



FCH Annals  
Journal of the Florida Conference of Historians

Volume 22  
June 2015

Michael S. Cole, Editor

*FCH Annals: The Journal of the Florida Conference of Historians*

ISSN 2373-9525 (Print)

ISSN 2373-9541 (Online)

The *Annals* is published annually by the Florida Conference of Historians, and includes a selection of papers presented at the most recent annual meeting. Inquiries or requests to purchase copies should be directed to [mcole@fgcu.edu](mailto:mcole@fgcu.edu), or to Michael S. Cole, Florida Gulf Coast University, 10501 FGCU Boulevard South, Fort Myers, Florida 33965.

**Copyright:** © 2015 The Florida Conference of Historians. All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced without the prior written permission of the copyright holder. Requests should be directed to [mcole@fgcu.edu](mailto:mcole@fgcu.edu), or to Michael S. Cole, Florida Gulf Coast University, 10501 FGCU Boulevard South, Fort Myers, Florida 33965.

**Disclaimer:** The Florida Conference of Historians and the editors cannot be held responsible for any errors or consequences resulting from the use of information published in this journal. The opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect those of the editors or the Florida Conference of Historians.

**Senior Editor**

Michael S. Cole, Florida Gulf Coast University

**Editorial Board Members**

*Campbell Award Committee Members*

Dr. Julian Chambliss, Rollins College

Dr. David Harvey, New College of Florida

Patricia Farless, University of Central Florida

*Browne Award Committee Members*

Dr. Blaine Browne, Broward College

Dr. Michael Butler, Flagler College

Dr. Rowena Hernández-Múzquiz, Broward College

*Clarke Award Committee Members*

Dr. Jay Clarke, Emeritus, Jacksonville University

Dr. Mike Epple, Florida Gulf Coast University

Dr. Sean McMahon, Florida Gateway College

*Published in memory of Dr. Thomas (Tom) M. Campbell, the driving force behind the creation of the Florida Conference of Historians.*

**Florida Conference of Historians  
Officers 2013-2014**

**President**

David Allen Harvey  
New College of Florida

**President-Elect**

Steven MacIsaac  
Jacksonville University

**Treasurer**

Jesse Hingson  
Jacksonville University

**Secretary**

David Proctor  
Tallahassee Community College

**Senior Editor**

*FCH Annals: Journal of the Florida Conference of Historians*  
Michael S. Cole  
Florida Gulf Coast University

## **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 US 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*

- 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*

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*

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 22 of *Annals: Journal of the Florida Conference of Historians*. The articles in this volume truly reflect the global interests of our organization, exploring various aspects of the history of the US, Europe, Latin America, and Asia. Within this wide geographic diversity the range of topics includes intellectual history, the US Civil War, the First World War, politics, historical archaeology, and Florida history.

With this volume the FCH also inaugurates a new award, the Blaine T. Browne Award, given to the best paper written by a graduate student who presents at the annual meeting. 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. This year's recipient is Jenny Smith of Valdosta State University, whose article, "Creating a Holy Community: The Genevan Consistory and Matrimonial Law, 1546-1557," is an admirable example of the high quality of research and historical analysis that has become the standard for the FCH.

Now much more than a regional conference, and thanks to the quality of historiographical scholarship as represented in this volume, the Florida Conference of Historians continues to attract talented researchers from all over the US, Canada, Latin American, and many other parts of the world. It is a rewarding experience for me to be associated with this fine organization.

Michael S. Cole  
14 May 2015

## Table of Contents

<i>Creating a Holy Community: The Genevan Consistory and Matrimonial Law, 1546-1557</i> Jenny Smith	1
<i>The Transformative Process of Research in the Intellectual Work of the Early Modern English Polymath Samuel Hartlib: Sharing of Information across Cultural and Geographical Boundaries, 1630-1660</i> Timothy E. Miller	15
<i>Civil War Nostalgia</i> R. Gregory Lande	31
<i>Natural Resource Exploitation in the Pilcomayo River Basin: Impacts on the Formation of Bolivian National Identity</i> Brent Spencer	45
<i>The Second Life of the Reverend J. Calvitt Clarke: Popular Novelist</i> J. Calvitt Clarke III	59
<i>Florida Women: Forestry and Fire</i> Leslie Kemp Poole	77
<i>Operation "Perez": The German Attempt to Own American Newspapers in World War I</i> Heribert von Feilitzsch	87
<i>George Franklin Drew: Florida's Yankee Redemption Governor</i> Seth A. Weitz	103
<i>Transatlantic Suffragism: British Perceptions of the American Suffrage Movement Prior to World War I</i> Kristina Graves	113
<i>Spy Games: German Sabotage and Espionage in the United States, 1914-1916</i> Tracie Provost	123
<i>Austrian Choices, 1918-1919: Independence or Anschluss?</i> Kevin Mason	137

<i>The Boricua Triangle: Tampa, Miami and Orlando-A Historical Overview of the Development of a Transnational Puerto Rican Diaspora in Florida</i> Victor Vázquez-Hernández	155
<i>An Archaeological Perspective on East Florida's Loyalist Influx: The Excavation of a Loyalist Refugee Vessel Lost at St. Augustine on 31 December 1782</i> Chuck Meide	171
<i>Competing Voices: Political Contests over the EEOC's Sexual Harassment Policy, 1980-1981</i> Sheila Jones	187
<i>Konoe Fumimaro and Chiang Kai-shek: Political Duel over Japan's Quest -- A New Order in Far East for An Establishment of Asia for Asia</i> Kazuo Yagami	197
Special Section: Selected Undergraduate Articles	
<i>The Forgotten Minority: Pro-Unionism in Florida's Secession Crisis</i> Tyler Campbell	209
<i>May the Living Profit: Commemorating the Battle of Olustee</i> Lindsay Keller	217
<i>Appendix: Florida Conference of Historians Annual Meeting Program, 2014</i>	125



# Creating a Holy Community: The Genevan Consistory and Matrimonial Law, 1546-1557

Jenny Smith  
*Valdosta State University*

Authorities in the newly Protestant city of Geneva denied Communion to a velvet-maker by the name of Jean Mercier on April 12, 1556. Having previously taken Communion in the city, he then committed the daring crime of journeying to the Catholic territory of Avignon where he wed a Catholic woman. As if having already “married in the papacy” did not constitute enough blatant rebellion, Mercier then returned to Geneva with his new wife and took Communion, ostensibly finding no discrepancy in his actions. Unsurprisingly, the Protestant authorities of Geneva became outraged. The double offenses of marrying in a papist realm as well as taking Communion without repentance for his actions led to Mercier’s appearance before the Genevan Consistory. However, upon his appearance, he learned that his own matrimonial behavior was not his only vice in question before the syndics. A witness, identified only by the title “Mr. Coppus,” informed the Consistory that Mercier “keeps a manservant and a maid who sleep together at his and his wife’s feet.” After explaining that he had already “taken care” of this cohabitation of servants as well as pleading for reconciliation for his interreligious marriage and subsequent misuse of the sacrament, Mercier eventually received readmission to Communion, but not without meticulous explanation of his behavior.<sup>1</sup>

This case serves as one of many in which the sixteenth-century Genevan legal body, known as the Consistory, sought to reevaluate matrimonial law within a distinctively new Protestant context. The shift from Catholic canon law to a new law of marriage based upon values espoused by the Genevan Reformers was far from simplistic. Rejecting a superficial evaluation of this shift in which the Consistory smoothly imposed this transition to a passive or even willing lay community, this essay instead seeks to explore the complexity of the Consistory’s reformulation of matrimonial law and sexual standards. This essay argues that the Consistory’s interrogation of lay defendants and witnesses in matrimonial cases between the years 1546-1557 reveals that the Consistory played a formative role in forging a new communal understanding of marriage and sexual relations in its attempt to create a holy community in the newly Protestant social order. Consistory records offer glimpses into the interaction between lay defendants and the ruling syndics who scrutinized their behavior. Though the rich contours of medieval canon law are beyond the scope of the present analysis, this essay seeks

---

<sup>1</sup> *Registres du Consistoire*, Unpublished transcriptions available in the Meeter Center, Calvin College and Seminary, Grand Rapids, Michigan. R. Consist. XI, 15, 57, ed. and trans. in John Witte, Jr. and Robert M. Kingdon, *Sex, Marriage, and Family in John Calvin’s Geneva: Courtship, Engagement, and Marriage* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2005), 378.

to view the execution of canon law through the eyes of the Consistory's syndics. As Consistory records reveal, these syndics viewed the execution of canon law as both excessively permissive of vices and lax in its interrogation of defendants. While refraining from either embracing or dismissing this perception, viewing canon law through the eyes of the presiding syndics remains necessary in order to grasp their behavior in creating a new legal precedent for matrimony and sexuality.

While the process of gathering testimony from defendants and witnesses had long served as an integral component of legal verdicts, predating the Reformation, analysis of the syndics' interaction with the laity in this context demonstrates the formative role of the Consistory in transforming social norms in Geneva. In some cases, the Reformers sought to use the Consistory to transform the very substance of matrimonial law by creating new precedents for sexual behavior and marriage. In other cases, they approached the same types of vices that had likewise been condemned within canon law, such as incest or adultery, but sought to punish them more rigorously than had their canon law counterparts. Exploration of these cases remains vital to understanding the degree to which the Reformers' attempt to create this holy community extended beyond the pulpit and Consistory bench and into the Genevan laity, from which it summoned its witnesses and defendants.

Before examining specific cases in which this newfound role of the Consistory manifested itself, it is necessary to understand both the basic functions of the Consistory and the recent evolution of thought regarding its role in crafting a Protestant community unified around common beliefs. Along with the spread of the Reformation in the sixteenth century came the need for a legal body to govern the newly Protestant city of Geneva. Although consistory courts had long existed as Catholic canon law courts throughout Europe, the Genevan Reformers crafted a new court that sought to enforce Protestant law around which to base the holy community of Geneva. John Calvin's remedy involved creating a body of ruling men that governed on legal, social, and religious matters. Consisting of approximately twenty-four men, it included both the clergy and the laity. The lay leaders, known as elders, were elected annually. The Consistory assumed a diversity of roles as it affirmed or annulled marriage contracts, mediated interpersonal quarrels, and even disciplined wayward church members who had neglected to attend sermons faithfully. When faced with a particularly challenging case, the Consistory sent the case to the Small Council, often referred to simply as "the Council," a body of twenty-five men headed by four syndics. The Small Council, along with the Council of Sixty, and the Council of Two Hundred, functioned as part of the church polity structure instituted in the Ecclesiastical Ordinances of 1541.<sup>2</sup> Before the

---

<sup>2</sup> "Les ordonnances ecclésiastiques," 1541, ed. and trans. in Henri Heyer, *L'église de Genève: 1555-1909; esquisse historique de son organisation; suivie de ses diverses constitutions, de la liste de ses pasteurs et professeurs et d'une table biographique* (Genève: Jullien, 1909), 272, ed. and trans. in Robert Kingdon, *Transition and Revolution* (Minneapolis: Burgess International Group, 1974), 97.

Council received a case, however, it often first passed through the Consistory's jurisdiction.

The institution of the Consistory has remained the subject of scholarly discussion regarding its fundamental nature in relation to the Genevan laity. Scott M. Manetsch argued that a historiographical shift occurred from viewing the role of the Consistory and its verdicts as “repressive agents of social control concerned primarily with punishing misbehavior,” to the more recent trend of viewing them instead as part of a large-scale attempt to create a community unified around common moral standards and confessional beliefs.<sup>3</sup> Raymond A. Mentzer similarly reflected on the more recent shift to viewing the Consistory's role in Geneva as an agent of social remedy for community conflicts, averring that recent scholarship has viewed the Consistory “less as a court than as a social agency for the resolution of, say, marital problems and conflict among church members.”<sup>4</sup> Paul W. Roberts argued that the Consistory found continuities between private marriage relationships and larger communal interactions, in what he termed the “corporate implications of private piety and marital faithfulness.” He further argued that pastoral concern for the members of the Genevan community, rather than sole desire to punish moral failures, drove the Consistory's verdicts and behavior.<sup>5</sup> Thomas Hawkes identified the Consistory as part of Calvin's broader program of pastoral concern to enforce a new moral order, which included pastors, elders, and Consistory syndics as agents to encourage adherence to these standards at the local level.<sup>6</sup> Jeffrey Watt focused on the community's response to this societal regulation by arguing that, while never entirely dissipating, resistance to the Consistory's laws did in fact lessen throughout the 1550s and 1560s.<sup>7</sup> Thus, according to this perspective, the Consistory's seemingly harsh punishment for offenses can instead be viewed as an attempt to preserve the purity and unity of the Genevan community.

Regarding the more specific application of Consistory rulings to matrimonial law and its departure from the prevailing Catholic canon law of centuries past, Robert Kingdon highlighted the necessity of the Consistory as a new code of law in Geneva following the abolition of the episcopal and archiepiscopal courts after the Reformation.<sup>8</sup> Mentzer had earlier countered this argument by asserting, “while

---

<sup>3</sup> Scott M. Manetsch, “Pastoral Care East of Eden: The Consistory of Geneva, 1568-1582” *Church History* 75 (June 2006): 275.

<sup>4</sup> Raymond A. Mentzer, “Morals and Moral Regulation in Protestant France” *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 31 (Summer 2000): 7-8.

<sup>5</sup> Paul W. Roberts, “The Politics of Piety: Pierre Viret, William Farel, and the Genevan Consistory as an Early Test-Case for a Unifying Theme in Viret's Theology” in Peter Opitz, ed., *The Myth of the Reformation* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 2013), 182.

<sup>6</sup> Thomas Devonshire Hawkes, “Pious pastors: Calvin's theology of sanctification and how it shaped the teaching and practices of the Genevan Academy, 1559-1564” (PhD diss., Middlesex University, London School of Theology, 2013), 127.

<sup>7</sup> Jeffrey R. Watt, “Calvinism, Childhood, and Education: The Evidence from the Geneva Consistory” *Sixteenth Century Journal* 33 (Summer 2002): 453; and Jeffrey R. Watt, “The Reception of the Reformation in Valangin, Switzerland, 1547-1588” *Sixteenth Century Journal* 20, no. 1 (Spring 1989): 103.

<sup>8</sup> Robert McCune Kingdon, *Adultery and Divorce in Calvin's Geneva* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1995), 41.

the Reformation may have reinvigorated or even enobled matrimony, Protestant legal theory and practice did not differ substantially from its medieval antecedents, with the notable exception that marriage was no longer a sacrament.<sup>9</sup> Mentzer's argument correctly noted that a large degree of continuity existed between late medieval Catholic conceptions of matrimony and those of the Reformers. John Witte even pointed to a number of these continuities such as the basis of freedom of marital contract and the distinction between contracts of engagement and contracts of marriage, among others.<sup>10</sup> However, Mentzer's argument obscured the fact that many of the writings of the Reformers, notably those of Calvin, suggest that the ideological shifts engendered by the Reformation led to a widespread reevaluation of the construction and execution of matrimonial law throughout Genevan society.

John Witte argued that Calvin and his fellow Reformers decisively departed from late medieval views on marriage by reformulating it as an institution within the realm of the earthly and social, rather than sacramental and heavenly, estate, pointing to Calvin's replacement of a sacramental model of marriage with a covenantal one.<sup>11</sup> Witte and Kingdon produced, in addition to a recent set of English translations of Consistory cases as well as many of Calvin's writings relating to marriage and sexuality, an analysis of the shift from Catholic canon law to that of the new theology of marriage engendered by the Reformers. Chief among Calvin's complaints of the prevailing canon law, Witte and Kingdon argued, stood

the Church's "usurpation" of marital jurisdiction from secular judges, its condoning of secret marriages of minors without parental consent, its restrictions on the seasons of engagement, its long roll of marital impediments beyond 'the law of nations and of Moses,' its easy dispensations from marital rules for the propertied and the powerful, its prohibitions against divorce and remarriage.<sup>12</sup>

The authors therefore drew attention to a number of the facets of canon law that inspired Calvin's disdain for both the Catholic sacramental nature of marriage as well as the precedents of canon law.

It takes for its scope the years 1546-1557, beginning with the enactment of the Geneva Marriage Ordinance in 1546. This year also marked one of the first in which Genevan authorities turned their attention to domestic social regulations after the distractions of surrounding religious wars and plague outbreaks in the

---

<sup>9</sup> Raymond A. Mentzer, Jr., "Disciplina nervus ecclesiae: The Calvinist Reform of Morals at Nimes" *Sixteenth Century Journal* 18, no. 1 (Spring 1987): 97.

<sup>10</sup> John Witte, *From Sacrament to Contract: Marriage, Religion, and Law in the Western Tradition* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2012), 170.

<sup>11</sup> John Witte, "Marriage Contracts, Liturgies, and Properties in Reformation Geneva" in Philip L. Reynolds and John Witte, eds. *To Have and to Hold: Marrying and Its Documentation in Western Christendom, 400-1600* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 454; and John Witte and Eliza Ellison, *Covenant Marriage in Comparative Perspective* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing, 2005), 19. See also Alexandre Ganoczy, *The Young Calvin* (London: T. and T. Clark, 1988), 141.

<sup>12</sup> Witte, *Sex, Marriage, and Family*, 40.

earlier years of that decade.<sup>13</sup> Its analysis ends in 1557 upon Calvin's acquisition of the power to excommunicate in that year. While the years post-1557 in which the Consistory employed excommunication undoubtedly reveal insight into how the legal body wielded its power throughout Geneva, the aim for this research revolves instead around the earlier years of the Consistory when Genevan authorities were yet in the process of fleshing out how exactly they would institute punishment in a society still in the throes of adapting to this new Protestant form of ecclesiastical control. In order to understand how the Consistory operated within this nascent Protestant ethos of sexuality, one of the most helpful sources remains analysis of records from Consistory cases.<sup>14</sup> These records provide insight into the offenses deemed unacceptable in Geneva as well as the role played by the Consistory in denouncing such offenses.

Much as in other sixteenth-century societies, rumor was no stranger to the community of Geneva. Town gossip spread quickly, augmented by summons for both the accused as well as surrounding witnesses to appear before the Consistory to testify about allegations of misbehavior. For example, when the Consistory accused a Genevan citizen named Aime Rivilliod for impregnating his maid in 1546, rumors throughout the community spread that he and his maid were blood relatives.<sup>15</sup> This implied the offense of incest, a vice for which the Reformer Theodore Beza demonstrated intolerance by creating of a table of impediments of affinity that clearly laid out the kin relations that were not allowed for marriage or sexual relations in Geneva. It condemned relations between blood relatives alongside those between in-laws and familial ties connected by marriage. The Geneva Marriage Ordinance of 1546 similarly prohibited relations between direct of kin, stipulating which degrees of affinity were not permissible for sexual interaction.<sup>16</sup> Although naturally never widely encouraged in any Christian religious community and even listed among the impediments punishable by Catholic canon law, incest came under increasing scrutiny in Geneva, in contrast

---

<sup>13</sup> For a more thorough discussion of the importance of 1546 in reformulating Genevan domestic concerns, see William G. Naphy, *Calvin and the Consolidation of the Genevan Reformation* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1994), and for the significance of the time span 1546-1557, see Witte, *Sex, Marriage, and Family*, 22-23.

<sup>14</sup> Judith Pollmann has drawn attention to the handicaps involved in utilizing Consistory records to base assumptions about ecclesiastical discipline. She argues that a substantial number of cases never made it before the Consistory but rather were handled by local churches, many of which did not formally report their discipline cases. Thus, a comprehensive account of Genevan ecclesiastical discipline involves analysis of local church records as well as Consistory cases. Although the aim for this essay focuses specifically on the institution of the Consistory, rather than local churches, Pollmann's article notes numerous considerations for broader research on Calvinist discipline in the sixteenth century, nonetheless. See Judith Pollmann, "Off the Record: Problems in the Quantification of Calvinist Church Discipline" *Sixteenth Century Journal* 33 No. 2 (Summer 2002): 423-438.

<sup>15</sup> Thomas A. Lambert and Isabella M. Watt, eds., under the direction of Robert Kingdon *Registres du Consistoire de Genève au Temps de Calvin: Tome II: 1545-1546*, (Geneva: Droz, 2001) R. Consist. II, 90, 92v, 93v, 94, trans. in Witte, *Sex, Marriage, and Family*, 342.

<sup>16</sup> Theodore Beza, *Tractatio de repudiis set divortiiis* (Geneva, 1569), 2:61-62, trans. in Witte, *Sex, Marriage, and Family*, 332; and *Registres de la compagnie des pasteurs de Genève au temps de Calvin*, ed. Jean-Francois Bergier and Robert M. Kingdon, 2 vols. (Geneva: Droz, 1964), 1:30-38, trans. in Witte, *Sex, Marriage, and Family*, 56.

to what the Consistory's syndics viewed as the Catholic propensity to allow such behavior to go furtively unpunished.<sup>17</sup>

Rivilliod appeared before the Consistory in November 1546 on charges of impregnating his maid, yet vehemently denied any blood relation. However, his claim alone was not enough to convince the Consistory of his veracity so he brought a witness with him when he returned the following week. The witness, identified as Noble Claude, admitted that an officer named Claude Chatron bribed him by offering him a new pair of hose if he would testify that Rivilliod was a blood relative of his impregnated maid. Admitting that the assertion of kinship between Rivilliod and his maid was false, Noble Claude convinced the Consistory of Rivilliod's truthfulness when he denied being related to his maid. In light of this removal of the accusation, Rivilliod received a lighter sentence in which he was imprisoned only for fornication, not for incest.<sup>18</sup>

This case reveals the severity with which the Consistory interrogated defendants and witnesses regarding allegations of incest. While the Reformers certainly made a number of changes to the very substance and enactment of marriage, they also approached many sexual vices that had likewise been condemned under canon law, such as incest, adultery, and fornication. The change engendered by the Reformers in these instances dealt less with a reformulation of the very substance of marriage, but rather with a more stringent approach to punishing them. Thus, at times, the issue at stake dealt not with the premise of canon law, but the execution of it.

The Consistory sought to voice this disapproval to the lay community through the Genevan Marriage Ordinance, Theodore Beza's table of impediments of affinity, and the threat of a guilty verdict at the hands of the Consistory for those caught in the act. Thus, the Consistory's questioning of Noble Claude regarding Rivilliod's innocence demonstrates the process of interrogation that the Consistory employed in its attack upon incest. Additionally, the very fact that an individual attempted to bribe Noble Claude to label Rivilliod's affair incestuous reveals that members of the community understood that such an allegation would prove particularly serious for Rivilliod if accused. Thus, the Consistory applied a rigorous method of interrogation to alert lay citizens of the punishment awaiting those who engaged in incest, a vice that the Reformers deemed unfit in the new community's moral order.

The Consistory's rigor in punishing sexual vices is also apparent in a case spanning the years 1546-1547 involving adultery, another vice relating to marriage and sexuality for which Geneva claimed little tolerance. Before analyzing the details of the case, it is first necessary to understand how Calvin compared his view on adultery with what he perceived as the Catholic perspective. Calvin strongly

---

<sup>17</sup> Hostiensis, *Summa Awea*, trans. in James D. Scanlan, "Husband and Wife: Pre-Reformation Canon Law on Marriages of the Officials' Courts" in *An Introduction to Scottish Legal History* (Edinburgh: 1958), 69nn. For more on the Reformers' view of sexual relations between family members, see Robert Kingdon, *Geneva and the Coming of the Wars of Religion in France: 1555-1563* (Geneva: Droz, 1956), 85.

<sup>18</sup> R. Consist. II, 90, 92v, 93v, 94.

voiced his opposition to tolerating adultery by criticizing what he perceived to be the Catholic Church's laxity in dealing with cases of it. In his commentary on the Biblical story of Christ pardoning the woman caught in adultery, Calvin drew a distinction between Christ offering the woman forgiveness and Christ trivializing the inherent sinfulness of the woman's actions. The latter, he argued, was a mischaracterization of the passage, on which the Catholic Church had erroneously focused. Argued Calvin on the Catholic Church's interpretation of John 8, "yet the Popish theology is, that in this passage Christ has brought to us the Law of grace, by which adulterers are freed from punishment. . . . Why is this, but that they may pollute, with unbridled lust, almost every marriage-bed, and may escape unpunished?," thus revealing his accusation of Catholic canon law as promoting a permissive view of adultery.<sup>19</sup> In contrast, however, Calvin, via the Consistory, sought to instead uphold a perceptibly more stringent standard by which Geneva would judge cases of adultery.

For example, in 1546, the Consistory summoned an unmarried man named Amied de Leamon and a woman, identified only as Claudine, on charges of fornication. However, more than a mere anecdote of promiscuity, this case constituted allegations of adultery, as rumors spread that although then widowed, Claudine remained wed to another man at the beginning of her supposed relationship with de Leamon. The Consistory noted a rumor that de Leamon's mother found the couple fornicating, at which time Claudine ran to hide in a cow stable to avoid being seen. De Leamon denied both having been advised not to see Claudine as well as having had sexual relations with her. The Consistory, apparently unconvinced, noted "he denied it, and was shifty." A week later Claudine told the Consistory that she hid in the cow stable to avoid having a fight with de Leamon's mother. She then mentioned her previous husband, and stated that she had not left him.<sup>20</sup>

At this point a witness appeared to testify regarding the couple. De Leamon's brother-in-law testified that he and another individual had advised Claudine to return to her husband, to little avail. The Consistory then asked Claudine if she had been alone with de Leamon, after which the record noted "she could not deny it" and explained that she confessed that it was true. Approximately six months later Claudine was imprisoned under the label "the whore from Gy." Two months later the Consistory questioned another witness, Antoine de Leamon of Gy, as to whether he believed the charges against Amied and Claudine were true. He answered that he had only seen them together in public, but that Claudine had once brought wine to a house where they drank together on a Sunday. Another witness, Martine du Soyt, the wife of Martin du Soyt of Gy, claimed that she knew

---

<sup>19</sup> John Calvin, *Commentaire sur l'Evangile selon saint Jean*, 1553, trans. in John Calvin, *Commentary on the Gospel of John* ed. William Pringle (Grand Rapids: Christian Classics Ethereal Library, 1847), 258.

<sup>20</sup> Thomas A. Lambert and Isabella M. Watt, eds., under the direction of Robert Kingdon, *Registres du Consistoire de Genève au temps de Calvin: Tome III: 1547-1548* (Geneva: Droz, 2004), R. Consist. III, 56, 66, 70; and R. Consist. II, 37, 38v, 91v, trans. in Witte and Kingdon, *Sex, Marriage, and Family*, 348-350.

the couple well, admitting that she believed Claudine to be a fornicator as well as her presumption that de Leamon “entertains her.” She further shed negative light on Claudine by testifying that she had taken two quaterons of wine to a banquet at Richard Lanterne’s home, implying that Claudine perhaps had less than scrupulous drinking habits.<sup>21</sup>

Approximately five months later Claudine again appeared, at which time the Consistory prohibited she and de Leamon from seeing one another on charges of rebellion and fornication before referring the case to the Small Council. Four days later de Leamon confessed before the Council to having fornicated while Claudine’s husband remained alive. Claudine denied that it occurred while her husband was still living, but both she and de Leamon did admit to charges of fornication. A few weeks later the Consistory voiced that it found the couple guilty of having entered into sexual relations before Claudine’s husband died and ordered that the two of them should appear the next Thursday to be confronted about the matter. When de Leamon appeared one week later he confessed to the Consistory that he and Claudine had in fact engaged in sexual relations for three years. Claudine then contradicted this statement by asserting that her husband died a year and a half ago while also denying that she and de Leamon had been having relations while he was still living, asserting that de Leamon “lied wickedly.” The Consistory decided that more information was needed, but if the evidence showed that the pair had fornicated before Claudine’s husband died, the marriage would be prohibited. A later record in which Claudine’s new husband asked the Consistory for permission to divorce her after she became pregnant with de Leamon’s child reveals that the pair never married, though apparently not to the hindrance of their sexual relationship.<sup>22</sup>

Thus, in interrogating de Leamon and Claudine, the Consistory subjected them to a rigorous ordeal of examination that involved not only the couple but outside witnesses as well. For example, the Consistory summoned de Leamon’s brother-in-law who admitted that rumors of Claudine’s promiscuity were true. By stating that he had advised Claudine to return to her husband during the time of her affair with de Leamon, he apparently convinced the Consistory to probe further in its questioning of Claudine, resulting in her confession that she had indeed been involved in an affair with de Leamon. Furthermore, the similar testimonies of Antoine de Leamon and Martine du Soyt regarding their observance of Claudine’s drinking habits as well as Martine’s assertion of Claudine’s sexual promiscuity certainly did not aid her case. Although it could be argued that the mutually exclusive testimonies of de Leamon and Claudine regarding the status of her first

---

<sup>21</sup> R. Consist. III: 56, 66, 70; and R. Consist. II: 37, 38v, 91v.

<sup>22</sup> Thomas A. Lambert, Wallace McDonald, Isabella M. Watt, and Jeffrey R. Watt, eds., under the direction of Robert M. Kingdon, *Registres du Consistoire de Genève au temps de Calvin, Tome VI: 1551-1552* (Geneva: Droz, 2012), R. Consist. VI, 81-82, VII, 46, 51, 69, 78, 82, 86, trans. in Witte and Kingdon, *Sex, Marriage, and Family*, 350-352.



husband at the time of their relationship would have caused the Consistory to deny the marriage anyway, the testimonies of multiple witnesses confirming the disgraceful reputation of the couple clearly influenced the Consistory's opinion by proving that de Leamon and Claudine were not being truthful in their accounts, prompting the Consistory to issue a verdict prohibiting the marriage. Although the phenomenon of an ecclesiastical court interrogating the veracity of rumors of adultery certainly did not originate in the Reformation, its occurrence in sixteenth-century Geneva proved unique because the Consistory carried out Calvin's attempt to tighten punishment on adultery, in contrast to the perception of the laxity with which Catholic authorities treated it within prior canon law.

In another case in which evidence of adultery persuaded the Consistory to prohibit a marriage, in 1546 the Consistory charged Dom Legier Joli with becoming engaged to, and impregnating, Jaqueme of Etaux while his first wife was still living. Although both he and Jaqueme denied these allegations, the Consistory tasked one of Joli's neighbors, Mermet, with gathering information from other neighbors to report to the Consistory. Soon after, Mermet sent word that two watchmen of Saint-Gervais admitted that they had heard Joli state several times that he would take Jaqueme as wife if his first wife ever died. He also stated that several neighbors suspected that Jaqueme was pregnant with his child. Although the couple continued to deny these charges, the Consistory ruled to prohibit the marriage because it would establish a poor precedent in Geneva, which would "open the door for many to kill their wives and provide the means," thus demonstrating its rigorous opposition to even rumors of adultery.

The incriminating evidence of Joli's neighbors convinced the Consistory that he was guilty of adultery and thus should not be allowed to remarry Jaqueme. Central to the Consistory's ruling was not only its strict punishment, but also its emphasis on not creating precedents that would allow sexual vices to be permissible within Geneva. By stating that allowing the marriage would create a precedent for other men to find means to dispose of their wives in exchange for remarriage, the Consistory sought to keep Geneva free from opportunities for such vices to occur.<sup>23</sup>

Another area of matrimonial reform in which the Consistory summoned defendants and witnesses to collectively testify involved the proper celebration of weddings. In 1546, the Genevan authorities published the Geneva Marriage Ordinance, which decried immodest celebratory measures and prohibited excessive drinking as well as "indecent, dissolute, or outrageous songs or dances."<sup>24</sup> That same year, the Consistory summoned a defendant named Antoine Lenz after rumors spread that he held a dance in his home to celebrate his daughter's wedding, leading to what soon became a prolonged controversy involving multiple witnesses

---

<sup>23</sup> *Registres du Consistoire de Genève Tome II*, R. Consist. II, 77-78, 84v, 86v, trans. in Witte, *Sex, Marriage, and Family*, 346-347.

<sup>24</sup> *Registres de la compagnie des pasteurs*, 1:30-38.

over the issues of dancing and drinking at the wedding. When he appeared the following month, Lenz admitted that he had in fact held a dance in his home to celebrate his daughter's wedding and that a guest, Monsieur de Crans, informed him that it was customary in the Bernese territory to dance. In search for testimony regarding Lenz's conduct, the Consistory summoned his wife, Donne Rolet, to testify. She stated before the Consistory that she denounced the men who had been present at the dance, among whom were Syndic Amblard Corne and Captain Ami Perrin. The Consistory then asked her if there had been a separate dance held at Bellerive, to which she stated she had no knowledge concerning it. One week later the Consistory questioned another witness, Jean-Battista Sept, as to whether or not he danced at Lenz's home as well as at Bellerive, to which he answered that he had done neither.

However, after being admonished to tell the truth, he reluctantly admitted that there had been a dance and that Monsieur de Crans had danced as well as a guest from Thonon. He listed in attendance guests by the names of Monsieur Amblard Corne, Monsieur Ami Perrin, and three other guests identified only by the names Gruet, Bergeron, and Mallard. At this point, the Consistory questioned another witness, Mia, identified as the sister of Phillipe. She stated that a dance had been held at Bellerive and another had been held at Lenz's home after they arrived home from Bellerive. She then told the Consistory that when Corne and Perrin arrived, everyone immediately stopped dancing. The Consistory then called upon Claude Baudicone's wife, who had also been present, to list the names of those who danced. She named only De Crans and the guest from Thonon. The Consistory then questioned Ami Perrin's wife, Francoise Favre, who echoed the earlier statement that when Syndic Corne and Perrin arrived, the dancing ceased.<sup>25</sup>

The Consistory then called upon another witness, Francoise, the wife of Monsieur Donzel, who accused only De Crans and a guest from Thonon. The Consistory asked Guido Mallet's wife as well as Jaques Gruet, who both gave the same answers as had Francoise Donzel. At this point, the Consistory decided to refer all parties of the case to the Council, at which time they should be forced to testify under oath. Dissatisfied with not only the conduct of the original defendant, but upon that of the witnesses who had also participated in the dance, the Council sent all parties involved to prison after reviewing the case. Three days later the Council released Amblard Corne, Guido Mallet's wife, and Mia Phillippe and sent them back to the Consistory. The Consistory then admonished Syndic Corne for being present at the dance. The following day the Council released six witnesses before instructing them to appear before the Consistory. The Consistory further admonished Gruet for participating in a type of dance known as *fleurets*, which the Consistory asserted constituted "venial sin" and of which Calvin reprimanded

---

<sup>25</sup> *Registres du Consistoire de Genève, Tome II*, R. Consist. II, 175, 179, 189-192, 195, 198, 202, 208- 211, 213, 221, 225, trans. in Witte and Kingdon, *Sex, Marriage, and Family*, 473.

him for his involvement with “fleurets and love games” as well as for becoming inebriated. Eventually, after prolonged acts of contrition over their involvement in the dance, most of the parties involved in the case gained forgiveness from the Consistory, which readmitted them to Communion after the case subsided.<sup>26</sup>

However, the Consistory’s interrogation of those involved reveals more than mere indictment of Genevan citizens for unlawful participation in a wedding dance. It signals the Consistory’s effort to reformulate the very manner in which the laity celebrated matrimony.

By instituting prohibitions against dancing and drinking as forms of celebration for weddings, the Consistory sought to reinforce its perception of matrimony as a sacred union which deserved only modest celebrations that echoed its solemn nature. Aware of the awaiting punishment for their participation in the wedding dance, a number of witnesses reluctantly testified about its occurrence, accompanied by full knowledge of the Consistory’s disapproval. By chastising defendants for their behavior at the dance, the Consistory reinforced its stance in the 1546 ordinances condemning the improper celebrations of marriage. This case therefore reveals that the Consistory sought to control the behavior of not only citizens directly involved in marital and sexual relations, but also the community at large, whose members were often frequent celebrants of marriages in Geneva.

In addition to sexual vices and improper celebrations, the Consistory also took a rigorous approach when investigating prospective marriages in which one or both parties came from a Catholic religious background. In many cases, prior Catholic religious affiliation raised questions for the Consistory that it attempted to have answered before it would legally recognize a couple as married. Calvin referenced the topic of marriage between individuals of different faiths in his Commentary on Genesis in which he drew attention to the sin of intermarriage among the biblical children of Seth and of Cain. Unsurprising, given his theological view of a chosen selection of individuals, Calvin commented regarding the Biblical prohibition of intermarriage, “It was thus fitting that the small portion which God had specifically adopted to himself, should remain separate from others.”<sup>27</sup> He then applied this position to the issue of marriage to former Catholics by stating in an unreserved assertion, “a person does not contract matrimony piously or with the Lord if he takes to himself any other partner than one who has previously been divorced from the Pope.” He further warned of what he perceived to be the resulting strife and division involved in interreligious marriage, asserting, “No one therefore shall incur that danger by my authority.”<sup>28</sup>

---

<sup>26</sup> R. Consist. II, 175, 179, 189-192, 195, 198, 208-211, 213, 211, 225.

<sup>27</sup> John Calvin, *Commentaire sur la Genèse, 1554 Ioannis Calvini opera quae supersunt omnia*, ed. G. Baum, et al., (Brunswick, 1863-1900), 23:111, trans. in Witte, *Sex, Marriage, and Family*, 366.

<sup>28</sup> John Calvin, “La lettre de Lelio Sozzini,” December 7, 1549, *Ioannis Calvini*, 13:484-487, trans. in Witte, *Sex, Marriage, and Family*, 371.

