of promotion for the fragrance.\textsuperscript{22} To celebrate the invention of the fragrance, Coco Chanel put together a dinner party stunt at an exclusive restaurant in Cannes where she invited famous Parisian trendsetters to join her.\textsuperscript{23} It was a huge success; everyone was captivated by the fragrance and the word spread that Chanel created one of the most alluring fragrances of the day. Later, Coco Chanel had Ernest Beaux produce a hundred bottles so she could give them to her loyal clients. This stunt further promoted the Chanel No. 5 hype. Many women were eager to possess their own bottle of No. 5.

The Chanel fragrance’s official launch in 1921 could not have been better timed. Women in the 1920s were moving away from the Victorian ideals of femininity established a century before and embracing the glamorous flapper archetype that acknowledged women’s sex appeal. The No. 5 scent complimented this new trend in female identity by providing a means for these women to play with their sexuality through smell. The overwhelming success of Chanel No. 5 was articulated in a tribute to the perfume produced by the famous lithographer Sem in 1921. In the lithograph, a flapper looks longingly at the No. 5 bottle floating above her. Sem conveyed the notion that the perfume’s success was tied to its effectiveness in “capturing the spirit of the Roaring Twenties.”\textsuperscript{24}

**Chanel No. in America**

For the first few years Chanel No. 5 was only available in Chanel boutiques in Paris, Deauville, Biarritz, and Cannes.\textsuperscript{25} Coco Chanel realized the marketing potential of distributing the fragrance overseas to the United States where French perfumes were in high demand, but she was also aware that Ernest Beaux’s research lab in Grasse could not keep up with such demands. So in the spring of 1923 Coco Chanel met with Paul and Pierre Wertheimer, the owners of the world’s largest perfume manufacturing and distribution company. Their company was well-suited to meet the demands of a mass market. The agreement between the Wertheimer brothers and Coco Chanel ushered in new ownership. In exchange for the Wertheimer brothers distribution of No. 5 overseas, Coco Chanel had to sell the rights to the fragrance over to their company. As compensation, she would receive 10% of the profits. In order to protect the name of her brand, as well as her control over her couture line, Coco Chanel separated the fragrance business from the rest of her business thus creating *Les Parfums Chanel* in 1924. This was the company handed over to the Wertheimers under the condition that the Wertheimer brothers

\textsuperscript{22} Mazzeo, *The Secret of Chanel No. 5*, 86.
\textsuperscript{23} Ibid., 95.
\textsuperscript{24} Ibid., 67.
\textsuperscript{25} Caldwell, “The Development and Democratization,” 101.
agreed to sell “only first-class products” under the Chanel name to maintain the status of the designer.26

With the manufacturing capabilities of the Wertheimer company, Chanel No. 5 went abroad to the United States. This was the first time women in America were able to purchase their own bottles in their home country. The Chanel No. 5 experience abroad in the United States was interesting in that it was competing with products that looked just like it. The Wertheimer company created multiple Chanel No. products that ranged in prices and notes. Though these variations on the original fragrance emphasized different notes of No. 5, the flacons of these various products were only distinguishable by the number on the label. In addition, advertisements were used for the first time to sell these Chanel No. products. The first ever known ad appeared in the New York Times on 16 December 1924. Advertisements such as the one in the New York Times were modest and confined exclusively to the American market. Such advertisements marketed the multiplicity of Chanel products rather than Chanel No. 5, the original and only true product of Coco Chanel.27

Though the Wertheimer company emphasized the multiplicity of Chanel fragrances, Chanel No. 5 remain the dominant choice for women. No. 5’s success overseas is also attributed to the word-of-mouth phenomena experienced within department stores. Retailers working behind the department store counters at places like Saks Fifth Avenue knew it was a runway favorite in France. They informed their customers that Chanel No. 5 was the ultimate Chanel scent.28 Though many of the products under the name of Chanel No. came and went, Chanel No. 5 remained the dominant choice for women seeking sensual femininity.

Before Chanel No. 5 was even officially launched in 1921, women were eager to own their own bottles of one of the most modern and sensual scents of their time. Coco Chanel knew exactly how to promote her fragrance without the aid of advertisements. The glamorous trendsetters of France embodied and conveyed the elements of the fragrance. By having them promote the fragrance, it solidified the luxurious and glamorous qualities of Coco’s product. Overall, Chanel No. 5’s success was tied to good timing and the right location. It developed during a period when women were increasingly embracing their sexuality. Chanel No. 5 provided a means to play with these newly formed identities of women through scent. In addition, Coco Chanel and Chanel No. 5’s association with Paris crystalized the brand’s image as world-class in luxury fashion.

27 Ibid., 114.
28 Ibid., 115.
Conditioning Consumers and Selling to the Subconscious: Psychology and Marketing in Twentieth-Century America

Madeline A. Huffsticker
New College of Florida

Psychological paradigms have frequently been applied in the attempt to comprehend and manipulate consumer behavior in the fields of market research and advertising. These fields share the common interest of determining the variables most influential on people’s decisions and actions. In order to market products effectively, producers and advertisers need to understand the preferences and desires of their intended consumers, as well as how to construct appeals that will be persuasive enough to convince potential buyers to purchase their product. Toward this end, advertising and market research firms have often drawn from the currently available body of psychological knowledge and applied prevailing theoretical understandings of human behavior to inform their approaches to consumers and how to advertise to them.

This intersection of marketing and advertising was particularly salient within the American milieu in the mid-twentieth century, when the various preeminent psychological models of human nature that held sway in America greatly informed marketing and advertising trends. Specifically, the marketing approach based in behaviorist psychological theory that had provided the most influential model for advertising and marketing in the first half of the twentieth century fell out of favor on Madison Avenue in the late 1940s, to be replaced by a psychoanalytic approach. Certain players in the field of marketing adapted tenets and techniques of this psychological paradigm into strategies for research and advertising, and utilized psychoanalytic conceptions of the human mind to inform their beliefs about consumers. The shift in marketing approach that parallels the shift in predominant psychological theories demonstrates how marketers during this period looked to the field of psychology to construct their approach to consumers and persuasive appeals to buy products, and found a rhetoric and theoretical framework that proved suitable to the project.