For example, in a 1547 case, the Consistory admonished Ami Andrion de la Rive for consenting to his daughter Francoise's engagement to a man in Piedmont, a papist region. The Consistory sought to forbid him from being allowed to "send his daughter out of the city and country of the Reformation." Two days after admonishing Ami Andrion, the Consistory questioned his daughter Francoise by asking her whether she believed she was "going into idolatry without regret." Francoise, however, remained insistent on marrying her Catholic fiancé. Francoise's mother also insisted on her desire for the marriage to take place, citing the fiancé's promise of financial gifts, to which the Consistory blamed Francoise's parents for "selling their daughter." The Consistory ruled that the family be prohibited from taking Communion, arguing that, in its opinion, the marriage should be denied on the ground that it would create an unhealthy precedent for others to follow, "an open door to the bourgeois and citizens and a bad example against God and the law." The Consistory only begrudgingly allowed this marriage after a French official voiced his approval of the proposed union. Though the Consistory did not record the specifics of the official's testimony, this case reveals the requirement of thorough examination and need for approval by outside witnesses that the Consistory employed in its stance against interreligious marriage in Geneva.<sup>29</sup>

This stringent type of interrogation can also be seen, for example, in the 1557 case of Bernard and Pavicte Martin. The couple had already been united in marriage in a Catholic region but now came to Geneva to have their marriage affirmed "in the congregation of the faithful." Four witnesses, identified as Dr. Fabri, Martin Taschard, Pierre Schuz, and Jean Blanc, appeared before the Consistory to testify about Bernard Martin's good reputation and how he had long intended to come to Geneva. They also testified to the good reputation of his wife and the fact that she had converted from Catholicism to Protestantism. Martin Taschard claimed that he had been present when they became engaged, and told the Consistory that both had "a firm intention of coming to live here according to the true reformation of the Gospel." The Consistory decided that Martin should appear before the Council to be admonished for delaying to come to Geneva after his wife had already arrived. However, the Consistory noted, "because there had been good evidence of his good will and respectability, let him be received into the marriage previously alleged and let it be sworn to and confirmed." Thus, in this case the Consistory required the collective testimony of witnesses who made explicit references to the couple's renunciation of Catholicism and embrace of Protestantism. This case demonstrates the Consistory's uncompromising requirement that it be convinced of the couple's embrace of the Protestant religion before granting the couple permission to marry.<sup>30</sup>

---

<sup>29</sup> *Registres du Consistoire de Genève, Tome III*, R. Consist. III, 77, 83, trans. in Witte, *Sex, Marriage, and Family*, 375-376.

<sup>30</sup> *Registres du Consistoire*, Meeter Center transcripts, R. Consist. XII, 12v-13, trans. in Witte, *Sex, Marriage, and Family*, 379-380.

Another interesting case on this topic involved a former nun and her new prospective husband. Yolande and her fiancé Blaise de Croix had become engaged in the Catholic territory of Provence, but Yolande's status as a former nun prohibited them from marrying there. Having both converted to Protestantism, they came to Geneva in 1552 asking to be allowed to post marriage banns. The Consistory recorded that two witnesses, Jeanne de Pester and Salme de Provence "testified that they are relatives of the aforesaid and do not know anything that is an impediment of marriage, and they know the parents consented to it and engaged her to him," thus revealing their support of the marriage. After examining the testimonies of the witnesses as well as the testimony of Yolande who informed the Consistory that her own family intended to come to Geneva, the Consistory ruled that "considering such testimony," the marriage should be allowed.<sup>31</sup>

In another case in 1557, Claude de Boyssiere asked the Consistory to confirm his marriage to Antoine Lenarde. The couple had previously married in the Catholic region of Dauphine, but having converted to Protestantism, came before the Consistory to ask that it be recognized in Geneva as well. Although they claimed to be already wed, the couple lacked a certificate to prove their marriage. However, they utilized the testimony of four witnesses identified as Master Piernis, Pierre Faugeasse, Jaques Rapetu, and Nycolas Pavin who testified to Claude's character as "a good religious man." Another unnamed witness stated that the marriage had taken place with Antoine's father's consent. Upon hearing this testimony, the Consistory ruled that the marriage should be recognized. This case reveals the Consistory's attempt to require evidence both that prospective marriage partners had converted to Protestantism and that they could prove the legitimacy of their union in order to preserve Geneva from unsanctioned marriages.<sup>32</sup>

As each of these cases demonstrate, the Consistory in sixteenth-century Geneva played a crucial role in transforming the sexual mores and marriage precedents in Genevan society. While some vices, such as incest or adultery, had long been condemned under canon law, the Consistory demonstrated its effort to punish such behavior more rigidly than its ruling syndics perceived had been the case under canon law. As shown in the case of Ami Rivilliod, incest was not tolerated and even the hint of rumors of it circling within the community could cause the Consistory to dismiss proposed marriages. Hints of adultery were likewise not acceptable and could serve as grounds for the rejection of proposed marriages as well, as seen in the cases of Amied and Claudine as well as Joli.

Additionally, the Consistory's harsh stance and rigorous interrogation of lay citizens who participated in improper celebrations of marriage reveals that the Consistory's matrimonial reformulation in the 1546 Marriage Ordinance affected

---

<sup>31</sup> *Registres du Consistoire de Genève au temps de Calvin, Tome VII (1552-1553)* R. Consist. VII, 70, 71v; 251, trans. in Witte, *Sex, Marriage, and Family*, 251.

<sup>32</sup> *Registres du Consistoire, Tome VII*, R. Consist. XII, 30v, trans. in Witte, *Sex, Marriage, and Family*, 471-472.

not only couples directly engaged in matrimonial misdemeanors but also large portions of the community who frequently celebrated weddings. As shown in the case of Antoine Lenz, the community's celebration of a marriage likewise carried particular regulations to be followed in order to preserve a sense of purity among a broad segment of society. Finally, by requiring evidence of the Protestant faith and good character of formerly Catholic candidates for marriage, the Consistory communicated its authoritative stance against interreligious marriage among those from non-Protestant religious backgrounds. As each of the above examples reveal, the new Protestant legal body acted as a powerful and crucial advocate of the newly defined social norms in Geneva. It was through its procedures and the proclamation of its verdicts that the Reformers worked to forge a new communal understanding of morality and sexual relations in the new social order. As Mark Valeri noted, the role of the Consistory as an agent of social regulation remained directly tied to Calvin's theological view of man: "individuals were incapable of reforming themselves" and thus needed a legal body to regulate outward behavior within the holy community.<sup>33</sup>

---

<sup>33</sup> Mark Valeri, "Religion, Discipline, and the Economy in Calvin's Geneva" *Sixteenth Century Journal* 28 (Spring 1997): 134.

# The Transformative Process of Research in the Intellectual Work of the Early Modern English Polymath Samuel Hartlib: Sharing of Information across Cultural and Geographical Boundaries, 1630-1660

Timothy E. Miller  
*Georgia State University*

## *Raison d'être of the Fall*

The central concern of this paper is to illustrate the ways in which the myth of the Fall informed discussions about the foundations of knowledge and influenced methodological developments in the Hartlib Circle and how the Circle did the same for the larger academic community of seventeenth century Europe.<sup>1</sup> During the seventeenth century the Bible came to occupy a place of “unparalleled authority,”<sup>2</sup> informing almost every academic discussion. Topics including the nature of the state, the rights of the individual, private property, education, international sovereignty, the status of indigenous people, work and leisure, agriculture, anthropology, and moral psychology were all grounded by leading academics in the texts of Scripture. Christopher Hill wrote, “The Fall then was central to seventeenth century debates about the nature of the state and its laws, as well as about the justification of private property, social inequality, and the subordination of women.”<sup>3</sup>

At the center of seventeenth-century epistemological change was a Lithuanian immigrant named Samuel Hartlib. He built a network of correspondents stretching from America to Eastern Europe to facilitate sharing of information. He believed in the empirical method and he tirelessly promoted it to hundreds of scholars, clerics, and craftsmen from his home in London. To understand Hartlib in his own theological context, the Fall did not simply affect the man and woman who fell, but as representatives of all humanity, Adam and Eve’s sin affected every person who would be born and it affected every part of every person, especially the mind.<sup>4</sup> “Wherefore, as by one man sinne entred into the world, and death by sin: and so death passed vpon all men, that all haue sinned.”<sup>5</sup> Hartlib believed there were immediate consequences for the man and woman such as their awareness of their nakedness.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Hartlib Circle is the informal, loosely organized community of correspondents centered on Samuel Hartlib which included most of the leading English scholars and many of those on the continent during the 17th century. These scholars included professors at Oxford, Cambridge, and other leading universities, especially those who were promoting the empirical method and who went forward to establish The Royal Society.

<sup>2</sup> Peter Harrison, *The Fall of Man and the Foundations of Science* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 3.

<sup>3</sup> Christopher Hill, “Sin and Society,” in *The Collected Essays of Christopher Hill: Writing and Revolution in 17th century England*, vol. 2 (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1985), 125.

<sup>4</sup> Mark Greengrass, ed., *Samuel Hartlib and Universal Reformation: Studies in Intellectual Communication* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 21.

<sup>5</sup> *The Holy Bible 1611 Edition*, King James Version (Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1990) *Romans* 5:12.

There were more enduring consequences for humanity such as the loss of pre-Fall knowledge and reacquiring this knowledge became the challenge of Hartlib. Many scholars of the seventeenth-century believed reason was overcome by passion in the Fall, the senses were dulled, and nature was altered from the perfect state created originally by God.<sup>6</sup> The curse of God for the Fall landed heavily on the man who would struggle to bring food from ground which was thereafter reluctant to yield. Food was at the root of the Fall and food through time was choked by thorns and weeds and destroyed by pests and disease. Men would produce only with great toil, sweat, and struggle, according to this interpretation adopted by Hartlib. After a life of struggle, people die. At the Fall, according to seventeenth-century Puritan theology, God withdrew his steady state and disintegration, disorder, and death came in. Thus the second law of thermodynamics, partially being developed at the time by Hartlib Circle members Robert Boyle, who experimentally established Boyle's law in 1660, and Robert Hooke who defined heat in 1665, "All systems if left to themselves, tend to become degraded or disordered."<sup>7</sup>

Hartlib understood this principle, even if he was unfamiliar with the name, to mean physical systems wind down and organisms grow old. He believed this was the explanation for what was wrong with the world.<sup>8</sup> To Hartlib this explained why there were conflicts among men, including wars such as the one which drove him from Prussia to England. In the book *Macaria*, the author explained "The cause is not in God, but in mens fooleries, that the people live in misery in this world, when they may so easily bee relieved."<sup>9</sup> The cause, according to Hartlib, was the Fall. The problem was a lack of knowledge. Hartlib also wrote, "It is nothing but the narrowness of our spirits that makes us miserable."<sup>10</sup> The answer, beginning with Francis Bacon who preceded Hartlib, was education because the Fall was an "unmitigated disaster" to human reason.<sup>11</sup> Hartlib saw education as the key to reforming religion and society but these *means* were actually his response to the Fall and his attempt to overcome the effects of Adam's sin.<sup>12</sup> The *end* would be the Great Instauration, or restoration of pre-Fall knowledge in the post-Fall world. For Hartlib and his friends, it meant an end to human suffering, poverty, disease, and hunger as a result of advances which would be made in agriculture, chemistry, mechanics, and medicine.

Hartlib believed the history of civilization was the long struggle of humanity to recover lost knowledge. The narrative of the Fall is found in Genesis chapter three

---

<sup>6</sup> Harrison, *The Fall of Man*, 6.

<sup>7</sup> M. W. Zemansky, *Heat and Thermodynamics: An Intermediate Textbook*, 5th ed. (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1968), 207–209.

<sup>8</sup> Charles Webster, *Samuel Hartlib and the Advancement of Learning* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970), 3.

<sup>9</sup> *A Description of the Famous Kingdome of Macaria* (London, 1641).

<sup>10</sup> Greengrass, *Samuel Hartlib*, 18.

<sup>11</sup> Harrison, *The Fall of Man*, 6.

<sup>12</sup> Webster, *Samuel Hartlib and the Advancement of Learning*, 4.



of the Bible. It occurs chronologically after the creation of the woman on day six when God said the totality of creation was “very good” and the expulsion from the garden, the first parents’ loss of paradise. Seventeenth-century empiricists believed medieval scholasticism was inherently flawed precisely because it was built upon the reliability of human reason. When chapter three of Genesis began, they argued, nothing was out of order. According to the first two chapters of the Bible, there was no pain, suffering, or disease in the pre-Fall world. There was no struggle for existence since God provided food for all living things, including the man and woman. Food was readily available in abundance on the many trees of the garden. There was no disharmony in the first two chapters of Genesis, no sin, and no death.<sup>13</sup> Then something went wrong according to the Bible text.

Now the serpent was more subtile then any beast of the field, which the LORD God had made, and he said vnto the woman, Yea, hath God said, Ye shall not eat of euery tree of the garden? And the woman said vnto the serpent, Wee may eate of the fruite of the trees of the garden: But of the fruit of the tree, which is in the midst of the garden, God hath said, Ye shall not eate of it, neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die. And the Serpent said vnto the woman, Ye shall not surely die. For God doeth know, that in the day ye eate thereof, then your eyes shall bee opened: and yee shall bee as Gods, knowing good and euill. And when the woman saw, that the tree was good for food, and that it was pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to make one wise, she tooke of the fruit thereof, and did eate, and gaue also vnto her husband with her, and hee did eate. And the eyes of them both were opened.”<sup>14</sup>

The serpent was an external agent in the story. The seventeenth-century parishioner was told the man and woman would have likely not sinned on their own. They could however, be persuaded to violate the only prohibition they had been given. The serpent was an extraordinary and experienced agent. According to other Bible passages, he was beautiful, fascinating, graceful, and very clever. The woman was not alarmed by his masterful approach. He found her alone in the garden and he found her near the forbidden tree of knowledge. The last book in the Bible says, “And the great dragon was cast out, that old serpent, called the deuill and Satan, which deceiueth the whole world: hee was cast out into the earth, and his angels were cast out with him.”<sup>15</sup>

The Fall, according to seventeenth-century theology, was more than a human rebellion. Satan, who had himself been cast out of heaven, first questioned what God had said when he asked, “Yea, hath God said, Ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden?”<sup>16</sup> He implied that God may not be as He had led the man and woman

<sup>13</sup> Barton J. Payne, *The Theology of the Older Testament* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1962), 214.

<sup>14</sup> *Genesis* 3:1-7a.

<sup>15</sup> *Revelation* 12:9.

<sup>16</sup> *Genesis* 3:1.

to believe when he said, “Ye shall not surely die.”<sup>17</sup> He encouraged the woman’s pride when he teased, “ye shall bee as Gods.”<sup>18</sup> He tempted Eve to sin and then she led her husband to do the same.

A Jewish prophet later wrote that God had said, “for my people is foolish, they haue not knowen me, they are sottish children, and they haue none vnderstanding: they are wise to doe euill, but to doe good they haue no knowledge.”<sup>19</sup> Most seventeenth-century scholars including Hartlib believed that man’s pre-Fall state was not one of ignorance but of knowledge. The condemnation was, however, that men loved darkness rather than light.<sup>20</sup>

Writers have commented on the intellectual capacities of the first man from the earliest days of Christian scholarship.<sup>21</sup> They wrote about his intellectual capacities before the Fall, the extent of his knowledge, and the magnitude of the loss at the Fall. The ideas were still being written in the middle ages. In the early modern period John Milton wrote,

Of Mans First Disobedience, and the Fruit  
Of that Forbidden Tree, whose mortal tast  
Brought Death into the World, and all our woe,<sup>22</sup>

Even though Milton’s most famous work *Paradise Lost* was not published until 1667, most Milton scholars believe this work was begun by this Hartlib associate as early as 1658 and, coupled with Hartlib’s own writings, can provide a window into the theology of the Hartlib circle. Some believe the poem was begun in the 1640s but was interrupted by the English civil wars. *Paradise Lost* is Milton’s expansion on the Biblical story of the temptation in the garden, the Fall, and the expulsion. Before the Fall, Milton, following the Biblical text, describes a time when there was no sin. Adam in *Paradise Lost* is presented by Milton a heroic figure. Adam is more intelligent and curious about external ideas than his partner while Eve is the seventeenth-century model of a good wife.<sup>23</sup> She is graceful and submissive but also happy in *Paradise Lost*. She longs for knowledge, specifically self-knowledge. Milton was acknowledging the natural superiority of God in his poem while he was asserting the illegitimacy of the authority of the English monarchy.

According to Milton biographer Barbara Lewalski, the earliest record of contact between Milton and Hartlib is a Hartlib note from 1643 which states, “Mr. Milton of Aldersgate Street has written many good books, a great traveler and full of projects and inventions.”<sup>24</sup> On June 5, 1644 “Milton published an eight-page

---

<sup>17</sup> *Genesis* 3:4.

<sup>18</sup> *Genesis* 3:5.

<sup>19</sup> *Jeremiah* 4:22.

<sup>20</sup> J. D. Douglas, ed., *The New Bible Dictionary* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1962), 413.

<sup>21</sup> Harrison, *The Fall of Man*, 1.

<sup>22</sup> John Milton, *Paradise Lost*, Book 1.

<sup>23</sup> Barbara K. Lewalski, *The Life of John Milton: A Critical Biography* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, Ltd., 2000), 172.

<sup>24</sup> Lewalski, *The Life of John Milton*, 173.

tractate, simply headed *Of Education, To Master Samuel Hartlib*.<sup>25</sup> This date allows for a nineteen year relationship between these two men and, based on their extensive correspondence through this period, is sufficient grounds for justifying a Hartlibian theology reflected in the writings of Milton.

### The Result of the Fall

When the man and woman succumbed to the temptation of the serpent and fell spiritually from the perfect state of their creation, the Bible says their eyes were opened, their knowledge was increased but their reaction was one of fear. The Puritan ministers of the seventeenth-century taught that Adam and Eve died spiritually the moment they chose to disobey the prohibition of God.<sup>26</sup> The first couple traded daily conversations with God, the benefit of God's provisions, and the tree of life for suffering, disease, pain, toiling for food, and an eventual physical return to the dust of the earth. According to Genesis 5:5, Adam lived to be 930 years old but he did eventually die.

According to Charles Webster, "from poor school to university . . . a reorganization of the curricula, new pedagogical methods . . . new textbooks with an explicit psychological foundation" were all concerns for correspondents in the Hartlib circle.<sup>27</sup> Hartlib himself envisioned the possibilities of discovery and the potential impact on humanity, "if our hearts were enlarged beyond our selves, and opened to lay hold of the Advantages which God doth offer, whereby we may become jointly serviceable unto one another in Publicke Concernments."<sup>28</sup>

The answer for Hartlib associate Robert Hooke in his *Micographia* was twofold, "every man is subject to slip into all sorts of errors," then he went on to explain how the answer is first spiritual then both mechanical and experimental philosophy.<sup>29</sup> The answer to the Fall, however, was far from obvious to others. Historian Peter Harrison argues that European Christianity broke into three schools of theological thought after the initial Protestant Reformation, each school developing its own philosophy of education. Hartlib and Hooke represent a resurgence of Augustinian theology. This view was typical among Calvinists, particularly those Calvinist Puritans in England with whom Hartlib identified. This school focused on the depravity of man and the need for objective mechanical instruments to minimize human error during experimentation. Catholics, the second school of the seventeenth-century break, fell into a more optimistic Augustinianism as represented by the Jansenists in France. The third school was composed of Protestant Scholars such as the mainline Anglican intellectuals who clung to an optimistic Thomist and Aristotelian scholasticism.<sup>30</sup> With so few influential Catholics left in England, the

<sup>25</sup> Ibid., 172.

<sup>26</sup> Douglas, *The New Bible Dictionary*, 414.

<sup>27</sup> Webster, *Samuel Hartlib and the Advancement of Learning*, 4.

<sup>28</sup> Greengrass, *Samuel Hartlib*, 18.

<sup>29</sup> Robert Hooke, *Micographia* (London 1665).

<sup>30</sup> Harrison, *The Fall of Man*, 7.

battle was thus fought there between the reformers of the first school, represented best by the Hartlib Circle, and the academic establishment represented by the Aristotelian scholars in the major universities such as Oxford. “One of the most common complaints,” Harrison argues, “to scholastic philosophy was that it was pagan.”<sup>31</sup> Not that it ignored theological issues, scholasticism had been founded by a non-Christian. Very few discussions of knowledge in the seventeenth-century are devoid of references to the problem of sin and its relation to knowledge. Just as the Reformation challenged the source of church authority and provoked an ecclesiastical revolution, Hartlib and his associates challenged the sources of intellectual authority and campaigned for an equally significant epistemological revolution.

According to some theologians, the pursuit of scientific knowledge is proof of the historicity of the Fall.<sup>32</sup> Based on the correspondence of the period, no one in the mid-seventeenth-century pursued knowledge, sought to harness the forces of nature, or tried to develop civilization more than Hartlib. At the same time, based on Hartlib’s papers, no one complained more of being cursed with frustration in these pursuits. Hartlib, however, shared Bacon’s confidence that by working together there would be an intellectual restoration, “a return of man’s dominion over nature which had been sacrificed at the Fall.”<sup>33</sup> In theory, the foundation was the Great Instauration but in practice it meant replacing the scholasticism of the middle ages with the new epistemology of empiricism.<sup>34</sup> “Certainly scholastic reform was one of the chief interests of Hartlib’s life.”<sup>35</sup> The modern scientific method was developed partially because Hartlib and his associates believed God could be found in creation. Hartlib and his circle of correspondents believed that the Creator had designed the world to operate along certain regular and observable principles or natural laws. Once discovered and understood, these principles would open the door to harnessing powers lost in the Fall which would allow for greater production and subsequent increased profitability for all of humanity.

Attempting to understand the Fall resulted in a seventeenth century theological debate of eschatology, the study of end time events. Scholars of several disciplines argued over whether the restoration of knowledge would occur before or after the return of Christ and the great Judgment. Those who believed the restoration, or instauration as they called it, would occur before the return were said to have taken a pre-millennial position and were called Millennialist, mostly by their detractors. The outcome of the Millennial debate was critical to Hartlib because if there was

---

<sup>31</sup> Ibid., 10.

<sup>32</sup> Douglas, *The New Bible Dictionary*, 414.

<sup>33</sup> Webster, *Samuel Hartlib and the Advancement of Learning*, 3.

<sup>34</sup> Allen G. Debus, *Science and Education in the Seventeenth Century: The Webster-Ward Debate* (New York: American Elsevier Publishing Company, Inc., 1970), 9.

<sup>35</sup> John William Adamson, *Pioneers of Modern Education in the Seventeenth Century* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1971) 106.

no instauration before the judgment then his efforts to regain knowledge “in this life” were doomed to fail. If, however, the judgment was to be after the Instauration then Hartlib and his circle had much work to do. The author confidently boasted in *Macaria*, “I can shew an hundred Texts of Scripture, which due plainly prove, that such a Reformation shall come before the day of judgement.”<sup>36</sup> One of Hartlib’s hundred texts was a favorite passage from the Book of Revelation.

And I saw an Angel come down from heauen, hauing the key of the bottomless pit, & a great chaine in his hand. And hee laid hold on the dragon that old serpent, which is the deuill and Satan, and bound him a thousand yeres, And cast him into the bottomlesse pit, and shut him vp, and set a seale vpon him, that he should deceiue the nations no more, till the thousand yeeres should bee fulfilled: and after that hee must be loosed a little season.<sup>37</sup>

### The Response to the Fall

Milton wrote in *Paradise Lost*,

With loss of *Eden*, till one greater Man  
Restore us, and regain the blissful Seat.<sup>38</sup>

Because Jesus had worn a crown of thorns, suffered the beating, the nails, and the pierced side, felt pain, and died a sinless sacrifice, atonement, for the sins of all humanity, Hartlib believed the door was open for an easy path to the Great Instauration. With spiritual bodies covered by Christ’s atonement, education would restore that which existed in the human mind before the Fall. According to Harrison, “For many champions of the new learning in the seventeenth-century, the encyclopedic knowledge of Adam was the benchmark against which their own aspirations were gauged.”<sup>39</sup> Hartlib believed he and his friends would produce a unified system of knowledge which would end discord, including religious discord, among men and would lead to this Great Instauration.<sup>40</sup> The proper response for the scholar to take, according to Hartlib, was to observe, experience, discover, take note, experiment, invent, share information through correspondence and free, public education to promote the same and do all these things unselfishly for the greater good of society from the heart of a true unselfish Christian character.<sup>41</sup>

Though some scholars including Harrison question whether or not Hartlib was the author, *Macaria* was written as a vision of the goal toward which the entire Hartlib circle was working.<sup>42</sup> If he did not write the book, Hartlib certainly adopted it as perfectly representing his views. Others affirm Hartlib as the author. While

<sup>36</sup> *A Description of the Famous Kingdome of Macaria* (London, 1641).

<sup>37</sup> *Revelation* 20:1-3.

<sup>38</sup> Milton, *Paradise Lost*, Book 1.

<sup>39</sup> Harrison, *The Fall of Man*, 1.

<sup>40</sup> Webster, *Samuel Hartlib and the Advancement of Learning*, 37.

<sup>41</sup> *A Description of the Famous Kingdome of Macaria* (London, 1641).

<sup>42</sup> Harrison, *The Fall of Man*, 188.

many utopian communities were described by various authors in the seventeenth-century, Hartlib, who is definitely the publisher of this work, and may be its unknown author, very seriously imagined how the world would appear after the curse had been reversed. Hartlib used Thomas More's 1516 *Utopia* as a model.<sup>43</sup> *Macaria* includes the line, "we will goe into Moore fields" and later more clearly has the Scholar say, "I have read over Sir Thomas Mores [sic] *Utopia*, and my Lord Bacons *New Atlantis*, which hee called so in imitation of Plato's old one, but none of them giveth mee satisfaction."<sup>44</sup>

In Hartlib's lengthy title, the reader is immediately aware of certain desired conditions. These Macarian conditions are exactly the Instauration conditions toward which Hartlib was working. These include the descriptors that *Macaria*, like the Garden of Eden, is a land of prosperity, health, and happiness.<sup>45</sup> The Traveler says in the book, "the people have not halfe so much trouble as they have in these European Countreyes."<sup>46</sup> *Macaria* has a king but according to *Macaria*, this king, like in the Garden of Eden, is God. There are social classes in *Macaria* because Hartlib indicates the nobles are honored as are all good men and the rule of law. Hartlib's utopia is not a place where persons are able to do whatever they may desire without restraint. Similar to contemporary English government policy in Ireland, vice is punished in *Macaria* but virtue is rewarded as a way to encourage Macarian ideals.<sup>47</sup>

Milton published *Brief History of Moscovia* in 1682 which may have been written as early as 1647.<sup>48</sup> Unlike the anonymity of *Macaria*'s location, Milton's book specifically describes the geography of Russia from eighteen accounts of English ambassadors to the country and travelers of the country. In the preface, Milton states that his desire is for this work, not necessarily the place of *Moscovia*, to be an example for others. *Moscovia* is not a utopia but is Milton's parallel to his interpretation of English history. The book includes an analysis of Russian tyranny, Russia's salvation from the chaos of civil war, and the struggle to eliminate corruption in the Russian government. In *Paradise Lost*, Milton later wrote of creation in similar words: "in the Beginning how the Heav'ns and Earth Rose out of Chaos."<sup>49</sup> After completing *Moscovia*, Milton started his sequel *History of Britain* in late 1647.<sup>50</sup> He continued to work on it during and after the Second Civil War. Like Bacon before him, Milton tried to "break free of the ponderous chronicle format" more common in histories of England prior to the seventeenth century.<sup>51</sup>

---

<sup>43</sup> Webster, *Samuel Hartlib and the Advancement of Learning*, 79.

<sup>44</sup> *A Description of the Famous Kingdome of Macaria* (London, 1641).

<sup>45</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>46</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>47</sup> Wayne E. Lee, *Barbarians and Brothers: Anglo-American Warfare, 1500-1865* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 42.

<sup>48</sup> Lewalski, *The Life of John Milton*, 212.

<sup>49</sup> Milton, *Paradise Lost*, Book 1.

<sup>50</sup> Lewalski, *The Life of John Milton*, 216.

<sup>51</sup> *Ibid.*

Bacon had previously published the utopian *New Atlantis* in 1624 seeking to reform the dominant epistemology in his own time. He “was motivated,” according to Harrison, “by an attempt to determine whether the human mind might by any means be restored to its perfect and original condition, or if that may not be, yet reduced to a better condition than in which it now is.”<sup>52</sup> Bacon’s utopia was called Bensalem or “Son of Peace.” Like *Macaria*, *New Atlantis* made the goal of the Hartlib Circle clear to all who chose to believe and allowed the correspondents to focus on the best path toward the Instauration they all envisioned.

Hartlib and his associates applied themselves to experimental research because this would best open the secrets of God in nature. Hartlib particularly applied himself to encouraging any serious researcher with words and funds as needed. He was a frequent visitor in the workshops of London and was criticized by Oxford professors for associating with mere mechanics. Hartlib argued that the best education was waiting to be obtained at the side of cobblers, makers, and smiths who learned by manipulating natural elements. The Circle applied themselves to the development of new technologies because these inventions would employ new discoveries to practical advances in various fields, especially agriculture but including mechanics and mining, reaping prosperity for everyone, freeing humanity from the curse of the Fall. This would be the path to reversing the effects of Adam’s sin and restoring the state of perfection in the pre-Fall garden. This would be the beginning of the Instauration.

Milton, both a member of the Hartlib Circle and an employee of the Puritan government, is known to have “contributed three shillings to the development of an engine of war for use against royalist cavalry,” in addition to the intellectual arrows launched in his writings.<sup>53</sup> Hartlib was then campaigning for donations to help Edmund Felton who was working on this same engine. Though Hartlib received grants and loans from investors, he remained poor because he himself channeled sponsorship gifts to any promising researcher.

Hartlib’s ideas concerning the value of education in the struggle to overcome the Fall were greatly influenced by Dutch epistemological reformer and philosopher John Amos Comenius, Scottish ecclesiastical reformer John Dury, and practicing schoolmaster Milton. According to Lewalski, “Milton shared with Hartlib and Comenius the belief that a reformed commonwealth requires educational reform.”<sup>54</sup> Like Comenius and Hartlib, Milton endorsed the use of public funds to establish and maintain a school system which would place a school in every English town to increase “learning and civility.”<sup>55</sup> Milton, unlike Hartlib and Comenius, does not explain how this would accommodate social classes and sexes but he is specific

---

<sup>52</sup> Harrison, *The Fall of Man*, 1.

<sup>53</sup> Lewalski, *The Life of John Milton*, 173.

<sup>54</sup> Ibid.

<sup>55</sup> Milton, *Of Education*.

in stating that each school should have about 150 students between the ages of twelve and twenty one. According to Lewalski, Milton intended this to replace the traditional university education.<sup>56</sup> Milton agreed with Hartlib and Comenius that the curriculum of his time should be replaced with a Baconian emphasis on useful knowledge, that which could be acquired through sensory experience. Milton believed languages should be studied for the purpose of accessing the knowledge of others. For example, in his proposed curriculum, Milton suggested that all students learn Greek, Latin, and Italian and that prospective ministers also master Hebrew, Chaldean, and Syriac.<sup>57</sup> Unlike Hartlib and Comenius who promoted the idea of *Pansophia*, a grand cooperative compendium of all knowledge, Milton sought *Areopagitica* in which truth is found by the constant clash of ideas that promotes individual struggle and choice.

Education for Hartlib included promoting vigorous correspondence among scholars outside the classroom. He attempted to connect as many scholars as possible regardless of culture or ethnicity. This seems to be his most passionate strategy in the attempt to overcome the Fall. The Traveller asks in *Macaria*, “Doe you know any man that hath any secrets, or good experiments? I will give him gold for them, or others as good in exchange.”<sup>58</sup> This is what Hartlib did. He consistently positioned himself as the relay point of correspondence but clearly felt the more researchers communicated the more discoveries would be made. He is known to have introduced many associates and acquaintances and he was normally quick to welcome sincere strangers into the circle.

In corresponding, Hartlib frequently sent complementary copies of substantial writings he himself had published to those he thought could benefit from the content or to those who may have been influenced toward implementation of new ideas. For example, he “sent a copy of Milton’s *Of Education* to the noted mathematician and astronomer Nicholaus Mercator who termed it ‘most reasonable’ and wished that ‘our method of teaching was so well designed as that writing advises.’”<sup>59</sup>

Hartlib was intrigued by the notion that sharing ideas so valuable was so easy and free of taxes. In *Macaria* he said, “I have travelled through many kingdoms, and paid neither freight nor Custome for my wares, though I valued them above all the riches in the Kingdome.”<sup>60</sup> Then he added insight into his passion, “I know a Gentleman that is greatly addicted to try experiments, but how hee hath prospered I am not certaine; I will bring you acquainted with him, perhaps you may doe one another good.”<sup>61</sup>

---

<sup>56</sup> Lewalski, *The Life of John Milton*, 174.

<sup>57</sup> *Ibid.*, 175.

<sup>58</sup> *A Description of the Famous Kingdome of Macaria* (London, 1641).

<sup>59</sup> Lewalski, *The Life of John Milton*, 344.

<sup>60</sup> *A Description of the Famous Kingdome of Macaria* (London, 1641).

<sup>61</sup> *Ibid.*



Education included publishing new ideas and communication for Hartlib included sharing publications with those who could benefit from the content at hand. He wrote, “the Art of Printing will so spread knowledge.”<sup>62</sup> In *Marcaria* the Traveller says, “I will propound a book of Husbandry to the high Court of Parliament.”<sup>63</sup> In reality, Hartlib published over 22 books which he propounded to the high Court of Parliament and one of them was his own *The Complete Husbandman or A Discourse of the Whole Art of Husbandry both Foreign and Domestic*. In this book, just as the Traveller in *Macaria* explains, he laid out a plan by which English farms could increase production and benefit every level of society. The population would increase with more food to eat and the king would benefit being able to “raise men and money upon any sudden occasion, without great difficulty.”<sup>64</sup> In the same book Hartlib states his Puritan conviction “that any man may be rich that will be industrious.”

Hartlib was convinced that England was God’s chosen location for the Great Instauration to take place.<sup>65</sup> He himself had fled the war in Prussia for the land of his mother. Milton said that Hartlib was “a person sent hither by some good providence from a far country to be the occasion and the incitement of great good to this island.”<sup>66</sup> Milton went on to say that this same opinion was shared by “men of most approved wisdom” and “some of highest authority among us.” Hartlib wrote, “though our neighbor Countreys are pleased to call the English a dull Nation, yet the major part are sensible of their owne good, and the good of their posterity, and those will sway the rest; so wee and our posterity shall bee all happy.”<sup>67</sup> Harrison argues that the authority of the Bible and the prominence of the centrality of the Fall in seventeenth-century debates was particularly pronounced in England because John Calvin’s interpretations of original sin were so popular among the Puritans.<sup>68</sup> This did not, however, limit restoration efforts to England. In France, for example, Descartes, Blaise Pascal, and Nicolas Malebranche were investigating the causes of human error during the seventeenth century.

Hartlib and Robert Boyle proposed schemes for the English to settle contentious areas like Ireland, America, and various other locations with civilized believers. They saw empire as means to instauration, not to oppress foreign populations but to benefit them. Boyle, who later became the director of the East India Company, was friends with Archbishop of Ireland James Ussher who worked with them to improve the life of the Irish.<sup>69</sup> Hartlib included “A Councill for new Plantations” in

---

<sup>62</sup> Ibid.

<sup>63</sup> Ibid.

<sup>64</sup> Ibid.

<sup>65</sup> Webster, *Samuel Hartlib and the Advancement of Learning*, 3.

<sup>66</sup> Milton, *Of Education*.

<sup>67</sup> *A Description of the Famous Kingdome of Macaria* (London, 1641).

<sup>68</sup> Harrison, *The Fall of Man*, 3.

<sup>69</sup> Steven Shapin and Simon Schaffer, *Leviathan and the Air-Pump: Hobbes, Boyle, and the Experimental Life* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1985), 300.

Macaria as part of his structure of utopian government.<sup>70</sup> According to his theory, the nation would double in population as it became more efficient and prosperous. The surplus of population would fuel plantation efforts around the world. He wrote:

Every yeere a certaine number shall be sent out, strongly fortified, and provided for at the publicke charge, till such times as they may subsist by their owne endeavours: and this number is set downe by the said Councell, wherein they take diligent notice of the surplusage of people that may be spared.<sup>71</sup>

Thus as Charles I continued his father's plantation of Ireland, it seemed to many at the time, providence simultaneously raised up and brought together in one place Hartlib, Dury, Comenius, Milton, Bacon, Boyle, Hobbes, and a multitude of others who worked together for the greater good. They operated under a deep sense of religious obligation; the advancement of learning occupied the central role of their work. These men were philanthropists according to S. S. Laurie. They were friends of progress "who take an interest in every question or project of their time promising social improvement."<sup>72</sup> Hartlib was tirelessly forming committees and writing letters to persons of influence. He was, according to John William Adamson, "that unwearied friend of education."<sup>73</sup> Hartlib's ideal government, as expressed in *Macaria*, featured God as king. He asked through the Traveller, "Who can but love and honour such a Prince, which in his tender and parentall care of the publick good of his loving Subjects, useth no pretences for realities, like to some Princes, in their Acts of State, Edicts and Proclamations?"<sup>74</sup> He was here saying, eight years before the regicide, subtly and indirectly how unlovable and dishonorable Charles I had been because he had not shown tender and parental care for the public good of his subjects. The highest human embodiment of government in *Macaria* was a Great Council, appearing much like the English Parliament, supported by five under Councils.<sup>75</sup> Hartlib might have been as content to work for the Instauration under the rule of a human monarch but the English Civil War gave him a unique opportunity he believed was later lost in the 1660 Restoration. He was easily loyal to the Puritan movement because of his personal theological beliefs but he cooperated with Cromwell and the Puritan Parliament because they were the seat of power in his day. He gave great support to the Independent cause over the Presbyterians in order to receive the attention needed to preach his ideas and campaign for funding. He grew so close to this political party he lost everything, or so he thought, in the Restoration. Others in the circle, such as Bacon and Hooke, escaped the Restoration more easily to salvage their work

---

<sup>70</sup> *A Description of the Famous Kingdome of Macaria* (London, 1641).

<sup>71</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>72</sup> S. S. Laurie, *John Amos Comenius: Bishop of the Moravians, His Life and Educational Works* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1904).

<sup>73</sup> Adamson, *Pioneers*, 106.

<sup>74</sup> *A Description of the Famous Kingdome of Macaria* (London, 1641).

<sup>75</sup> *Ibid.*

and reputation in a restored royalist and anti-Puritan regime, some even becoming members of the Royal Society which Society Historian Thomas Sprat said was formed to regain “the knowledge that Adam had once possessed.”<sup>76</sup> The politics in academia may have necessarily changed in the aftermath of the Restoration but the methods and purposes of research and experimentation would remain. The legacy of the Hartlib Circle lived on in the Royal Society as monarchists adopted Hartlib’s methods while denying him his proper role in the Society’s history, going so far as to purchase and hide his voluminous personal papers. Hartlib would not have been disappointed because he would have chosen to have his name hidden as long as empiricism continued moving forward toward the Instauration.

Milton may not have been so content with the Restoration. As previously mentioned, Milton questioned Charles II’s legitimacy in *Paradise Lost*. In 1649 he published *The Tenure of Kings and Magistrates* in which he defended the idea of popular government. Milton was appointed Secretary for Foreign Tongues by the English Council of State in the same year and served enthusiastically in this post until he began to lose his sight almost ten years later. In this position he produced foreign correspondence for the Puritan government in Latin, wrote propaganda for Cromwell, and censored published materials judged to be inappropriate by the Cromwellian regime. While Milton worked for the Lord Protector, he had an official staff but he also relied heavily on an unofficial staff which included Hartlib and others in the Circle such as Theodore Haak, Dury, and Hall.<sup>77</sup> During this time he often wrote of England as God’s elect nation comparable to Old Testament Israel with Cromwell appearing similar to Moses. Milton promoted the theory of Four Empires with a new interpretation of Daniel’s vision<sup>78</sup> in which England appears as the fourth and final empire of history. When Cromwell died in 1658, Milton was heavily invested in Puritan politics and continued to promote his ideas of representative government. In 1659 he published *A Treatise of Civil Power* attacking the idea of a state church. After the Restoration, Milton, then totally blind, went into hiding and his works were burned. He was pardoned but nonetheless arrested and imprisoned until friends in Parliament were able to secure his permanent release.

Few desired Christian unity more than Dury but even Hartlib believed unity in the church was necessary despite differences in faith or politics. In *Macaria* he proposed a Christian conference in which Catholic France, Spain, and “other Christian Countreys” would take part.<sup>79</sup> He therein asked through the Traveller,

---

<sup>76</sup> Thomas Sprat, *The History of the Institution, Design, and Progress, of the Royal Society of London. For the Advancement of Experimental Philosophy* (London, 1667).

<sup>77</sup> Lewalski, *The Life of John Milton*, 238.

<sup>78</sup> *Daniel* 8:22.

<sup>79</sup> *A Description of the Famous Kingdome of Macaria* (London, 1641).

“why should not all the inhabitants of England joyne with one consent, to make this country to bee like to Macaria, that is numerous in people, rich in treasure and munition, that so they may bee invincible?” Dury was sent on a European tour to actually negotiate such a conference. There was no doubt in Hartlib’s mind that he had laid out an easy path to the Instauration. His great fear was that the path might not be clearly communicated to the inhabitants of England so that they might have a fair chance to understand. Once properly taught, he was quite confident the masses would do the right thing and the Instauration would come to pass. He concluded in Macaria, “none but fooles or mad men will be against it.” Unsure whether it would occur in his lifetime, he determined, “I will change as many minds as I can.”

As progress was made in knowledge, Hartlib believed the benefits of inventions and discoveries were to be made available to all humanity without the inventor seeking any personal gain, which he saw as selfish enrichment. Hartlib had “the belief that all human knowledge was a public endowment from God to be used in the service of all mankind.”<sup>80</sup> Hartlib believed it was wrong for anyone to have a monopoly on truth or keep secrets for selfish gain, certainly not the King or Parliament. This explains why Hartlib placed himself at the center of his system of information exchange; he could trust no one more than himself. Beyond that, he needed to be assured of the credibility of those with whom he was dealing.<sup>81</sup> When “Protestant merchant Peter le Pruvost presented his proposal for overseas colonization by means of improved techniques of husbandry and fishing,” Hartlib asked Dury to check him out before taking his idea to Parliament.<sup>82</sup>

Hartlib’s desire to make information freely available and to remove censorship in revolutionary English printing also led to a proliferation of political views, interpretations of events, and theologies among his correspondents. While Hartlib was in favor of increasing the availability of valuable information, no one in the Circle thought false or dangerously contradicting information should be so promoted. For example, in 1649 as secretary of the government, Milton was asked to investigate the papers of Marchamont Nedham who was writing under the name of Pragmaticus.<sup>83</sup> Nedham, like many others was reporting on domestic and foreign news in small pamphlets, without license, and on underground presses. He was frequently changing his allegiances between Parliament and King. After Milton’s investigation and Nedham’s brief imprisonment, the two men eventually became friends. Milton did not become friends, however, with Adrian Vlacq, who Milton labeled a “troublesome crier” after receiving his work from Hartlib, though Vlacq was writing and causing controversy in a manner similar to Nedham.<sup>84</sup>

---

<sup>80</sup> Greengrass, *Samuel Hartlib*, 18.

<sup>81</sup> *Ibid.*, 20.

<sup>82</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>83</sup> Lewalski, *The Life of John Milton*, 245.

<sup>84</sup> *Ibid.*, 288-289.

The proper response to the Fall and the avenue to overcoming the Fall involved a researcher's character as well as the fruits of his labor. Hartlib believed that the man who had no love for God was driven by selfish motives.<sup>85</sup> Piety and learning were integrally related manifestations of the resurgence of intellect.<sup>86</sup> Hartlib's requirements of credibility reflect his knowledge of and submission to the principles of the Bible as the source of that which would lead to success. Hartlib did not ask more of his associates than he was willing to be himself.<sup>87</sup> Milton said that Hartlib was, "studying more to this very day, to be useful to God's Creatures, and serviceable to his church, than to be rich or honorable."<sup>88</sup> Referring to multiple Bible passages, Hartlib wrote at various times that he wanted to see his associates free from partiality, cautiously wary, prudent, quiet, free from vanity of appearing, have a truly public spirit, zealous for the Protestant cause, not covetous, and not a lover of money. The list sounds like the requirements for ordaining a pastor but it also made for a good scientist in the economy of Hartlib's Circle.<sup>89</sup>

## Conclusion

Ultimately Hartlib's response to the Fall was his attempt to overcome it. His plan involved all the elements mentioned above, laid out clearly in *Macaria*. In the book, which was written at beginning of the civil wars when he and his Circle were young and optimistic, Hartlib, speaking through the scholar says that he will preach it, he will write about it in books and send copies to the government, he will organize a conference, and he will put men together who have new ideas to make the world a better place.<sup>90</sup> He said through the Traveller, "If I could change all the minds in England as easily as I suppose I shall change yours this Kingdom would be presently like to it: when you heare the manner of their government, you will deeme it to be very possible, and withall very easie." This is Hartlib's great commission. Hartlib intended that empiricism would conquer the world beginning with the European Christian nations. Empirical baptism for Hartlib was receiving a practical education. Not that Hartlib would have compared himself to Christ, he never did, but his Great Instauration was certainly inspired by the example of Jesus' Great Commission.

---

<sup>85</sup> Douglas, *The New Bible Dictionary*, 414.

<sup>86</sup> Webster, *Samuel Hartlib and the Advancement of Learning*, 3.

<sup>87</sup> Laurie, *John Amos Comenius*, 72.

<sup>88</sup> Henry Dircks, *A Biographical Memoir of Samuel Hartlib, Milton's Familiar Friend* (London: John Russell Smith, 1865), 4.

<sup>89</sup> Greengrass, *Samuel Hartlib*, 20.

<sup>90</sup> *A Description of the Famous Kingdome of Macaria* (London, 1641).



# Civil War Nostalgia

R. Gregory Lande

*Walter Reed National Military Medical Center \**

Every Civil War soldier probably experienced varying degrees of homesickness, a manageable melancholia for most. In some cases homesickness took a morbid turn in a downhill direction ending in death. Military surgeons naturally focused their efforts on the illnesses and injuries of war but a few were mystified by a morbid melancholia eventually labeled as nostalgia. Nostalgia could be considered one of the earliest American medical descriptions of the emotional casualties of war.

The history of nostalgia is principally uncovered through official records, personal accounts by soldiers, newspaper stories, and the reports of military surgeons. Taken as a whole, these sources suggest that the impact of nostalgia assumed significant dimensions, in terms of morbidity and mortality. The assessment of nostalgia related deaths is particularly complicated. In many cases nostalgia acted like a catalyst, hastening the demise of debilitated soldiers, and being consumed in the process, left behind only the faintest residue. The Union Army and northern newspapers provided the best evidence of nostalgia's existence during the Civil War. That is not to say that Confederate soldiers were immune. As soldiers, they inevitably suffered the same pangs of homesickness but the evidence is far more limited. As a consequence, understanding nostalgia begins with the North's experience, followed by Florida's two recorded cases.

Civil War surgeons could be rightly excused from devoting much attention to homesickness. After all, dreadful combat injuries and endless illnesses consumed most of their time. Nonetheless, homesickness, and its deadly sibling nostalgia, commanded a certain degree of attention. Even so, once identified, nostalgia could not fully disentangle itself from two intertwining threads. Both malingering and moral opprobrium strangled the melancholic. These two forces, and the efforts to counter them, provide indirect evidence of the incidence of homesickness, and the fear it inspired.

A newspaper lamenting the short enlistments of drafted men invoked nostalgia in a decidedly negative connotation.<sup>1</sup> The editorial clearly pined for an indefinite term of enlistment, or at least one so distant that the corrosive influence of an early release from the military was so remote as to be invisible. "The longing for discharge in many cases resembled insanity—medically speaking—and that strange malady which shrinks from popular contempt under the scientific name of

---

\* The views expressed in this article are those of the author and do not reflect the official policy of the Department of Army, Navy, Air Force, Department of Defense, or U.S. Government.

<sup>1</sup> "Five Hundred Thousand More," *Brooklyn Eagle*, July 19, 1864.

nostalgia, but which is nothing more than homesickness, raged in some regiments like an epidemic.<sup>22</sup> Clearly the newspaper, no doubt reflecting the opinions of many readers, enjoyed many approving comments around the breakfast table of those safely sheltered from the battlefields. The notion that these soldiers would eagerly count the days until they could return to their own dining rooms provoked a harsh reaction from the editorial questioning, “What were such troops good for in a fight?”<sup>23</sup>

The public learned of homesickness almost at the same time the Southern States left the Union. Much like iron rusts with rest, so ran a popular convention about military units. Units in garrison or otherwise not actively prosecuting the war were deemed susceptible to all manner of incapacitating vices.<sup>4</sup> A newspaper correspondent observing the inaction at Camp Nevin, Kentucky complained that, “every day we linger here increases the sickness among the soldiers.”<sup>5</sup> While paying due homage to the ravages of typhoid fever and other related ailments, the reporter turned his pen towards nostalgia. “Readers have, often, perhaps, stumbled over the word nostalgia in ‘surgeons’ reports. . . . It will be better understood when called by the more familiar name of Home Sickness.”<sup>6</sup> While faintly condemning the condition the reporter acknowledged that, “before the Yankees succeed in subjugating Kentucky we rather think a good many more of them will be afflicted with “nostalgia” in its most aggravated form.”<sup>7</sup>

The moral condemnation of homesickness took a more invidious turn when equated with cowardice. Connecting the dots between yearning and weakness might have inured untold numbers of soldiers from pursuing the path of nostalgia towards discharge. It did not deter a fecklessly portrayed and unashamed officer. “Recently a cowardly Lieutenant in one of the Ohio regiments asked [sic] a discharge on the ground of ill-health.”<sup>8</sup> A surgeon examined the lieutenant and after determining that the officer suffered from nostalgia concluded that he was “useless in camp and worthless on the field.”<sup>9</sup> Whereas Hamlet agonized about “whether ‘tis nobler in the mind to suffer the slings and arrows of outrageous fortune or take arms against a sea of troubles,” the Lieutenant apparently suffered no similar doubts while contemplating the moral equivalent of a social suicide. Surely being publicly branded a coward would forever harm this officer but “the Lieutenant gladly left the service upon those terms.”<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> Ibid.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid.

<sup>4</sup> “Sickness Among the Yankees,” *Daily Nashville Patriot*, Dec. 4, 1861.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid.

<sup>6</sup> Ibid.

<sup>7</sup> Ibid.

<sup>8</sup> “Nostalgia,” *Cleveland Morning Leader*, Oct. 16, 1861.

<sup>9</sup> Ibid.

<sup>10</sup> “Nostalgia,” *Cleveland Morning Leader*, Oct. 16, 1861.



The moral war against homesickness was probably destined to fail because a strong counter current continually eroded the effort. A note sounded by some voiced sympathy with the privations occasioned by the war. To these individuals, the Civil War naturally created conditions conducive for the development of fear, loneliness, and alienation. Homesickness was an obvious consequence. Nostalgia, even if it sapped the strength of armies, was measured with heaping doses of compassion. A Southern newspaper epitomized this approach by declaring that “every one who has a beloved relative in the army can surely comprehend something of the heart-sinking and dreamy home-sickness with which the strong man lies down...as he thinks of his peaceful home far away, (which he thinks he shall most likely see no more).”<sup>11</sup>

The notion that homesickness was accepted without second thought seems evident as betrayed in soldiers’ letters. For some it was a badge of courage to recognize its existence and defeat it. A member of the 21st Ohio Volunteer Infantry stationed at Camp Jefferson, Kentucky proudly noted that, “I have not yet had a single attack of the blues, or suffered from homesickness in the least.”<sup>12</sup> Another letter published in a local newspaper, this time from a mature member of the Pennsylvania “Silver Grays” stationed at Camp Curtain in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania thanked the editor for a large supply of tobacco. The letter’s author gushed, “It was a most timely donation. It was natural enough to expect the “boys,” just breaking away from the apron-stings of their maternal guardians, would at first feel a little homesick. The tobacco’s assuaging properties dispelled regrets...and we could think of home with . . . composure.”<sup>13</sup>

One way to attack homesickness was to ridicule it as an emotional weakness. The ridiculers equated a pining for home life with a mother’s tender, nurturing care. Clearly, adapting to the rigors of warfare was not advanced by clinging to such sentimentality. Real men severed their mother’s apron strings and strode independently off to the battlefields. For those who could not, newspapers offered cautionary stories to deter the weak-kneed.<sup>14</sup> “A lady residing in one of the interior counties of New York had an only son. When the war broke out he volunteered as a private.”<sup>15</sup> Whatever aspirations motivated the son’s enlistment soon evaporated from the heat of battle. The soldier deserted, citing homesickness as the precipitant. His arrival home however, was not an occasion for celebration. “Expecting a warm reception, the wretched youth rushed into the arms of his mother; but instead of returning his caresses, she flung him from her in disgust.”<sup>16</sup> The newspaper story continued the assault, quoting the mother as accusing her son of desertion

---

<sup>11</sup> “The Hospital at Culpeper,” *Staunton Spectator*, July 2, 1861.

<sup>12</sup> “Dear Brother,” *Weekly Perrysburg Journal*, Jan. 16, 1862.

<sup>13</sup> “From the ‘Silver Grays,’” *Alleghenian*, Jan. 9, 1862.

<sup>14</sup> “How a Mother Received Her Son who had Deserted,” *Cincinnati Daily Press*, Oct. 4, 1861.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*

and disgrace. The thoroughly whipped soldier retreated to the barn, plotting his eventual escape to Canada.

In a clever twist, newspapers enlisted homesickness in the propaganda war. The ammunition for one skirmish came from an intercepted letter.<sup>17</sup> A Confederate officer, full of doubt and despair, penned an all too revealing missive. “We have neither the men nor the means to carry on the war. Our troops are utterly demoralized, and heartsick and homesick.”<sup>18</sup> Union newspapers seized on the embarrassing disclosure, publicizing the letter throughout the northern states. This letter’s value as a propaganda instrument soon faded. In the end, neither the Confederate officer’s gloom nor the newspaper’s presumed euphoria prevailed as the war dragged on.

Confederate authorities bitterly accused Federal officials of exploiting nostalgia. “The Federal authorities, . . . having for a long time refused exchange of prisoners, finally consented to a partial exchange.”<sup>19</sup> In response, Confederate officials drafted rules that would guide the process. Because many of the Union soldiers were battle casualties, the Confederate officials primarily selected prisoners who could survive the trip north. Confederate surgeons, in response to the plaintive pleas “of some officers and men in the last stages of emaciation, suffering not only with excessive debility, but with ‘nostalgia,’ or home-sickness, whose cases were regarded as desperate, and who could not live if they remained, and might possibly improve if carried home” were also selected.<sup>20</sup> This act of kindness was betrayed “with a hideous violation of decency” when northern officials published pictures of the stricken soldiers, never mentioning the role of nostalgia or the Confederate surgeons’ compassion.<sup>21</sup>

A southern newspaper attacked homesickness in a different manner.<sup>22</sup> The proximity between confederate encampments and urban areas fostered an unhealthy trend. Family members would routinely visit their soldier sons. The constant socializing between the parties eroded military discipline and divided the soldiers’ loyalties. Major General Leonidas Polk recognized the problem and issued an order forbidding such intermingling. The General’s edict changed nothing. Colonel Rufus P. Neely, 4th Tennessee Infantry Regiment, bitterly complained that nothing had “done more to demoralize all military virtues of this regiment.”<sup>23</sup> Far from ascribing this outcome to sloppy sentimentality, Neely blamed a far more sinister dynamic. For example, a soldier’s father would piteously lament his son’s absence, calculating the cost in terms of lost man power. The father’s woeful tale cast the

---

<sup>17</sup> *Highland Weekly News*, May 8, 1862.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>19</sup> Pollard, E.A. 1866. *The Lost Cause: A New Southern History of the War of the Confederates: Comprising a Full and Authentic Account of the Rise and Progress of the Late Southern Confederacy--the Campaigns, Battles, Incidents, and Adventures of the Most Gigantic Struggle of the World's History* (New York: E.B. Treat, 1866), 631.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>22</sup> “Why Do Citizens Visit the Soldiers at Columbus,” *Memphis Daily Appeal*, Oct. 18, 1861.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*

beleaguered family as suffering from untilled land, rotting crops, or buildings in disrepair. According to Neely, far too many soldiers succumbed to the seduction. “Should the son get the least ill, the father strait way makes his appearance in camp, demands that his son shall go home—and his son becomes homesick—can’t get well any where but home.”<sup>24</sup>

Neely’s complaint somewhat obliquely addressed fabrication. Homesickness was simply too easy to simulate. Midway through the Civil War, two physicians briefly commented on feigned nostalgia in the influential book, *Elements of Medical Jurisprudence*.<sup>25</sup> As the book’s title suggests, this book was dedicated in part to helping physicians detect malingering. The authors remarked that “pretenders generally express a great desire to revisit their native country, while those who are really diseased are taciturn, express themselves obscurely on the subject of their malady, dare not make an avowal, and are little affected by the consolations which hope or promises offer to them.”<sup>26</sup>

Military surgeons became exceedingly adept at suspecting malingering although decidedly less skilled at identifying the counterfeit behavior. There were two points during which malingering peaked, among soldiers seeking a discharge and among men avoiding conscription. Naturally, feigned nostalgia occurred only among soldiers looking to shed their uniforms for good. Distinguishing normal homesickness, malignant nostalgia, and malingering surely challenged even the best military surgeons. In an effort to unravel the twisted diagnostic strands, authoritative texts offered helpful hints.<sup>27</sup> Nostalgia was clearly classified as a mental disease and distinguished from homesickness and malingering in terms of magnitude. “The extreme mental depression and the unconquerable longing for home soon produce a state of cachexy, loss of appetite, derangement of the assimilative functions, and finally, disease of the abdominal viscera.”<sup>28</sup> The fact that nostalgia often ended in death justified a medical discharge.

Homesickness was infectious, a contagion often spread through unwitting compassion. Perhaps in an effort to strike a compromise between a callous disregard of homesickness and a medical discharge, some military doctors opted for a third pathway. The reconciliation took the form of a special dispensation—a furlough. Neither the Confederate nor Union Army systematically granted furloughs to soldiers. As a consequence, a medically authorized leave of absence was a highly coveted prize. Not surprisingly then, “nostalgia, supper added to perhaps slight ailments, under the idea of being sent away with the prospect of a furlough.”<sup>29</sup> The abuse of the privilege probably dissuaded many military surgeons.

---

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>25</sup> T.R. Beck, J.B. Beck, and C.R. Gilman, *Elements of Medical Jurisprudence* (J. B. Lippincott & Company, 1863).

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, 60.

<sup>27</sup> R. Bartholow, *A Manual of Instructions for Enlisting and Discharging Soldiers* (Lippincott, 1864).

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*, 21.

<sup>29</sup> H.H. Kynett, S.W. Butler, and D.G. Brinton, *Medical and Surgical Reporter*, vol. 11 (1864), 151.

A similar problem arose among sick soldiers at the “hospital of the army of the Mississippi.”<sup>30</sup> The largest complex of tent hospitals in this southern state was near Corinth where 11,000 federal troops languished in 1862. As might be imagined, Union commanders dreaded the loss of these troops. The governors of several northern states aided and abetted the loss of military personnel by sending boats to retrieve their sick sons. The floating vessels encouraged “flocking on board of many whose only complaint was nostalgia. The really sick were left behind, and the convalescent, and often the malingerer, was sent away.”<sup>31</sup>

Setting concerns about the morality and abuse of nostalgia aside revealed a definite reality. Nostalgia was a serious mental disorder often culminating in death. Witnesses of the time concluded that “during the late Civil War thousands of soldiers were afflicted with the . . . melancholy arising from home-sickness, and large numbers died.”<sup>32</sup> Without challenging the veracity of this statement, an interesting disparity arises when exploring the rate of nostalgia’s occurrence. Unofficial accounts, gleaned from soldier’s letters, individual military surgeon’s observations, and newspaper accounts differed from the official version. From the former, homesickness and nostalgia seemed common while the latter seemed to minimize the problem.

A union soldier reminiscing about his winter encampment along the Potomac River recalled endless military drills and pervasive sickness. “Dysentery and typhoid fever made their appearance; nostalgia raged fearfully.”<sup>33</sup> As the dreary days of winter receded somewhat, “the bright, warm sunshine made camp life more endurable . . . and there was nothing more serious than homesickness apparent in the camp.”<sup>34</sup> Winter weather contributed to a substantial decline in active military operations, along with a corresponding increase in boredom among the bivouacked soldiers. The respite from combat all too often replaced excitement and fear with maudlin meditations. As a result, “the hospital lists had many cases of what is known as nostalgia, homesickness, the patient really ill from *ennui*.”<sup>35</sup>

Inactivity and the dull, gray, cold winter weather contributed to homesickness but more serious cases sometimes developed in debilitated soldiers. Sick or injured soldiers’ thoughts would naturally turn to more pleasant times at home. “It is a pathetic fact that all through the war many men who might have recovered from the fevers and other ailments common to a soldier’s life died because homesickness had quenched their power of resistance to disease.”<sup>36</sup> This remarkably insightful

---

<sup>30</sup> C. Smart, J.K. Barnes, and United States Surgeon General’s Office, *The Medical and Surgical History of the War of the Rebellion: 1861-65* (U.S. Government Printing Office, 1870), 33.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>32</sup> Benson John Lossing, *The American Historical Record*, vol. 1 (Philadelphia: Chase & Town Publishers, 1872), 234.

<sup>33</sup> R.B. Irwin, “Seeking the Bubble,” *The United States Service Magazine* (April, 1865): 354.

<sup>34</sup> Frederick Clifton Pierce, *Foster Genealogy* (Chicago: W.B. Conkey Co., 1899), 851.

<sup>35</sup> “Our Winter Camps,” *Chicago Tribune*, Dec. 30, 1861.

<sup>36</sup> Ira Seymour, “The Household of the Hundred Thousand,” *McClure’s Magazine* (May, 1898): 157.

observation might account for some of the disparity between the official and unofficial record regarding the incidence of nostalgia. Instead of listing the aggravating effect of nostalgia as the precipitant, some physicians might have listed the physical illness as the cause of death.

The weather's impact on the soldier's mood paled in comparison to the hardships in the prisoner-of-war camps. As could be easily imagined, the deprivations and forced confinement of prison life reduced dreams of home to a mirage. It was a bitter blow to the dispirited, debilitated inmates. The Union prisoners-of-war facility at Camp Douglas in Chicago, Illinois in the spring of 1865 counted 1,400 inmates on the sick list. "One of the most frequent causes of death" was nostalgia.<sup>37</sup> Confederate prisoner-of-war camps were no better, and in some instances much worse. A Northern newspaper, with an obvious eye towards titillating its readership, screamed about the "horrible barbarities of the rebels" through a "thrilling account of their [Union prisoners] sufferings."<sup>38</sup> While sanctimoniously snubbing the plight of southern prisoners, the newspaper excoriated the depraved treatment of Union soldiers. In reality, neither side could lay claim to much of a moral advantage. In any event, like their Confederate counterparts, for Union soldiers, "nostalgia is the parent of physical ailments, and, under the terrible monotony and privations of the prison pens, it is more fatal than bullets on the field of battle."<sup>39</sup>

Throughout the Civil War, hospitals concentrated the sick and injured in increasingly vast complexes. The isolated examples of nostalgia reported in the field congregated in the hospitals. In some respects this forced the medical system to recognize and respond to the emotional disorder. Even so, for many soldiers a trip to the hospital was tantamount to a death sentence, and to be avoided if at all possible. Part of a soldier's reluctance could perhaps be traced to the apathetic care.<sup>40</sup> A newspaper correspondent captured the essence by noting, "perhaps the greatest fault military surgeons are apt to fall into, is to be too military in their treatment of their patients."<sup>41</sup> The surgeons could perhaps be pardoned for insisting on military decorum but in doing so they underestimated the emotional side of their patient's recovery. Striking the right balance in the soldier-patient dyad was difficult but not without consequences. "Through want of a uniform understanding on the part of our military, and even some of our medical officers on this very point, many lives are sacrificed."<sup>42</sup>

It seems reasonable to speculate that many military surgeons appreciated the therapeutic value of a sympathetic word or caring caress. Fortunately when the

---

<sup>37</sup> "Camp Douglas," *Jeffersonian*, March 16, 1865.

<sup>38</sup> "Our Prisoners," *New York Times*, Nov. 26, 1864.

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>40</sup> Frank Moore, *Anecdotes, Poetry, and Incidents of the War North and South, 1860-1865* (New York: Publication Office, Bible House, J. Porteus, agent, 1867), 129.

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*

physician could not supply this tender tonic, a nurse could.<sup>43</sup> Elvira Powers, the matron at the Jefferson Indiana General Hospital during the Civil War, recorded her observations in a diary published just after the conflict ended. Powers, working in a field dominated by men, noted that “there are very many wise and noble surgeons in the service who rightly appreciate woman’s influence in a hospital.”<sup>44</sup> Aside from any chores the physicians required, the woman’s presence softened the patient’s hardships. Powell recalled one physician’s heartfelt gratitude, “there are those whose lives are due to your care. Some were very low with nervous prostration and nostalgia . . . and your conversation and attention has aroused, cheered, strengthened and saved them.”<sup>45</sup>

If the military doctor was short on sympathy he countered with keen powers of observation. Michael D. Benedict, an assistant surgeon with the 75th Regiment New York Volunteers, provided a short briefing on the medical status of the unit in the summer of 1862.<sup>46</sup> Benedict’s assessment was mostly positive, citing only mild cases of fever and diarrhea. He did express some concern that the regiment was “a little afflicted with nostalgia, owing principally to the length of time intervening between the reception of mail from the North.” As Benedict astutely established, in an untold number of cases the clinical course of nostalgia hinged on news from home. In most cases, good news brightened the soldier’s outlook but letters could also bring disappointments which propelled a downward emotional decline.<sup>47</sup>

The best medical descriptions of nostalgia came from doctors. A surgeon tending the myriad of medical problems in an army hospital described a curious example.<sup>48</sup> “The man came here almost entirely recovered from fever, and claiming himself to be entirely well, refusing medicines and talking very rationally about everything but home.”<sup>49</sup> It was during sleep that his real wishes made their appearance. He babbled endlessly about his wife and children. When morning came and the soldier awakened not a word of home passed his lips. Instead, the soldier would daily pack his gear and walk to the wharf hoping a boat would take him home. Quietly disappointed, the soldier returned to his hospital bed awaiting the satisfaction that his dreaming gave. The surgeon recognized the nostalgia and the soldier finally boarded a boat bound for home. As the astute doctor noted, “to have kept him here would have ended, probably in suicide.”<sup>50</sup>

James A. Mowris, a surgeon with the 117th Regiment New York Volunteers (Fourth Oneida), recalled campaigns where “it was not uncommon to see nearly a

---

<sup>43</sup> Elvira J. Powers, *Hospital Pencillings: Being a Diary While in Jefferson General Hospital, Jeffersonville, Ind., and Others at Nashville, Tennessee, As Matron and Visitor* (Boston: Edward L. Mitchel, 1866).

<sup>44</sup> *Ibid.*, 209

<sup>45</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>46</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>47</sup> Elisha Harris, *American Medical Times*, vol. 5 (New York: Bailliere Brothers, 1862.), 182.

<sup>48</sup> “Nostalgia,” *Cleveland Morning Leader*, July 10, 1862.

<sup>49</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>50</sup> *Ibid.*

hundred present at sick call.”<sup>51</sup> Mowris recognized and commented on the diffuse despondency that dwelled among the sick men. The dreary mood was principally due to nostalgia, which took its toll primarily among the very youngest and oldest soldiers. To illustrate the point, Mowris described a particularly painful example. “The writer has a case vivid in memory, of a boy of eighteen, who had been steadily melting away. . . . The most approved remedies had been employed in vain; he became scarcely, a living skeleton.”<sup>52</sup> The dying soldier was the beneficiary of a furlough. As he was gingerly placed aboard the boat, those remaining behind surely predicted his imminent demise. Such was not the case as the trip home proved a powerful tonic. In due course the soldier returned. Mowris regretted that more soldiers could not take the cure.

The Federal War Department summarized the official response to nostalgia in *The Medical and Surgical History of the War of the Rebellion*. The tabulation recorded here provides the most direct evidence of nostalgia, at least in terms of an official tally. Aside from the numbers, the few pages dedicated to the subject presented a parsimonious description of nostalgia. In an opening preamble to the short discussion, the authors admitted that the rigors of military life were often accompanied by fond reminiscences of home life. This form of homesickness was mild, limited to encamped troops, and dissipated with the anticipation of combat. As such, it was detrimental only to the extent that garrisoned soldiers divided their attention between thoughts of home and camp duties, with the latter suffering.<sup>53</sup>

In some cases homesickness transitioned into a severe depression. These curious cases were remarkable for their clinical presentation and not their frequency. According to the official record, military surgeons reported 5,213 cases of nostalgia among white troops. The records are incomplete for black soldiers and only begin with the year ending 30 June 1864. As a result, military surgeons only reported 334 cases of nostalgia among the black soldiers. The incidence of nostalgia-related deaths peaked at 3.35 deaths per 1,000 white soldiers serving in the field with the year ending 30 June 1863. Determining army field strength during the Civil War was difficult. With that in mind, perhaps the actual number of deaths surgeons attributed to nostalgia is a better measure. The numbers were always miniscule, with 12 deaths reported among white soldiers in the year ending 30 June 1863, 16 deaths in year ending 30 June 1864, and 24 deaths in the year ending 30 June 1865. For black soldiers the peak number of nostalgia deaths was 9, reported in the year ending 30 June 1864.<sup>54</sup>

---

<sup>51</sup> J.A. Mowris, *A History of the One Hundred and Seventeenth Regiment, N.Y. Volunteers, (Fourth Oneida,) from the Date of Its Organization, August, 1862, Till That of Its Muster Out, June, 1865*, 81.

<sup>52</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>53</sup> Charles Smart, *The Medical and Surgical History of the War of the Rebellion, part III, vol. I. Medical History. Being the Third Medical Volume . . .* (U.S. Government Printing Office, 1888), 884.

<sup>54</sup> *Ibid.*, 884-885.

Medical officials assigned the morbid development of nostalgia to “young men of feeble will, highly developed imaginative faculties and strong sexual desires, and married men for the first time absent from their families.”<sup>55</sup> Prevention was simple enough – keep the soldiers busy. As a camp disease, military leaders could avoid the descent from homesickness to nostalgia by encouraging sports, physical labor, and construction projects that softened the rough edges of army life.<sup>56</sup>

John L. Taylor, a military surgeon with the 3rd Missouri Cavalry, cast a jaundiced eye on his troops. According to Taylor “the home-sick patient shows a want of resolution and activity in all his undertakings: he is serious, sad, and timid, apprehending on the slightest ground the most serious results – great personal danger, and even death itself.”<sup>57</sup> Taylor described a soldier stricken with panic attacks, depression, and a morbid turn of mind that catastrophized the slightest discomfort. As might be imagined, such behavior was scorned. Taylor condemned the soldier’s laziness: “They were generally found lying in bed or sitting around the tents, making a great deal to do about their sufferings.” Even more infuriating to Taylor was his observation that kind comments only prompted the nostalgic soldier to complain even more.<sup>58</sup>

The homesick-induced indolence that so incensed Dr. Taylor also contributed to other problems for soldiers. Perhaps the chief culprit was alcohol. “If alcoholic liquors can be obtained they are much resorted to at these times, and excesses tell on the nervous system by depressant action.”<sup>59</sup> Tobacco was another noxious influence. Although widely used by soldiers some prescient surgeons sounded an alarm. “Tobacco is smoked . . . nominally to pass the time, but in reality for its sedative influence on the unemployed nervous system, until the circulation becomes poisoned and loss of appetite, impaired digestion, and prostration of nerve-power are the results.” Gambling, which excited the soldier’s passion, was yet another deleterious camp recreation. The leadership’s response to alcohol, tobacco, and gambling required a determined effort to promote healthy exercise and sports.<sup>60</sup>

Nowadays scurvy, a nutritional disease resulting from an absence of vitamin C, is quite rare in developed countries. That was not the case during the Civil War, when an embryonic understanding of diet and disease was only beginning to take shape. According to doctors of the era the prevention of scurvy depended on adequate amounts of vegetables, milk, and meat. The Union Army officially adjusted the rations several times in an effort to prevent scurvy. Aside from diet, “depression of spirits, from whatever cause – in the individual from nostalgia and

---

<sup>55</sup> *Ibid.*, 885.

<sup>56</sup> *Ibid.*, 886.

<sup>57</sup> *Ibid.*, 885.

<sup>58</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>59</sup> *Ibid.*, 886.

<sup>60</sup> *Ibid.*



private or personal troubles and anxieties and among the prisoners of war was no doubt a powerful predisposing agency” contributing to scurvy.<sup>61</sup>

De Witt C. Peters was an assistant surgeon in charge of Jarvis Hospital in Baltimore, Maryland.<sup>62</sup> During his service in the Civil War Peters wrote a short article describing nostalgia.<sup>63</sup> “That peculiar state of mind denominated nostalgia by medical writers, is a species of melancholy, or a mild type of insanity.”<sup>64</sup> Peters’s suggestion that nostalgia was a form of insanity was grounded in the rapid, unresponsive descent towards death. No amount of comfort, cajoling, or reasoning could alter the course. The soldier’s rigid, unbending sense of doom bordered on the delusional—the hallmark of insanity. Peters described a typical case: “As the disease progresses it is attended by hysterical weeping, a dull pain in the head, throbbing of the temporal arteries, anxious expression of the face, . . . and a general wasting of all the vital powers.”<sup>65</sup>

According to Dr. Peters, troops stationed in the south suffered nostalgia greatly, given the climate and the lack of reliable mail. Prisoners of war also suffered from nostalgia and “it is the worst complication to be encountered.”<sup>66</sup> It was from these observations that Dr. Peters eventually concluded that age was the decisive factor leading to nostalgia. “The statistics and experience of the U.S. Army conclusively demonstrate, that persons received at the minimum standard of eighteen years are, in a majority of cases in this country, not sufficiently matured in mind and body to undertake the arduous duties of a soldier.”<sup>67</sup> Peters’s prescription to prevent nostalgia was to avoid such youthful enlistments. The Doctor’s gratuitous advice was surely a bitter pill to swallow for an army fighting a long and costly war.

All of the factors cited as contributing to nostalgia among union soldiers, such as age, distance from home, lack of mail, climate, diet, and lazy bivouacs surely affected Confederate soldiers. Unfortunately, primary source materials documenting nostalgia among the southern soldiers are very limited. Basil Lanneau Gildersleeve, in *The Creed of the Old South*, briefly mentioned nostalgia. While serving in the Confederate Army, Gildersleeve recalled, “Nostalgia, which we are apt to sneer at as a doctor’s name for homesickness . . . was a power for evil in those days, and some of our finest troops were thinned out by it.”<sup>68</sup> After the war ended, a few other confederate memoirs surfaced but this still left an author researching nostalgia to conclude that, “this area of interest still awaits its historian.”<sup>69</sup>

---

<sup>61</sup> Ibid., 771.

<sup>62</sup> United States Sanitary Commission, *Narrative of Privations and Sufferings of United States Officers and Soldiers While Prisoners of War in the Hands of the Rebel Authorities* (Philadelphia: King & Baird, 1864).

<sup>63</sup> De Witt C. Peters, “Remarks on The Evils of Youthful Enlistments and Nostalgia,” *American Medical Times*, no. 6 (1863): 75-76.

<sup>64</sup> Ibid.

<sup>65</sup> Ibid.

<sup>66</sup> Ibid.

<sup>67</sup> Ibid.

<sup>68</sup> Basil L. Gildersleeve, *The Creed of the old South, 1865-1915* (Johns Hopkins Press, 1915).

<sup>69</sup> D. Anderson, “Dying of Nostalgia: Homesickness in the Union Army during the Civil War,” *Civil War History*, vol. 56, no. 3 (2010): 247-282.

As the preceding discussion suggests, the incidence of nostalgia among Confederate soldiers surely existed, but evidence is sparse. Such is the case with Florida's records. Many of Florida's military records from the Civil War are apparently forever lost. "It is supposed that most of the records were destroyed by someone at the Capitol before it was occupied by the Federals in 1865 to prevent any incriminating evidence falling into their hands."<sup>70</sup> Another theory suggests the records were destroyed during the Civil War reconstruction.