The turn of the twentieth century brought about a turn in producer-consumer relations not only in the approach to the making of products and economic climate of American capitalism, but also to marketers’ common ideologies about and methods for appealing to consumers. In “The Changing Concept of Human Nature in the Literature of American Advertising,” Merle Curti argues that the understanding of “human nature” within the field of American advertising shifted around 1905-1910 from a conception of people as rational, self-interested agents, to one of people as irrational, reactionary organisms. The adoption of this new philosophy of human nature called for a change in advertising strategy. The previous appeals based in logic and common sense created to persuade consumers conceived of as sensible
and able to make decisions based on rational assessment of economic principles were no longer fit for an understanding of buyers as merely reactors to external stimuli and irrational impulses. After this shift in ideology, “advertising and the sales plan became linked in an effort to utilize these nonrational impulses,” and operated according to tactics of “suggestion, the use of forceful concrete details and pictures, by attention-arresting stimuli, by playing on human sympathy, and by appeals to the senses.”

This transformation in conceptions of “human nature” in the arena of marketing from the 1910s and into the 1920s occurred concordantly with and partly due to the increasing prominence of behaviorism and its creator, John Watson, in psychological academia and then in professional advertising. Watson became known as the “founder of behaviorism” for his series of lectures at Columbia University in 1912-1913, where he attempted to reorient the study of psychology around the scientific rigor of experimental methods and redefine the goals of the field as successful prediction and control of human behavior. Watson’s behaviorist psychological paradigm explains human behavior in terms of instinctual and conditioned responses to internal drives and external cues. The outcome of a given action serves as either positive or negative reinforcement, which either increases or decreases, respectively, the likelihood that, given similar cues, the particular behavior will be repeated in the future. With systematic repetitions of cues and reinforcements, humans could be conditioned to respond in ways controlled by an outside agent. The shift towards a conception of people as irrational and malleable in the world of advertising coevolved with and drew from behaviorist psychology, until Watson applied his theories directly to advertising when he began a career in advertising at J. Walter Thompson in 1920. Operating according to Watson’s behaviorist logic, endless repetition of a straightforward message became the foundation for effective advertising, in which advertisers attempted to condition consumers through ceaseless exposure to externally manipulated stimuli. Behaviorism proved a perfect match for the world of marketing at the time: it offered both a framework within which to interpret human purchasing behavior that reinforced the changing perceptions of human nature in the marketing field, as well as promised the social control that could lead to increased sales for clients and increased business for ad firms.

Yet Watson and behaviorism went a step further than validating belief systems or providing a theoretical foundation for the development of advertising

strategies. Watson’s presence at J. Walter Thompson specifically, and the widening intersection between psychology and advertising more generally, lent scientific credibility to the profession of advertising, which during the first decades of the twentieth century still was attempting to shake off old charges of hucksterism and establish itself as legitimate business. Markers and advertisers attempted to elevate their craft and bolster claims to expertise by situating their profession within a psychological framework developed from experimentally controlled situations, and borrowed the authority of a theory grounded in the application of scientific methods to human behavior. But marketers did not rely only on the observations and conclusions of experimental psychologists to inform advertising strategies. Throughout the 1920s and 1930s, marketers conducted their own market research, applying these scientific principles within the context of consumption. This form of research addressed questions of buyer preferences and purchasing habits with quantitative measurement and statistical analysis. The field of market research borrowed sampling, surveying, and statistical techniques from the social sciences to bestow upon its findings the status of scientific certainty in addition to the credibility acquired through association with behaviorist principles.

As the field of marketing developed around the turn of the century, marketers consistently turned to the discipline of psychology to elevate the status of their trade. Appeals to science and the application of systematic research methods adapted from psychological studies to the study of consumer behavior did serve as effective aids in the endeavor to professionalize marketing. Additionally, the tenets of behaviorism provided a useful paradigm for understanding human action and successful approaches to advertising strategy for several decades. But around the latter half of the 1940s, some in marketing began to look for theoretical foundations for human action from a different branch of psychology as behaviorism began to fall out of favor within the psychological community. As new understandings of buyer behavior took hold in America, marketing approaches to consumers and research methodologies changed to accommodate these conceptions and utilize emerging insights into human motivation.

As the development of a psychological viewpoint that emphasized the importance of instinctual drives and conditioned responses to repetitive stimuli rose to challenge the belief in the inherent rationality of consumers that was prevalent before the beginning of the twentieth century in America, the psychoanalytic theories developing in Europe were calling human rationality into question in a different way. Instead of supposing that people make logical decisions and
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act according to an objective assessment of relevant factors of the situation, a psychoanalytic understanding of human nature generally denies the possibility of all of these. These theories assert that decisions are never only informed by logic, that truly objective measurement is impossible in practice, and that people do not have the capacity to consciously realize the multiplicity of factors that influence a given circumstance. In an essay summarizing theories of human motivation that informed advertising strategy around the mid-1900s, Wroe Alderson outlines the way in which psychoanalytic concepts challenge the assumption of people as inherently rational actors:

Psychoanalysis held that behavior is primarily determined by instinctive drives and contended that we are unconsciously motivated to seek goals which we do not recognize or may be unwilling to acknowledge even to ourselves. . . . Much of human behavior lies outside of the area of rationality so defined, and . . . some of the most fundamental aspects of motivation are hidden below the level of consciousness.⁹

Both behaviorist and psychoanalytic theories recognize instinctual drives as an important factor in human motivation generally and buying habits specifically. Yet the former holds that these impulses manifest as directly observable, measureable, and controllable behavior, the knowledge of which can be harnessed by advertisers for the purposes of selling a product. In contrast, the latter posits a series of unconscious defenses that restrict the expression of such drives and that prohibit total conscious awareness of the reasons for certain actions or purchases. These defenses restrict the ability to ascertain motivation through direct reflection or questioning, and limit the effectiveness of appealing to conscious processes in the attempt to persuade consumers. Psychoanalytic ideology’s de-emphasis on the role of conscious decision-making in buying habits proved compatible with the ideological trend taking place in the field of American marketing. This mindset “addressed the consumer not as homo oeconomicus—the rational, economically self-interested decision maker of classical political economy and neoclassical economics—but as a subject driven by unconscious sexual desire” and repressed emotions.¹⁰

Though the conception of human nature shared by psychodynamic theory and marketing were particularly compatible, this form of psychology was attractive to marketers and advertisers as tool for understanding buyers for other reasons as well. Fundamental psychodynamic texts themselves (particularly those of Sigmund Freud—the father of psychoanalysis and author of many of the discipline’s foundational works) situated psychoanalysis as relevant in an economic context.

Richard T. Gray argues that the “curious reciprocity between economic argument and economic language is a constant and pervasive feature of Freud’s thought and work,” and that his “psychoanalytic project was underwritten by economic categories both on the substantive level of theoretical blueprint and in its rhetoric.” As evidence, Gray points to Freud’s early attempts to develop an “economics” of neuronal energy as a basis for unconscious mental processes. Psychic energy is “saved” or “spent,” and pathologies are construed as mental “profits,” as the unconscious tensions that produce these maladaptive tendencies are simply extreme forms of normal mental functions that function to limit excessive “psychic expenditure.”\(^\text{11}\) Lawrence Birken similarly concludes that Freud’s idea of a “psychic economy” was not merely metaphoric language, but an analogy central to his model of mental life. He cites Freud’s explanation of such diverse phenomena as dreams, jokes, and slips of the tongue in terms of “psychic expenditure,” where the brain assesses levels of psychic tension, or “capital,” and seeks to “spend” or “invest” this energy in the most efficient way possible.\(^\text{12}\) The prevalence of economic language and the significance of a model of the human psyche that operates according to consumerist logic in the foundational texts of psychoanalytic theory demonstrate the connection between the psychodynamic paradigm and the field of marketing that was inherent in the former’s theoretical texts. Freud’s use of an economic model to explain libidinal energy made for an easy application of his ideas about human motivation and behavior to understandings of consumer preferences and habits.

Even with the economic undercurrent in psychoanalytic theory and the emphasis on the irrationality of human behavior that boded well with the ideological climate in American marketing at the time of the paradigm’s development in Europe, these concepts might well have remained across the Atlantic if it had not been for the persecution of Jews and Nazi occupation of Austria around the Second World War. The psychoanalytic tradition originated and developed within Jewish intellectual and clinical psychological circles in Austria and Germany, and threat of persecution caused many analysts to seek asylum in the United States, where they continued to practice and advance their new theories. Among them was Ernest Dichter, the Viennese psychoanalyst who, within two decades after his arrival in 1938, revolutionized the field of marketing through the application of Freudian psychodynamic theories, techniques, and interpretations to the practice of market research, an approach he would come to call “Motivation Research.”\(^\text{13}\)

As an analyst with a psychodynamic understanding of human nature, Dichter believed that an individual’s motivations and behaviors (including purchasing
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preferences and habits) were largely determined by multiple interrelated factors on the subconscious level, and therefore not readily accessible to the conscious mind. Therefore, he maintained that asking direct questions was a largely ineffective and often a downright “unscientific” method for determining the “why” of human behavior. Such an approach falsely presupposes people’s capacity for objective insight into their own emotions and motivations. According to Dichter, even when respondents gave candid answers to straightforward questions, such replies were subject to a whole host of conscious and unconscious interferences and distortions, which rendered the information invalid.

Dichter’s solution to the problem of determining genuine attitudes, feelings, and motivations was Motivation Research. This market research approach, which he developed throughout the forties and fifties, attempted to circumvent conscious evaluation with a variety of techniques, tap directly into the subconscious, and interpret the symbolic representations of unconscious desires manifested in the responses. Motivation Research attempted to solve marketing questions and propose advertising strategies through decoding of consumers’ unconscious minds with the aid of techniques originally developed to treat neuroses in a psychodynamic therapeutic context. Dichter drew from his training as a psychoanalyst, and adapted many clinical psychological assessment tools to the purpose of understanding consumer decisions. As James Vicary outlines in his 1951 essay “Psychiatric Methods Applied to Market Research,” among these techniques were word associations (reminiscent of the free association methods practiced in psychoanalytic psychotherapy), sentence completion tasks, Rorschach and other Thematic Apperception tests, role-playing and “psychodrama,” and “depth interviews,” in which a researcher spends several hours conducting a semi-structured interview with a participant with the aim of assessing his or her unconscious motivations and responses (also modeled loosely after the analytic session). By the mid-1950s, these techniques and Motivation Research more generally were becoming widely used within the entire marketing and advertising profession. It had become “the technique of choice for marketers,” and more and more clients of advertising firms expressed interest in the practice, which caused many market research agencies to scramble to learn this revolutionary method.

Yet Dichter and other market researchers developing Motivation Research at the time did not only borrow tools of investigation from psychoanalytic practice, but its interpretive lens and aura of science as well, even though these two elements were often in tension. After amassing the data collected with various
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diagnostic techniques, motivation researchers utilized psychoanalytic theories to interpret the results and advise clients on how best to market their product with the subconscious associations and desires of consumers in mind. Keeping with much of psychodynamic theory, the findings and suggestions that came from Motivation Research often emphasized the sexual nature of products or how individuals’ libidinal drives influenced their consumption practices. With a foundation in Freud’s economic model of psychic processes, Motivation Research theories equated spending money with the pleasurable catharsis associated with the release of pent-up sexual energies. Motivation researchers often recommended that advertisements appeal to the ways in which consumers could achieve a modicum of sexual gratification from the use of a given product, or at least exploit consumer’s unconscious sexual associations with it to construct more persuasive appeals.

For example, Dichter first applied psychodynamic investigative methods and a Freudian interpretative lens to market research when he worked with Ivory Soap in 1939. He concluded from the results of his “depth interviews,” in which “people were permitted to talk at great length about their most recent experiences with toilet soap,” that applying soap was “one of the few occasions when the puritanical American was allowed to caress himself or herself.” He advised Ivory Soap to use their advertising to play up this association between soap and sensual pleasure, give the product an erotic “image,” and reconstruct their brand’s somber, utilitarian “personality” into one that was more glamorous.

Despite the recommendations regarding the intangible elements of a brand’s personality and the focus on the primitive drives that supposedly motivated consumers to buy the product, those who conducted Motivation Research often drew from the method’s roots in clinical psychoanalytic contexts to legitimize the use of qualitative research methods and borrowed medical rhetoric to claim the authority of science. Dichter co-opted the newly-discovered healing potential of Freud’s “talking cure” to give his consultations the status of “remedy” and to validate the data derived from free-associative “depth interviews.” He utilized many medical metaphors to discuss the efficacy of Motivation Research and drew analogies between researchers and doctors to illustrate how subjective interpretations by experts could still be scientifically credible. Yet for a psychodynamic researcher who was trained to analyze individuals’ unconscious tensions and conflicts, Dichter ironically perceived neither tension nor conflict in the use of what he perceived to be logical and systematic research methodology to uncover customers’ irrational motivations.