Florida seceded from the Union on 10 January 1861. Two days later Florida soldiers, joined by a small contingent from Alabama, proceeded to the Pensacola Navy Yard and demanded its surrender. The commanding officer at the Pensacola Navy Yard complied. The Union flag was hauled down and immediately replaced with Florida's state flag. In succeeding days Florida troops fortified strategic positions throughout the state.<sup>71</sup>

More than 15,000 Florida soldiers supported the Confederacy.<sup>72</sup> From the surviving records, two Florida soldiers, Arnold D. Sledge and Ellsberry T. Sledge, died from nostalgia.<sup>73</sup> Both soldiers were listed on the rolls of Company H, (Jefferson Rifles) of the 3rd Florida Infantry Regiment. The 3rd Florida Infantry formed in June 1861 on Amelia Island.<sup>74</sup> Company H, otherwise known as the Jefferson Rifles, came from Jefferson County and joined the 3rd Florida Infantry at Fernandina. The newly constituted company, under the command of Captain William O. Girardeau, counted only 45 soldiers among its ranks when they began the trip to Fernandina. The journey was a glimpse of things to come for the soldiers, "as they were confined to two boxcars and exposed to almost constant rain and gnawing hunger."<sup>75</sup> Upon arrival the beleaguered soldiers from the Jefferson Rifles joined with other units in promoting William Dilworth to lead the 3rd Florida Infantry Regiment. In fairly short order, the 3rd Florida Infantry joined forces with the Army of Tennessee.<sup>76</sup> The soldiers no doubt grew familiar with names like Knoxville, Chattanooga, Murfreesboro, and Perryville, Kentucky. The 1862 Perryville campaign was particularly bloody for the 3rd Florida Infantry, with 14 dead, 86 injured, and four captured.<sup>77</sup>

It was against this backdrop that Privates Arnold D. Sledge and Ellsberry T. Sledge served. As both soldiers had the same last name and, mustered from the same location in Florida, it seemed reasonable to consider the pair related. A bit

---

<sup>70</sup> Florida, *Soldiers of Florida in the Seminole Indian, Civil and Spanish-American Wars* (Live Oak, Fla.: Democrat print, 1903), 37-38.

<sup>71</sup> *Ibid.*, 36.

<sup>72</sup> Florida, *Military Service & Pension Records* (Florida Department of State, Division of Library & Information Services, 2004-2012), <http://dhis.dos.state.fl.us/archives/militarypension/>.

<sup>73</sup> Florida, *Soldiers*, 115.

<sup>74</sup> Jonathan C. Sheppard, "'By the Noble Daring of Her Sons': The Florida Brigade of the Army of Tennessee" (PhD diss., Florida State University, 2008), 39.

<sup>75</sup> *Ibid.*, 20.

<sup>76</sup> *Ibid.*, xi.

<sup>77</sup> *Ibid.*, 90.

of sleuthing uncovered a surviving great nephew who recalled, “Two of my great uncles died as Confederate soldiers. Ellsberry was a brother to A. Darius Sledge. They were born in Jefferson County in the 1830s. Both were unmarried. They were both in the 3rd Florida Infantry Regiment.”<sup>78</sup>

Arnold Sledge joined Company H at Fernandina on 10 August 1861.<sup>79</sup> Arnold began his military service as a private, initially under the command of Captain Girardeau. The same document listing Arnold’s enlistment, an affidavit recorded in Jefferson County before Justice of the Peace Thomas Simmons on 27 June 1863, authorized the father Green Sledge to claim the worldly possessions of his son. According to the affidavit, Arnold died 24 April 1863 “leaving neither wife nor child”<sup>80</sup> as legatees. Arnold died at Tullahoma, Tennessee. The cause of death is not listed on that document. His son’s death left the Confederate States War Department owing Green Sledge \$135.08.<sup>81</sup>

Like his brother, Ellsberry Sledge also joined Company H at Fernandina on 10 August 1861. At the time of his enlistment Ellsberry was 25 years old, stood a respectable five feet and 10 inches tall, and had a fair complexion, gray eyes, and light hair. Ellsberry was a farmer.<sup>82</sup> Green Sledge also filed an affidavit “for the purpose of obtaining from the Government of the Confederate States whatever may have been due the said Ellsberry Sledge.”<sup>83</sup> According to this document, Ellsberry died at home of an unspecified disease on January 30, 1862. His grave is located at the Walker Cemetery in Jefferson County, Florida.<sup>84</sup>

Arnold Sledge died at Tullahoma, Tennessee on April 24, 1863. He is buried at the Maplewood Cemetery, also referred to as the Tullahoma Confederate Cemetery.<sup>85</sup> His name is listed on a memorial recognizing Confederate soldiers. He could not have died during the Tullahoma Campaign since that action started on June 23, 1863.<sup>86</sup> The Army of the Tennessee had great stretches of inactivity, such as “between January 1863 and April 1864, during which nearly eleven of sixteen months were spent virtually dormant.”<sup>87</sup> A Mississippi soldier recalled the tedium

<sup>78</sup> James Sledge, e-mail message to author, June 25, 2012.

<sup>79</sup> Carded Records Showing Military Service Confederate Compiled Military Service Records Confederate Service Records edited by War Department. The Adjutant General’s Office. (03/04/1907-09/18/1947) (Most Recent) and War Department. Record and Pension Office. (1892-05/11/1904) (Predecessor). Washington, DC: National Archives.

<sup>80</sup> Ibid.

<sup>81</sup> Compiled Service Records of Confederate Soldiers Who Served in Organizations from the State of Florida 1861-1865. Washington, DC: War Department. The Adjutant General’s Office. (03/04/1907-09/18/1947) (Most Recent)

<sup>82</sup> Carded Records Showing Military Service of Soldiers Who Fought in Confederate Organizations, compiled 1903-1927, documenting the period 1861-1865. 1861-1865. edited by War Department. The Adjutant General’s Office. (03/04/1907-09/18/1947) (Most Recent) and War Department. Record and Pension Office. (1892-05/11/1904) (Predecessor). Washington, DC: War Department.

<sup>83</sup> Ibid.

<sup>84</sup> James Sledge, *Ellsberry Sledge*, <http://www.findagrave.com/cgi-bin/fg.cgi?page=gr&GRid=26682551>.

<sup>85</sup> Jody & Lesa Baltz, *Pvt Arnold D. Sledge*, <http://www.findagrave.com/cgi-bin/fg.cgi?page=gr&GRid=5059680>.

<sup>86</sup> James Sledge, e-mail message to author, 29 June 2012. Also, Jody & Lesa Baltz, *Pvt Arnold D. Sledge*, <http://www.findagrave.com/cgi-bin/fg.cgi?page=gr&GSln=sledge&GSiman=1&GScid=15093&GRid=5059680&>

<sup>87</sup> Larry J. Daniel, *Soldiering in the Army of Tennessee: A Portrait of Life in a Confederate Army* (University of North Carolina Press, 1991), 83.

of camp life on 17 April 1863, writing, “Drilled hard for an hour rested a half hour and then drilled again to near sunset.”<sup>88</sup> It seems reasonable to conclude the Sledge was among those soldiers suffering the boredom of garrison life. In any event, the cause of Arnold’s death is simply listed as nostalgia on the available Confederate records—apparently while his unit was bivouacked in Tennessee.

The deaths of Arnold D. Sledge and Ellsberry T. Sledge are both attributed to nostalgia. The only evidence confirming this is two solitary entries in the rolls of Florida Soldiers who served in the Civil War. If their deaths followed a protracted period of deep depression they probably joined an unknown number of other Confederate soldiers suffering untimely deaths from this morbid melancholia. In the end these deeply dispirited southern soldiers shared a common bond with their northern foes—both groups succumbing to a fatal despondency.

---

<sup>88</sup> *Ibid.*, 26.

# Natural Resource Exploitation in the Pilcomayo River Basin: Impacts on the Formation of Bolivian National Identity

Brent Spencer  
*Florida Gulf Coast University*

## Introduction

Starting as a trickle high in the Andes *altiplano* (high altitude plains) and glacial peaks, the Pilcomayo River flows into the environmental and social history of the countries of Bolivia, Paraguay, and Argentina before emptying into the Paraguay River and eventually to the Paraná and out to the Atlantic Ocean via the River Plate. The Pilcomayo River and the exploitation of its natural resources played an important role in the formation of a centralized national identity being imposed on the diverse populations in Bolivia by the governing Creole elite in the early national period while the Chaco War and the National Revolution, both events tied to the environmental and social history of the Pilcomayo River, caused paradigmatic shifts in the national ideology regarding indigenous integration in the Pilcomayo River basin.

Bolivia is rich in natural mineral, hydrocarbon, forestry, agricultural, and hydrographic resources. Exploitation of these resources has created uneven social structures often based upon class and ethnic lines. The resources of the current economically dominant zones of La Paz, Cochabamba, and Santa Cruz receive much attention for their role in the national character of Bolivia, but the southern Bolivia valleys and Chaco of Bolivia along the Pilcomayo River have historically been crucial to the formation of the national identity as well. Communities and civilizations have quenched their thirst for irrigation, fished, powered mines, flushed mining wastes, explored for possibilities of navigable transportation, and shed blood in wars for the national cause along this river's banks. Riparian and wetland ecosystems have flourished and floundered in its waters. Heavy Andean sediments have flowed in its waters down to the marshes of the Chaco. Delicate ecosystems have adapted and species have evolved to match their environment. People have adapted to and altered this landscape (and vice versa) as related through stories which have been told in English, Spanish, Quechua, Guarani, and dozens of other spoken languages, and through natural, scientific, and archeological evidence. This natural and human story is interwoven into the social fabric of a national society.

---

## Pre-Hispanic Incan Conceptions of the Pilcomayo

The name of the Pilcomayo River is of Quechua origin and refers to some distinct natural description of the river probably of religious or cosmological significance. *Mayo* is the Quechua word for river. *Pilco* may be the name of a bird or perhaps comes from the Quechua word, *puka* (spelled *ppilco* by some scholars) which means red.<sup>1</sup> The indigenous chronicler, Pachacuti Yamqui, drew a river called ‘Pillcumayo’ in the early seventeenth century as part of the Andean cosmology that he said adorned the wall of the sacred Inca Coricancha temple of Cuzco.<sup>2</sup> Interpreted by art historian Paul Steele, and anthropologist Catherine Allen, Yamqui’s drawing shows that “from Capac Pacha or Lord Earth, emanated the river Pilcomayo, linking this deity with the male manifestation of flowing water that inseminates and germinates. This is opposed by Pacha Cocha, which is standing water such as a lake or the ocean that expresses feminine nurturing qualities,”<sup>3</sup> Anthropologist Billie Isbell interpreted that “exiting from the earth is the river Pillcumayo, the legendary place of origin of the Incas.”<sup>4</sup> The illustration in this sacred cosmology shows the reverence that Andean pre-Hispanic and indigenous cultures had for rivers and other natural features in general, whether the river drawn by Pachacuti Yamqui represents the modern day Pilcomayo River that is the subject of this essay, or some other mythical river.

In the words of Tricia Cusack, rivers throughout the world have had a “universal symbolic potential . . . to represent life and time, and consequently [provide] a powerful metaphor for the vital stream of national history flowing unimpeded out of the past and into the future.”<sup>5</sup> Major rivers such as the Nile in Egypt, the Ganges in India, the Thames in England, and the Amazon in Brazil have had existential impacts on the countries through which they flow. It is important to understand the significance of the water system and rivers, as represented in the underlying Andean cosmology, in trying to understand the unique impacts Bolivian rivers such as the Pilcomayo have on the formation of national identity, and resistance to forcedly imposed identities in Bolivia. A discussion of the geography and history of the Pilcomayo River may be helpful in explaining how the potential of the Pilcomayo, in the minds of Bolivia’s governments, may be its most enduring symbolic contribution to the national identity of Bolivia.

---

<sup>1</sup> Florencio Gilberto Arenalzo, “Rio bravo el Pilcomayo,” *Todo es historia*, no. 51 (July 1971), <http://www.histarmar.org/InfHistorica-2/Pilcomayo-1/Pilcomayo-RioBravo-1.htm>.

<sup>2</sup> Marcos Jiménez de la Espada, Fernando de Santillán, and Juan de Santa Cruz Pachacuti Yamqui Salcamayhua, *Tres relaciones de antigüedades peruanas* (Madrid: Impr. de M. Tello, 1879), 256.

<sup>3</sup> Paul R. Steele, and Catherine J. Allen, *Handbook of Inca Mythology* (Santa Barbara, Calif.: ABC-CLIO, 2004), 147.

<sup>4</sup> Billie Jean Isbell, *To Defend Ourselves: Ecology and Ritual in an Andean Village* (Austin: Institute of Latin American Studies, University of Texas at Austin, 1978), 209.

<sup>5</sup> Tricia Cusack, *Riverscapes and National Identities* (New York: Syracuse University Press, 2010), 1.

## The Pilcomayo in its Geographic Context

The current territory of Bolivia is greatly reduced from its holdings and claims at independence. Losses of land to Brazil, Chile, and Paraguay in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries due to natural resource disputes and access to ocean ports have played a significant role in the formation of Bolivian nationality. The loss of Bolivia's coastline to Chile in the War of the Pacific (1879-1883) over control of *guano*, nitrates, and coastal ports led to the discrediting of the military leadership of Bolivia, and triggered a shift in political organization from caudillo rule to a more modern parliamentary citizen-dominated regime.<sup>6</sup> Bolivia's demands on Chile for a sovereign outlet to the Pacific continue to be a source of Bolivian national unity in an otherwise highly fractious political environment. Treaties negotiated by the Mariano Melgarejo regime under influence of the mining elite, who favored free trade in the 1860s, ceded large pieces of rubber-rich land to Brazil and secured access to ports in Buenos Aires in exchange for favorable terms for imports from Brazil and Argentina.<sup>7</sup> The Chaco War (1932-1935), fought over control of potentially hydrocarbon-rich territory and access to the Pacific Ocean via the Pilcomayo River led to the loss of a large portion of the Bolivian Chaco to Paraguay. As will be discussed below, this loss of territory had profound influences on Bolivian national identity. The potential of the Pilcomayo River to help recuperate access to the ocean in landlocked Bolivia created a sense of nationalistic hope.

Physically, Bolivia is a land of extreme proportions. Among the towering peaks and highland altiplano plains, pink flamingos feed on brine and algae in salty lakes within the sight of llama herds and steaming snow-capped volcanoes. In the northeastern jungles, pink river dolphins share the waters of slow moving rivers with piranhas and a multitude of other species. The highland plains drop in cliffs and steep cloud forest slopes through river valleys down to the low-lying regions where the land is covered by jungle, cattle pasture, and soy and sugarcane fields. In Southern Bolivia the altiplano drops through mostly dry forest valleys into the semi-arid to humid Chaco plateau.<sup>8</sup> This diversity of elevations creates many sub-climates and variations in humidity and vegetation patterns.<sup>9</sup> The Pilcomayo River traverses these landscapes from the glacial trickles in the peaks, to cascades in the valleys, to meandering swamps in the Chaco. The Pilcomayo River itself is notoriously hard to define with characteristics that are not found in other rivers around the world, especially in its lower reaches.<sup>10</sup> While maps of the region show

---

<sup>6</sup> Herbert S. Klein, *A Concise History of Bolivia* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 143. Guano is a type of bird manure used as fertilizer.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, 135.

<sup>8</sup> Ramiro P. Lopez, "Phytogeographical Relations of the Andean Dry Valleys of Bolivia," *Journal of Biogeography* 30, no. 11 (2003): 1659.

<sup>9</sup> Claudio Laboranti, "Pilcomayo River Basin Institutional Structure," *International Journal of Water Resources Development* 27, no. 3 (September 2011): 541.

<sup>10</sup> Laboranti, "Pilcomayo River Basin Institutional Structure," 541.

a clearly defined path for the river, its actual course spills out over the Chaco plains in undefined swamps during the wet season before making it to the Paraguay River.<sup>11</sup>

According to the Tri-National Commission for the Development of the Pilcomayo Basin, an estimated 1.5 million people from twenty ethnic groups now live in the Pilcomayo River basin in Bolivia, Paraguay, and Argentina, with nearly a million of these inhabitants in Bolivia. Thirty-seven percent of the Bolivians that live in the region are indigenous and half of the Bolivian inhabitants live in rural areas. Sixty percent of all inhabitants in the area live below the poverty line of their respective country.<sup>12</sup> Subsistence agriculture, livestock herding, fishing, mining, and hydrocarbon development comprise most of the economic activity in the area. Over twelve percent of the Bolivian economy is connected to activity within the Pilcomayo basin.<sup>13</sup>

### **Settlement, Mining, and Land Ownership Patterns In the Upper Basin**

The region of the upper Pilcomayo in the present day departments of Potosí and Chuquisaca, Bolivia, was settled by ethnic groups connected through the federation Charcas-Karakaras who resisted the advancement of the Incas. The Incas took control of this area after defeating these ethnic groups in the valleys of present day Cochabamba and built forts, tambos (storehouses), and routes in the second half of the fifteenth century integrating it into the Collasuyu region of the Tawantinsuyu or Inca empire in order to exploit the mostly silver and other mineral natural resources of the area.<sup>14</sup>

Archeological evidence shows that the pre-Hispanic Incan infrastructure was strategically built near water sources in valleys that eventually drain into the Pilcomayo River, and on hill tops in different ecological niches and elevation zones to take advantage of trade using the different agricultural and forestry production capacities. Indigenous peoples made ceramic jars to store food, and mined silver and copper mostly for symbolic and religious artifacts. The mines of the Pre-Hispanic Incas were comparatively rudimentary and lacked the large-scale exploitation of the later European mines in the area.<sup>15</sup> Trade between the Incas of the upper Pilcomayo basin and Chiriguano of the lower basin in the Chaco can be seen through pottery evidence especially in the early Inca period. By the end of Inca rule, Inca forts along the Pilcomayo and lack of trade evidence suggest that the Incas may have been in the process of trying to conquer these lower basin

---

<sup>11</sup> J.P. Martín-Vide, J.P. M. Amarilla, and F.J. Zarate. "Collapse of the Pilcomayo River," *Geomorphology* (2012): 1.

<sup>12</sup> Dirección Ejecutiva de la Comisión Trinacional para el Desarrollo de la Cuenca del Río Pilcomayo, Marco de referencia: Caracterización, localización, división geográfica y política.

<sup>13</sup> Laboranti, "Pilcomayo River Basin Institutional Structure," 542-543.

<sup>14</sup> Patrice Lecoq, "La ocupación en los valles de Yura y los alrededores de Potosí durante los periodos intermedio tardío e Inca, a la luz de nuevos descubrimientos arqueológicos," *Textos Antropológicos* 14, no.2 (2003): 105, <http://www.revistasbolivianas.org.bo/pdf/ta/v14n2/v14n2a06.pdf>.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, 109-112.



Chiriguano bands.<sup>16</sup> The subsequent Spanish conquest and occupation of the area greatly changed the economic, social, and ecological environment of the region.

Under the Spanish Crown, Bolivia (then called The Audiencia of Charcas or Upper Peru) was under the jurisdiction of Lima, which grew rich with trade based on silver from the mines of the iconic Cerro Rico hill in Potosí. Trade from the port of Buenos Aires was legalized by the Spanish Empire in the latter half of the eighteenth century and in 1776 the territory of modern Bolivia was placed under control of the Viceroyalty of Buenos Aires. While this led to the decline of Lima, it jumpstarted the growth of Buenos Aires as mule train overland trade routes were established through northern Argentina from Potosí to Buenos Aires.<sup>17</sup> By 1600 Potosí was as big as London and Tokyo and was the largest city in the western hemisphere at around 150,000 inhabitants.<sup>18</sup> The organization of labor required to run the colonial mines and the agricultural economy in the valleys that sustained the mines, first established by the Peruvian Viceroy Francisco de Toledo, had a defining impact on the region's social structure.<sup>19</sup> The changes to the land and environment resulting from this application of labor on a massive scale also affected livelihoods and identities along the river.

With independence from Spain Bolivia began to form its own national identity. In 1891, during the Aniceto Arce administration, the National Corps of Engineers was commissioned to build a new bridge across the Pilcomayo River on the borders of the provinces of Chuquisaca and Potosí to replace “the old bridge of the Pilcomayo, whose disappearance has been complete in consequence of the destructive action of the latest rises [of the river].”<sup>20</sup> Dalence in 1851 mentions a wooden bridge in this spot and a previous bridge of lime and masonry that had been swept away by the Pilcomayo.<sup>21</sup> With fifty to sixty Bolivianos in 1851 drowning in attempted river crossings per year, these bridge improvements represented the progress of a nation in its ongoing attempts to subdue the difficult terrain of Bolivia.<sup>22</sup> Attempts to subdue the indigenous population along the river would prove to be equally as challenging.

Patterns of population, land ownership, and the natural environment of Bolivia played an important role in how the young nation would develop. Bolivia's first national census, taken in 1847 by Jose Maria Dalence, recorded that the population living “subject to the Constitution and laws of the Republic, reached 1,373,896

---

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, 125-126.

<sup>17</sup> Klein, *A Concise History of Bolivia*, 68-69.

<sup>18</sup> John Demos, “The High Place: Potosí,” *Common-Place* 3, no. 4 (July 2003), <http://www.common-place.org/vol-03/no-04/potosi/>.

<sup>19</sup> Klein, *A Concise History of Bolivia*, 35.

<sup>20</sup> T. Ichaso to Julio Pinkas, December 5, 1891, in *Anuario de leyes y supremas disposiciones de 1891: edición oficial* (La Paz: Imprenta de El Comercio, 1892), 242, [http://books.google.com/books?id=Wq0pAQAAMAAJ&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs\\_ge\\_summary\\_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false](http://books.google.com/books?id=Wq0pAQAAMAAJ&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs_ge_summary_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false). All English translations by Brent Spencer unless otherwise noted.

<sup>21</sup> José María Dalence, *Bosquejo estadístico de Bolivia* (Chuquisaca: Ympr. de Sucre, 1851), 326.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, 327.

souls; and the unfaithful tribes 760,000.”<sup>23</sup> With 659,398 of these citizens of European descent,<sup>24</sup> 70 percent of the population was of indigenous descent living mostly in the countryside. The majority of the population in the upper Pilcomayo River basin either lived in Sucre or Potosí, or they lived in rural settlements and landholdings.

These rural highland Bolivians were organized in *ayllus* or indigenous communities on communal landholdings, on haciendas working the land of a usually absent landowner, or as peasant freeholders.<sup>25</sup> Liberal reformers such as President Mariano Melgarejo of the 1860s and 1870s chipped away at the communal landholding structure of many indigenous communities with policies that culminated in the 1874 law of *ex-vinculación*, which abolished communal landholdings and introduced policies “waging economic and cultural warfare on Indian lifeways, while trying to contain the threat of violent insurrection.”<sup>26</sup> This effort proved to be impossible as indigenous rebellions lashed back at individual land ownership policies to expropriate land from indigenous communities.<sup>27</sup> According to historian Brooke Larson, “out of the 1899 [Zarate Willka indigenous Aymara rebellions in La Paz] came a new national obsession with the Indian race and the determination to conquer it once and for all.”<sup>28</sup> The policies that followed called for civilizing the indigenous population in the highlands to make them productive workers of the land, and to exterminate specific tribes of the eastern lowlands.<sup>29</sup> The Quechua communities of the upper Pilcomayo, and the Guaraní, Guaycuruan, and Chirguano communities of the lower Pilcomayo, became a part of the Bolivian nation according to these norms. The goal of the governing elite was to integrate those tribes that did not conform to the highland land tenure system into a productive labor force.

The seminal event that changed the social landscape of Bolivian land tenure systems was the rise of the Nationalist Revolutionary Movement (MNR) party and the National Revolution of 1952. The MNR nationalized the mines, and absentee hacienda owners in 1953 lost title to their land which was granted to indigenous *campesinos* (peasants) through their network of *sindicatos* (unions) and *comunidades* (communities).<sup>30</sup> Thousands of indigenous families along the Pilcomayo River gained suffrage and title to their land in this and related subsequent land reforms, making them property owners and giving the rural communities a larger stake and role in the national political scene. The concentration of arable

---

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*, 196-197.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, 222.

<sup>25</sup> Brooke Larson, *Trials of Nation Making: Liberalism, Race, and Ethnicity in the Andes, 1810-1910* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004) 206. An ayllu is an indigenous administrative unit based on extended family relations.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, 215.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*, 220.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*, 242.

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>30</sup> Klein, *A Concise History of Bolivia*, 215.

land along the Pilcomayo and its tributaries was not the central front in the National Revolution, but it was nonetheless an important space in the battle over Bolivian identities. Disputes over land tenure between indigenous and Creole citizens resulted in a clash of lifestyles between the mostly indigenous rural communities and mostly European and mestizo populations of the cities and villas.

Well before the National Revolution and after the wars for independence in South America, the mining sector of the Bolivian economy declined, as evidenced by a drastically declining population in Potosí, but investments in modern mining technology revived the mining sector by the 1880s.<sup>31</sup> As industrialization around the world expanded, demand for tin became a boon for Bolivian miners. New routes for railroads and highways were needed in this period as Bolivia had just lost its sovereign access to the Pacific Ocean after the War of the Pacific. Bolivia as a young nation was anxious to explore its territories and to establish trade with other nations on its own terms in an expanding industrialized world. Several failed expeditions had been commissioned by Bolivia to explore the lower basin of the Pilcomayo in 1844, 1863, and two in 1882.<sup>32</sup>

### **Exploring and Defining National Territory in the Lower Pilcomayo Basin**

The Pilcomayo River, especially in its lower reaches, in the words of the Argentine historian Florencio Acenaloza, “has been the hardest river to understand in the whole country [Argentina]. More than two hundred years were necessary to gain the full understanding that we now have of it.”<sup>33</sup> The first recorded expedition in colonial times by someone of European descent to find a navigable path up the Pilcomayo River from the Paraguay River was that of Padre Patiño, who left Asunción in 1721 only to return without having successfully navigated the full river. Padre Augustin Castañares led an expedition up the Pilcomayo River in 1742, but never returned to tell what he saw.<sup>34</sup>

The territory of the Gran Chaco in the lower Pilcomayo basin was already inhabited by tribes of Chiriguano, Guaraní, and Guaycuruan people including Abipones, Mbayás, Mocobis, and Toba bands that militantly resisted Spanish encroachment on their ancestral lands.<sup>35</sup> This diversity has been explained by the proliferation of nomadic groups migrating up the river and establishing themselves in isolated geographic niches.<sup>36</sup> Missions and forts were gradually established among these varying indigenous groups mostly along the Paraguay and Bermejo Rivers, but the Tobas and other groups up higher along the Pilcomayo River

---

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, 144.

<sup>32</sup> Acenaloza, “Río bravo el Pilcomayo,” 1.

<sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*, 1.

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid.*, 1.

<sup>35</sup> James Schofield Saeger, *The Chaco Mission Frontier: The Guaycuruan Experience* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2000), xi.

<sup>36</sup> Julian Steward and Louis Faron, *Native Peoples of South America* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959), 349.

remained resistant to Spanish attempts at civilization at the Naranjay Mission, which disappeared with the independence period.<sup>37</sup>

Tobas and other Guaycuruans were, according to James Saeger, “indigenous but not aboriginal by the early 1700s.”<sup>38</sup> Living adjacent to Spanish colonial society, they established trade networks with the Spanish, based on the networks they had established with the Incas before the Spanish conquest, selling animal skins, honey, wax and salt in Spanish markets. Their semi-nomadic lifestyle lent well to pastoral pursuits as they raised cattle, sheep, and horses.<sup>39</sup> The use of the horse expanded the military capabilities of Indigenous groups, as the Abipon, Mocavi, Mbaya, and Guaicuru had horses by the mid-seventeenth century, making the Chaco an unsafe place for outsiders to settle.<sup>40</sup> Livestock raising had positive effects for the semi-nomadic lifestyle of indigenous groups as it provided food, clothing, and energy.<sup>41</sup> According to Crosby, it was rare for indigenous people to raise sheep, though the Navajo of North America and the Chaco tribes of South America were notable exceptions to this, and “by the end of the seventeenth century most of the tribes of the Chaco . . . were beginning to herd sheep.”<sup>42</sup>

In 1851, Dalence proposed an ambitious project to unite the Pilcomayo with the Mamoré River basin via canals in the headwaters of Potosí and Oruro, in order to reach the Atlantic by both the Amazon and Rio de la Plata.<sup>43</sup> While recognizing the difficulty of the task, he considered it possible, as “illustrated patriotism, when it wants, works more than is commonly believed.”<sup>44</sup> Navigation of both rivers proved to be an unsurmountable task.

In 1882, Dr. Jules Crevaux was commissioned by the Paris Academy of Geography to do a scientific study of the Pilcomayo River. The members of this expedition were massacred at the hands of a Toba band.<sup>45</sup> Joaquin Lemoine, prefect of the Bolivian department of Tarija, wrote to the Bolivian minister of government and exterior relations, before the failure of yet another ill-fated expedition led by Colonel Andres Rivas expedition in 1882, that land should be won by the building of forts in a successive line along the river and that “land conquered from the barbarians” should be studied scientifically.<sup>46</sup> Bolivia took great interest in an expedition led by Amadeo Baldrich with a contingent of 127 officials and soldiers commissioned by the Argentine Geographic Institute. The

---

<sup>37</sup> Saeger, *The Chaco Mission Frontier*, 170.

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*, xiv.

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid.*, xiv.

<sup>40</sup> Alfred W. Crosby, *The Columbian Exchange: Biological and Cultural Consequences of 1492* (Westport, Conn: Greenwood, 1973), 105.

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*, 99.

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*, 99-100.

<sup>43</sup> Dalence, *Bosquejo estadístico de Bolivia*, 332-343.

<sup>44</sup> *Ibid.*, 343.

<sup>45</sup> Acenaloza, “Rio bravo el Pilcomayo.”

<sup>46</sup> Joaquin Lemoine to Ministro de Gobierno y Relaciones Exteriores, 24 November 1882, in *Documentos relativos a la exploración del Pilcomayo* (Tarija: El Trabajo, 1883), 6.

indigenous groups of the lower Pilcomayo regions were not considered part of the Bolivian nation, and the scientific expedition was sent with armed troops in consideration of the disastrous failure of the Crevaux expedition. In a letter from Lemoine to the Bolivian minister of government and exterior relations, Lemoine pleaded,

at first sight Mr. Minister you will note that the science will be the soul of this [Argentine] Exploration, and that technical men will illuminate it and direct it, making the soldiers just their instrument. . . . I have insisted much to the [Bolivian] Government [to do the same] . . . without any fruit, and permit me to do so one last time inspired by the ardent patriotic desire carried out by the navigation of the Pilcomayo.<sup>747</sup>

In 1883 Dr. Daniel Campos led a successful Bolivian expedition. While Lemoine hoped to bring civilization to the region by the use of military occupation to allow for scientific study, patriotic missionaries of the Propaganda Fide congregation, as quoted by Campos, hoped God would “send men of faith and sincere patriotism, in order for them to bring to happy success a business of so much importance to Bolivia; and that the disgraced savage hoards of the Pilcomayo participate finally in the beneficial influences of the civilization and Christian religion, which is what makes men and nations happy in time and in eternity.”<sup>748</sup>

Amadeo Baldrich of the Argentine expedition considered that agricultural settlement of the land now occupied by the hostile Tobas was the best way of civilizing the land, stating that “you can see now that the territory is apt for its soil and its climate for the cultivation of an immense variety of products, some of them special and of great importance like cereals, cotton, tobacco, coffee, sugar cane, rice, and flax.”<sup>749</sup>

Dr. Campos also painted an optimistic picture of the possibilities of cultivating the land and using the Pilcomayo as an outlet to the Atlantic trade in the “unknown and surprising world that once seen can never be erased from memory”<sup>750</sup> that he saw in his expedition. Dr. Campos assessed that “the Chaco has a delicious climate, and with time will be the provider of the world, as it is given to all kinds of productions.”<sup>751</sup> He concluded that the expedition was successful as it “was able to demonstrate that the Gran Chaco will not eternally have its doors shut to the civilization; that it will no longer be the terrorizing sphinx, and that from today on

---

<sup>747</sup> *Ibid.*, 120.

<sup>748</sup> Padres Misioneros de Propaganda Fide, [Pamphlet with Unknown Title] quoted in Daniel Campos and Antonio Quijarro, *De Tarija a la Asunción; expedición boliviana de 1883* (Buenos Aires [etc.]: Impr. de J. Peuser, 1888), xv.

<sup>749</sup> Amadeo Baldrich, *Las comarcas virgenes: El Chaco central norte* (Buenos Aires: J. Peuser, 1889), 66.

<sup>750</sup> Campos and Quijarro, *De Tarija a la Asunción*, 291.

<sup>751</sup> *Ibid.*, 294.

it won't be the implacable antrum, mysterious and delighted, unconquerable by man. . . . The Pilcomayo . . . is our artery of life, progress, and future security."<sup>52</sup>

Conflicting claims in the Chaco territory, through which the lower Pilcomayo flows by Bolivia, Paraguay, and Argentina, created an unstable situation by the early twentieth century as these nations began to encroach more and more into each other's claims. Bolivia used the Argentine towns along the Pilcomayo River as supply posts. With the loss of its Pacific coastline to Chile in the War of the Pacific, Bolivia was anxious to secure its own territory all the way down the Pilcomayo to the Paraguay River for potential shipping purposes. Paraguay saw this as a threat to its national existence, as it had already suffered loss to its territory in the War of the Triple Alliance in the previous century.<sup>53</sup>

Access via the Pilcomayo River to the Atlantic Ocean was the primary reason for the early expeditions and the Chaco War (1932-1935), although oil exploration by Standard Oil and Royal Dutch Shell in the area played a large role, at least in the minds of later *indigenista* writers and the public, who were concerned with the exploitation of the indigenous soldiers sent from the altiplano to die in the arid jungles of the Chaco. One scholar describes the 1935 novel, *Blood of Mestizos*, written by Augusto Cespedes, a founding member of the MNR party, as a chronicle of the "turbid management" of these oil companies and posits the theme of "the native confronting death for a country that he doesn't know and which ignores him."<sup>54</sup> Recent hydrocarbon exploration and development in the Bolivian Chaco has led to economic and population growth in the town of Villa Montes, and tensions between the national government and indigenous Guaraní groups in Tarija.<sup>55</sup> The Chaco War brought the Pilcomayo to the forefront of national consciousness in the early twentieth century. A U.S. expatriate living in the mining camps of Bolivia during the time of the Chaco War reported that the name of the Pilcomayo "appears almost daily in the dispatches of the fighting in the Chaco."<sup>56</sup>

The Chaco is described by one scholar as "one of the least hospitable places on earth. Not exactly desert and not exactly jungle, it manages to combine the worst characteristics of both."<sup>57</sup> This rugged environment was very different from the high and dry altiplano where most of Bolivia's well-trained fighting force came from. The use of the familiar machete to clear through the thick underbrush, and as a weapon rather than bayonets, gave an edge to the Paraguayans who were more

---

<sup>52</sup> *Ibid.*, 299-300.

<sup>53</sup> René De La Pedraja, *Wars of Latin America, 1899-1941* (Jefferson, N.C.: McFarland & Co, 2006), 326.

<sup>54</sup> Perla Zayas de Lima, *La novela indigenista Boliviana de 1910-1960* (Buenos Aires: Producciones Graficas Carra, 1985), 59.

<sup>55</sup> Denise Humphreys Bebbington, "State-Indigenous Tensions Over Hydrocarbon Expansion in the Bolivian Chaco," in *Social Conflict, Economic Development, and Extractive Industry: Evidence from South America*, ed. Anthony Bebbington (New York: Routledge, 2012), 135.

<sup>56</sup> Alicia O'Reardon Overbeck, *Living High: At Home in the Far Andes* (New York: D. Appleton-Century, 1935), 11.

<sup>57</sup> Bruce W. Farcau, *The Chaco War: Bolivia and Paraguay, 1932-1935* (Westport, Conn: Praeger, 1996), 5.

familiar with the territory.<sup>58</sup> The environment of the lower Pilcomayo River played a lasting role in the formation of Bolivian national identity, as natural conditions contributed to the defeat of the Bolivian army and the rise of a new generation of Bolivian nationalist.

The Bolivian thinkers, military officers, and politicians known as the Chaco generation, who took over the national political scene after defeat in the Chaco War and the subsequent discrediting of President Daniel Salamanca and the traditional elite, would go on to usher in the National Revolution of 1952. This revolution and the subsequent administrations of Paz Estenssoro and his MNR party would have profound effects on the national identity of both the indigenous majority and the traditional elite of Bolivia, in terms of both land tenure and access to Bolivia's natural resources by ethnic majorities. Imbalanced land tenure systems and other domestic issues, such as Chaco generation resentment of the Chaco War and the traditional elite that led the nation into it, combined with international events, led to what Herbert Klein has called the "disintegration of the established order." This disintegration was characterized by the end of the traditional political system and the beginning of military socialism under the Busch and Toro dictatorships, and other mostly unstable civilian and military governments.<sup>59</sup>

### **Recent Environmental Degredation, Migration, and Identity**

Migration from rural campesino communities along the Pilcomayo River to other parts of Bolivia and to other countries is common, because the land is able to sustain fewer people as the resources are depleted. Many who migrate to Argentina and Chile do not return. Those who do return do so with an altered sense of Bolivian national identity after facing racial and ethnic discrimination abroad. Migrants, especially women from the older generation, maintain their traditional dress that identifies them as Bolivian, and represents a connection to working a land that is increasingly being lost to desertification and environmental degradation, and the subsequent migration. As young people migrate to the large urban centers of Bolivia, or to other countries, they often abandon their traditional dress and language customs for more modern styles, and adopt foreign slang in their speech that identifies them with their newfound urban or international life. Bolivian campesino migrants to Argentina that I am acquainted with have reported that border guards required them to dress as Argentines in the 1980s and 1990s before granting them entrance to Argentina. National identity has shifted as environmental pressures forced more migration among the inhabitants of the Pilcomayo River basin.

Several recent studies have documented the adverse effects of environmental degradation and pollution in the upper Pilcomayo. Jodi Brandt and Philip

---

<sup>58</sup> De La Pedraja, *Wars of Latin America*, 3.

<sup>59</sup> Klein, *A Concise History of Bolivia*, 178.

Townsend, using remote sensing technology to map the land cover changes in a defined area along a tributary of the Pilcomayo in Tarija, discovered a 17.3 percent change in the forms of desertification, deforestation and other “substantial land cover conversion between 1985 and 2003.”<sup>60</sup> J. Archer et al. described “severe contamination of the Pilcomayo’s waters and sediments for at least 200 km downstream” from mining operations, and they document arsenic concentrations above World Health Organization standards in hair, urine, and drinking water samples in several communities, though it is uncertain if the source of the arsenic comes directly from the mines.<sup>61</sup> P. Higuera et al. described how the sixteenth century método de patio procedure and practice for extracting silver from ores using mercury has had lasting effects, as elevated mercury levels are released to the atmosphere when topsoil around the old Spanish mills is disturbed.<sup>62</sup>

David Preston cites several other studies of mining related pollution, and documents the ways communities along the upper Pilcomayo, and environmental organizations have perceived and responded to this pollution, especially in the wake of catastrophic mine tailings dike failures in 1996 and 2005.<sup>63</sup> As concern over the contamination of vegetables produced in communities along the Pilcomayo River got wide media attention in the city of Sucre, communities were primarily concerned with the economic consequences in the city’s markets that resulted from their products being associated with the river pollution.<sup>64</sup> Stuart Kirsch compares this concern to the concern of the seafood industry in the Gulf of Mexico after the recent British Petroleum oil spill.<sup>65</sup> The resulting protest movements were echoed by similar recent indigenous protest movements in the lower Pilcomayo Basin on the border of Argentina and Paraguay (formerly Bolivian territory) against Southern Common Market (MERCOSUR) driven bridge and canal projects.<sup>66</sup> These projects, and the increased sedimentation due to irregular rainfall patterns, have affected fisheries that at least 6,000 Bolivian families depend on for their livelihood.<sup>67</sup>

The Pilcomayo River is dotted by hundreds of Quechua, Guaraní, Tapiete, Weenhayek, Chiriguano, Toba, and other communities that consist of subsistence

---

<sup>60</sup> Jodi Brandt and Philip Townsend, “Land Use – Land Cover Conversion, Regeneration and Degradation in the High Elevation Bolivian Andes,” *Landscape Ecology* 21, no. 4 (May 2006): 607.