18 Bennett, “Getting the Id to Go Shopping,” 3.
As psychodynamic therapy began to be practiced and as the psychoanalytic paradigm for understanding human nature took hold in the United States after World War II, so the field of marketing increasingly looked to this discipline to inform how to conceptualize, research, and advertise to the minds of the consuming public. By adapting the theories of human behavior and the techniques for studying it from the psychoanalytic tradition—even when the implications of each were potentially contradictory—the field of market research demonstrated an ongoing commitment to drawing from the discipline of psychology to design advertising strategy. However, this commitment proved problematic for marketing beyond any potential contradictions between the systematic rigor of how Motivation Research was practiced and the scientific validity of what it preached. Applying psychological theory to market research and advertising became an increasingly risky way to gain credibility, as consumers were becoming ever more suspicious that the information gleaned from such an enterprise was not being used for their own good. The days when psychology was considered a force for positive social change had come and gone; with fear of communism and conformity and conspiracy looming large in the American psyche, the growing popularity of Motivation Research further aroused public paranoia that an ominous, unseen external force was attempting to control the minds of the masses with tactics learned through advances in psychological knowledge.21

Journalist Vance Packard rang the alarm bells particularly loudly in 1957, during the heyday of Motivation Research. His bestselling book *The Hidden Persuaders*, an exposé of the advertising industry, revealed the profession’s alleged “use of mass psychoanalysis to guide campaigns of persuasion.” Packard claims that “many of the nation’s leading public-relations experts have been indoctrinating themselves in the lore of psychiatry and the social sciences in order to increase their skill at ‘engineering’ [consumers’] consent to their propositions.”22 He paints in a sinister light the techniques employed by marketers to probe the subconscious minds of consumers, suggesting that the goals of Motivation Research amounted to a diabolical plot to brainwash the American public into buying products they neither wanted nor needed. In the wake of the book’s publication, the discipline of psychology was transformed from a useful tool for understanding how people think and shaping their behavior in positive directions, to a weapon of mind-control wielded by faceless authorities that threatened the unalienable right of every American to the privacy of his or her own mind.23

Despite the controversy over Motivation Research that Packard’s book inspired in the minds of the public, the marriage of psychology and advertising was far from over. In fact, the notoriety Motivation Research achieved actually spurred its
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continued practice on Madison Avenue through the second half of the twentieth century, though not in its orthodox form. Throughout the 1960s, the school of thought became increasingly fragmented as different divisions emerged and diluted as new market research techniques were integrated with classic Motivation Research practices. Advances in computing technologies allowed for increasingly large amounts of consumer data to be statistically analyzed more quickly and cheaply, which allowed market researchers to more easily combine quantitative, large-sample survey data with the more qualitative analytic approach of Motivation Research. Though strictly psychoanalytic interpretations of human behavior fell out of favor within the psychological community and with the American public, psychology-based market research in various capacities continued to thrive well into the last quarter of the twentieth century.

As the psychological discipline and the advertising profession developed throughout the past century, the boundary between them was often blurry. Advertisers increasingly utilized psychological theory to legitimize their profession and help them create more persuasive appeals, and psychologists went to work on Madison Avenue as evaluators of market research and consultants for product advertisements. Market researchers adapted psychological theories and research techniques to answer questions about consumption behavior, while psychologists like John Watson and Ernest Dichter looked to the world of advertising in the attempt to better understand people in order to influence them. The efforts of the two fields were mutually constitutive; findings and practices from one discipline informed the approaches and actions of the other. While today no one school of psychological thought predominates in modern-day American marketing as behaviorism or psychoanalysis has in the past, the study of human thought and behavior and the creation of advertisements remain inexorably linked by a shared history and common goals.
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*The Red Terror of Greece’s EAM Communist Resistance Movement against the Other Resistance Groups in German Occupied Greece, 1943-1944*
Nickolaos Mavromates and George Mavromates, Independent Scholars

Chair and Discussant: Colleen M. Moore, Florida Southern College

5:00-6:00 PM: Welcome Reception
Location: Sharp Family Tourism and Education Center
Florida Southern College
Refreshments Available
Saturday, February 14, 2015

8:00 AM-4:00 PM: Registration
Location: Christoverson Humanities Building Lobby
Refreshments Available

Frank Lloyd Wright Architecture Tour Available:
Basic Tour is $20 at 10:00 AM and 12:00 PM; In-Depth Tour is $35 at 10:30 AM or 1:00 PM. FCH Attendees will receive a 10% discount off the regular price.
Location: Sharp Family Tourism and Education Center, Florida Southern College
Contact: 863-680-4597
E-mail: fllw@flsouthern.edu
Website: http://www.flsouthern.edu/fllw-visitors.aspx

Session Three: Saturday, 8:00 AM-9:15 AM

Panel 3A: “New Studies on Non-Western Religions”
Meeting Room: Christoverson Humanities Building 206

Sacrifices and their Significance in the Pre-Islamic Arab Religion
Hessa T Al-Hathal, Princess Nora bint Abdul Rahman University (Saudi Arabia)

The Rise of Modern Japanese Religions
Kazuo Yagami, Savannah State University

Chair and Discussant: Alan Smith, Florida Southern College

Panel 3B: “Re-Examining the Impact of World War I”
Meeting Room: Christoverson Humanities Building 208

Dependence or Diplomacy?
The Low Countries and the United States at Versailles
Hubert P. van Tuyl, Georgia Regents University

David Lamar, Wolf of Wall Street and German Agent in World War I
Heribert von Feilitzsch, Independent Scholar

War and the Ballet Parade
Lylas Rommel, Ave Maria University

Chair and Discussant: Jack McTague, Saint Leo University
Panel 3C: “History and Pedagogy”
Meeting Room: Christoverson Humanities Building 209

The Pedagogical Merits and Pitfalls of Using the Letters of Hernan Cortes to Teach the Conquest of Mexico
Michael S. Cole, Florida Gulf Coast University

Fictionalizing History in the College Classroom
Claudia Slate, Florida Southern College

Chair: Michael S. Cole, Florida Gulf Coast University
Discussant: Nicholas Steneck, Wesleyan College

Panel 3D: “Women Saving Florida”
Special Interest Section: Florida History
Meeting Room: Christoverson Humanities Building 207

Miami Maven Helen Muir:
Writer, Historian, Advocate & Tea Party Host
Kimberly Wilmot Voss, University of Central Florida

Saving Biscayne: Women’s Roles in the Effort to Save the Bay
Leslie Kemp Poole, Rollins College

The “Housewife Who Roared”: Marjorie Harris Carr and the Death of the Cross Florida Barge Canal
Peggy Macdonald, Florida Polytechnic University

Chair and Discussant: Kimberly Wilmot Voss, University of Central Florida

Session Four: Saturday, 9:30 AM-10:45 AM

Panel 4A: “Immigrant Identities and Experiences”
Meeting Room: Christoverson Humanities Building 206

Jacob De Cordova: Immigrant, Messenger and Prophet
Tom Aiello, Gordon State College

Fighting for Freedom through the Press:
The ‘Phoenix’ and Irish-American Nationalism
Matt Knight, University of South Florida

Chair and Discussant: Douglas Astolfi, Saint Leo University
Panel 4B: “Gender and Race in Comics”  
Special Interest Section: Media, Arts, and Culture  
Meeting Room: Christoverson Humanities Building 208

*The Adventures of Ms. Meta:*  
Celebrating the Female Superhero through Digital Gaming  
Sarah Zaidan, Emerson College

*Iron Maidens:*  
Female Muslim Superheroes and the Representation of Agency  
Helen Tarzwell, Independent Scholar

*Ambassadors of Race: The Role of Sports Personalities in Breaking the Color Barrier in American Comics*  
Christopher Hayton, Florida State University

Chair: Julian Chambliss, Rollins College  
Discussant: Lisa Mills, University of Central Florida

Panel 4C: “The Politics of Banking and Finance in the U.S. since the Nineteenth Century”  
Meeting Room: Christoverson Humanities Building 209

*Andrew Jackson’s Bank Wars:*  
“The Bank, Mr. Van Buren is trying to kill me, but I will kill it!”  
Michael J. Goodwin, Florida Atlantic University

*Eastern Airlines: Deregulation, Labor Wars, and Bankruptcy*  
Rhonda Cifone, Florida Atlantic University

*AIG: Why It Couldn’t Fail*  
Douglas Provenzano, Florida Atlantic University

Chair and Discussant:  
Lesley Mace, Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta-Jacksonville Branch

Panel 4D: “Florida, Race, and Ideology at the Turn of the Twentieth Century”  
Special Interest Section: Florida History  
Meeting Room: Christoverson Humanities Building 207

Defending the Old South: The Myth of the Lost Cause in Florida  
Seth A. Weitz, Dalton State College
Beating Back the Mob:
One Florida Sheriff’s Fight Against Racial Vigilantism
Billy Townsend, Independent Scholar

Chair and Discussant: Sean McMahon, Florida Gateway College

Panel 4E: “Russia and the World”
Special Interest Section: Undergraduate Research
Meeting Room: Christoverson Humanities Building 210

Russia and the United States: A Distanced Relationship, 1867-1917
Michael Twillman, New College of Florida

Bolsheviks in Bavaria: Soviet Republics in Central Europe, 1919
Jim Dickey, New College of Florida

Chair: David Allen Harvey, New College of Florida
Discussant: Hubert P. van Tuyll, Georgia Regents University

Session Five: Saturday, 11:00 AM-12:00 PM

Panel 5A: “Artistic Representations of Historical Trauma in Latin America”
Meeting Room: Christoverson Humanities Building 206

Redeeming Memory through the Dysfunctional, Dis-united “no-body”: A Neo-Baroque Approach to Doris Salcedo’s Oeuvre
Andrea Villa, University of Florida

Memory and Dictatorship in the Antidetective Fiction of the Southern Cone
Alicia Mercado-Harvey, New College of Florida

Chair and Discussant: Jesse Hingson, Jacksonville University

Panel 5B: “State Building and Democracy in the Americas during the Late Nineteenth and early Twentieth Centuries”
Meeting Room: Christoverson 209

School Boards and the Limits of Local Management of Primary Education: Brief Democratic Experiments in Argentina’s Interior Provinces, 1872 to 1874
Mark McMeley, Valencia College
Vicissitudes of Democratic Party Politics: From the Cross of Gold Crusade to the Great War
Thomas J. McInerney, Metropolitan State University of Denver

Chair: Mark McMeley, Valencia College
Discussant: Heribert von Feilitzsch, Independent Scholar

Panel 5C: “Remembering the Ancient World”
Meeting Room: Christoverson Humanities Building 207

The Grand Procession at Daphne: An Example of Late Seleucid Strength
Tyler Campbell, University of Central Florida

Ancient Roman Women in Modern Cinema
Andrea Schwab, Florida Atlantic University

Chair and Discussant: J. Calvitt Clarke III, Jacksonville University

12:00 PM-12:50 PM: Lunch (on your own)
Options Close to the Meeting Site:

· FSC Cafeteria (FSC Student Union)
· TuTus Cyber Café (directly in front of the FSC Library)
· Reececliff’s Café (three blocks from campus, on Florida Avenue)
· “Subs and Such” (next to Reececliffs on Florida Avenue)
· Numerous options downtown next to Terrace Hotel

FCH Business Meeting
Meeting Room: Christoverson Humanities Building 210

Session Six: Saturday, 1:00 PM-2:15 PM

Panel 6A: “Identities in Colonial Latin American Society”
Special Interest Section: Undergraduate Research
Meeting Room: Christoverson Humanities Building 210

Growing Up Mestizo: Forming New Identities in Colonial Society
Madeleine Yount, New College of Florida

Santidade in Bahia and the Role of Millenarianism
Victoria McCollough, New College of Florida

Chair: Alicia Mercado-Harvey, New College of Florida
Discussant: Sara Rodríguez-Argüelles Riva, The Ohio State University
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Panel 6B: “Southern Drawls: Rhetoric, Discourse, and the U.S. South”
Meeting Room: Christoverson Humanities Building 209

Peace If Possible, Justice At Any Rate: The Views of Wendell Phillips
Charles Boyd, Georgia State University

“Political Gossip” and the Threat to White Male Supremacy in the South: Woman Suffrage Politics and Rhetoric in Middle Georgia, 1865-1920
Megan Neary, Georgia State University

Chair and Discussant: David Proctor, Tallahassee Community College

Panel 6C: “Exploring Irish Legends, Folklore, and History”
Meeting Room: Christoverson Humanities Building 208

Evil vs. Enchanted Magic: The Demonization of Morgan le Fay and Preservation of Folkloric Roots in Sir Gawain and the Green Knight
Cheyenne Oliver, Florida Atlantic University

Gender and Comedy in the Medieval Irish Tale “Bricriu’s Feast”
Jennifer Dukes-Knight, University of South Florida

Redefined Nationhood:
English National Identity and the Irish War of Independence
Michael Makosiej, Florida Atlantic University

Chair: Jack McTague, Saint Leo University

Panel 6D: “Approaching Modern Germany from a Global and Transnational Perspective”
Meeting Room: Christoverson Humanities Building 206