<sup>61</sup> J. Archer, K. A. Hudson-Edwards, D. A. Preston, R. J. Howarth, and K. Linge, “Aqueous Exposure and Uptake of Arsenic by Riverside Communities Affected by Mining Contamination in the Río Pilcomayo Basin, Bolivia,” *Mineralogical Magazine* 69, no. 5 (2005): 719.

<sup>62</sup> P. Higuera, W. Llanos, M. E. Garcia, R. Millan, and C. Serrano, “Mercury Vapor Emissions from the Ingenios in Potosi (Bolivia),” *Journal of Geochemical Exploration* 116 (2012): 1.

<sup>63</sup> David Preston, “Household and Community Responses to Mining-Related River Contamination in the Upper Pilcomayo Basin, Bolivia,” in *Social Conflict, Economic Development, and Extractive Industry: Evidence from South America*, ed. Anthony Bebbington (New York: Routledge, 2012), 187.

<sup>64</sup> *Ibid.*, 192.

<sup>65</sup> Stuart Kirsch, “Afterward: Extractive Conflicts Compared,” in Bebbington, *Social Conflict*, 208.

<sup>66</sup> Gastón Gordillo and Juan Martín Leguizamón, *El río y la frontera: movilizaciones aborígenes, obras públicas y MERCOSUR en el Pilcomayo* (Buenos Aires: Editorial Biblos, 2002), 15.

<sup>67</sup> “Bolivian communities fearful as river fish stranded,” *BBC News*, 29 June 2011, <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-latin-america-13931330>.



farmers, ranchers, and fishermen who have used the resources of the river, and have contributed to the desertification, river silting, and overgrazing of the land. These communities have been affected by pollution from local mining operations, infrastructure projects that disrupt fishing and other traditional methods of sustaining themselves from the river, and by pollution from seemingly unrelated urban centers around the world that have contributed to climate change. As environmental conditions deteriorate in the region, migration becomes a dominant force that separates families, and changes the traditional and national identity of the river basin's inhabitants.

## **Conclusion**

The formation of a single national identity in Bolivia has always been complicated by the diversity of nations within Bolivia. The current constitution of 2009 defines Bolivia as a "plurinational" state with no less than 37 official languages representing the Spanish, African, and original indigenous communities.<sup>68</sup> The diversity of peoples is matched by the diversity of landscapes, from snowcapped peaks and highland altiplano grasslands above, to sweltering jungles and dry scrub palm-lands below, with many microclimates in the precipitous river valleys in between. This nation of ethnic and physical diversity is represented in the people and environments along the Pilcomayo River that traverses the boundaries between them, before crossing international boundaries into Paraguay and Argentina.

Cooperation between Bolivia, Paraguay, and Argentina regarding the shared resources of the Pilcomayo began in 1974, and resulted in the formation of the Tri-National Commission for the Development of the Pilcomayo River in 1995.<sup>69</sup> The commission will need to learn from past experience to succeed in defining its common objectives in order to find solutions. The tensions between local indigenous farmers, miners, and fishermen, and the forces for globalization that have defined each nation, persist to the present day.

The natural mineral, agricultural, hydrocarbon, hydraulic, and human resources of the Pilcomayo River basin in Bolivia have generated exploration, vast wealth for some and poverty for others, ethnic clashes, wars with foreign nations, pollution, and environmental degradation of a plurinational people. This story accounts for the rich cultures, civilizations and nations living within the context of a beautiful and fascinating natural environment. The search for an outlet to the Atlantic Ocean via navigation of the Pilcomayo is one of the unfulfilled promises of the river. The solutions to the problems caused by its increasing environmental degradation must be the subject of future promises from the nations whose borders and identities are defined by the Pilcomayo River.

---

<sup>68</sup> Constitution of Plurinational State of Bolivia, art. 5, sec. 1.

<sup>69</sup> Laboranti, "Pilcomayo River Basin Institutional Structure," 539.



## The Second Life of the Reverend J. Calvitt Clarke: Popular Novelist

J. Calvitt Clarke III  
*Jacksonville University*

Dedicating his life to the welfare of children, Dr. J. Calvitt Clarke (1887-1970) was one of the twentieth century's most successful charitable fundraisers. An ordained Presbyterian minister, during and after the Great War Clarke, worked with the American Committee for Armenian and Syrian Relief and its successor, Near East Relief. Laboring among marooned Russian troops, he spent a few months with the YMCA in France immediately after the war. In the late 1920s, he helped set up the Golden Rule Foundation, an outgrowth of Near East Relief's work, and then the China Child Welfare Association. In 1932, Clarke helped found Save the Children, USA. In 1937 and 1938, he worked with Helen Keller and the American Foundation for the Blind. For his crowning success, in 1938 he founded China's Children Fund, which after World War II he renamed Christian Children's Fund. Today known as ChildFund International, while under his tutelage it became the world's largest Protestant, non-governmental organization dedicated to helping children. After leaving Christian Children's Fund in 1964 and at an age when others retire, Clarke with his daughter founded Children, Incorporated, another child welfare organization that continues to make a significant difference for the world's needy.<sup>1</sup>

### A Literary Life

Clarke had a second life of considerable merit. He was a successful author, sometimes writing under his own name, often under the pseudonym of Richard Grant, and once as Carol Addison. Republished in paperback, one of his novels carried the name of Richard Lee. While he publicly promoted the works he wrote under his own name and used them to publicize his fundraising work, he never publicly acknowledged his significant—and more prurient—production under his pseudonyms.

Clarke wrote fiction because he needed money. He was, after all, working in the charitable field during the Great Depression and later economic crises. He enjoyed writing fiction and he was good at it. It easily passed the test of captivating “reading in a hammock on a hot Summer's day,”<sup>2</sup> as one reviewer wrote. Clarke also saw the

---

<sup>1</sup> *Richmond Times Dispatch*, July 18, 19, 1970; Edmund W. Janss, *Yankee Si! The Story of Dr. J. Calvitt Clarke and his 36,000 Children* (New York: William Morrow & Co., 1961); John C. Caldwell, *Children of Calamity* (New York: John Day Co., 1957); Larry E. Tise and Kristin Helmore, *A Book about Children: The World of Christian Children's Fund, 1938-1991* (Falls Church, VA: Hartland Pub., 1993).

For an earlier version of this paper, see “The Literary Life of Dr. J. Calvitt Clarke,” *Paperback Parade: The Magazine for Paperback Readers & Collectors* (Mar. 2014): 20-49.

<sup>2</sup> *Richmond Times-Dispatch*, May 17, 1951.

didactic nature of his early novels as part of his ministry, and his characters laid out how Clarke saw the world.

### **Didactic Romances**

Between 1933 and 1938, he wrote thirteen morally edifying “love novels.” The genre featured fast women who got into trouble by being naughty. They smoked, drank, and aggressively explored their sexuality. Clarke’s women did all this and more—a point his publisher highlighted in eye-catching and provocative dust jackets and paperback covers. His heroines underwent broadly similar travails in discovering their true selves and love.

### **Insight into Clarke’s Beliefs**

These love novels provide insight into Dr. Clarke’s primary life as a minister and professional fundraiser. His writings swam in the currents of the Protestant Social Gospel movement, prominent in the early twentieth century in the United States and Canada. The movement applied Christian ethics to social problems, such as economic inequality, poverty, inadequate labor unions, and poor schools—all themes in Clarke’s work. Suspicious of prudery, in his fiction Clarke painted a world in which Protestant-defined, Victorian morality, pummeled by the Great War, the Roaring Twenties, and the Great Depression, had crumbled.

Interestingly, he wrote almost exclusively from the feminine point-of-view. Otherwise, Clarke wrote about things he knew: New York City and Brooklyn, his birthplace; Richmond, Virginia, his adopted hometown; life in boarding houses, where he lived his boyhood years; preparatory schools in the Northeast, which he attended; and the pressures facing those not born into but trying to enter the more privileged classes. As Southern Regional Director for Save the Children, Clarke visited many of the country’s poorest regions, and he drew many of his fictional characters from the poverty of Appalachia and southern mill towns. Nor did Clarke ignore the harsh conditions of wage slavery in factories or even in stores and offices of New York and Brooklyn. Even as a young lad, he had witnessed the hardships facing his co-workers and neighbors during the Panic of 1901—the first market crash on the New York Stock Exchange. Always sympathetic toward the exploited, he enthusiastically excoriated those who lived well through the misery of others.

### **Seeking Sexual Equality**

Clarke’s novels delved deeply into the changing social mores of a modernizing society. From the beginning of his ministerial and fundraising career, Clarke had energetically supported the Suffragette Movement. Most notably, in 1915 he joined in the festivities surrounding Pennsylvania’s Women’s Liberty “Justice” Bell, a replica of the original Liberty Bell, with the clapper chained to its sides, not to be rung until women had achieved the right to vote. The woman’s movement, however, faced tensions between those seeking only the vote and those demanding

full emancipation—a radical liberation from not just political repression but from economic and sexual bondage as well. Clarke clearly identified with the latter, favoring more liberation in all fields. What is fair game for men should be for women as well.

Clarke's deeply conflicted women muddled through changing social customs, and in exploring what it means to be a modern woman Clarke explicitly preached sexual equality between the genders. The "conflict" in Clarke's novel, *Conflict of Desire*, was Zoe's hunger for sex and her wish to be chaste, although, to be sure, the novel centered more on the appetite than on the chastity. The novel's women accepted that men by nature are promiscuous. But what of women's wants? Challenging the hypocrisy of conventional attitudes, Zoe accused her first lover of being a "Victorian." She continued, "a man thinks that he can go bumming around all he damn pleases but the very girl he seduces is expected to be virtuous except, of course, with him."<sup>3</sup> Zoe told another of her lovers that she was willing to share him with one of her girlfriends, "Can't you give me credit for practicing what I preach? What's the use of saying we are modern and that sex is a natural thing if we are going to act conventionally jealous and proprietary toward each other? . . . The only stipulation about other women is that you use good taste and that you don't stop ringing my bell."<sup>4</sup>

Similarly, in *Virgin's Destiny* Jean finally surrendered her virginity to Jack in a lingering scene. The next morning, she told him, "I'm a modern girl—especially now . . . and I want to keep my freedom. I am willing to see you and we can have more parties like last night."<sup>5</sup> And she did keep her freedom, at least until she met Sidney. At their first meeting Jean went to his apartment, and drawing on his own experience of falling quickly in love with his own future wife, Clarke had Sidney immediately professing his love. Jean returned the sentiment and they agreed to marry; Sidney then asked Jean her name. Clarke repeated this scene of quickly falling in love in almost all his romance novels.

Clarke viscerally understood that gender and sexual equality depended on women's economic independence. In *Teaser*, Clarke's heroine, Sue, was a small-town girl from Southwest, Virginia, trying to make it in Richmond, Virginia, which by this time was Clarke's own hometown. She told Bruce, her "office husband," that change would come only "as women become economically independent. . . . How many unmarried, successful women executives do you suppose there are in New York who haven't their lovers? . . . They are scarcer than waterfalls in the Sahara Desert." When Bruce suggested that the depression had made women more

---

<sup>3</sup> Richard Grant [pseudo.], *Conflict of Desire* (New York: William Godwin, 1934), 141. I have tried to avoid anachronisms to better understand the flavor of Dr. Clarke's life and times. I have used his terminology, e.g., "girls," not, say, "young women." Similarly, Clarke referred to "niggers," "negroes," "darkey," "coloreds," "half-breeds," and "yellow," all words most today would properly question.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, 108-09.

<sup>5</sup> Carol Addison [pseudo.], *Virgin's Destiny* (New York: William Godwin, 1933), 183-84.

conservative, Sue answered, “Sure, some, because it made them less independent economically.” Bruce then asserted, “I don’t think women are promiscuous like men,” and Sue drove her point home, “They are when they can afford to be.”<sup>6</sup>

Few women could afford economic independence and for Clarke, bosses—by definition almost all male—used their positions to hire and fire young women based on sexual attraction, and economic need made seduction an accepted part of the boss-employee relationship. Yet, women also had their own arsenal, and sexual manipulation was the flip side of the coin to sexual exploitation. In *Teaser*, Sue used her ample sexuality to manipulate men, being especially skillful at extracting marriage proposals. She seduced—or was seduced by—her immediate boss and she barely evaded the more exploitative and extortious predations of her husband’s boss.

In *Tenement Girl*, Linnea noted that not all women were equally miserable in the box factory where she worked—some of the prettier girls did not have to work as hard as did the less appealing. Linnea herself seduced the head of the marketing department at her job so she could learn the art of advertising. At her next job, she again seduced her boss to get ahead. While Clarke reminded his readers that Linnea’s cleverness and hard work had made her a success in advertising, it was only her beauty and conscious use of her sexuality that allowed her the opportunities to use that intelligence.

Sometimes, as with Linnea, wives, girlfriends, and secretaries could triumph over the sense of male entitlement to become the brains and hard work behind a successful businessman. These women notwithstanding, many of Clarke’s men saw feminine competence at work as something worthy of remark. One patronizing man in *Virgin’s Destiny* validated a young female office worker, “Do you know there are not many men who could have handled that correspondence as remarkably as you did?”<sup>7</sup> Not all of Clarke’s men, however, felt this way, one telling Shirley in *Man Hater*, “Only a man who’s dubious about himself resents a woman’s brains.”<sup>8</sup>

Parallel with questions about sexual equality, Clarke’s characters wondered at the place of marriage and marital fidelity in modern society. Of the three marriage proposals Sue received in quick succession in *Teaser*, she quickly rejected one. Even though she thought him weak, Sue married Bart because he needed her more than Bruce did. She, however, had her doubts and as a modern woman she wondered, “I married him and as my husband he will get more from me than any other man will get. The question is should he get everything?” Sue added, “I want to govern my life by reason and sense, not dead customs handed to me without my yes or no.”<sup>9</sup> In fact, Sue and Bruce consummated their adulterous affair.

---

<sup>6</sup> Richard Grant [pseudo.], *Teaser* (New York: Godwin Publishers, 1937), 91-92.

<sup>7</sup> Addison, *Virgin’s Destiny*, 156.

<sup>8</sup> Richard Grant [pseudo.], *Man Hater* (New York: William Godwin, Inc., 1934), 222.

<sup>9</sup> Grant, *Teaser*, 193.

### Prostitution, Homosexuality, and Sexual Violence

How far should sexual equality go? Especially in France and Soviet Russia while working with the YMCA and Near East Relief soon after the First World War, Clarke had seen the pathos and degradation surrounding prostitution. While he loathed the economic and wartime conditions that drove women to prostitution, he was more ambivalent about the act itself. In his fiction, money for sex was merely a fact of life, neither to be praised nor condemned.

His novelized prostitution was mostly casual, born of the immediate economic necessity of keeping body and soul together. Polly, Jean's friend in *Virgin's Destiny*, had to supplement her income, so she sold herself to a young man. Linnea, when very young, practiced petty prostitution with her boarders in *Tenement Girl*.

In *Wanda*, the novel's namesake turned full-time professional. When she was only fourteen years old, a local man started Wanda down her career path by paying her quarters to lift her dress so he could pet her. Liking the money, the light sex did not disturb her, but this was enough for her to develop a manipulative and jaded view toward men. Many of Clarke's women developed similar attitudes for similar reasons. She ran away to New York City. Finding a job there, Wanda manipulatively allowed her boss to take her virginity. In a series of paid sexual encounters, Wanda met men, several of whom successively set her up in apartments with maids; she believed she had found the future. "Possibly normal family life with its simple sex impulses might entirely disappear. A hundred years hence 'nice' people might look upon sexual gratification as lightly as they accept promiscuous kissing today."<sup>10</sup>

She was not completely without doubts, however. Paid \$250 for a night of group sex, on their way home the man who had taken her, Teddy, ecstatically gushed to Wanda, "Last night you experienced . . . the ultimate in sex. It can reach no higher place. . . . Freedom from every restraint. Last night we were gods." Although Clarke did not make it clear why this experience had pushed her over the edge, Wanda replied, "Oh, I don't know what I think, Teddy. . . . Those couples . . . some of them married. Life isn't all sex, all gratification. . . . last night wasn't—clean. We weren't gods and goddesses. We were damned souls, following the devil."<sup>11</sup>

The prostitute with a heart of gold, Wanda generously maneuvered several friends into satisfying relationships. While setting up her own sometimes lover, May, with another friend for a lesbian affair—to save their respective heterosexual marriages—Wanda exclaimed, "If the majority of opinion is correct I'm a very bad sort of person." May reassured her: "You are, the worst possible sort of person. The sort of person that is always helping in other people's problems. . . . My husband speaks your name as if you were divine and I always feel an impulse to kneel

---

<sup>10</sup> Richard Grant [pseudo.], *Wanda* (New York: W. Godwin, Inc., 1934), 159.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, 164.

and kiss the hem of your skirt. . . . you are the grandest, dearest thing that ever breathed.”<sup>12</sup>

An iconoclast, in *Boarding House Blonde* Clarke tied homosexuality into a knot in which it is impossible to distinguish the strings of normal sexuality from deviance. Gladys and Miriam engaged in a long-term lesbian affair in a conservative, small town in Georgia. Before publication of the scandal, Miriam’s husband tried to calm the cuckolded and disgusted husband, Fred:

“You call it perversion. Where are you going to draw the line? Just keep your shirt on . . . and use your head. Over some corn [liquor] one night you confessed to doing the same things that Gladys and Miriam were. . . . Well, you have gone that far on the pervert path yourself. Those two only went a step further by not bothering to pick someone of the opposite sex. . . . I know human nature. I know that when a man or woman starts doing tricks in sex there is no end. The more hot tamales you eat the higher you want them spiced.”<sup>13</sup>

In most of his romances, Clarke’s heroines met many sexually insistent men and women. Men groped them in darkened movie theaters and on lighted public transportation; and aggressive seductions, often fueled by alcohol and sometimes other drugs, were commonplace.

Worse, in a world dominated by men, Clarke’s women often faced rape, although in his fiction he never used the word. Nor did he use it in his copious writings for fundraising. For example, the newsletter for China’s Children Fund, he starkly described the brutality of Japan’s occupation in China and the rape of nurses and orphanage workers—but, as in his novels, without giving the act its name.<sup>14</sup>

An essential part of the plot, Zoe in *Conflict of Desire* successfully defended herself three times against attempted rape. She never told anyone of the incidents. Rape, it seems, was a fact of life, to be resented, perhaps, like catching a cold, but there was little else to be done. In fact, none of Clarke’s women ever sought help from the police or others. They never sought direct retribution against their attackers but, rather, took their revenge against men in general.

Not all of Clarke’s women successfully fought off their attackers. In *Man Hater*, a much older man raped the sixteen-year-old Shirley, an innocent, small-town Ohioan. On seeing his disheveled daughter, her controlling, self-righteous, and religiously fanatical father kicked her out of her home. Stealing some money from him, Shirley headed for New York City. While on the train she stewed and came to hate all men, and she decided to take her vengeance on the gender. With unlikely sophistication and insight, she quickly began her training in how to take as much

---

<sup>12</sup> Ibid., 224.

<sup>13</sup> Richard Grant [pseudo.], *Boarding House Blonde* (New York: Godwin, 1936), 270-71.

<sup>14</sup> See, e.g., Mildred Dibden, “Extracts from the Diary of Mildred Dibden,” *China News* 4 (Spr. 1946): 1 and “How People Lived During the Occupation,” *China News* 4 (Spr. 1946): 2.



as possible from a man without paying, at least in the beginning, the price of sex.

Eventually, Shirley became close to Dan, but when he realized that she was another's mistress, he raped her. For both, the experience was intense. "All the months of waiting on Dan's part poured forth in a wild abandon of passion. Like the restless sea, waves of desire washed over him again and again." In contrast to her first rape, this time—and more in line with male fantasy than reality—"Shirley found a woman that night she had never known before. That woman was herself. A woman who smiled in happiness over the dull pain on the side of her face where Dan had struck her"<sup>15</sup> The attack over, Shirley continued with her life—while kept by one, she bedded others. After not seeing each other for some time, Shirley once more ran into Dan. He raped her again. All ended well, however. The rape culminated in an accepted proposal for marriage.

Women faced other violent abuses as well. In *Tenement Girl*, Clarke strongly implied that at her mother's insistence, a doctor sterilized Linnea. Later, at Linnea's urging, that same doctor provided an abortion for Ellen, the girlfriend of her Chinese servant. Clarke described these scenes as mundane commonplaces rather than as ones deserving censure.

### Reverend Clarke's Christianity and His Economic Critique

A foundation of traditional American morality, Christianity was often a subtext in Clarke's work. Ecumenical by personality and training, his religion was not pharisaical but had a strong backbone of the Social Gospel, and his characters often pled for a religion highlighting love, humanity, and good works—without these, faith was not enough.

More comprehensively than in any of his other didactic romances, Clarke used *The True Light* to proselytize his views on religion and its place in a modern, capitalistic world. Getting to the heart of Clarke's own beliefs, one pastor admonished, "This over-dependence on God is, of course, a weakness. It is a good idea to pray a little and work a lot. . . . The essence of true religion is found in the Lord's own words when He said that all the law and all the prophets depend upon love."<sup>16</sup> Later driving this point home, Camilla declared, "Religion is not dogma and creeds, magic and superstition. It is a way of living. It is not easy; it is hard. It calls for man's highest and most noble instincts."<sup>17</sup>

In fact, doctrinal and other squabbles between denominations especially discouraged Clarke. His story in *Castles in the Sand* revolved around the divisions in a small town, which included the mutual dislike afflicting local Methodists and Disciples.<sup>18</sup> Clarke had witnessed such depressing conflicts in Pennsylvania's small towns, where he had preached between 1913 and 1919.

<sup>15</sup> Grant, *Man Hater*, 236.

<sup>16</sup> J. Calvitt Clarke, *The True Light* (New York: Arcadia House Publications, 1935), 252.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, 261.

<sup>18</sup> J. Calvitt Clarke, *Castles in the Sand* (New York: Arcadia House, 1935).

Clarke's characters often cynically despaired about religion. In *Tenement Girl*, while Linnea's father appreciated religion for its beauty, "Its theology is based on fables and old women's tales. Its altar is but wood and stone, brass and velvet. Its prayers are but ponderous words as empty of meaning as tea leaves in a cup."<sup>19</sup> Similarly, Linnea's husband told her, "Theologians base their major premise on an untruth and build elaborate structures of reasoning on its sandy foundation."<sup>20</sup>

Christians themselves provided reasons for cynicism. In *Teaser*, Sue stood before a preacher to marry while Clarke described her thoughts. "Religion to her was an aspirin tablet some people dosed themselves with to dull the pain of reality. People, terrified by things as they were, knowing their own helplessness and facing in the end their own annihilation which their animal instincts made them fear, craved some assurance of plan and mercy behind the ghastly mess."<sup>21</sup> For her, too many abused their faith by making God in their own image. "They made a religion and a god as a chemist might make an anesthetic. She thought of Hitler's theologians taking everything Jewish out of Christ because they wanted a Nordic god. . . . In religion man believed what he thought would comfort him and shunned the truth because it hurt." Yet even this cynical and secular Sue was not immune to the tug of spirituality. "Sue was impressed by the preacher before her. . . . He was an instrument and through him God was speaking in the little parlor. Was there something that she did not understand beyond the turbulent world she knew?"<sup>22</sup>

The tenement girl herself, Linnea, agreed with Sue's cynicism. After examining the living and working conditions of a striking factory her husband owned and speaking with the strike leader, Grey, Linnea attended her first Sunday religious service in years:

[T]he sermon to her seemed unreal. She had a feeling that the rector was sincere but unconsciously an opportunist. She felt that he was talking to his employers. These people were paying for what he said. God was not paying him. . . . She wondered if the rector knew about Grey and the families he was spending himself for. . . . There was a bruise on his forehead where some policeman's club had landed. Did the rector know about these families who lived on twelve dollars a week?<sup>23</sup>

Clarke's Social Gospel provided the foundation for his political and economic critique, and as a good New Deal Democrat the travails of the Great Depression provided the backdrop to his stories. Hedda in *Boarding House Blonde* starkly put it, "Capitalism . . . what a swell system when you're on the up and up. How deplorable when you're on the toboggan."<sup>24</sup> Punctuating the desperate search for

---

<sup>19</sup> Richard Grant [pseudo.], *Tenement Girl* (New York: Godwin, 1935), 61.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, 226.

<sup>21</sup> Grant, *Teaser*, 170-71.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, 171.

<sup>23</sup> Grant, *Tenement Girl*, 240.

<sup>24</sup> Grant, *Boarding House Blonde*, 258-59.

work, a girl in *Virgin's Destiny* fainted from starvation while waiting for a job interview.

Clarke's characters naturally wondered who had caused this disaster, but beyond the bitingly generic "Wall Street," the guilty were faceless. In *Virgin's Destiny*, Jack, when visiting Jean sourly complained, "Beans for breakfast—Christ, do they expect a white man to eat that? Whoever the sons of—well, God damn them, whoever is responsible for this depression should be boiled in oil."<sup>25</sup> Later, when Jack told Jean that he had slept the night before in a subway station with fifty others, she replied bitterly. "It is the fault of Wall Street that men willing to work have to sleep on cement and eat in bread lines mostly supported by the poor or near poor. Some of those big-tie crooks wouldn't even give you cake to eat."<sup>26</sup> They understood that the rich exploited the poor and that capitalism's rapacious individualism and selfish greed were at the heart of the Depression's evil and even threatened to overthrow capitalism itself. This rhetoric would have been at home in the "Occupy Wall Street" movement of 2011 or in the American presidential election of the following year.

In *Tenement Girl*, Clarke scathingly described the harsh working conditions facing too many Americans. Linnea's mother at the turn into the twentieth century had worked in an oppressive Brooklyn department store: "The store was their prison. They were thankful for every five minutes that passed."<sup>27</sup> Their enemies were the floorwalkers, detectives, store spies, and, too often, customers. When Linnea's mother married, "She had broken the chains of industrial bondage. She was no longer owned ten hours a day by the department store."<sup>28</sup>

Linnea herself entered the working world as one of the "wage-slaves"<sup>29</sup> on whose backs the rich become rich.

She felt sorry for the girls that worked from eight to six gluing boxes before noisy machines. . . . The company, always out to save a dollar, had an extremely low class of employees. It amused Linnea when she learned that [her boyfriend] Clarence's father was a large stockholder in the concern. . . . Mr. White was such a gentleman in his home, so polite and considerate with the ladies. Did he know that supporting his fine home with its fine manners was this immense buzzing house of human misery?<sup>30</sup>

Later, on the cusp of the Great Depression, Linnea visited a striking factory owned by her husband's family and she saw what poverty does to people. She met

---

<sup>25</sup> Addison, *Virgin's Destiny*, 164.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, 217.

<sup>27</sup> Grant, *Tenement Girl*, 27-28.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*, 38.

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*, 117.

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*, 116.

the strike's self-styled, socialist leader, Grey, and thought of him in terms clearly reflecting Clarke's own beliefs and the reason behind his life's work with children.

He told her that half the children living in the world would never see the inside of a school room, that they were born to a life as hopeless and full of drudgery. . . . He told her of the cheapness of human life in India and China. His voice broken with sympathy, he discussed child labor in the United States and explained how in certain industries there were acids that slowly and insidiously ate out the lives of the workers. Like a prophet in the Old Testament Grey cried out against the injustices of society.<sup>31</sup>

Grey foresaw a better place, a utopia, "where every child could look forward to life, assured of his place in the sun. Here men could be happy in their work for the common good of society knowing that the same society would care for them in sickness, and permit them to face old age fearlessly, knowing they would be provided for."<sup>32</sup> This world coincided with that envisaged by New Dealers, who passed the original Social Security Act in 1935, the same year as *Tenement Girl's* publication. Grey had opened Linnea's eyes.

Clarke particularly denounced those who used their religion to sanctify their superior economic status. Camilla in *The True Light* visited a company town in the rural South, where life was even worse than at Linnea's factory. Her eye-opening experience mimicked Clarke's own in Appalachia with *Save the Children*:

She found conditions which it was difficult for her to believe existed in America. In many of the houses she could catch glimpses of blue through the holes in the ceilings. . . . Most of the children slept on rags piled on the floor. Families of eight and ten people who only owned one bed were common. Children with spindly legs, big knees, and pot bellies ran around practically naked. . . . The streets were dried, rutted mud. . . . The unspeakably ugly rows of outhouses in the back, the unpainted shacks themselves, the lack of a bit of color save the drab brown of bare earth and unpainted human kennels filled Cam with dreary melancholy. And the dull leaden faces of adults and children alike made her feel that the inhabitants of the village were doomed souls.<sup>33</sup>

Camilla's visit conjured up images of a feudal-like past. Hunger and pellagra haunted the village and for this privilege, families in each cottage paid five dollars in rent every month to Stires, the mill's owner. Any complaint or effort to organize meant discharge. "American mill peasants, wretched . . . while in a big house in Bedford was Mr. Stires, pillar of the church."<sup>34</sup> The evangelist had pierced the heart of the religion too often practiced by the rich, and she divined the cause, "here was

---

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, 243-44.

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*, 244.

<sup>33</sup> Clarke, *True Light*, 125-26.

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid.*, 126.

evil, the sin of greed. Here was hypocrisy, putting money in her collection basket with the right hand, while the left crushed fellow human beings.”<sup>35</sup>

How could the rich, self-righteous and smug, justify themselves? Guided by Friedrich Nietzsche, several financially successful antagonists saw the world through Social Darwinist lenses. For them, inequality was the natural order, and the poor deserved no better than to scramble for the crumbs that Ayn Rand’s John Galt might spill from his table. Clarke, despite his own beliefs, gave them the time to explain why.

Anthony Stires and his father described the businessman’s ethos in a way that continues to ring true for many well into the twenty-first century. Anthony explained that people from the hills had never lived any better and did not know how. Besides, the mill faced intense competition, and the Stires family could not afford to treat or pay their workers any better. In the fashion of David Ricardo’s “dismal science,” Anthony matter-of-factly continued, “To make a factory pay has to be the first consideration of any factory manager, the codes and the college professors in Washington notwithstanding. I know those people live one week ahead of actual hunger, and a shut-down for a few days means suffering and that even in good times their children go without proper medical attention.”<sup>36</sup>

Despite her love for Anthony and the political, social, and economic power of his father—despite the financial backing from the elder Stires that made her revival meetings in Bedford possible—Camilla remained true to her evangelistic calling. She decided to denounce Stires’ mill town in her revival meeting. Trying to forestall that denouncement, Anthony spoke to his father, hoping to convince him to moderate conditions for his workers. The elder Stires haughtily denounced “New Deal gimcracks,”<sup>37</sup> and added, “Anybody that doesn’t want to work for me does not have to, but, as long as he does, I am running my business and no working man or Yankee agitator or bund of petticoats is going to dictate to me.”<sup>38</sup>

Provoked, Camilla took her turn at Stires. “There was a strike two years ago and you hired legalized thugs and killers. You won the strike. You cowed your slaves. You have cowed the whole town. You have taken the manhood out of the men in this town and make them fawn. . . . What does it mean to you, Mr. Stires, to be a Christian?<sup>39</sup> During their heated discussion, Camilla got to the heart of Clarke’s argument, “Can the gospel touch everything but business? Is there one law for the lowly and another for the mighty? Can America ever be Christian when it bows its head to Christ but prostrates itself before greed?” Threatening to disown his son

---

<sup>35</sup> *Ibid.*, 128.

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid.*, 128.

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid.*, 138.

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*, 136.

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid.*, 142.

for loving Camilla, the Stires also laid bare his position—more the spleen than the heart—“God did not create all men equal.”<sup>40</sup>

Uncowed by Stires’ argument or warnings that her enemies would denounce her as a Red, she remained clear in her duty to herself and her beliefs: “The only trouble is that I believe our system of economics makes men evil. . . . While his Bible gathers dust on its cover, he kneels before the mighty god of Business. Business is built on selfishness. It makes men selfish, sinners.”<sup>41</sup>

Between them, Camilla and Linnea had eviscerated the economic inequality that so corrupted American life and had spread its tentacles everywhere, and Clarke was up to the task of exposing them. In his fiction and in his fundraising, his Social Gospel was international. In 1964 for the sponsors of Children Incorporated, he described condition in South America: “The gap between those who have and those who have not is so great. . . . There are children who . . . live like stray animals in the streets . . . they have no purpose nor hope. They do not know the happiness or fulfillment of childish play. . . . They learn too readily to fear and to hate and to steal.”<sup>42</sup>

Clarke’s fiction did not just criticize. Some of his characters, several favorably, others less so, referred to solutions offered by Communists and socialists. In *Man Hater*, Shirley asked one of her men what book he was reading and he responded, “A book all about a girl who went from college to the coal mines of Pennsylvania and lived with the striking miners. She ate their food, when they had any, slept in their beds which teemed with vermin, got lice in her hair, begged food in Pittsburgh with them, got in messes with the police and learned why a lot of poor devils think Bolshevism is better than Capitalism.”<sup>43</sup>

Clarke’s own calls to collective action, however, had more the feel of a congregation than a red cell, although the New Deal did have its role in rectifying matters and would see everyone’s physical and psychological needs satisfied.

In *Conflict of Desire*, Jimmy proposed to Zoe and said he would support her on a \$200 a month government job. She objected, saying that her father made more in a month than the president of the United States earned in a year. Jimmy replied, “Times are changing dear. The governments of the world are taking over more and more. . . . But taxes are going to put an end to such uneven distribution of wealth, even in this country.”<sup>44</sup> She replied, “Maybe you are right. Perhaps Mr. Roosevelt and those that follow him will work it out so that every man willing to work will have a nice little home and his radio, bath tub, garden in the back, automobile

---

<sup>40</sup> Ibid., 145.

<sup>41</sup> Ibid., 179-80.

<sup>42</sup> J. Calvitt Clarke, “Central and South America,” *C. I. News* 1 (Win. 1964-65): 2. Also see, e.g., Clarke’s articles in *C. I. News*: “Our Southern Neighbors,” 3 (Spr. 1967) 1-2; “Peru,” 3 (Sum. 1967): 1; “Bolivia: The Tin Roof of the Andes,” 3 (Fall-Win. 1967): 1-2; “No One Puts Fertilizer on Weeds,” 4 (Win. 1968-69): 1-2; and “Iran,” 6 (Sum. 1970): 3.

<sup>43</sup> Grant, *Man Hater*, 172-73.

<sup>44</sup> Grant, *Conflict of Desire*, 189-90.

in his garage and know that even when he gets old he'll still have his home and bread on his pantry shelf. I can't see how anybody could be selfish enough not to want to see that day come." Not yet fully convinced—after all, Zoe had been born rich—she then added, but "Brains and ambition ought to count for something."<sup>45</sup> Jimmy continued denouncing the rich and their selfishness. In a reply that later acolytes of Ayn Ryan would love, Zoe asserted, "It's damn true to nature," and she continued with a survival-of-the-fittest speech. Jimmy got the last word, closer to Clarke's own views, "But men are supposed to be higher creatures. We have minds, sympathies. I'm not religious but it does say somewhere in the Bible, doesn't it, that God made men just a little lower than the angels."<sup>46</sup>

### Eliza Doolittles

Beyond the New Deal there was another solution available. During the Depression, Clarke visited many of the country's poorest regions, and he drew several of his characters from the grinding poverty of Appalachia. But with help, some could escape, and several of Clarke's characters were Eliza Doolittle's by other names.

Despite a disturbing but common enough tendency to suggest that physical good looks implied an internal beauty and intelligence, Clarke assumed that inner character, when given a chance, would triumph over the disability of an impoverished environment. *Melissa* told the story of a poor, fourteen-year-old, mountain girl from Virginia. Soon after her mother died of malnutrition, fickle luck intervened and Wesley took her into his home to play the teacher. On the board of the fictitious American Society for Unfortunates, Wesley was surely an autobiographical element. After all, Clarke had seen and felt the same devastating poverty that had moved Wesley. Surely too, the novel also expressed a deep and abiding torment for Clarke. Wesley, beyond granting Melissa's entrancing beauty, had arbitrarily plucked her out of poverty.

In neither his real life nor his fiction could Clarke rescue everyone; there was a Calvinist's sense of God's grace arbitrarily saving one undeserving soul out of many. After all, one well-worn tag line for his fundraising advertisements for Christian Children's Fund, was "More hungry children than sponsors." And one-wartime brochure plaintively lamented, "We cannot save them all. . . . We can save some."<sup>47</sup>

*Dream No More* echoed just as strongly the Pygmalion story in *Melissa*. The novel celebrated the transformative power of education to elevate even the most downtrodden of children. The novel's heroine, June, lived a life of poverty in

---

<sup>45</sup> *Ibid.*, 190.

<sup>46</sup> *Ibid.*, 191.

<sup>47</sup> Brochure: Virginia Department of Conservation and Development, Division of History, Records, 1927-1950. Accession 24806a, State Records Collection, The Library of Virginia, Richmond, Virginia. Series I. Correspondence, 1927-1950, Box 12, Folder 6, China's Children Fund, Inc.

Virginia's mountains. Fresh and unspoiled, she was only fifteen years old when Robert first saw her. He persuaded his parents to pay for June's education in Massachusetts at a fashionable school, where she initially struggled academically but she studied hard and eventually found success. Schoolmates had at first ostracized her as they had Melissa, and both heroines experienced hardly believable changes to become hugely popular.<sup>48</sup>

Robert's parents, however, doubted the possibility of such transformations and often spoke about "blood" deciding behavior. His father blamed June's poverty on her family's lack of gumption to move after the local coal mine had closed, and he scorned mountaineers for their lack of drive. Robert retorted by praising June's native goodness and ability, which would triumph over the bad luck of birth. Robert proved to be correct, and he and June eventually married.