Nation(s) of Provincials? The Role of Multinational Empire, Federalism, and Particularism in Defining Politics, Law, and the State from 1500-2000
Bernd Grewe, Pädagogische Hochschule Freiburg (Germany)

Germans as World Citizens? The Contradictory Forces of Nationalism and Cosmopolitanism in Central European Culture and Society, 1500-2000
Eric Kurlander, Stetson University

Germany’s Place in the Sun: Capitalism, Empire, and Globalization
Doug McGetchin, Florida Atlantic University

Chair: Richards Plavnieks, University of Central Florida
Discussant: Patricia Kollander, Florida Atlantic University
Panel 6E: “The Environment and Nature in Florida’s History”  
Special Interest Section: Florida History  
Meeting Room: Christoverson Humanities Building 207

“The Dead are in Some Respects Better Than the Living”:  
Lake City and the Hurricane of 1896  
Sean McMahon, Florida Gateway College

From Wasteland to Wonderland:  
An Environmental History of Florida’s Southwest Gulf Coast  
Nano E. Riley, University of South Florida, St. Petersburg

The Hammer, the Sickle, and the Phosphate Rock: The 1974 Political Controversy over Florida Phosphate Shipments to the Soviet Union  
Brad T. Massey, Polk State College and the University of Florida

Chair and Discussant: Seth Weitz, Dalton State College  
Co-Discussant: Robert Hutchings, Carnegie Mellon University

Panel 6F: “What Dreams May Come:  
Urban Utopia and Dystopia in American Popular Culture”  
Special Interest Section: Undergraduate Research  
Meeting Room: Christoverson Humanities Building 109

Buying the American Dream: Mr. Blandings Builds His Dream House and Postwar National Consensus  
Joy Feagan, New College of Florida

Building the ‘Noir City’: Cultural Visions of the Bradbury Center and the Politics of Urban America  
Zane Plattor, New College of Florida

For Your Amusement: The Display of Nostalgia and the Production of Desire in Disneyland  
Shoshana Lovett-Graff, New College of Florida

Chair and Discussant: Brendan Goff, New College of Florida  
Session Seven: Saturday, 2:30 PM-3:45 PM

Panel 7A: “Questioning Connections Between Heteronormativity and the Law Throughout History”  
Meeting Room: Christoverson Humanities Building 206

Against Neutrality: The Law As a Facilitator of Violence Against Women  
Sara Rodríguez-Argüelles Riva, The Ohio State University
Consent and Citizenship: Reshaping Women’s Relationship to the State from Rape Shield Laws to Affirmative Consent Policies  
Erin Tobin, The Ohio State University

Controlling Sexuality Through the Construction and Criminalization of Red Light Districts  
Joshua Bates, The Ohio State University

Chair: Karen Huber, Wesleyan College  
Discussant: Erin Tobin, The Ohio State University

Panel 7B: “Visions, Versions, and Voices: Collective and Divergent Histories in the Panama Canal Museum Collection”  
Meeting Room: Christoverson Humanities Building 209

Balancing Perspectives and Myths in the Center of the Canal Zone  
Shelley Arlen, University of Florida

Facing Diversity: Challenges of Curating an Exhibit on the Panama Canal  
Margarita Vargas-Betancourt, University of Florida

Collective Visions of Triumph and Tourism: Portrayals of Panama and the Panama Canal in Stereographs  
Rebecca Fitzsimmons, University of Florida

Chair and Discussant: Jessica Belcoure, University of Florida

Panel 7C: “Emerging (Mass) Markets: Madame Butterfly, Coco Chanel, and the Psychology of Buying and Selling”  
Special Interest Section: Undergraduate Research  
Meeting Room: Christoverson Humanities Building 207

Transpacific Crossings: Performing the ‘Far East’  
Nicole Rockower, New College of Florida

Chanel No. 5: An Historical Interpretation of a Cultural Staple  
Kana Hummel, New College of Florida

Conditioning Consumers and Selling to the Subconscious: Psychology and Marketing in Twentieth-Century America  
Madi Huffstickle, New College of Florida

Chair and Discussant: Brendan Goff, New College of Florida
Panel 7D: “Turbulent Transitions: America in the 1970s and 1980s”
Meeting Room: Christoverson Humanities Building 208

From Confrontation to Exclusion: The Military-Press Relationship in the Wake of the Vietnam War
Andrew J. McLaughlin, University of Waterloo (Canada)

A Tale of Two Pardons: Gerald Ford’s Amnesty for Richard Nixon and Clemency for Draft Dodgers
Jason Friedman, Wasatch Academy

Disability Civil Rights Laws through the 1970s and 1980s
Liana Souchet, Florida Southern College

The United States, Reagan, Gorbachev, and Their Implications on the Soviet Collapse
Christopher Walsh, Florida Gulf Coast University

Chair and Discussant: Marco Rimanelli, Saint Leo University

Panel 7E: “Sources for Understanding Early Modern England”
Meeting Room: Christoverson Humanities Building 210

Romeo and Juliet: A Statue of Liberty
Olivia Coulomb, University of Clermont-Ferrand, CERHAC

Pleasure, Honor, and Profit: Samuel Hartlib in his Papers, 1620-1662
Timothy Earl Miller, Georgia State University

Chair and Discussant: Jennifer Dukes-Knight, University of South Florida

Session Eight: Saturday, 4:00 PM-5:30 PM
Panel 8A: “Constructing and Re-Constructing Race in Modern Urban America”
Special Interest Section: Undergraduate Research
Meeting Room: Christoverson Humanities Building 206

Reconstructing Racial Caste in ‘Post-Racial’ America: From Racism to Respectability
Patrick Tonissen, New College of Florida

Anglo-Saxon America vs. Pacific Empire: Multi-Racial and Multi-Spatial Perspectives on the Origins of Japanese American Internment
Michael Dorney, New College of Florida
Counterculture Comix and the City: Portraying Racial Tensions and Urban Decay in Underground Comics  
Dario Mitchell, New College of Florida

A Pineland Understory: Women and African Americans in the Historical Environment of Orange City, Florida  
Kimberly Reading, Stetson University

Chair: Brendan Goff, New College of Florida  
Discussant: Erin Tobin, The Ohio State University

Panel 8B: “Territorial Florida in Transition”  
Special Interest Section: Florida History  
Meeting Room: Christoverson Humanities Building 207

“The extraordinary measure of permitting the two Scotsmen to import British trade goods”: A Spanish Borderlands Historiographic Reconsideration of the Panton, Leslie, and Company  
Kathryn L. Beasley, Florida State University

The Contraband Hub: Florida and Smuggling during the Early Republic  
Daniel Vogel, Texas Christian University

George Brown: Letters of a Florida Pioneer  
Keith L. Huneycutt, Florida Southern College

Chair and Discussant: Deborah L. Bauer, University of South Florida

Panel 8C: “Bubbles and Crises in Florida”  
Special Interest Section: Florida History  
Meeting Room: Christoverson Humanities Building 210

Currency, Credit, Crises and Cuba: The Fed’s Early History in Florida  
Lesley Mace, Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta-Jacksonville Branch

Seminole Gaming in Florida: Tribal Sovereignty, Economics, and the Law  
Shellie A. Labell, Florida Atlantic University

A Capital Idea: Northern Dollars, Southern Citrus, and the Exploitation of a Tax Shelter in Postwar Florida  
Robert Hutchings, Carnegie Mellon University

Chair and Discussant: Sean McMahon, Florida Gateway College
Panel 8D: “France and the World during the Long Nineteenth Century”
Meeting Room: Christoverson Humanities Building 209

Blurred Lines: Debating the Status of Free People of Color in the Pre-Revolutionary French Caribbean
David Allen Harvey, New College of Florida

“The Simplicity of the Dove and the Intelligence of the Snake”: Visiting Revolutionary Paris
Dawn Shedden, University of South Florida, St Petersburg

Napoleon and America, 1800-1815
Marco Rimanelli, Saint Leo University

“Forging a New France”: Gustave Le Bon’s Vision of Nationalism and Race, 1881-1931
Khali I. Navarro, University of Central Florida

Chair and Discussant: Erika Vause, Florida Southern College

Panel 8E: “Anglo-American Culture in the Eighteenth Century” Meeting Room: Christoverson Humanities Building 208

Chase Kelly, Valdosta State University

Religious Loyalties Transformed: Anglican Liturgy, Presbyterian Polity, and the American Revolution
Jenny Smith, Valdosta State University

Chair: Nicholas Steneck, Wesleyan College

6:00 PM-7:00 PM: Banquet
Wellness Center Gym, Florida Southern College

Welcoming Remarks
Dr. James M. Denham
Florida Southern College
FCH President, 2015-2016
Presentation of Best Paper Awards
J. Calvitt Clarke III Award for Best Undergraduate Student Paper: Presented by J. Calvitt Clarke III, Jacksonville University

Blaine Browne Award for Best Graduate Student Paper: Presented by Jesse Hingson, Jacksonville University

Thomas M. Campbell Award for Best Professional Paper: Presented by David Proctor, Tallahassee Community College

FCH Annals Remarks
Dr. Michael S. Cole
Florida Gulf Coast University
Senior Editor, FCH Annals

Invitation to the 2016 FCH Annual Meeting in Orlando
Patricia Farless
University of Central Florida
FCH President-Elect

7:00 PM-8:30 PM: Keynote Address
Wellness Center Gym, Florida Southern College

Welcoming Remarks
Dr. Brad Hollingshead
Dean of Arts and Sciences, Florida Southern College

Introduction of Keynote Speaker
Dr. James M. Denham
Florida Southern College

Keynote Address
Dr. Jane Landers, Vanderbilt University

“Filling in the Missing Pieces”: The Extraordinary Life of Captain Francisco Menendez, Leader of the Free Black Town of Gracia Real de Santa Theresa de Mose

Born of a Spanish father and an African mother, Francisco Menéndez escaped colonial South Carolina and like hundreds of others in similar condition found his way to Spanish Florida, where he received his freedom in exchange for converting to Catholicism and joining the militia in defense of the beleaguered colony. As a loyal subject of the Spanish crown, Menéndez served his king as a soldier and was appointed head of black militia based at Fort Mose, approximately one mile north of St. Augustine. Menéndez’s remarkable human saga, as told through primary documents discovered in Spain and Cuba, is a story of the perseverance and resourcefulness under extreme hardships.
Sunday, February 15, 2014

9:00 AM-12:00 PM: Registration
Location: Christoverson Humanities Building Lobby
Refreshments Available

Frank Lloyd Wright Architecture Tour Available:
Basic Tour is $20 at 10:00 AM and 12:00 PM; In-Depth Tour is $35 at 10:30 AM or 1:00 PM. FCH Attendees will receive a 10% discount off the regular price.
Location: Sharp Family Tourism and Education Center,
Florida Southern College
Contact: 863-680-4597
E-mail: flw@flsouthern.edu
Website: http://www.flsouthern.edu/fllw-visitors.aspx

Session Nine: Sunday, 8:00 AM-9:15 AM

Panel 9A: “Perspectives on Cold War Events at Home and Abroad”
Meeting Room: Christoverson Humanities Building 207

Sputnik Verses Eisenhower: Reassessing the Situation
Patrick Gallagher, Florida Gulf Coast University

Placing Responsibility for the Bay of Pigs Operation
Hannah Lipsey, Florida Gulf Coast University

The Fall of the Communist Government in Bulgaria
Samouil Panayotov, Florida Gulf Coast University

Erik D. Carlson, Florida Gulf Coast University

Panel 9B: “Bloomers, Educators, and Prostitutes: Cultural and Geographical Borderlands of Female Reformers in the 19th Century” Meeting Room: Christoverson Humanities Building 206

Bloomers Were No Bust: The Role of the Bloomer Campaign in Creating Gender Consciousness
Patricia Farless, University of Central Florida

Cosmopolitan Imperialism:
US Teachers Populate the Argentine Public Education System
Carolina Zumaglini, Florida International University
“Outline of a Plan for a Self-sustaining Institution for Homeless and Outcast Females”: Emma Hardinge and Caroli
Transatlantic Mission to Rescue the Lives of Outcast Women in 1860s Boston
Lisa Howe, Florida International University

Chair and Discussant: Patricia Farless, University of Central Florida

Panel 9C: “Social Change and the Catholic Hierarchy”
Meeting Room: Christoverson Humanities Building 208

Knights and Bishops: Catholic Bishops and the American Labor Movement in the 1880s
Zach Brasseur, Saint Leo University

Race, Cohabitation, and the Archbishop: Antonio Maria Claret and Interracial Marriage in Cuba, 1851-1857
Sean Mallen, Florida Atlantic University

Chair and Discussant: Douglas Astolfi, Saint Leo University

Panel 9D: “Nation-Building in Africa”
Meeting Room: Christoverson Humanities Building 209

Food and Nationalism in an Independent Ghana
Brandi Simpson Miller, Georgia State University