In his charity fundraising, after presenting the problem, Clark always provided a solution—sponsorship through Children, Incorporated, for example, could save the future by saving children just as Robert had saved June or Wesley had Melissa. "Yet, such children can be salvaged—pearls found in the gutter. They can learn to read and write, play and work, to be happy and to be pleasing to others—even to love and be loved."<sup>49</sup> Or in India, "You can wipe the dirt off a little street beggar girl—an untouchable, perhaps—dress her in an Indian sari, and you find you have a dark-eyed Cinderella."<sup>50</sup>

## Race

Another source of unfair inequality in America revolved around race, and racial issues—black and white, yellow and white—concerned Clarke. His sympathetic protagonists in his romances never disparaged others for their race, and while recognizing realities, these characters sometimes criticized them.

In *Tenement Girl* Linnea hired Wong, a Chinese as a servant. When he got Ellen, an Irish girl, pregnant, Linnea tried to reassure her: "Try and think of me, Ellen, as a person who hasn't any of the race and moral prejudices that you have."<sup>51</sup> Linnea took in Ellen as a servant. Later, Wong wanted to marry her but he feared how the world would react, telling Linnea that, "It is not that Ellen and I could not be happy together. It is the world that would point and make her unhappy." To which Linnea cried, "The stupid world. Every time I see a baby in a cradle I sigh and say to myself, 'It will grow up to be a reformer.' At least you know, Wong, that as long as Linnea has enough to support her little menage of three you two are a part of it." Further reassuring Wong, Linnea added that she would never marry a man who "couldn't understand such things."<sup>52</sup>

---

<sup>48</sup> J. Calvitt Clarke, *Dream No More* (New York: Gramercy, 1937).

<sup>49</sup> J. Calvitt Clarke, "Central and South America," *C. I. News* 1 (Win. 1964-65): 2.

<sup>50</sup> J. Calvitt Clarke, "India," *C. I. News* 2 (Win. 1965-1966): 1-2, quote, p. 2.

<sup>51</sup> Grant, *Tenement Girl*, 182-83.

<sup>52</sup> *Ibid.*, 198.



Race was the plot's silver thread in *Eurasian Girl*. One of her boyfriends asked Selene to marry him. Mistakenly believing that she was half Chinese, she refused: "Marry me? . . . Perhaps you don't know what it means to be an Eurasian. I have lived in Singapore. A Chinese wouldn't marry an Eurasian. They are the most pitiful creatures on earth, half-breeds, outcasts, pitied by all."<sup>53</sup> Potential children were the problem. Selene brooded, "Probably there would be too much white blood for the world to be able to guess but there was always the danger of a flare-back later."<sup>54</sup> Selene later discovered that she was one hundred percent white and she rejoiced: "Now we can get married. Ho, I am so happy! . . . Gee, I feel as if I had been through some nightmare. I'm white! I'm white! I don't have to be ashamed."<sup>55</sup>

Jim Crow's casual racism occasionally entered Dr. Clarke's other stories; his hometown of Richmond was, after all, the former capital of the Confederacy. In *Melissa*, for example, well-dressed "niggers" in New York shocked the heroine.<sup>56</sup> Clarke later noted that "The sun grew tired of the white race and began to think of the yellow" and "Her family were respectable. That mountain stock may be stagnant but it's straight Anglo Saxon."<sup>57</sup> On the other hand, in *Dream No More*, June, did not hold the typical attitudes of white southerners toward negroes, because there were few of them where she had lived in Virginia's mountains. In *Teaser*, drunken housewives in Richmond momentarily forgot that "the living room floor should be re-waxed and no negro could be trusted to do it properly."<sup>58</sup> Later, Clarke described a scene at a diner: "[H]e moved over toward the colored waitress. She handed the check to him indolently, but her face broadened in a smile at the unexpected fifty cent tip. You resented white people, always keeping you in your place and then they were good to you like this. It would help pay the overdue installment on last winter's fur piece purchased for three times its value on the wrong side of Broad Street."<sup>59</sup> Here too was Clarke's appreciation of how it often costs more to be poor than when financially secure.

Clarke also raised race in *Boarding House Blonde*, which differed from Clarke's other works of the 1930s in that the narrator gave almost equal attention to the cuckold Richard as to his wife, Miriam. Further, she was a less sympathetic character than were the women in Clarke's other romance fiction. While no more manipulative and "lost" than were others, she was shallow, without the depths of character, inner beauty, or natural concern for others—in her self-centered depravity, there was no foundation on which to build a more noble life.

---

<sup>53</sup> Richard Grant, *Eurasian Girl* (New York: Godwin, 1935), 87.

<sup>54</sup> *Ibid.*, 97-98.

<sup>55</sup> *Ibid.*, 242.

<sup>56</sup> J. Calvitt Clarke, *Melissa* (New York: William Godwin, 1934), 88.

<sup>57</sup> *Ibid.*, 89.

<sup>58</sup> Grant, *Teaser*, 56.

<sup>59</sup> *Ibid.*, 154.

Reflecting these faults, she earlier had reacted with shock on entering a cabaret where whites and negroes were dancing together; even more scandalously, so were negro and white women. In contrast, in the same novel when the more sympathetic Hedda visited a small Georgian town, she showed a dangerous innocence toward Southern racial customs. Richard met her at the train station:

Richard stopped before the broad row of ivory teeth the porter exposed.

“Oh, don’t mind him. We’re friends.” Hedda put her hand on the darkey’s arm.

He shrank back, his smile vanishing.

“Hedda.” Richard pulled on her arm. “They are liable to put you in irons and lynch the porter. You can’t get away with that down here.”

“The hell with them,” Hedda said aloud. “Don’t they know Lincoln freed the slaves?”<sup>60</sup>

## **Conclusion**

Clarke published the last of his romances in 1938. They had opened a window to the soul of a Presbyterian minister who was trying to come to grips with the big issues of the day. After 1938, engaged with creating China’s Children Fund amid the throes of the Second Sino-Japanese War and then the Second World War, Rev. Clarke did not produce any fiction for the next several years. By 1942 when he began publishing again, he had turned to other genres, especially the hardboiled crime novel and adventure-fantasy.

Dr. Clarke’s literary career spanned almost thirty years, and the income from his writing allowed him to devote the rest of his busy life to helping the world’s less fortunate, especially children. Some of his fiction is quite engaging, and his willingness to delve into many of the twentieth century’s most crucial problems displayed a fertile imagination and a moral courage and clarity. He was not a run-of-the-mill Presbyterian minister.

---

60 Grant, *Boarding House Blonde*, 254.

## Chronological Bibliography of J. Calvitt Clarke's Published Fiction

### Romances and Love Novels, 1933-1938

- Carol Addison [pseudo.]. *Virgin's Destiny*. New York: William Godwin, 1933.
- Richard Grant [pseudo.]. *Conflict of Desire*. New York: William Godwin, 1934.
- J. Calvitt Clarke. *Melissa*. New York: William Godwin, 1934.
- Richard Grant [pseudo.]. *Wanda*. New York: W. Godwin, Inc., 1934. Republished and abridged as Richard Lee. *Dishonorable Lady*. New York: Lev Gleason Publications, 1950.
- Richard Grant [pseudo.]. *Man Hater*. New York: William Godwin, Inc., 1934. Republished as *Man Bait: A Novel of Love*. New York: Universal Publishing and Distributing Corporation, 1950.
- J. Calvitt Clarke. *The True Light*. New York: Arcadia House Publications, 1935.
- J. Calvitt Clarke. *Castles in the Sand*. New York: Arcadia House, 1935.
- Richard Grant [pseudo.]. *Eurasian Girl*. New York: Godwin, 1935. Republished and abridged in paperback as *Eurasian Girl*. New York: Universal Publishing and Distributing Corporation, 1935.
- Richard Grant [pseudo.]. *Tenement Girl*. New York: Godwin, 1935.
- Richard Grant [pseudo.]. *Boarding House Blonde*. New York: Godwin, 1936.
- J. Calvitt Clarke. *Dream No More*. New York: Gramercy, 1937.
- Richard Grant [pseudo.]. *Teaser*. New York: Godwin Publishers, 1937. Also published in paperback as *Office Wife*. New York: Designs Publishing Corporation, 1937. Abridged as *Office Wife*. New York: Godwin, 1937. Republished in 1950, 1952, 1960 by Beacon Press.
- J. Calvitt Clarke, *Graduate Nurse*. New York: Gramercy Publishing Co., 1938.

### Crime, Adventure/Fantasy Novels, and Short Stories, 1942-1960

- Richard Grant [pseudo.]. *The Serpent Stirs: A Crime Story*. London: Stanley Paul, 1942.
- Richard Grant [pseudo.]. *Doom Candle, an Adventure Story*. London: Stanley Paul, 1943.
- Richard Grant [pseudo.]. *Who Strikes by Night*. London: Stanley Paul, 1944.
- Richard Grant [pseudo.]. *Men in Knots*. London: Stanley Paul, 1945.
- Richard Grant [pseudo.]. "That Arizona Ranger!" *10 Story Western Magazine* 27 (May 1945): 8.
- Richard Grant [pseudo.]. "King of the Cactus Wire." *10 Story Western Magazine* 28 (Nov. 1945), 8.
- Richard Grant [pseudo.]. *Five Ways To Die: A Romantic Adventure*. London: Stanley Paul, 1946.
- Richard Grant [pseudo.]. "Friendly and Treacherous." *10 Story Western Magazine*. 30 (May 1946): 71.

- Richard Grant [pseudo.]. "Apaches' Greenhorn Chief," *10 Story Western Magazine* 30 (June 1946): 10.
- Richard Grant [pseudo.]. *The Silky Ones Sting*. London: Stanley Paul, 1947.
- Richard Grant [pseudo.]. *Shoot Your Enemies*. London: Stanley Paul, 1948.
- Richard Grant [pseudo.]. "Sleep-a-Bye Dukes." *Fifteen Sports Stories*. 2 (Sept. 1948) 112-18.
- Richard Grant [pseudo.]. "Howdy, Cowboy!" *10 Story Western Magazine* 39 (Apr. 1949).
- Richard Grant [pseudo.]. *The Threat of the Cloven Hand*. London: Stanley Paul, 1950.
- Richard Grant [pseudo.]. *The Slaves of Ishtar*. London: Stanley Paul, 1951.
- Richard Grant [pseudo.]. *Lives in a Box*. London: Stanley Paul, 1951.
- Richard Grant [pseudo.]. *The Storm Gang*. London: Stanley Paul, 1952.
- Richard Grant [pseudo.]. *Circle of Death*. London: Stanley Paul, 1952.
- Richard Grant [pseudo.]. *Legacy of Danger*. Stanley Paul, 1954.
- Richard Grant [pseudo.]. *This Is Dynamite*. London: Stanley Paul, 1955.
- Richard Grant [pseudo.]. *Formula for Crime*. London: Stanley Paul, 1956.
- Richard Grant [pseudo.]. *The Sniper Murders*. London: John Long, 1958.
- Richard Grant [pseudo.]. *The Death Light*. London: John Long, 1959.
- Richard Grant [pseudo.]. *The Case of the Baronet's Memoirs*. London: John Long, 1960.

## Florida Women: Forestry and Fire

Leslie Kemp Poole  
*Rollins College*

Two centuries ago, more than half of Florida was covered in tall, majestic pine forests. From its northern borders with Georgia and Alabama to the upper shore of Lake Okeechobee, the state was home to massive stands of longleaf pine, a slow-growing tree that can reach fifty to sixty feet in height and 500 years in age. Walking through a longleaf forest is akin to visiting an outdoor cathedral; the thick-barked trees shoot heavenward, breezes play a high-pitched hymn through the thin, spiky leaves, and the clean, piney scent is nature's incense. Early visitors to the nation's Southeast thought the 60 million acres of longleaf forests growing there would last forever. Pioneers marveled at their size and length while alternately complaining about their monotony and the difficulty of traveling through them.<sup>1</sup>

These trees became settlers' homes, fences, and, in some cases, their livelihood as demand for turpentine and wood products from them increased with development and transportation. Longleaf pines grew with other pine and tree species on an additional 30 million southeastern acres—all resources that supplied a growing nation whose citizens, for a while, were firmly convinced that the superabundance of American forests would never end. For them, trees had become not only shelter but also commodities that brought personal wealth.<sup>2</sup>

By the end of the nineteenth century, however, it was clear that this was the delusion of a populace that had placed its faith in an American myth. Forests across the state as well as the nation were disappearing with little thought to replenishing them for future generations. Joining in the budding conservation movement, many Florida women worked to address this enormous problem. They sounded alarms, educated the public, and pushed industry and government to improve forestry attitudes and practices. They did this because they loved the beauty of trees as well as the birds and wildlife that lived in them, but they also saw the natural resource as vital to national economic health and independence.

"The time has arrived when the people of Florida must awake to the fact that beautiful forests of timbered land, pine trees and cypress swamps must be conserved if the picturesque landscapes of Florida count for anything in the welfare of the state," Veola Ezell of Leesburg warned members of the Florida Federation of Women's Clubs (FFWC) in a 1923 article that predicted a national wood famine because of forest depletion. She added: "Forests prevent cold winds

---

<sup>1</sup> Lawrence S. Earley, *Looking for Longleaf: The Fall and Rise of an American Forest* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2004), 1, 8, 14-16.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 1; Stewart L. Udall, "The Conservation Challenge of the Sixties," lecture given April 19, 1963, Berkeley, CA, <http://cnr.berkeley.edu/site/lectures/albright/1963.php>.

from devastating orange groves and temper the cold waves from the north and the northwest.” It was a particularly Floridian appeal.<sup>3</sup>

By 1880, an estimated 75 percent of the country’s forests had been hewn, and by 1930 only 13 percent still existed; in the next sixty years, half of these disappeared as well. By the 1890s, pines that were once plentiful in Michigan, Wisconsin, and Minnesota began to disappear, and fires often followed as farmers claimed lands for agriculture that never became productive because the clear-cutting and fires had reduced soil fertility.<sup>4</sup>

Longleaf forests, treated with the same carelessness, also were disappearing by the late nineteenth century. By 1996, only 2.95 million acres of longleaf remained in the Southeast, and almost all the old-growth areas were gone. This 98 percent decline made the loss “among the most severe of any ecosystem on earth,” writes historian Lawrence S. Earley.<sup>5</sup>

“Need, greed, and mismanagement” were the culprits, Earley writes. “People cut the forest, burned it to farm and make spaces to live, exploited its resources, and changed the natural processes that had evolved with it and maintained it.” The guilty included farmers, turpentine extractors, lumber and paper companies, foresters, and others who “made their livings from the forest and tried to shape it for their own ends.” The loggers treated forests as inexhaustible mines “from which [they] extracted the trees and left the land” for another use while they moved on to the next forest without replanting the areas they had denuded. Those watching the resulting devastation advocated new forestry principles that called for treating trees as a crop, which meant that they needed to be grown, harvested, and regenerated, an enlightened idea compared to previous practices.<sup>6</sup>

In 1860, Florida’s forests were valuable commodities and lumber products amounted to big business for in-state and out-of-state companies. The state, with a population of 140,424, contained eighty-seven sawmills that produced products valued at \$1.47 million annually. Within the next two decades Florida had ten naval stores plants, and its 135 sawmills were producing 248 million feet of products annually. The state’s lumber production peaked in 1909 at 1.25 billion board feet. Huge tracts of public timberland were sold in the late nineteenth century to largely non-southern lumber companies benefitting “northern owners, processors, and speculators.” Lumber transport also was a very wasteful practice. In Florida, as well as in other southern states, timber often was floated by river to sawmills or

---

<sup>3</sup> “Mrs. F.L. Ezell Pleads for Protection of Virgin Timber Lands,” *The Florida Bulletin* (September 1923): 5.

<sup>4</sup> Clive Ponting, *A Green History of the World: The Environment and the Collapse of Great Civilizations* (New York: Penguin, 1991), 256; William Cronon, *Nature’s Metropolis: Chicago and the Great West* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1991), 151-154, 202-203.

<sup>5</sup> Earley, *Looking for Longleaf*, 2.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, 3, 175.

to railroad spurs, but frequently many cut logs were left rotting on riverbanks or sunken on river bottoms.<sup>7</sup>

This visible wreckage left in the wake of the nation's rapid industrialization and urbanization awakened many Americans in the late 1800s to the idea of conservation of natural resources. Conservationists advocated for wise, scientific, efficient use of resources so they would be available for future generations. That meant replanting forestry acres formerly logged over and left barren or smoldering from fires. The conservation movement reached its peak in the reform-minded Progressive Era of the early twentieth century, embraced by scientists, politicians, professionals, and, importantly, women.<sup>8</sup>

Many middle-class women during this era turned their attention to issues outside their homes, using their ethical authority as wives and mothers to pursue community improvement activities labeled "municipal housekeeping" by many historians. "The idea that women as the center of home life were responsible for the moral tone of a community did not vanish, but increasingly it was said that such responsibility did not end with the four walls of a home, but extended to the neighborhood, the town, the city," notes historian Anne Firor Scott.<sup>9</sup> Despite the fact that they could not vote until 1920, women exerted influence in a number of arenas, including child welfare, temperance, and tree preservation. Historian Adam Rome asserts that these women were "indispensable in every environmental cause in the United States, and they often justified their activism as an extension of traditionally feminine responsibilities."<sup>10</sup>

The leader in U.S. forestry conservation was Gifford Pinchot, who, having trained in France, became the first career forester in the United States. A friend of President Theodore Roosevelt, Pinchot became the first director of what would become the U.S. Forest Service, where he emphasized the utilitarian "wise use" of forests in the national interest. For Pinchot, this meant recognizing the limits of resources and using them "for the benefit of the people who live here now" without waste.<sup>11</sup>

During Roosevelt's presidential terms from 1901 to 1909, he and Pinchot worked together to set aside more forested land, developing a national policy that gained

---

<sup>7</sup> "The History of the School of Forest Resources & Conservation and the Austin Cary Memorial Forest," University of Florida School of Forest Resources & Conservation, <http://sfrc.ufl.edu/history.html>; Albert E. Cowdrey, *This Land, This South: An Environmental History* (Lexington: The University Press of Kentucky, 1983), 111-114.

<sup>8</sup> Samuel P. Hays, *Beauty, Health, and Permanence: Environmental Politics in the United States, 1955-1985* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 13-17.

<sup>9</sup> Anne Firor Scott, *Natural Allies: Women's Associations in American History* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1992), 141-142.

<sup>10</sup> Adam Rome, "'Political Hermaphrodites': Gender and Environmental Reform in Progressive America," *Environmental History* 11, no. 3 (July 2006): 440. <http://ezproxy.rollins.edu:2048/login?url=http://search.proquest.com/docview/216130110?accountid=13584><http://www.historycooperative.org/journals/eh/11.3/rome.html>

<sup>11</sup> Roderick Frazier Nash, ed., *American Environmentalism: Readings in Conservation History*, 3rd ed. (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1990), 73; Gifford Pinchot, "The Birth of 'Conservation,'" in *American Environmentalism: Readings in Conservation History*, 75.

public support. By the time Roosevelt left office, the country had preserved 150.8 million acres in 159 national forests. What had been an industry of exploitation became one of long-term planning and promotion of “sustained-yield forest management.”<sup>12</sup> These forests, however, would not resemble the biodiverse woods of the past. They were planted and replanted with specific species desired for their quick growth and commercial success. It was an improvement on past practices, but still with an eye toward nature as a commodity.

Women’s groups across America, including the all-white national General Federation of Women’s Clubs (GFWC) and the Daughters of the American Revolution (DAR), supported this new conservation model. “And Pinchot himself declared that the Daughters of the American Revolution ‘federated and organized spells only another name for the highest form of conservation, that of vital force and intellectual energy.’” Like their sisters in the Audubon movement geared toward saving America’s birds, GFWC members were “particularly active” in organizing campaigns to save the nation’s forests.<sup>13</sup>

Women, freed from the constraints of business ties, were horrified by the aesthetic toll of clear-cut logging, but also moved to act by its collateral damage: erosion, watershed pollution, and forest fires. They rallied together in all-female groups, expecting that the power of their congregate numbers would gain public and political attention and force change. In Minnesota, Lydia Phillips Williams, of that state’s clubwomen federation and GFWC Forestry Chair from 1904-1906, organized members to seek the repeal of a timber act that threatened the Chippewa Forest Reserve. They traveled to Washington, D.C., to threaten their congressmen, saying they had a state membership of “between six and seven thousand,” which represented an equal number of husbands and “a few thousand sons who will possibly vote as their fathers vote.” These non-voting women used their male relatives to exert ballot pressure on male representatives, an interesting electoral twist. The GFWC also supported and coordinated efforts to create national forest reserves in the Southern Appalachians and New Hampshire and backed the passage of the federal Weeks Bill to protect stream watersheds. In 1910, some 283 clubs sent letters and petitions to press for forestry reforms.<sup>14</sup>

The GFWC created a forestry committee in 1902, as did many state and local women’s groups, to educate its members and the public about better forestry practices. They invited professionally trained foresters to their meetings to gain information and appealed to state governments to create forestry departments, set

---

<sup>12</sup> Douglas Brinkley, *The Wilderness Warrior: Theodore Roosevelt and the Crusade for America* (New York: Harper Collins, 2009), 237-238; Samuel P. Hays, *Conservation and the Gospel of Efficiency: The Progressive Conservation Movement 1890-1920* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1959), 2, 47, 127.

<sup>13</sup> Hays, *Conservation and the Gospel of Efficiency*, 142, 144.

<sup>14</sup> Carolyn Merchant, *Earthcare: Women and the Environment* (New York: Routledge, 1996), 110-116; Cameron Binkley, “Saving Redwoods: Clubwomen and Conservation, 1900-1925,” in *California Women and Politics: From the Gold Rush to the Great Depression*, ed. Robert W. Cherny, Mary Ann Irwin, and Ann Marie Wilson (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2010), 171n. 21n. 22.



aside forest reserves, create parks, and to force better lumber practices.<sup>15</sup> Local women's clubs often took the initiative to save forests, an effort that often led to working with and against members of the opposite sex. Sometimes it meant raising money to help purchase forest areas.<sup>16</sup>

Perhaps nowhere is the difference in sexes more apparent than in a 1908 article for *Forestry and Irrigation*, written by Lydia Adams-Williams, a conservation writer and GFWC forestry chair. She argued that women's "integrity, resourcefulness, genius and capacity for endurance" accomplished great work. And to Adams-Williams conservation clearly was women's work. She said it fell to her gender to rally public sentiment to save natural resources: women were naturally interested in issues related to home, family, and future generations while male ventures tended to focus on economics, causing the destruction found across the country. Men, she wrote, were too busy "building railroads, construction [sic] ships, engineering great projects, and exploiting vast commercial and financial enterprises, to take the time necessary to consider the problems which concern the welfare of the home and the future." She noted that the GFWC, with a membership of 800,000, had long worked to preserve forests. "It is conceded that the almost universal sentiment in favor of preserving forests is due to the interest taken in the subject by the women's clubs and the work done for them."<sup>17</sup>

Initially, women were welcomed to the forestry movement by the American Forestry Association (AFA), which included them at its annual meetings and published their articles and poems in its journal. The GFWC was invited to submit reports on its forestry activities in 1906. But the welcome door to women closed in the 1910s when the AFA decided to focus on professionalizing forestry, a field in which few women had credentials and were viewed as "unprofessional" because they concerned themselves more with the "beauty of forests than the resource value of trees," writes Rome.<sup>18</sup> However, Florida's women received more encouragement from state forestry leaders, largely because one of them was a politically powerful and adept woman.

Like other U.S. clubwomen, Florida women were alarmed by the state's disappearing forests. The FFWC advocated for better logging practices by publishing articles about the value of forests. In 1905, the group's forestry committee issued a report quoting Roosevelt, who cautioned, if the "present rate of forest destruction is allowed to continue, a timber famine is obviously inevitable."

---

<sup>15</sup> Kimberly A. Jarvis, "How Did the General Federation of Women's Clubs Shape Women's Involvement in the Conservation Movement, 1900-1930?" in *Women and Social Movements in the United States, 1600-2000*, ed. Kathryn Kish Sklar and Thomas Dublin, <http://wass.alexanderstreet.com>.

<sup>16</sup> Cameron Binkley, "No Better Heritage Than Living Trees'--Women's Clubs and Early Conservation in Humboldt County," *The Western Historical Quarterly* 33, no. 2 (Summer 2002): 182-189, 196-200, 202.

<sup>17</sup> Lydia Adams-Williams, "Conservation--Woman's Work," *Forestry and Irrigation* 14 (1908): 350-351, in "How Did the General Federation of Women's Clubs Shape Women's Involvement in the Conservation Movement, 1900-1930?" in *Women and Social Movements in the United States, 1600-2000*.

<sup>18</sup> Rome, "Political Hermaphrodites", 450-451.

Roosevelt warned that a lack of lumber resources could hinder U.S. industry, a common sentiment that appealed to male and female sensibilities.<sup>19</sup>

The most powerful Florida woman in the forestry conservation movement—perhaps the most powerful *person*—was May Mann Jennings, the “vivacious and charming” wife of a former governor, and a committed conservationist born into the political life. Her father was an astute businessman and politician; her husband was Florida’s governor from 1901 to 1905, representing a period of progressive politics in which his administration achieved a variety of innovative social and conservation legislation, including protection for birds and timber. After her husband’s gubernatorial term (he died in 1920), Jennings, described as her husband’s “intellectual equal” and similarly enthused about politics, became increasingly active in club work, serving in a variety of leadership roles at local, state, and national levels. She also served on the Florida Chamber of Commerce and worked on forestry conservation initiatives, earning the title of “Mother of Florida Forestry.” According to her biographer, Linda D. Vance, by age 42, Jennings, newly elected as president of the state women’s clubs, was “the most politically powerful woman in the state.”<sup>20</sup>

Jennings’s love of nature drew from her childhood in rural Florida where she developed a kinship with the outdoors. Her family had large timber holdings and, therefore, she had a personal interest in their wise management. Jennings often worked with her son, Bryan, on forestry matters. In 1919 she spoke before the Conference of Southern Foresters, arguing that Florida needed a department of natural resources to oversee forestry and conservation programs. As a result, she was appointed to a committee whose work eventually led to the creation of the Florida Forestry Association. Bryan was named vice president, and Jennings was named the group’s “special consultant on legislation,” something particularly notable because it was one year before female suffrage, indicating her legislative power and prowess. The new group had many tasks: saving forests, preventing wildfires, setting up county forest fire protective associations, pushing the creation of a state forestry board, and publishing pamphlets to educate the public. The FFA’s first president remembered Jennings as “a public spirited woman [who] realized the loss occurring the way forests were being handled. She at the time . . . conceived the idea of getting together a group to develop it into the forest service and she really sparked the flame that developed into the FFA.”<sup>21</sup>

Although the FFA’s attempts to establish a state forestry board failed initially, Jennings’s hard work paid off with legislative approval in 1927. She wrote: “I handled the Forestry law entirely myself except for several days work done at

---

<sup>19</sup> Jessie Hamm Meyer, *Leading the Way: A Century of Service. The Florida Federation of Women’s Clubs, 1895-1995* (Lakeland, FL: GFWC Florida Federation of Women’s Clubs, Inc., 1994), 35.

<sup>20</sup> Linda D. Vance, *May Mann Jennings: Florida’s Genteel Activist* (Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 1985), 1-8, 18-19, 79, 121.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, 1, 7, 118-120.

different times during the session by my son, who is the author of the law. We are very proud of this big step in conservation for Florida.” Jennings was lauded by news media and national forestry officials for this achievement, which merged with male interests in promoting state growth and economics. A friend wrote: “I wish Florida had a half dozen of you.”<sup>22</sup>

Florida clubwomen enthusiastically joined Jennings in the campaign to save Florida’s forests, producing pamphlets about fire prevention and tree planting to raise public awareness. Their interests also meshed with concerns about the state’s dwindling bird populations. Saving large stands of timber was commensurate with protecting birds and wildlife, adding impetus to the movement to conserve trees. They fought for forests, habitat, and wildlife, using a many-pronged approach to appeal to both sexes.

“It is idle to talk of game and bird protection if the forests are to be destroyed,” wrote Maud Neff Whitman, FFWC conservation chair, noting in 1922 that some states had begun saving swamp and forest lands for wildlife. “Without forests in a land having no mountains or sheltered haunts for wild life there can be no birds or game.”<sup>23</sup> Whitman, of Orlando, railed about devastation caused by lumber interests and forest fires, and called upon women to change things, using reasoning that incorporated conservation and economic messages:

It is useless to expect the average man financially interested in timber to heed any altruistic appeal. He is not concerned with the beauties of Nature, is indifferent to an appeal to sentiment but is quick to listen to sound financial argument. If he can be shown that his business and his children’s business will come to financial loss unless it can be assured a continuous supply of timber he will at least give some attention to the conservation question.”<sup>24</sup>

Whitman used a conservation message designed to appeal to male and female sensibilities—economic and sports reasons for men and beauty for women. Florida’s female activists were demonstrating that they grasped all the pertinent issues that concerned both women and men and were ready and able to address them in their efforts to protect forests and wildlife.

As conservation issues involving the natural world captured the nation’s attention, women became politically adept in their activism and often were courted by industry groups who sought their participation. By the 1920s, the American Forestry Association, in a turnaround from its stance a decade earlier, sought women’s club cooperation in the movement to conserve forests and prevent fires; clubwomen were urged to present programs on the topic, work with forestry

---

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, 121.

<sup>23</sup> Mrs. Alton B. Whitman, “Report of Committee on Conservation,” *The Florida Bulletin* 11, no. 3 (December 1922): 6-7.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, 7.

commissions about state needs, press for school instruction on the issue, and write new club programs and literature.

Articles regularly featured in *The Florida Bulletin*, the FFWC publication, demonstrated a sensibility about the state's agriculture, forestry, and economics as well as a plea to aesthetics. During World War II, Susan Floyd Fort Jeffreys viewed the state's pinelands as supply weapons in the country's defense. "As I look at a Florida forest of planted slash pine I feel that here are trained soldiers, soldiers in God's own living green. These planted pines are great factors in our defense program. These trees are patriots and ready to aid us when needed," she wrote in 1948, noting that Florida had 38 million acres of land, of which 23 million acres were forests. She bemoaned forest fires that she reported caused \$8 million in damage the previous year, of which 1 percent was caused by lightning—the rest, she claimed, was manmade. "Let us give thought to the beauty and the healing balm of the forests. This would be a dreary and cheerless land without forests. While we are battling for economic stability let us with our minds and hearts and souls battle for beauty. Let's keep Florida green."<sup>25</sup> It was an argument appealing to patriotism, male and female alike, while also invoking the largely female aesthetic appeal.

Forest fires that blackened wooded areas and destroyed wildlife habitat were another concern for the state's women. The fires were destructive and ugly, women loudly proclaimed in their efforts to stem the blazes. Unknown to them was the fact that many of Florida's habitats, including longleaf pine, need fire to be healthy. Thunderstorms and lightning are regular summer phenomena in the state, leading many native trees to adapt to the fires that clear the forest floor of debris and shrubs, allowing the growth of grasses and germination of pine seeds. With its thick bark, the longleaf easily survives fires. However, without regular burns, plant detritus builds up and fuels high-temperature fires that can be catastrophic to trees and their ecosystems. As Earley notes, "fire in longleaf pine forests is like rain in a rain forest." So, regular, low-intensity forest fires in Florida are positive events—but in the decades before fire ecology became widely understood in the mid-twentieth century, women saw them as evil and unsightly. And, as Jeffreys claimed, they believed humans were the primary cause of the infernos.<sup>26</sup>

One mostly female group that involved itself in fire prevention was the Florida Federation of Garden Clubs (FFGC), founded in 1924 with a mission of protecting the state's trees, shrubs, flowers, and birds; five years later it counted 2,180 members, many of whom were also women's club members and community activists. Like the FFWC, the garden clubbers supported the FFA, even giving the forestry group its membership list to help it raise funds. At its 1932 annual meeting, the FFGC adopted a resolution supporting the FFA's educational work in

---

<sup>25</sup> Mrs. Linwood Jeffreys, "Forests, Their Use and Beauty Natural Resources," *The Florida Bulletin* 25, no. 12 (January 1948): 13, 24.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, Earley, *Looking for Longleaf*, 20-25.

hopes “that the prevention of woods fire shall become State-wide.” The resolution explains their reasons: “The wide-spread practice of woods burning in Florida is denuding our woodlands and killing baby trees by the million, and . . . the shelter and food for wild game and bird life is being destroyed by wild-fire, resulting from the common practice of light-burnings, and . . . wild flowers and plant life are being driven from our woods and fields thereby destroying the natural beauty of our state.”<sup>27</sup>

Concern about wildfires was more urgent in 1935 when the FFGC adopted a new resolution that pledged a stronger focus on forestry conservation. It stated that Florida had an average of 15,000 fires annually, giving it the largest “burned over area” of any state and resulting in destruction of scenic beauty and “wasting our material resources to a ruinous extent.” The group urged its member clubs to work for fire prevention and control while also stimulating public awareness through “schools, press, radio, speeches, exhibits, and all other ways possible.”<sup>28</sup>

Public awareness also was a national concern. With statistics showing that 90 percent of forest fires were caused by people, the U.S. Forest Service (USFS) and a group of advertising executives organized a national campaign in 1942 to increase public knowledge of the issue. An early campaign placed the lead character from the 1944 Walt Disney film *Bambi* on a poster to promote fire prevention. Its success showed that an animal was a good symbol for the effort. But the USFS was allowed to use Bambi for only a year, leading the group to switch to a bear for its fire prevention icon. Smokey Bear was chosen and, in 1947, the slogan “Only YOU Can Prevent Forest Fires” was featured. Three years later, a fire crew working in New Mexico found a bear cub whose paws and hind legs had been burned. He became the physical embodiment of Smokey Bear, making public appearances on behalf of the campaign. He was housed at the National Zoo in Washington, D.C. After his death in 1976, Smokey was returned to New Mexico, where he is buried in the Smokey Bear Historical Park.<sup>29</sup> Florida garden club members, already concerned about the effects of wildfires, embraced the Smokey Bear campaign, sponsoring annual poster contests for child artists that featured Smokey and his message about stopping human-caused fires. These contests continue today.<sup>30</sup>

The long-term effect of Smokey Bear has left mixed results. Earley notes: “It was a spectacularly successful public relations program, but one that undermined public education about the necessity of prescribed fire for decades to come.” Today

---

<sup>27</sup> Isabel T. King, Mrs. Melville Hall and Mrs. Truman Green, eds., *Fifty Year History of the Florida Federation of Garden Clubs, Inc. 1925-1975* (Board of Directors of the FFGC), 14-17; FFGC, Board Reports, March 21, 1929-March 20, 1935, 7; “Florida Federation of Garden Clubs Board Meeting, March 14, 1932.”

<sup>28</sup> FFGC, Board Reports March 21, 1929-March 20, 1935; “Florida Federation of Garden Clubs In Convention Assembled at West Palm Beach, Florida,” 14-15.

<sup>29</sup> “History of Smokey Bear,” <http://sdda.sd.gov/legacydocs/Forestry/educational-information/PDF/history-of-smokeybear.pdf>.

<sup>30</sup> “Smokey Bear Woodsy Owl Poster Contest,” Florida Federation of Garden Clubs website, [http://www.ffgc.org/youth/smokey\\_bear\\_woody\\_owl.html](http://www.ffgc.org/youth/smokey_bear_woody_owl.html).

the Florida Division of Forestry views fire as both a friend and a foe to the state's forests. Prescribed burns, carefully applied to clear dead wood and excess brush, are administered periodically to keep forests healthy; wildfires from lightning and arson that can threaten homes and large tracts of timber pose a different challenge to the state. It is a delicate balance for state officials and residents.<sup>31</sup>

For much of the twentieth century, Florida's women worked together to address the best use and care of the state's forests. They sounded alarms, educated the public, and pushed industry and government to improve forestry attitudes and practices. They did this because they loved the beauty of trees as well as the birds and wildlife that lived in them, but they also saw the natural resource as vital to national economic health and independence. With time, they came to understand the importance of forest fires and to see the evolution of thinking from utilitarian conservation to big picture environmentalism. Their work was critical in teaching a developing state to love and value its vast woodlands, of which only a remnant exists today.

---

<sup>31</sup> Earley, *Looking for Longleaf*, 206; "Florida Forests: Keep Them Growing. You Can Help," pamphlet from State of Florida, Department of Agriculture & Consumer Services, Division of Forestry, n.d., n.a.

# Operation “Perez”: The German Attempt to Own American Newspapers in World War I

Heribert von Feilitzsch  
*Independent Scholar*

Traditionally, propaganda had the task of rallying public support behind the policies of its government. Whether it was used to promote changes in social, economic and foreign policy, or prepare a nation for war, propaganda had a distinct domestic purpose. This changed dramatically in World War I. As a result of an economic war complementing the efforts of combatants on the battlefield, foreign governments recognized the importance of using propaganda as a means to influence the general public of the United States with respect to its trade policy. From 1915 to 1917 the U.S. was the main supplier of war materials to the Entente powers. Neutrality, the official position of the United States in those years, allowed any combatant to purchase and transport supplies of any kind. While there were no legal restrictions for either party in the war, the Central Powers on the one side and the Entente Powers on the other, the reality of an effective British control of shipping lanes and cargo capacity between the United States and Europe by and large eliminated the Central Powers' ability to transport supplies. In addition to the effective British sea blockade, British control over the international financial system, as well as liberal loans from J. P. Morgan to the Entente further disadvantaged Germany and her allies. In the eyes of the German government Wilson's trade policy one-sidedly advantaged Germany's enemies. Hardliners within the German power structure saw this as an act of war in itself.

In response to the lopsided supply situation, the German government decided in January 1915 to actively prevent the exportation of American military supplies to Germany's enemies.<sup>1</sup> The means to achieve this goal fell into five distinct categories: 1) Sabotaging the logistics of the supply chain through submarine warfare, firebombing ships and factories, and cornering critical raw materials. 2) Instigating labor unrest. 3) Fomenting border troubles between Mexico and the United States. 4) Supporting groups opposed to the Wilson administration's policies such as the peace movement, disadvantaged minorities, and opposition parties. And last but not least 5) Expanding the propaganda campaign to supplement the other clandestine projects. When uncovered, the Wilson administration correctly characterized these German efforts as threats to national security, which eventually led the United States to join the war on the side of the Entente.

The propaganda war in the United States started right from the beginning of hostilities in August 1914. Immediately, Germany found itself completely

---

<sup>1</sup> Rudolf Nadolny, “Nadolny to Foreign Office,” 24 January 1915, RG 76 Mixed Claims Commission, Box 2, cables, National Archives (hereafter NA).

outflanked. Wholly unprepared when British warships cut the transatlantic cables on 5 August, Germany did not have any public relations expertise stationed in the United States. Even the ambassador had not yet returned from his summer vacation in Europe. Without a means to receive up to date information from Germany and without any strategic guidance, German officials in Washington and New York blundered the opportunity for a more positive first impression. For months, German propaganda efforts were in the hands of amateurs, mostly German-American intellectuals, who utterly botched the task of balancing British influence on American dailies and magazines. Not that a balance would have been easy to achieve, even for professionals.

A large majority of the American public believed in 1914 that the German Emperor had started the war. Demonstrations of hundreds of thousands of people on New York's Times Square enthusiastically greeted the British declaration of war against Germany on 4 August.<sup>2</sup> On the day after the British declaration, the major dailies in New York underlined the sharp delineations of American public opinion. The *New York World*, owned by German-American Joseph Pulitzer, sharply criticized Germany's role in the war.<sup>3</sup> The *New York Tribune* voiced hope that England joining the war would keep international commerce afloat.<sup>4</sup> William R. Hearst's papers, such as the *Evening Mail*, adopted a wait-and-see attitude.<sup>5</sup> Hermann Ridder's *New Yorker Staats-Zeitung*, a German language publication, argued that England created the mess with all her bi-lateral treaties.<sup>6</sup> These manifestations of opinion occurred before the Central Powers or the Entente had cranked up their propaganda efforts. A lack of enthusiasm for the German cause extended to most editorial boards in the country, even those controlled by German-Americans. The public reaction in the United States confirmed a general sense that Germany would have to fight an uphill battle to garner American sympathies.

Because the theatre of the conflict was far away, the general public did not initially spend too much thought on the question of war guilt. The violation of Belgian neutrality in the middle of August changed that attitude. Reports of unspeakable atrocities graced the headlines of American dailies. Many of these reports were exaggerated and they were initially provided exclusively through English channels of information. The extent of the German army's destruction of Belgium entered the news around 16 August. The invasion presented a clear breach of international law and Germany appeared to the public as a despotic bully pouncing on a weak neighbor. The American public, often on the side of the underdog, cheered the resistance of Belgian forces against the overwhelming Prussian armies. The battle of Liège, a Belgian town near the German-Dutch border, became the symbol for

---

<sup>2</sup> *New York Times*, "Multitudes Cheer at Bulletin Boards," Aug. 5, 1914.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, "New York Press Reviews."

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*



the courage and desperate strength of Belgian defenders.<sup>7</sup> English propaganda purposely fed the general impression of Germany as the European bully. British controlled news reports from the front very successfully documented war crimes, crimes against the civilian populations, and the destruction of cities, including religious and cultural monuments. The German side countered with official declarations that within weeks proved to be false and untruthful.

There were opportunities for German propagandists to influence American public opinion. Newspapers in the South and Midwest railed against the British blockade. Labor unions decried the practice of taking ships into prize court on ever increasing lists of *conditional contraband*. In the very beginning of the war the American economy reeled from the interruption in international trade and the shortages of available commercial shipping. The Wilson administration found itself under intense pressure from labor unions and the Southern agriculture industry.<sup>8</sup> Prices for cotton averages less than half from the year before.<sup>9</sup> The American textile industry suffered from the lack of German dyestuffs. Product shortages affected average Americans. Eye glasses, binoculars, scopes, and cameras with lenses from Germany became more expensive. Unemployment, especially in the South, the Mid-Atlantic, and the Midwest further ruined the pre-war standard of living. The prodding of southern politicians forced President Wilson to accede to demands for curbing the British blockade and upholding free international trade, even with German ships if necessary. Germany had then the unique chance to turn public opinion against the British government – and utterly failed to recognize it.

Rather than preempting articles in American papers detailing Belgian atrocities, the German embassy in Washington issued half-hearted denials, which did little to diffuse the reports emanating from or being censored in London. Worse, unable to look on as the German propaganda stumbled along, self-styled German-American leaders, many of them intellectuals and scholars working with or for American universities, took matters into their own hands. These scholars gave speeches, wrote articles, and published books with the purpose of teaching the American public about the superiority of German *Kultur*. Their treatises on a thousand-year European history that inexorably led to the war hardly convinced a general American public. Rather, these books produced a backlash from moderate and Anglophile intellectuals fanning a public debate that the German scholars lost miserably.<sup>10</sup>

After six weeks of continuous battering, German officials in New York under the auspices of the former Imperial Colonial Secretary Dr. Bernhard Dernburg

---

<sup>7</sup> For example, "Legion of Honour for Liege," *London Times*, Aug. 9, 1914.

<sup>8</sup> "Protection of Cotton Sought," *Christian Science Monitor*, Sept. 4, 1914; "Cotton Industry Leader Urges the Need of Action," Sept. 12, 1914.

<sup>9</sup> "Costs South 700,000,000," *New York Times*, Sept. 20, 1914.

<sup>10</sup> "Another Defense of Germany," *New York Times*, Sept. 20, 1914.

organized the German Information Service, a German press office.<sup>11</sup> Dernburg, who had come to the United States in the beginning of September alongside the returning German ambassador Johann Heinrich Count von Bernstorff, had initially been sent to raise a large loan in the U.S. He failed in that effort and, unable to return to Germany, immersed himself in reorganizing the fledgling German propaganda effort. The editors of the weekly magazine *Fatherland*, under the leadership of German-American writer and poet George Sylvester Viereck, took on most of the editing functions and moved into Dernburg's large office suite at 1123 Broadway. Heinrich F. Albert, the commercial advisor and purchasing agent for the German government in the U.S., was in charge of finances.<sup>12</sup>

Dernburg hit the ground running. From the pulpit of a private citizen and backed by the entire German diplomatic staff, the former German colonial secretary bombarded the American public with a heavy barrage of articles and speeches. Ambassador Bernstorff commented in his memoirs: "He had a gift for explaining the causes of the war in a quiet, interesting manner, and particularly for setting out the German standpoint in a conciliatory form. . . . The whole New York Press [sic] readily printed all the articles he sent in to contradict the statements of the anti-Germans."<sup>13</sup> Dernburg's strategy scored initial successes. German-friendly publications such as the *New York Evening Mail*, the *Washington Post*, the *San Francisco Examiner*, the *Chicago Tribune*, the *Boston Globe*, and the Irish, Yiddish, and German language press such as the *Gaelic American*, the *Day*, and the *New Yorker Staats-Zeitung* frequently published interviews with Count Bernstorff or articles that emanated from the German press office. Hostile to the German cause were a majority of American dailies, especially the *New York Times* (although in comparison quite fair in its presentation of both sides), the *New York World*, the *New York Evening Telegram*, and the *Providence Journal*. Yet Dernburg and Bernstorff's efforts also yielded regular published interviews as well as letters to the editor in these papers.<sup>14</sup> The Dernburg office also contacted German-American, Irish-American or Jewish-American editors who they hoped to influence, often with under-the-table payments. Between September 1914 and February 1917 the Press Bureau published several hundred pro-German pamphlets through the *Fatherland Press*, the *German Publication Society*, and the publishing

---

<sup>11</sup> Heinrich Albert, "Transaction with Fatherland Group," 16 September 1914, RG 65 Albert Papers, Box 23, Diary, NA.

<sup>12</sup> Arthur S. Link, *Wilson: The Struggle for Neutrality, 1914-1915* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1960), 31.

<sup>13</sup> Johann Heinrich Count von Bernstorff, *My Three Years in America* (London: Skeffington and Son, Ltd., 1920), 35.

<sup>14</sup> For example, "Ambassador Happy Over German News," *New York Times*, Sept. 1, 1914; "Germany is not Seeking Peace," *New York Times*, Sept. 22, 1914; "Reichstag and Bundesrath," *New York Times*, Sept. 22, 1914.

arm of the *German University League*.<sup>15</sup> The German-American scholars Hugo Muensterberg, Edmund von Mach, Kuno Francke together with Dernburg, Viereck, and other prominent German-Americans served as authors.<sup>16</sup> The Bureau also translated and issued publications distributed directly from Berlin. However, the outlets almost exclusively targeted German-Americans in the various clubs and organizations that existed all across America. The Dernburg organization wanted German-Americans to receive the arguments with which to convince their friends and neighbors.

Dernburg worked hard on a turn-around of the German propaganda effort. Within weeks of his arrival, articles penned by him (or his staff) appeared in the *New York Times*, the *Saturday Evening Post*, the *North American Review*, the *Review of Reviews*, the *Los Angeles Examiner*, and the *Independent*.<sup>17</sup> The themes ranged from defending militarism as a vehicle for self-defense to promoting Germany as the bulwark against lower civilizations.<sup>18</sup> He made the case that treaties were not binding, and that Belgium was not neutral.<sup>19</sup> He espoused the historical ties between Germany and the United States.<sup>20</sup> He equated the German political system with that of the United States.<sup>21</sup> He warned that “British greed would drag [the] U.S. into war.”<sup>22</sup> Finally, he vowed that the British goal of starving the German population through the naval blockade would never succeed because of Germany’s technical superiority.<sup>23</sup> A handful of editors appreciated Dernburg’s attempts to present the German case. The editor of the *Review of Reviews* introduced the German propagandist as a representative of the Red Cross and man with a distinct background:

For some weeks Mr. Dernburg has been in New York, having come over in the interest of the German Red Cross. He typifies Germany’s efficient men of affairs who have built up the empire’s financial and industrial strength. He is one of the foremost of Berlin’s bankers [sic], is a member of the upper house

---

<sup>15</sup> Unites States Senate, *Brewing and Liquor Interests and German Propaganda, Subcommittee of the Committee of the Judiciary*, vol. 2 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1919), 1410-11; Horace Cornelius Peterson, *Propaganda for War: The Campaign Against American Neutrality, 1914-1917* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1939), 137n.; *The War Plotters of Wall Street, Thou Shalt Not Kill, The Truth About Germany, Germany’s Just Cause, Germany’s Hour of Destiny, The Catechism of Balaam Jr.* are just some examples quoted in George Sylvester Viereck, *Spreading Germs of Hate* (London: Duckworth Publishers, 1931), 82nn.

<sup>16</sup> There were dozens of additional authors writing on behalf of Germany. See George William Hau, ed., “List of Representative Articles with the Names of the Authors,” in *War Echoes or Germany and Austria in the Crisis* (Chicago: Morton M. Malone, 1915), 3. Hau’s collection features twenty authors (other than those mentioned above) as contributors to his collection. The most complete analysis of the German propaganda in the United States in WW I is contained in David Wayne Hirst, “German Propaganda in the United States, 1914-1917” (PhD diss., Northwestern University, 1962).

<sup>17</sup> These articles are collected in Dernburg’s publication Bernhard Dernburg, *Search-Lights on the War* (New York, NY: Fatherland Press, 1915).

<sup>18</sup> Dernburg, *Search-Lights on the War*, 6, “I do not say that Germany’s civilization is superior to that of England and France; it certainly is superior to the civilization of any of the other warring nations.”

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*, 7.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, 46.

<sup>21</sup> “The German Constitution,” *New York Times*, Sept. 20, 1914.

<sup>22</sup> “British Greed Would Drag U.S. Into War,” German View,” *Los Angeles Examiner*, Sept. 23, 1914.

<sup>23</sup> Dernburg, *Search-Lights on the War*, 53nn.

of the Prussian parliament [sic], was for four years the Emperor's Minister of Colonies, and is a man of an extraordinary range of information, not only regarding the political, industrial, and military affairs of Germany, but also regarding the conflicts and rivalries of the great nations for foreign trade and colonial empire.<sup>24</sup>

Certainly, the flurry of activity of the Press Bureau made a huge impact if compared to the earlier attempts at propaganda. However, Dernburg's message could never divorce itself from the pan-Germanism of his scholarly advisors and the fanatic attitudes of the *Fatherland* staff. The major themes contained in Dernburg's articles, the peace-loving empire forced into a struggle of survival against the greedy European nations, and the portrayal of Germany as the bulwark against Pan-Slavic *Untermenschen* (sub-humans) simply did not synchronize with the American psyche. On 20 September 1914, another scholar, Irish-American history professor William Milligan Sloane of Columbia University defended German militarism as defensive and urged Americans to observe strict neutrality. His *New York Times Magazine* contribution, a large two page spread, earned him a sharp editorial rebuke and continued the string of arrogant, misplaced, and uncoordinated German propaganda by intellectuals.<sup>25</sup>

What Dernburg needed, and what advisors such as German Ambassador Count Bernstorff desperately pushed for, was a heavy hitter from within the American press corps. The candidate of choice was the American newspaperman William Bayard Hale. The journalist and author was widely acclaimed for his thoughtful political analysis in the decades leading up to World War I, including a widely publicized interview with the German Kaiser. As a personal friend and adviser of the then governor of New Jersey Woodrow Wilson, Hale had written and published his biography in 1911 and played a major role on his presidential campaign of 1912. As Wilson's friend and confidante Hale went to Mexico and Central America on sensitive diplomatic missions in 1913 and 1914.

Hale attended the first meeting of the Press Bureau in New York on 2 October.<sup>26</sup> By November, he directed much of the output of the Press Bureau as a paid consultant. He also edited a book called *Germany's Just Cause* that appeared through the *Fatherland Press* in the fall of 1914.<sup>27</sup> Hale's advice on mounting a wider-based German propaganda campaign in the U.S. changed the dynamic of the propaganda team in New York. One of the most vocal critics of the German propaganda had been the Imperial Ambassador Count Bernstorff. Having grown up in England, married to a German-American, and with an understanding of the

---

<sup>24</sup> *The American Review of Reviews*, vol. L, November 1914 (New York, NY: Review of Review Companies, 1914), 64nn.

<sup>25</sup> "Another Defense of Germany," *New York Times*, Sept. 20, 1914.

<sup>26</sup> Heinrich Albert, Diary Entry, 2 October 1914, RG 65 Albert Papers, Box 23, Diary, NA.

<sup>27</sup> William Bayard Hale, *Germany's Just Cause* (New York, NY: The Fatherland Press, 1914).

American psyche from having served as Germany's ambassador in the United States since 1908, Count Bernstorff disliked the elitism of German scholars and the blatant, confrontational tone of Sylvester Viereck's publication. He wrote in his memoirs: "The American does not care to be instructed. He has no interest in learning the 'truth' which the German Press [sic] communications and explanatory pamphlets were so anxious to impress upon him. The American likes to form his own opinions and so only requires facts."<sup>28</sup>

A shift in the propaganda approach had to take place, not the least because of changing conditions in the United States. Shortly after Hale joined the Press Bureau in October, the American economy rebounded sharply. In November, the price for cotton normalized. Beginning in January 1915 munitions and military supply demands from the Entente all but eliminated unemployment and quieted public discontent. On 24 January 1915, the flood of American war supplies to Germany's enemies prompted the German government to order a sabotage campaign against American production and logistics facilities.<sup>29</sup> A week later, Germany declared unrestricted submarine war against any ship entering a war zone around the British Isles.<sup>30</sup> The goal of German propaganda now switched from trying to convince the American public of German righteousness to empowering an opposition to exports of war supplies. At the same time her agents actively tried to prevent the flow of goods to the Entente through other clandestine means.

Subsequent to the decision to wage a clandestine war against the United States in the beginning of 1915, the Imperial War Department authorized the use of \$9.45 million (approximately \$200 Million in today's value) for projects in the United States.<sup>31</sup> Heinrich Albert's bookkeeping shows four new accounts in the spring of 1915, all of which were designated to the War Department's representative in the United States, Military Attaché Franz von Papen. One of these accounts, "Von Papen III," comprised propaganda expenditures. This account was separate from the German embassy account that Albert kept for other propaganda funds. Von Papen's propaganda accounts contained payments to agents and news outlets that agitated on behalf of Germany in the United States.<sup>32</sup> The fact that the Imperial War Department now paid for propaganda projects clearly implies that these projects were part of the larger war strategy against the United States.

One of the mainstays of German-American newspapers was the *New Yorker Staats-Zeitung*, one of more than 547 German-language publications in cities all over the North and West of the United States in 1914.<sup>33</sup> The *New Yorker Staats-*

---

<sup>28</sup> Bernstorff, *My Three Years in America*, 46.

<sup>29</sup> Rudolph Nadolny, "Nadolny to Foreign Office," 24 January 1915, RG 65 Mixed Claims Commission, Box 2, cables, NA.

<sup>30</sup> Charles F. Horne, ed., *Source Records of the Great War*, vol. III (New York, NY: National Alumni, 1923).

<sup>31</sup> Heinrich Albert, "Memo to the Department of War," 20 April 1915, RG 65 Albert Papers, Box 10, Folder 39, NA. Albert refers to the authorized \$9,450,000.

<sup>32</sup> Heinrich Albert, "Propaganda v. P. III," 20 July 1915, RG 65 Albert Papers, Box 5, Folder 20, NA.

<sup>33</sup> Carl Wittke, *The German-Language Press in America* (Louisville: University of Kentucky Press, 1957), 243.

*Zeitung* was the largest and one of the oldest. The *New York Times* and others often quoted articles that had appeared in Ridder's *Staats-Zeitung*. Naturally, the German embassy considered the paper an important outlet to communicate with the German-American community of New York. Herman Ridder, the senior owner, unexpectedly died in January 1915. He left to his sons a paper that was indebted close to \$300,000 (\$6.3 million in today's value). Afraid of having to declare bankruptcy, the Ridders appealed to the German ambassador Count Bernstorff for help. In a telegram to Germany, von Bernstorff estimated the cash needs of the paper to be around \$550,000 (\$11.5 million in today's value) and urged the German government to provide immediate help of at least \$200,000 (\$4.2 million in today's value).<sup>34</sup>

The fact that the *Staats-Zeitung* was in dire straits had been known to Dernburg and Albert for a while. Adolph Pavenstedt of G. Amsinck and Co., the primary banking connection for Albert in 1914, admitted in 1917 that Dernburg supported the ailing paper financially. A witness had produced the copy of a check for \$20,000 from Pavenstedt to Ridder dated 12 October 1914.<sup>35</sup> The small loan did little to save the paper when the extent of Ridder's financial problems came to light in January of 1915. In response to Count Bernstorff's emergency request, the Imperial Foreign Office agreed to prop the Ridders up with the requested credit of \$200,000. Rather than disbursing the money, Pavenstedt organized the issuing of \$200,000 worth of preferred stock. With the German government's guarantee in the background, the shares raised the required cash of half a million U.S. dollars and the paper remained in business.<sup>36</sup> Until the entry of the United States into the war, the *Staats-Zeitung* and the *Fatherland* constituted the two main German language dependencies in the United States. The German propaganda effort also covered a wide range of publications that served other minority communities considered to be pro-German or susceptible to German propaganda.<sup>37</sup>

Dernburg himself also increased his public speaking engagements and flooded American mainstream media with articles. In addition, a news bulletin from the press bureau in New York disseminated daily pro-German information to editorial boards as well as to thousands of private recipients.<sup>38</sup>

The bulletin, about twenty-two by twelve inches in size, was usually five-columned and printed on one side only. The masthead of every issue bore the title, "German Information Service." This was followed by "M. B. Claussen, 30 East 42nd Street, New York City." To the side, in small print,

---

<sup>34</sup> Reinhard R. Doerries, *Imperial Challenge: Ambassador Count Bernstorff and German-American Relations, 1908-1917* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1989), 51. According to Major Humes of the U.S. Justice Department, Ridder's debts were closer to \$300,000. See United States Senate, *Brewing and Liquor Interests and German and Bolshevik Propaganda*, 2773.

<sup>35</sup> "Dernburg Money Helped to Finance *Staats-Zeitung*," *New York Times*, Oct. 21, 1917.

<sup>36</sup> United States Senate, *Brewing and Liquor Interests and German and Bolshevik Propaganda*, 2775.

<sup>37</sup> For example Irish-American and Jewish publications *Bull*, the *Gaelic-American*, and *Der Tag*.

<sup>38</sup> Doerries, *Imperial Challenge*, 47.

was a message to the recipient, "The Managing Editor": The material sent herewith is offered for publication without charge and is released for use upon receipt. This bulletin is issued daily, except Sundays. Its contents come only from reliable sources, chiefly the press of the European capitals. The authority for every story is clearly indicated. In view of the British censorship of war news, it is believed that this sheet will be found an invaluable supplement to the regular news reports, enabling papers to give a more comprehensive picture of events. We shall be glad to supply photographs, mats or cuts of any illustrations appearing in the sheet, upon request, by mail or telegraph. We shall appreciate the courtesy of a place on your exchange list.<sup>39</sup>

Was it successful? "Our mail is Dernburged [sic] until the postman can scarcely stagger up the front stoop with it. They are systematic those Germans. If you doubt it, send them your postoffice [sic] address," a journalist complained in 1915.<sup>40</sup> Yet despite the turnaround more needed to be done.

Ambassador Count Bernstorff had been pushing to purchase mainstream American newspapers since the beginning of the war. He believed that owning American newspapers and influencing American journalists, maybe even with financial enticements, would be the only solid answer to the effective British propaganda. Count Bernstorff's push to buy American papers had fallen on deaf ears for months, not the least because of lack of funding. Any such undertaking required finances. As early as 17 October 1914, he wrote to Albert and Dernburg in a strictly confidential note, "I was offered to buy the *Washington Post* today for two million dollars with the intention to allow a buy back after the war for one-and-a-half million. A second offer was to put the paper at our complete disposal for two months for \$100,000. The paper has significance as it is the only large paper in the capital. What is your opinion with respect to the funding question?"<sup>41</sup> Albert and Dernburg's answers are not preserved, but the two officials shelved the idea. In the spring of 1915, with the propaganda effort starting to show better results, with Hale and others pushing for more mainstream efforts, Count Bernstorff's idea resurfaced. Instrumental in the change of attitude was the change of strategy towards the United States and the resulting resolution of the funding question.

In February 1915, in line with the other measures to wage war on the United States, Heinrich Albert suggested to Ambassador Count von Bernstorff to rekindle the efforts for the acquisition of American newspapers. He wrote:

True neutrality does not exist. . . . The English have systematically worked long before the war, and especially in the first few weeks when German news was not available here, in order to malign us, and to paint a fake picture of us.

---

<sup>39</sup> Hirst, *German Propaganda in America, 1914-1917*, 72.

<sup>40</sup> Heinrich Albert, "About Dernburging," undated, RG 65 Albert Papers, Box 5, Folder 20, NA.

<sup>41</sup> Johann Heinrich Count von Bernstorff, "Memo to Albert and Dernburg," 17 October 1914, RG 65 Albert Papers, Box 3, Folder 10, NA.

We neglected both to gain sufficient influence, and to win the entire American people; exchange professors influence but a small part of the nation; the only means [to influence a broader public is] English printed news papers [sic], which would give the readers, and impregnate them without their knowing or noticing it, German ideas. . . . Following are the most influential papers under E. [English or Embassy?] influence.

*Times* – Editor is the publisher Ochs (G. [German] Jew.)

*Sun* – Rinst, German Jew (embittered)

*Herald*

*Evening Post* and *Evening Mail*.

German *Staatszeitung*, Ridder, very much read by German Americans, poor German.

*Fatherland*, special war-sheet, published by Viereck.

*Hamburg Fremdenblatt*, also saily [sic] correspondence by Hale, published by Dernberg [sic].

We have the feeling now, that lectures and discussions are of little purpose—Dernberg [sic] and his associates have done much good—but no one alters his veins, and things speak for themselves. That the Americans are so wholly pro-Ally is explained by reason of their general ignorance, poor education, no knowledge whatever of business, and of German government.<sup>42</sup>

Glad to have his idea finally considered, Count Bernstorff cabled to the Foreign Office on 10 March 1915:

Main point is no longer organization of news service, but in placing news here. Entire press here, as well as all telegraph agencies, in hands of money interests allied with England. Therefore, although best possible news bureau organized here under Dernburg's direction, news gets only scant circulation, as long as we do not control an important newspaper here which will force other papers to accept German news for sake of their journalistic reputation. Offer for purchase of suitable newspaper under consideration. Urgently request immediate authorization to make initial payment of \$325,000. Total sum \$1,300,000.<sup>43</sup>

His superiors in the Foreign Office approved the project within days. Heinrich Albert had made contact with a curious thirty-three-year-old American businessman from La Porte, Indiana. Dr. Edward Aloysius Rumely, a third generation German immigrant, had studied medicine in Germany. He had inherited the family business, the Rumely Company, a farm implement manufacturer. Among other

---

<sup>42</sup> Heinrich Albert, "Extracts from letter to 'His Excellency,'" undated, RG 65 Albert Papers, Box 5, NA. Date estimated around February 1915 (definitely before the attempts to buy American papers in March 1915 and before the *Lusitania* sinking in May). His characterization of the American public in itself showed an attitude which would make a more sensible propaganda impossible.

<sup>43</sup> United States Senate, *Brewing and Liquor Interests and German and Bolshevik Propaganda*, 1453-1454.



things Rumely developed a revolutionary kerosene-fueled tractor, the Rumely Oil Pull, nicknamed “Kerosene Annie.” It became a resounding commercial success with over 60,000 tractors sold before the World War. According to the chief of the Bureau of Investigation, A. Bruce Bielaski, Rumely took “that corporation from a \$3,000,000 corporation up to a \$36,000,000 corporation in a very short period of time.”<sup>44</sup> However, Rumely overextended the business and faced financial woes by 1913, after which the Board of Directors forced him to resign.

A fervent pro-German and desperate to steer business towards his fledgling firm, Rumely approached Bernhard Dernburg in November 1915, who introduced him to Albert.<sup>45</sup> With money available from the sale of war bonds and with the blessing of the War Department and the Imperial Foreign Office, Albert and Count Bernstorff made their move. Not wanting to appear as the outright owner of the daily, Albert made a secret agreement with Rumely to act as the front man for the German government. On 15 March and again on 1 April 1915, he paid Rumely \$100,000 (\$4.2 million in today’s value) in what would be the first installments for buying the *New York Evening Mail*, code-named “Perez.”<sup>46</sup>

On 15 May, \$707,500 moved from Albert’s accounts to Rumely, coded “Perez matter.”<sup>47</sup> Another \$78,664 followed on 11 June, and \$75,000 on 20 September.<sup>48</sup> In 1916, two payments of \$7,500 and \$75,000 completed the sale.<sup>49</sup> The total cost of the *New York Evening Mail* for the German Empire came to \$1.2 million (\$24 million in today’s value).<sup>50</sup> With the paper secured, Rumely moved to New York and took the post as editor-in-chief. Throughout the fall of 1914 and spring of 1915 the paper had become the public mouth piece of Theodore Roosevelt, who used the platform to voice his harsh criticism of President Wilson’s foreign policy towards Germany. It landed the former American President on a list of “German sympathizers” compiled by the Bureau of Investigations.<sup>51</sup> Rumely had partnered with the Irish immigrant Samuel McClure, a muckraker of the first order. McClure became the public face through the *Evening Mail*’s editorials.

Famous editors such as H.L. Mencken and John E. Cullen, as well as reporters of the stature of John Reed joined the pro-German editorial staff.<sup>52</sup> Despite the German ownership of the paper, Rumely made some effort to keep up the appearance of neutrality and objectivity. However, the message in the paper’s editorials mirrored that of the *Fatherland*: England’s blockade violates international law, Germany

---

<sup>44</sup> *Ibid.*, 1452.

<sup>45</sup> Johannes Reiling, *Deutschland: Safe for Democracy?* (Stuttgart, GE: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1997), 187.

<sup>46</sup> Heinrich Albert, “Trial Balance,” 14 October 1915, RG 65 Albert Papers, Box 3, Folder 10, NA.

<sup>47</sup> Heinrich Albert, “To the Secretary of the Imperial Treasury,” 15 May 1915, RG 65 Albert Papers, Box 3, Folder 16, NA.

<sup>48</sup> Heinrich Albert, “Temporary Advance Account,” 11 June 1915 and 20 September 1915, RG 65 Albert Papers, Box 24, NA.

<sup>49</sup> *Ibid.*, “Verzeichnis der Belege.”

<sup>50</sup> *Ibid.*, “Utilization of Treasury Notes,” 25 August 1916.

<sup>51</sup> Bureau of Investigations, “German Sympathizers,” undated, RG 65 Albert Papers, Box 12, File 67, NA.

<sup>52</sup> H.L. Mencken, *My Life as Author and Editor* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1993), 194.

has a right to defend itself with submarines, the United States should be militarily better prepared (therefore using available arms and munitions for its own forces rather than selling them to the Entente), and the U.S. should intervene in Mexico and create order.<sup>53</sup> One significant difference was the absence of scholarly contributors, especially the German-American professors that cluttered the pages of the *Fatherland* with their intellectual treatises week after week.

The sinking of the *Lusitania* on 7 May 1915 effectively ended the potential for the financial success of the German-owned paper before it even had a chance. Within months of the sinking the public sentiment in New York caused subscription rates for Rumely's venture to deteriorate. By the fall of 1915, the *Evening Mail* slid into the red. The German embassy, unwilling to give up on its investment, propped the paper up financially until the entry of the United States into the war. Over and over, a steady stream of German funds flowed across to the McClure Newspaper Corporation, Rumely and McClure's partnership.<sup>54</sup> According to the *New York Times* the total financial support of the embassy amounted to \$626,000, although Albert's books reflect payments of only \$273,000 coded to "Hays-Perez."<sup>55</sup> On 8 July 1918, Rumely finally was arrested on charges of perjury because he lied about the true ownership of the paper to government investigators.<sup>56</sup>

The purchase of the *Evening Mail* would not be the only investment of the German propagandists in an American newspaper. The bookkeeping of Heinrich Albert contains a second newspaper purchasing account under the code "Perez II." This second account shows a \$220,000 (\$4.6 million in today's value) investment in a "Jewish Newspaper."<sup>57</sup> The Foreign Office had dispatched two German Zionists, Dr. Isaac Strauss and Arthur Meyerowitz with a translator in the fall of 1914 to specifically target the American-Jewish community. They were to promote a pro-German message and collect donations "for the needy Jews in Eastern Europe."<sup>58</sup> On 14 January 1915, Dr. Isaac Strauss received \$20,000 from Albert. Another payment \$25,000 followed later that year.<sup>59</sup> At the same time, von Papen's propaganda accounts show monthly stipends of \$1,500, \$2,000, and

---

<sup>53</sup> *New York Evening Mail*, 1915 (Library of Congress, Chronicling America).

<sup>54</sup> Heinrich Albert, "Accounting," 1915 to 1916, RG 65 Albert Papers, Box 3, Folder 16, NA. Entries marked Hays-Perez in amounts ranged from \$18,000 to \$40,000 in 1916. In the final accounting Albert lists three outlays in 1916, which seem to reflect the sum of the Hays-Perez entries.

<sup>55</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>56</sup> "Arrest Rumely; Say Germany owns the Evening Mail." *New York Times*, July 9, 1918. Also see Heinrich Albert, "German Embassy Account," 1916, RG 65 Albert Papers, Box 3, Folder 16 and Box 24, NA.

<sup>57</sup> Doerries, *Imperial Challenge*, 63.

<sup>58</sup> *Ibid.*, 62.

<sup>59</sup> Heinrich Albert, "Temporary Advance Account," 1914 to 1917, RG 65 Albert Papers, Box 24, NA. Also Bigelow and Wise, "Commission for the sale of the *SS Atlantic*," 1 February 1918, RG 131 Allied Property Custodian, Entry 199, Box 28, File 654, NA. This payment is referred to in the statements of the Allied Property Custodian as The Allied Property Custodian questions this charge which seems to have been a payment to Strauss for something else.

\$3,000 to Strauss.<sup>60</sup> In 1916 he received another \$7,500 and \$12,000.<sup>61</sup> In total Strauss received over \$100,000 (\$2.1 million in today's value) from Albert.

Albert's books as well as von Bernstorff's memoirs are silent as to the identity of the "Jewish Newspaper" that they purchased. The project could in fact have been the publication of a new, monthly periodical, the *American Jewish Chronicle*, owned by Isaac Strauss.<sup>62</sup> It first appeared in May 1916 and does not seem to have produced the desired impact Albert had envisioned. According to Doerries, the investment had been a grave mistake and Strauss refunded the full amount to the German government. Bernstorff wrote to Chancellor von Bethmann Hollweg later that year: "May I ask you to treat this transaction as nonexistent, especially also when dealing with Jewish circles."<sup>63</sup> On 21 and 23 September 1916, Strauss refunded the \$100,000 in two payments, coded "Payment by J. Simon, Dr. Strauss."<sup>64</sup> Since John Simon was one of Albert's most important trade connections, it cannot be said for sure whether this credit reflected a true reimbursement or whether Albert simply re-coded the investment from the Foreign Office to his commercial accounts, so that von Bernstorff's superiors would be content. The Strauss venture neither amounted to \$220,000 nor did it concern a newspaper, which leads to the suspicion that there were other, secret investments into Jewish publications.

Albert's accounts show two mysterious payments in his temporary advance account. On 27 May 1915, coded "Steamship 'Perez,'" Albert paid \$190,000 to an unknown recipient. Of course there was no steamship Perez nor was this payment related to the purchase of the *New York Evening Mail* which had largely been paid for by 15 May.<sup>65</sup> On 17 September 1915, another strange payment went to a Leo Wallerstein, coded "Perez matter." Wallerstein was the inventor of a brewing technique that revolutionized industrial beer production. His involvement with the Perez project is unknown. It is certain, as a result of the coding and timing of the payment, that the payment to Wallerstein as well had nothing to do with the *New York Evening Mail*.<sup>66</sup> Again, no explanation as to what these funds supported can be found. It is very likely, however, that some of these payments covered the \$220,000 investment in the mysterious "Jewish Newspaper," which Albert shows under the code "Perez II."<sup>67</sup>

One of the preeminent Jewish journalists and editors in New York was Herman Bernstein. With unknown funding, he founded the Yiddish daily *Der Tag* in October 1914, just around the time when the German Press Bureau was ramping up

<sup>60</sup> Heinrich Albert, "Report," 20 July 1915, RG 65 Albert Papers, Box 5, File 20, NA.

<sup>61</sup> Heinrich Albert, "Temporary Advance Account," 1916, RG 65 Albert Papers, Box 24, NA.

<sup>62</sup> George E. Cogswell, "Re. Dr. Isaac Strauss and John Simon," 30 January 1919, RG 131 Allied Property Custodian, Entry 199, Box 28, File 654, NA.

<sup>63</sup> Quoted in Reinhard R. Doerries, *Imperial Challenge: Ambassador Count Bernstorff and German-American Relations, 1908-1917* (University of North Carolina Press, 1989), 269.

<sup>64</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>65</sup> Heinrich Albert, "Temporary Advance Account," 15 May 1915, RG 65 Albert Papers, Box 24, NA.

<sup>66</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>67</sup> Heinrich Albert, "Utilization of Treasury Notes," 25 August 1916, RG 65 Albert Papers, Box 3, Folder 16, NA.

operations.<sup>68</sup> Correspondence of Bernstein with Strauss and his colleague Arthur Meyerowitz in 1915 suggests that there was quite a substantial interaction between the journalist and the German propagandists, especially Meyerowitz.<sup>69</sup> In a letter to Bernstein dated 14 December 1914, Strauss mentioned *Der Tag* as “our paper.”<sup>70</sup> In a letter from 17 January 1915, the time when the Perez project was feverishly discussed in the Press Bureau, Meyerowitz wrote to Bernstein, “Today I wrote to Mr. Schiff in great detail about the conversation I had yesterday with Gr. B. [Count Bernstorff] and would ask you urgently, not to do anything until Tuesday afternoon and also not to write anything. I hope that Gr. B. [Count Bernstorff], to whom I announced your visit of today in writing yesterday, gave you a friendly reception this morning. We have to discuss all questions in detail before [underline in original] you face public discussion. . . . Professor [illegible] introduced me to Mr. Schapiro whom I liked quite well.”<sup>71</sup> On 15 May, David Shapiro, Hans Jakob Schiff, and Max Warburg bought a majority interest in the paper for \$75,000. Bernstein had to raise the remaining \$30,000 for the agreed capitalization of \$100,000.<sup>72</sup> Bernstein raised the main portion of this money through Julius Rosenwald of Sears and Roebuck, and Julius Goldman.<sup>73</sup> The meetings between Meyerowitz and Count Bernstorff, as well as between Bernstorff and Schiff at the same time indicate that money from Albert found its way via Jewish bankers in New York to support *Der Tag*. How Albert accounted for the funds is not clear in his bookkeeping. The obvious link seems to be Leo Wallerstein who received a one-time payment of \$75,000 in September coded “Perez.”

Marcus Braun, the Hungarian-American editor of the magazine *Fair Play*, also received support through the German propaganda organization. After Count Bernstorff had publicly commended the pro-German reporting of the magazine in March 1915, he directed Heinrich Albert to pay Braun a monthly stipend of \$1,200 (\$25,200 in today’s value) for a few months in 1915.<sup>74</sup> In January 1916, Braun received \$3,574.20 (\$75,000 in today’s value) to go away after he had tried to milk the German embassy for more.<sup>75</sup> Albert’s accounts are not entirely clear on other payments to smaller publications. Two entries in October 1916 show \$18,000 and \$5,000 withdrawals from Albert personally coded “Press matter.” Where the money ended up cannot be surmised. The Hearst Press reported the German side

---

<sup>68</sup> Herman Bernstein, “Papers,” October 1914, RG 713 Papers of Herman Bernstein, Folder 250, YIVO Institute for Jewish Research, New York.

<sup>69</sup> Herman Bernstein, “Correspondence with Arthur Meyerowitz,” 1915, RG 713 Papers of Herman Bernstein, Folders 213 and 191, YIVO Institute for Jewish Research, New York.

<sup>70</sup> *Ibid.*, “Strauss to Bernstein,” 14 December 1914, Folder 213.

<sup>71</sup> *Ibid.*, “Meyerowitz to Bernstein,” 17 January 1915.