Nigeria, 1914-2014: From Creation to Cremation?
Ojo Emmanuel Oladipo, Ekiti State University (Nigeria)

Chair and Discussant: Michael Joseph Mulvey, Saint Thomas University

Panel 9E: “Exploring the ‘Dark Turn’ in American History:
A Century of Irregular Warfare and Political Violence”
Meeting Room: Christoverson Humanities Building 210

“When Our Cannon They Do Roar”: Revolutionary Privateering and Violence at Sea
Kylie Alder Hulbert, University of Georgia

Excessive & Expressive: Preston Brooks, Righteous Violence, and the White Southern Male
James Hill Welborn III, Georgia College and State University

The Moral High Ground of a Guerrilla Massacre: Lawrence, Kansas, August 1863
Matthew C. Hulbert, University of Georgia

Chair and Discussant: David Proctor, Tallahassee Community College
Session Ten: Sunday, 9:30 AM-10:45 AM

Panel 10A: “The Modern War Economy and Society”
Meeting Room: Christoverson Humanities Building 206

“The Blessing of Being Judged”: Napoleon’s Moral Economy of Credit and Debt
Erika Vause, Florida Southern College

Russian Peasants, Speculators, and the State:
A Story of Food Supply Work during World War I
Colleen M. Moore, Florida Southern College

Food for Conquerors: Military Rations and Patriotism as an Advertising Tool
Jordan Malfoy, Florida International University

Chair: Nicholas Steneck, Wesleyan College
Discussant: Colleen M. Moore, Florida Southern College

Special Interest Section: Undergraduate Research
Meeting Room: Christoverson Humanities Building 207

The Gentleman from Florida and His Personal Crusade Against the Kinzua Dam
Michael Warne, Florida Southern College

Congressman James A. Haley and the Cuban Missile Crisis
Abby Eskridge, Florida Southern College

Congressman James A. Haley and Foreign Aid to Israel in 1977
Jason Kochenburger, Florida Southern College

Chair and Discussant: James M. Denham, Florida Southern College

Panel 10C: “Children and Society during the Twentieth Century”
Meeting Room: Christoverson Humanities Building 208

Child Murder and Society in Argentina during the Depression Era
Jesse Hingson, Jacksonville University

“Children do not have race prejudice as a rule”:
Reforming Children’s Radio in the 1940s
Amanda Bruce, Florida Polytechnic University
Baby Snowbirds: Children’s Educational Experiences in the Orange Belt, c.1946-1956
Catherine R. Eskin, Florida Southern College

Chair: Jesse Hingson, Jacksonville University
Discussant: Karen Huber, Wesleyan College

Panel 10D: “Latin America during the Twentieth Century”
Meeting Room: Christoverson Humanities Building 210

Clipped Wings: The Truman Administration and the First Attempt at a Bilateral Air Transport Agreement with Mexico, 1945-1947
Erik D. Carlson, Florida Gulf Coast University

Reimagining the Primitive: Tourism and the Golden Ages in Haiti, 1946-1956
Tonya St. Julien, Florida International University

A Killing in Quiriguá, Guatemala: Race, Nation and Empire in the Caribbean
Joseph Floyd, Georgia State University

Chair and Discussant: Michael S. Cole, Florida Gulf Coast University

Panel 10E: “Cultural Representations of Race and Racism”
Special Interest Section: Media, Arts, and Culture
Meeting Room: Christoverson Humanities Building 209

Our Land is Our Church: The American Indian Movement’s Mission to Retain Spiritual and Cultural Identity
Christina Naruszewicz, University of Central Oklahoma

Black Entertainer, White Audience: R&B, Race, and the Complexities of Crossing Over
C. Wylie Lenz, Florida Polytechnic University

The Anti-Semitic Comic Dieudonné M’bala M’bala and Postcolonial Memory of the Shoah in France
Michael Joseph Mulvey, Saint Thomas University

Chair and Discussant: Julian Chambliss, Rollins College
Plenary Session: 11:00 AM-12:30 PM

Documentary: “Voices From Mariel”
Anne MacGregor Jenkins Recital Hall

Screening and Discussion:
José Manuel Garcia, Florida Southern College

On April 1, 1980, five individuals seeking political asylum crashed a bus through the gates of the Peruvian embassy in Havana, Cuba. Over the next several days up to 10,000 people stormed that embassy’s grounds. Fearing that continued civil unrest might cause further violence or even a coup d’état, Fidel Castro proclaimed that any Cuban who wished to immigrate to the United States could board a boat at the nearby port of Mariel. Thus were born “Los Marielitos.” Told through the previously unheard stories of ten Cuban-American families, “Voices From Mariel” brings new insight into the lives of over 100,000 Cuban-born immigrants who came to the United States thirty years ago as the survivors of the “Mariel Boatlift.” “Voices From Mariel” explores the legacy of the brave and committed people who risked their lives for a new chance in the United States. Thirty years later, where has that short but dangerous 90-mile sail across the Straits of Florida taken “Los Marielitos?”
The Florida Conference of Historians began in 1962 as the Florida College Teachers of History (FCTH). FCTH founders included Sister Mary Rice of Barry University and Maurice Vance and Tom Campbell of Florida State University. They conceived of an organization covering all historical fields that would give historians an opportunity to share their scholarship and develop a sense of collegiality among historians teaching history in Florida’s colleges and universities. In 1992, the organization changed its name to the Florida Conference of Historians (FCH) to encourage participation by historians outside the state’s colleges and universities. In 1993, the FCH began publishing the Selected Annual Proceedings of the Florida Conference of Historians. In 2011, the Executive Council members agreed to change the name of the annual proceedings to the FCH Annals: Journal of the Florida Conference of Historians, currently housed at Florida Gulf Coast University. The FCH is a federally recognized 501(c) (3) non-profit organization, and contributions (including bequests, gifts, etc) are tax deductible. Since the organization’s first meeting in 1963, thirty different institutions of higher education have hosted the FCH.

Special Thanks To:
Kevin Adair, Guest Services, Florida Southern College
Keith Huneycutt, Florida Southern College
Erika Vause, Florida Southern College
Mark Tlachac, Director of the Frank Lloyd Wright Visitor Center, Florida Southern College
Sherri Jackson, Jacksonville University

Thank you for attending the 2015 Florida Conference of Historians!

We hope to see you again in Orlando for the 56th annual meeting hosted by the University of Central Florida!

Please go to our website http://www.floridaconferenceofhistorians.org or follow us on Twitter (@FLHistorians) for updates.