<sup>72</sup> *Ibid.*, “Schapiro and Aronson to Bernstein,” 15 May 1915, Folder 250.

<sup>73</sup> *Ibid.* Also Heinrich Albert, “Diary Entry,” 23 April 1915, RG 65 Albert Papers, Box 23, NA. At the end of April, Heinrich Albert noted in his diary, “Dinner at Goldmann’s [sic].” Purely circumstantial, the entry does indicate that this could be another connection between the German government and the funding of the *Day*.

<sup>74</sup> Heinrich Albert, “Temporary Advance Account,” 1915, RG 65 Albert Papers, Box 24, NA. For von Bernstorff’s commendation see Johann Heinrich Count von Bernstorff, “Bernstorff to Braun,” 15 March 1915, RG 131 Alien Property Custodian, Entry 199, Box 129, File 3103, NA.

<sup>75</sup> *Ibid.*

of daily events with more than casual sympathy. Whether Albert or Dernburg financially rewarded individual reporters is not documented but highly likely. In addition to the already pro-German papers and magazines of the Irish-American, German-American, and Indian-American communities, Hirst documented that by 1916 German influence on editorial boards of mainstream American magazines and newspapers covered several dozen publications all across the United States.<sup>76</sup>

Without question, German propaganda efforts made a significant leap in the spring of 1915. Dernburg's speeches started to have a positive impact. Mainstream publications, especially the Hearst press, used more and more information of the press offices' news service. American correspondents began to bring back news items that were not controlled by the British. Then the the *Lusitania* sank in May 1915. Within days, the German propaganda machine lay in shambles. Desperate attempts by Dernburg and others to explain away the savagery of the German action with legal arguments dug the hole for German propagandists even deeper. Within a month of the sinking, Dernburg was on his way back to Germany. While the press bureau continued its work, and many of the projects of the spring of 1915 came to fruition in the latter part of that year, German propaganda never fully recovered from this single setback. Albert described his definition of the United States to his wife on 13 May 1915, one week after the demise of the *Lusitania*, "I feel like a sane person who is watching with uneasiness whether a grown, powerful brat with an atrophying brain is able to become healthy again or whether he will harm those next to him or living with him while he is recovering."<sup>77</sup>

It is easy for historians to judge the German efforts as a complete failure from start to finish. Undoubtedly, a German propaganda with the express goal of convincing the American public to support the German cause had been inefficient between August and November 1914.<sup>78</sup> Amateur propagandists with a complete lack of plan and focus clumsily botched the few existing chances to make a case for true neutrality in the German definition. Hirst wrote: "The Germans seemed determined, not only to counter Allied interpretations, but to provide Americans with so much information that they could not fail to see the justice of the German cause. That this procedure would induce the United States to pursue a kind of neutrality that ruled out aid or encouragement to the Allies, was the obvious hope."<sup>79</sup> This hope was clearly dashed in the spring of 1915, when the American economy hummed with British, Russian, and French orders financed by J. P. Morgan. There was no chance, and Count Bernstorff, Dernburg, Albert, von Papen, Boy-Ed and others of the German team in the U.S. understood that the U.S. would voluntarily embrace an embargo and return to an economic recession. On 8 April 1915, Albert noted in his diary, "Press session. Important communications from H. [Hale] which

<sup>76</sup> See Hirst, *German Propaganda in the United States, 1914-1917*, 87-91.

<sup>77</sup> Heinrich Albert, "Letter to Wife Ida," 13 May 1915, RG 65 Albert Papers, Box 23, NA.

<sup>78</sup> Peterson, *Propaganda for War*, 137.

<sup>79</sup> Hirst, *German Propaganda in the United States, 1914-1917*, 238.

coincide with my view that there is no hope at all for energetic action on the part of the United States against England.”<sup>80</sup> For the Wilson administration a munitions embargo against the warring factions one year before presidential elections would have been political suicide.

After November 1914, and especially with the proper funding from the War Department starting in February 1915, German propaganda changed its purpose. By the time the German government sent orders to New York to start deliberate acts of war in the United States on 24 January 1915 and declared unrestricted submarine warfare on 4 February, the propaganda organization in the U.S. was well staffed, its efforts focused, and its projects funded. Thus from the spring of 1915 until the fall of 1916 it became the most effective it would be in the whole war period. Some British observers agreed, such as Sir Horace Plunkett, who in April 1916 sent a memorandum to Sir Cecil Spring Rice, claiming that the Germans were using various kinds of news “superbly” and that “the British were being bested in this area.”<sup>81</sup>

It would be a mistake to try to separate the German propaganda from the concurrent sabotage campaign, the market cornering efforts, the efforts to create a war between the U.S. and Mexico, and the destabilization of the American workforce. Albert did not switch hats from propaganda agitator with the goal of American neutrality to throat-cutting mastermind in his responsibility as paymaster of German sabotage agents. One set of responsibilities complemented the other. By the spring of 1915 no one had any doubts as to the disposition of the United States towards the German Empire. The supply of the Entente with arms and ammunition had made her into a combatant from the German point of view, and that of William Jennings Bryan, scores of American politicians, and leaders of minority communities. The munitions supplies had to be stopped and the German agents in New York had authorization to use any means at their disposal, propaganda being one of them. Operation Perez was perhaps one of the most brazen attempts of a foreign government to influence American public opinion against the policies of its own government. Despite the fact that the *Lusitania* disaster sabotaged the effort, the German strategy in the United States between 1914 and 1917 sowed the seeds for the use of propaganda as a tactical weapon integrated into a larger war strategy. Adolf Hitler, while very critical of the German clandestine efforts in the U.S. during World War I, described the role of propaganda in modern warfare in his book *Mein Kampf*: “Propaganda is . . . [nothing less than] a weapon, though a frightful one in the hand of an expert.”<sup>82</sup> Operation Perez, although it failed in World War I, added a new tactical dimension to warfare used by experts in every major conflict since.

---

<sup>80</sup> Heinrich Albert, “Diary Entry,” 8 April 1915, RG 65 Albert Papers, Box 23, NA.

<sup>81</sup> Quoted in Hirst, *German Propaganda in the United States, 1914-1917*, 247.

<sup>82</sup> Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf, Volume 1: A Reckoning*, (Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1939), 228-240.

# George Franklin Drew: Florida's Yankee Redemption Governor

Seth A. Weitz  
*Dalton State College*

The 1870s were a turbulent and violent decade in Florida's history as the state faced a tumultuous political period, while also suffering through a trying time highlighted by racial strife. In the middle of the decade, Florida, along with Louisiana and South Carolina, was at the center of the controversial 1876 Presidential election. More than a decade after the conclusion of the Civil War, most of the South had been "redeemed" from those whom Southerners referred to as Scalawags, Southerners who supported Reconstruction and the Republican Party; and Carpetbaggers, Northerners who moved South after the Civil War to seek their fortune. This was accomplished through various methods including intimidation and violence. Florida was one of a handful of Southern states that still housed Federal troops, and was still ruled by a Republican governor, Marcellus Stearns, who had assumed office when fellow Republican Ossian B. Hart died of a heart attack in office in 1874. Along with the national election, Floridians were also set to elect a governor in 1876, and many white Floridians hoped that this election would finally deliver them from the hands of what they deemed to be their Northern oppressors. What they received was a native of Alton, New Hampshire, George Franklin Drew. White Floridians hoped Drew would not be an ordinary Yankee though, and would be the man to "redeem" the state, and return Florida to the "Old South." While Drew's sympathies often lay with the South, his views were of a "New South," and his business background would help to begin the transformation of Florida from a backwater, insignificant state, into one of the nation's playgrounds and important industrial and manufacturing states heading into the twentieth century.

Born in 1827 on a New Hampshire farm, Drew wanted to pursue his education, but his family forced him to quit school at the age of 12 to help work on the family farm. In 1847 he left the North and moved to Columbus, Georgia, where he opened a machine shop. Despite his lack of education, Drew's business prospered, and he soon branched out, becoming one of the most successful lumbermen in West Georgia. When Georgia seceded, Drew was placed in a precarious position. His wife was a Georgia Belle, and while his new life and small fortune had been forged in the South, most of his sympathies lay with his native region. When Georgia had deliberated during the Secession Winter, Drew had urged calm and moderation, and he would remain a Unionist during the war, something not lost on his friends and neighbors in Georgia.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Robert Sobel and John Raimo, eds., *Biographical Directory of the Governors of the United States, 1789-1978*, vol. 1 (Westport, Conn.: Meckler Books, 1978), 47-53.

After the war Drew was seen by many in Georgia as an outsider, owing largely to his to Unionism, but also because of the mere fact that he had been born and raised in the North. While it is not accurate to say that he was run from the state as many Northerners were during Reconstruction, Drew felt it was in the best interest of his family to relocate. Despite his Northern roots, Drew had grown fond of the South, and though many in Columbus considered him a Yankee, Drew felt an allegiance to his adopted region. Disregarding warnings from family and friends back in New Hampshire, Drew and his family decided to move even further south, eventually settling in Ellaville, Florida on the Suwannee River in Madison County, located in Florida's panhandle about 80 miles west of Florida's capital city of Tallahassee. Here, Drew once again displayed his business prowess, building, owning, and operating the largest sawmill in Florida. In all, Drew owned eleven sawmills in Florida. This success only whetted his appetite, and soon after moving to Florida, Drew decided to parlay his business acumen into the political arena.<sup>2</sup>

Florida, like most Southern states in the early 1870s was controlled by the Republican Party after it was readmitted to the Union by meeting the requirements of Reconstruction, including ratifying the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Amendments to the Constitution. Florida's representatives were readmitted to Congress and the state was thus fully restored to the United States on 25 July 1868.<sup>3</sup> Many white Floridians took pride that Tallahassee had been the next to last Confederate state capital to fall to the Union army, as only Austin, Texas fell later, about a month after Confederate Colonel George Washington Scott surrendered the last active rebel troops in the state to Union General Edward M. McCook on 13 May 1865.<sup>4</sup> This pride carried over after the war as many disgruntled ex-Confederates looked to regain their power and prominence within society. As Drew would soon find out, the state to which he had moved was still simmering with political unrest that was about to ignite in bloodshed. Florida during the early years of Reconstruction was engulfed in a virtual second Civil War.

The former planter class, eager to regain the lofty status they once maintained, sought to paint anyone who did not support their white supremacist agenda as being on the fringes of society. To maintain white solidarity in the face of a new threat, the influx of Northerners and perceived encroachment by newly freed slaves into Southern society, they founded the Constitutional League of Florida on 30 November 1867. The organization, created by Charles Fenwick, was nothing more than a local branch of the newly established Ku Klux Klan.<sup>5</sup> The by-laws of the league, which would eventually be absorbed into the Klan, outlined goals for

---

<sup>2</sup> Ibid.

<sup>3</sup> Charlton Tebeau, *A History of Florida* (Coral Gables: University of Miami Press, 1971), 249.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid., 240.

<sup>5</sup> Michael Newton, *The Invisible Empire: The Ku Klux Klan in Florida* (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2001), 10.



the organization, one of which called for members to oppose Negro Supremacy.<sup>6</sup> After the 1868 Constitution sanctioned what the former ruling class felt was outside, or Republican, rule, the Klan and its allies declared war on the freedmen and their allies, mainly Republicans, killing over twenty in the summer of 1868 alone.<sup>7</sup> Practicing a form of guerilla warfare led by former Confederate officers and the Klan, a state of virtual civil war persisted in Alachua, Jackson, Madison and Columbia Counties, which were still dominated by the “Old South” agrarian plantation society.<sup>8</sup>

Jackson County saw the worst of these conflicts, a race war that lasted from 1869-1871, and is remembered today as the Jackson County War. The local Klan leader, James Coker, referred to as the “generalissimo of the Klan” promised that the easiest way to redeem the county from outside rule would be to “kill the last damned Republican in the place.”<sup>9</sup> They did not solely target African-Americans as their stated goal was to “kill out the leading men of the Republican Party,” which they did by murdering Dr. John Finlayson, county clerk, as well as Jewish merchant Samuel Fleishman, who made the mistake of extending credit to African-Americans at a time when such action was severely frowned upon.<sup>10</sup> In all, the Jackson County War claimed the lives of more than 150 white Republicans and African-Americans.<sup>11</sup>

While Drew certainly did not condone this violence, when he entered Florida politics he was a Democrat. His first taste of politics came in 1872 when he ran unsuccessfully for the state Senate. He did find some political success on the local level, as he was elected Madison County Commissioner. No one, except possibly Drew himself, could have imagined that the “Yankee lumber king” as one newspaper referred to him, would grab the Democratic gubernatorial nomination in 1876, and the Governor’s mansion in 1877.<sup>12</sup> According to the *Tallahassee Weekly Floridian*, he owed his nomination to the fact that he was a former Whig, Unionist and moderate, who was viewed as one of the only Democrats who could court the African-American vote.<sup>13</sup> He was also, possibly more importantly, a compromise candidate for whites; someone who could unite all white factions within the state as it was redeemed from carpetbag rule, which, of course, is ironic in itself considering his Northern roots.

With the elections of 1876 looming, Democrats in Florida felt they had an excellent chance of regaining control of the state, and when the party met at Quincy on 21 June, they nominated Drew, much to the chagrin of some ardent

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, 11.

<sup>7</sup> “Testimony Taken by the Joint Select Committee to Enquire into the Condition of Affairs in the Late Insurrectionary States,” vol. 13 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1872), 186-187.

<sup>8</sup> *Tallahassee Weekly Floridian*, Nov. 10, 1868.

<sup>9</sup> “Testimony Taken by the Joint Select Committee,” vol. 13, 150.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, vol. 13, 89-90; 290-291.

<sup>11</sup> Newton, *Invisible Empire*, 18.

<sup>12</sup> *Tallahassee Weekly Floridian*, June 8, 1876.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, June 5, 1877.

party members, many who were Confederate veterans. Drew had a reputation as a Unionist, even though he had sold timber and salt to the Confederates in Columbus. Some questioned whether he was a true Democrat, pointing out that when he first entered politics, he had been a Whig until that party imploded over the question of slavery.<sup>14</sup>

Both the state and national elections were heated and controversial, with the Presidential election garnering more attention, even within Florida, as both Democrats and Republicans in the state proclaimed victories for their respective candidates (as was the case in South Carolina and Louisiana). The national election would not be resolved until a Congressional commission declared Rutherford B. Hayes, the Republican, the winner in all three Southern states in question, victorious over the Democrat, Samuel Tilden, in the so-called Compromise of 1877.

In Florida, Drew's opponent was the current Governor, Maine born, one-armed Union Army veteran Marcellus Stearns, who was seeking reelection. Stearns had been elected Lieutenant Governor, and had subsequently assumed the office of Governor upon Ossian B. Hart's death.<sup>15</sup> The original tally gave the election and most state offices to the Republicans, but Drew and the Democrats went to the courts, with the case eventually making its way to the Florida Supreme Court, which ordered a recount in several disputed counties. The recount awarded the Governor's mansion to Drew, while handing most other state offices to Democrats. Upon hearing the decision, Stearns proclaimed that he would not yield the office, but when confronted by armed Drew supporters, many that were Confederate veterans, and some ex-Klansmen, the Governor complied.<sup>16</sup>

"Millionaire" Drew took the oath of office on 2 January 1877 in Tallahassee, and proceeded to deliver what the Tallahassee *Weekly Floridian* derisively described as a "middle of the road" speech.<sup>17</sup> Outgoing Governor Stearns did not bother to stay in Tallahassee to watch the proceedings, leaving not only the city, but also the state, heading to Arkansas and finally New York.<sup>18</sup> In his inaugural address Drew assured the African-Americans present that he would do everything in his power to uphold their constitutional rights, exclaiming, "we are a law abiding people, resolved to perpetuate free institutions."<sup>19</sup>

In reality Drew's election ushered in the dawn of the Bourbon age in Florida, with Democrats often being referred to as Bourbon Democrats, a derogatory term alluding to the fact that, like the Bourbon Kings of France, Southern Democrats had learned nothing from the dark past they romanticized and wished to return to the region. They were adherents to the Lost Cause of the Confederacy, and while

---

<sup>14</sup> Ibid., June 24, 1877.

<sup>15</sup> Michael Gannon, *Florida, A Short History* (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 1993), 50.

<sup>16</sup> Tebeau, *A History of Florida*, 254.

<sup>17</sup> *Tallahassee Weekly Floridian*, Jan. 2, 1877.

<sup>18</sup> John Wallace, *Carpetbag Rule in Florida* (Jacksonville: Da Costa Printing, 1888), 343.

<sup>19</sup> *Tallahassee Weekly Floridian*, Jan. 2, 1877.

they acknowledged slavery could not be restored, they vowed to keep the newly freed slaves as second-class citizens. Further, their campaign had forged a peculiar political alliance, which would compel any dissenting whites to consent to their leadership for the next seventy years.

In return for the nomination and their support, Drew played the patronage game and handed out cabinet positions to prominent Democrats, even those who did not share his moderate views. One major player in Florida politics whose career was revitalized by Drew's victory was William D. Bloxham, one of the leaders of the state's Democratic Party during Reconstruction. Despite his previous position of power and influence, Bloxham had fallen on hard times because he had neglected his plantation outside of Tallahassee in favor of his true love, politics. In financial ruin, his party seemingly turned its back on him until Drew threw him a lifeline by appointing him Secretary of State. Other cabinet positions were filled from all other factions of the Democratic Party, save one. No member of what he referred to as a "Ku Klux like club" would serve in his cabinet.<sup>20</sup> Drew could also call on support from the state Legislature, which had a Democratic majority for the first time since the Civil War, with Democrats holding an advantage of 32-18 in the Assembly and 14-9 in the Senate.<sup>21</sup>

In his first message to the legislature, the new governor laid out the agenda for his term, and his words seemingly toed the Bourbon party line. On 10 January 1877, he proclaimed "that government will be most highly esteemed that gives the greatest production to individual and industrial enterprises at the least expense to the tax payer." He went on to apply his personal business philosophy to governance by stating, "the basis of nearly all personal success in business can be equally well applied to state finances. Spend nothing unless absolutely necessary and pay bills when made, or at the earliest point thereafter." He also lambasted the previous Republican regime for its liberal spending that left the state with a \$90,000 deficit.<sup>22</sup>

In order to combat the deficit, Drew advocated cutting spending in numerous areas. He lowered taxes and instituted a debt management program, which paid dividends as the floating debt was reduced from \$250,000 to \$60,000 in a year and down to \$30,000 by 1879, while the operating expenses fell from \$212,530 when he assumed office to \$133,970 by 1878.<sup>23</sup> He also revived a twenty-year old claim with the national government for reimbursement of expenses from the third and final Seminole War (1855-1858). Drew demanded the government pay Florida more than \$250,000, a number which he maintained had increased due to interest since the 1850s. The government balked, and the issue would not be resolved until 1903 when Washington doled out \$700,000.<sup>24</sup>

---

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, February 19, 1877

<sup>21</sup> *Florida Assembly Journal*, 1877, 4-5; *Florida Senate Journal*, 1877, 7-9.

<sup>22</sup> *Florida Senate Journal*, 1877, 37-49.

<sup>23</sup> Tebeau, *A History of Florida*, 276.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*

One of the ways he did lower costs, which proved to be highly controversial and remains so today, was to close the state penitentiary at Chattahoochee, which saved the state \$25,000 per year. In its place the governor created the convict lease system, which was also an effort to keep African-Americans, who comprised a majority of the prisoners, in a system as close to slavery as possible. Many of the prisoners were forced to work in turpentine factories and lumber camps, making Florida's convict lease system one of the strictest in the South. A contemporary newspaper depicted the brutality of the system by noting, "for the slightest infractions, [convicts] were prodded with bayonets or whipped with straps dipped in salt until they could not walk."<sup>25</sup> At the onset of the program, the state leased 110 prisoners to private citizens, with thirty sent to Major Henry A. Wyse, who in turn sent them to work for the St. Johns, Lake Eustis, and Gulf Railroad Company.<sup>26</sup> According to J.C. Powell, in his 1891 work, *American Siberia*, the men, mostly African-American, were housed in former slave quarters, or dirt floored sheds in swamps, only to be awoken in the morning by guards who disciplined them by hanging them by their thumbs.<sup>27</sup> They were often denied food, and when Wyse reclaimed his prisoners following a malaria outbreak more than 50 percent had died.<sup>28</sup> The survivors were sent to the Suwannee River where they labored in turpentine camps, which claimed the lives of thirteen more. Official state records claimed fewer deaths, and Florida Civil War hero and state Adjutant General "Dixie" Dickson called the new turpentine culture, "a very healthy business."<sup>29</sup>

Drew and his Democratic allies were also conflicted over how to handle the amazing growth patterns that characterized Florida in the postbellum years. Florida was home to 33.7 percent more people in 1870 than 1860 and by 1880 the population of the state reached 269,493, an increase of 43.5 percent from the preceding decade.<sup>30</sup> According to Charlton W. Tebeau, these numbers alone do not tell the entire story. To grasp the fundamental changes, one has to closely examine the economic structure of the state. Tebeau maintained "cotton growers had had their day, and Floridians moved in new economic directions that set them apart from the people of the other states of the lower South."<sup>31</sup> Tebeau further asserted that while "Florida was on the way to becoming a typical southern cotton state in 1860 . . . [it] changed that course before it was fully realized."<sup>32</sup> Cotton production in Florida, in fact, dropped dramatically from 1860 to 1900 and the decline in the percentage of farm property value in Florida was greater than in Virginia, whose land had been ravaged by four years of fighting during the Civil War.<sup>33</sup>

---

<sup>25</sup> Pensacola *Journal*, May 9, 1907.

<sup>26</sup> J.C. Powell, *American Siberia* (Chicago: W.B. Conkey Company, 1891), 11.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*, 16.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*, 17.

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*, 22.

<sup>30</sup> Tebeau, *A History of Florida*, 257.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*, 274.

<sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*, 258.

As early as the first years of Reconstruction, the state was targeted by Northerners as a winter Eden, a place where they could escape the harsh winters and more importantly recuperate from various illnesses. Floridians, native as well as recent immigrants, knew change was afoot and they looked to exploit their natural resources to benefit the financial growth of the state. The Constitution of 1868 echoed this sentiment by providing for a Commissioner of Immigration, charged with establishing a specific program to entice immigration into the state.<sup>34</sup> Because many of the Republicans in power at the time hailed from the North, the publication of pamphlets and periodicals which touted the state's attractions were widely distributed throughout the North. The bureau also hired agents to travel throughout the region to promote Florida. These measures directly contributed to the start of the rapid population increase in the late 1860s and 1870s but once the Bourbons redeemed the state government in 1877, they cut back on the selling of the state to potential tourists and investors. They chose this path not only because their governmental practices were deeply rooted in a fiscal conservatism at odds with the practices of the Bureau of Immigration, but, as stated previously, they suffered from a severe distrust of outsiders, especially Northerners. Despite being a Northerner by birth, Drew did not challenge his Legislature, and though he personally believed Florida was a land ripe for outside investment, he acquiesced in the name of fiscal conservatism.

Denied any formal education past the age of 12, Governor Drew promised to be an advocate for education once in office. In his initial address to the Legislature he stated it was "cheaper to build schoolhouses and maintain schools than to build poorhouses and jails and support paupers and criminals." He also maintained that it was the state's responsibility to educate African-Americans so they could become informed citizens, and carry out their duties as such, including voting.<sup>35</sup> Faced with the reality of rising costs during his term, he only supported elementary education, and even went as far as canceling the opening of the Florida Agricultural College in Brevard County.<sup>36</sup> He would later call for the abolition of the state's public high schools.<sup>37</sup>

Drew concluded his first address to the Legislature by urging Floridians to "bury the passions of the past because all within the state were one people, with one hope and one destiny."<sup>38</sup> His address received mixed reviews as the leading Democratic paper, the *Weekly Floridian*, applauded the entire speech, save for his stance in favor of African-American education.<sup>39</sup> His plans were deemed superficial by the editor of Jacksonville's *Daily Florida Union*, a former Republican stalwart who had

---

<sup>34</sup> Martin M. LaGodna, "Agriculture and Advertising: Florida State Bureau of Immigration, 1923-1960," *Florida Historical Quarterly* 46, no. 3, 197.

<sup>35</sup> *Florida Senate Journal*, 1877, 37-49.

<sup>36</sup> Tallahassee *Weekly Floridian*, Jan. 20, 1877.

<sup>37</sup> *Florida Assembly Journal*, 1879.

<sup>38</sup> *Florida Senate Journal*, 1877, 37-49.

<sup>39</sup> Tallahassee *Weekly Floridian*, Jan. 16, 1877.

expected Drew to announce lower taxes, and who also did not trust the Governor to keep his word in regards to helping African-Americans.<sup>40</sup> African-Americans soon discovered that Drew's words were in fact hollow, when in February 1877 he introduced new restrictive voter re-registration laws that proved to be the first step towards disenfranchising African-Americans.<sup>41</sup>

Drew made little effort at reconciliation with the Republicans, stating he had no time for those who were "loudmouthed in the denunciation of the people who supported" him.<sup>42</sup> The two-party political system was dead in Florida, as it was throughout the South, though the Republican leaning *Daily Florida Union* credited Drew with ensuring a bloodless and seamless transition.<sup>43</sup> Drew was even praised for showing restraint in not pursuing perceived Republican election frauds from the 1876 state and national elections, despite the fact that numerous Bourbon Democrats were out for blood.<sup>44</sup>

One of the biggest challenges Drew faced as governor was reconciling his pledge to not spend money, with the reality that Florida desperately needed to revamp its archaic transportation system, which was virtually nonexistent. Railroad construction, once a pet project of antebellum Senator David Levy Yulee, had been at a virtual standstill for over twenty years, and this was further complicated by legal issues involving a suit filed by the Northern businessman who had supplied the iron for one of Yulee's railroads before the war.<sup>45</sup> Discouraged, Drew began exploring the possibility of constructing a cross-state canal, inspired by the Erie Canal, which would link the St. Marys River to the Okefenokee Swamp to the Gulf of Mexico. When he heard about the proposed canal, Yulee, who was the president of numerous railroads in Florida, and had garnered the nickname, the "Father of Florida's Railroads," protested that the canal's route followed almost the exact same path as one of his rail lines. Yulee, who was still influential within the state, wrote a scolding letter to Drew and subsequently the plans for the canal were scrapped.<sup>46</sup>

Opening the 1879 Legislature, Drew highlighted the economic gains made during the previous two years, but to many staunch Bourbons it was not enough. They disregarded his suggestions and introduced more radical tax cuts, which included slicing county taxes in half.<sup>47</sup> They also pushed new railroad bills through the Assembly over his objection, despite the fact that this would obviously cost money. It was clear by 1879 that true Bourbon Democrats had grown tired of

---

<sup>40</sup> Jacksonville *Daily Florida Union*, Jan. 13, 1877.

<sup>41</sup> *Florida Senate Journal*, 1877, 287-301.

<sup>42</sup> Jacksonville *Daily Florida Union*, Jan. 19, 1877.

<sup>43</sup> *Ibid.*, January 23, 1877.

<sup>44</sup> *Ibid.*, September 20, 1877.

<sup>45</sup> Jacksonville *Florida Times-Union*, May 23, 1886.

<sup>46</sup> "David Levy Yulee to George Franklin Drew," 12 July 1877, David Levy Yulee Papers, P.K. Yonge Library, Gainesville.

<sup>47</sup> *Florida Assembly Journal*, 1879, 27-28.

the Northerner or Yankee, as he was now routinely called in the newspapers.<sup>48</sup> Immune to the criticisms, Drew openly spoke of his desire to run for a second term, confident that the man he considered to be a friend, his Secretary of State, William Bloxham, would not challenge him for the nomination. Unbeknownst to him, as early as 1879 a secret campaign was well underway to unseat Drew and replace him with the Bourbon favorite, Bloxham, at the Democratic Convention in 1880.<sup>49</sup>

At the convention Drew was thanked for his service to the party, and Bloxham was nominated as the Democratic candidate for Governor. Several northern businessmen tried to convince Drew to run as an independent, but he declined, announcing that he was retiring from political life.<sup>50</sup> In 1883 Drew sold his mansion and lumber business in Ellaville for \$72,000 and moved to Jacksonville where he would become the city's first President of the Board of Trade.<sup>51</sup> While Drew continued to prosper as a businessman throughout the remainder of his life, his feud with Bloxham continued to grow. In 1884 Drew publicly threatened to leave the state if Bloxham was re-nominated, which prompted Bloxham to retort that Drew was not a Democrat and that he was planning to challenge Bloxham as an independent. Bloxham did not win the nomination in 1884 as Drew's supporters rallied around former Confederate General Edward A. Perry, who won the nomination. They also called for a Constitutional Convention, which resulted in the 1885 Florida Constitution that denied Governors the right to succeed themselves in office. When Bloxham emerged as a candidate for the United States Senate in 1887, Drew announced that he would spend his entire fortune, which was considerable at the time, in an effort to defeat him. Much to Drew's dismay, Bloxham was elected governor a second time in 1896. Drew had done little to challenge his old nemesis as his health was fading, and he did not live to see the completion of Bloxham's term, dying in Jacksonville in 1900 at the age of 73.<sup>52</sup>

After eleven years of Reconstruction, and two carpetbagger Governors, Florida was one of the last states still occupied by Federal troops in 1876. When Floridians went to the polls, most did not know what to expect from the election, and the subsequent controversies exceeded everyone's imagination. What Florida attained was an end to Reconstruction, and a Northern Governor who had been chased from Georgia for his alleged Unionist leanings during the Civil War. While George Franklin Drew was the choice of those who wanted to turn back the clock, he soon proved he was more interested in charting a new path for the state, leading Florida into a New South. When this was deemed unacceptable, the old guard hastened his political demise, and finally redeemed the state under William Bloxham.

---

<sup>48</sup> Monticello *Constitution*, July 16, 1879.

<sup>49</sup> Tallahassee *Weekly Floridian*, June 15, 1880.

<sup>50</sup> *Ibid.*, Aug. 4, 1880.

<sup>51</sup> *Ibid.*, March 27, 1883.

<sup>52</sup> Edward C. Williamson, "George F. Drew, Florida's Redemption Governor," *Florida Historical Quarterly* 38, no. 3 (January 1960): 214-215.





# Transatlantic Suffragism: British Perceptions of the American Suffrage Movement Prior to World War I

Kristina Graves  
Georgia State University

In 1910, *Votes for Women*, the paper of the Women's Social and Political Union (WSPU), the militant British suffrage organization, published an observation of American suffragists: "in America, as in England, the voteless position of women involves injustice at the hands of the law. Even this injustice, however, has not broken the spirit of these indomitable women. Women, it seems, are ready to fight and to suffer for justice in America as in England."<sup>1</sup> Ever since the 1840 World Anti-Slavery Convention in London, suffragists in America and Great Britain had engaged in transatlantic observation of each other's movements. This mutual scrutiny reflected the emergence of an international movement for women's rights and suffrage in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Due to advances in travel and communication, suffragists were able to engage with valuable allies abroad and gain support for their own movements at home.<sup>2</sup> The unique relationship between the American and British movements stemmed from a shared Anglo-American history reaching back to colonial ties before American independence.

Much of the research regarding these two movements has examined the British movement's influence on the American movement. This article differs from previous work in that it focuses on how, and how well, British suffragists understood the United States and the American suffrage movement. I show that British suffragists revealed their views of the U.S. and the American movement in British suffrage periodicals before World War I. My main sources are the *Common Cause*, the paper of the constitutional National Union for Women's Suffrage Societies (NUWSS), and *Votes for Women* and *The Suffragette*, the papers of the militant WSPU. In these periodicals, British suffragists conveyed their perceptions of gender and masculinity in America; their understanding of the political structure and the opportunities it afforded American suffragists; and, finally, their interpretations of the role of militancy in the American movement.

## Perceptions of Masculinity

The American and British suffrage movements challenged the "male national identities forged on each side of the Atlantic" in the early twentieth century.<sup>3</sup> They recognized they could not win the vote without male support. Olive Walton,

---

<sup>1</sup> "Women Strikers in New York," *Votes for Women*, March 18, 1910.

<sup>2</sup> Patricia Harrison, *Connecting Links: The British and American Woman Suffrage Movements, 1900-1914* (Westport, Greenwood Press, 2000), 2; Christine Stansell, *The Feminist Promise: 1792 to Present* (New York: Modern Library, 2011), 138.

<sup>3</sup> Christine Bolt, *Feminist Ferment: "The Woman Question" in the USA and England, 1870-1940* (London: University College London Press, 1995), 4.

a British suffragist, wrote, “can we ever forget those men who stood by us in those first days, when we were not victors, but outcasts?”<sup>4</sup> British suffragists considered American men to be more progressive than British men because of their willingness to hear women’s demands for suffrage. In *Woman Suffrage in America*, Ethel Snowden wrote, “the men [in America] are in the majority,” and “women are treated with greater courtesy and consideration . . . than in this country.”<sup>5</sup> When Sylvia Pankhurst traveled to America in 1911, she spoke before the Iowa state legislature. This event was rare for British suffragists, for women were unable to attend sessions of Parliament and were often ignored by many of their own political leaders. *Common Cause* rejoiced that Pankhurst had received “a tremendous ovation from a packed [male] audience.”<sup>6</sup> But British suffragists failed to recognize an inherent contradiction of American politics that allowed women as petitioners, while preventing them from being voters. British women did not have even this ambiguous standing as citizens, which led them to perceive a progressive attitude among American men that was more about upholding a tradition of women as partners in the political process than a true desire for women’s equal participation.<sup>7</sup>

British suffragists portrayed American masculinity in the tall, slender, and imposing icon of Uncle Sam. British suffrage periodicals ran political cartoons that contrasted Uncle Sam with the rotund, short, and stodgy image of John Bull, the icon of the British nation. This was an attempt to show America as a young, progressive nation and Great Britain as an old country attached to its masculinist ways. In August 1909, *Votes for Women* ran a headline featuring Uncle Sam and John Bull standing outside a schoolhouse. In the illustration, John Bull pulls a struggling Lloyd George, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, towards the schoolhouse door, demonstrating that Lloyd George is dragging his feet on the issue of suffrage. John Bull says to Uncle Sam, who is watching the scene with amusement, “I shall be obliged, if you will knock a little sense into his head. He is too stupid or too obstinate to learn constitutional history.”<sup>8</sup>

In another cartoon, Uncle Sam graciously bestows the right to vote to a California woman and says, “I have the greatest pleasure in handing you this small token of my esteem and respect.” Once more, John Bull watches from the background, remarking, “I shall have to hurry up and enfranchise the women of my country or I shall get left behind.”<sup>9</sup> In 1914, *Votes for Women* celebrated the passing of suffrage in Illinois with a cartoon of a community fair, featuring a woman wearing the label “Illinois Voter,” successfully shooting down excuses against women’s

---

<sup>4</sup> Olive Walton, Personal Scrapbook, Suffragette Fellowship Collection.

<sup>5</sup> Ethel Snowden, *Woman Suffrage in America*, 1909, Suffragette Fellowship Collection.

<sup>6</sup> “Foreign News: United States,” *Common Cause*, March 9, 1911.

<sup>7</sup> Stansell, *The Feminist Promise*, 13.

<sup>8</sup> “Entirely Political,” *Votes for Women*, Aug. 9, 1909.

<sup>9</sup> “The Victory in California,” *Votes for Women*, Oct. 20, 1911.

suffrage. Uncle Sam watches on the sidelines with a proud smile and the caption reads “Illinois Women Shoot Straight.” In all cases, Uncle Sam illustrates the lack of support from British lawmakers. As a result, America was viewed as a nation of open-minded men who resembled the “new woman” of the century, but in reality, American men were considerably more conservative than British men on issues of race. American men were more inclined to vote for women’s suffrage to prevent non-whites from voting. American men were also concerned with immigration, so granting white women the right to vote was a pragmatic rather than an idealistic solution because white women in combination with white male voters were able to prevent immigrants and other ethnic groups from voting.<sup>10</sup>

British suffragists recognized that the Men’s League for Women’s Suffrage (MLWS) was a necessary partner in the American suffrage campaign. Originally a British organization, the MLWS brought with it the hope that “men could be feminists, too” and would provide aide to the growing movement in the United States.<sup>11</sup> “An event to be welcomed with joy in Britain as well as in America,” stated *Common Cause* on 27 January 1910, “is the recent formation of a Men’s League for Women’s Suffrage of the State of New York.”<sup>12</sup> Two months later, *Common Cause* reported that a Massachusetts’ MLWS had been formed, “for the same purpose [as the] New York [organization].”<sup>13</sup> British suffragists found the support given by men on both sides of the Atlantic to be worthwhile, even if those men advocated for women’s suffrage on the basis of a chivalric “misogyny.”<sup>14</sup>

British suffragists closely monitored prominent American men who advocated for women’s suffrage. One example is Theodore Roosevelt, who left the Republican Party to form the new Progressive Party. *Votes for Women* ran a headline article entitled, “U.S. Progressive Party and Woman Suffrage,” which included an explanation of the party platform on woman suffrage. Sylvia Pankhurst wrote, “We must always hope that the new Progressive Party may be worth the trust of [women].”<sup>15</sup> Israel Zangwill, an MLWS member, remarked that “no one could accuse Mr. Roosevelt of not being a manly man; . . . members of the Men’s League . . . could no longer be called effeminate.”<sup>16</sup>

Other men were equally outspoken for suffrage. George Creel served as an officer for the MLWS in New York, and was described as having a unique “ability [to] assure the success of the work.”<sup>17</sup> Creel wrote articles that British suffragists routinely used as an example of American male support, such as “What Women

<sup>10</sup> “Illinois Women Aim Straight,” *Votes for Women*, April 17, 1914; Bolt, *Feminist Ferment*, 70.

<sup>11</sup> “Men Support the Woman Suffrage Movement,” National Women’s History Museum, <http://www.nwhm.org/online-exhibits/rightsforwomen/menforsuffrage.html>; Stansell, *The Feminist Promise*, 162.

<sup>12</sup> “Foreign News: United States,” *Common Cause*, Jan. 27, 1910.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, March 10, 1910.

<sup>14</sup> Bolt, *Feminist Ferment*, 66.

<sup>15</sup> Pankhurst, “U.S. Progressive Party and Woman Suffrage,” *Votes for Women*, Sept. 20, 1912.

<sup>16</sup> Men’s League for Women’s Suffrage, *More Light on the Woman Question: A Record of the First Congress of the Men’s International Alliance for Women’s Suffrage*, 23-29 October 1912, Suffragette Fellowship Collection.

<sup>17</sup> Letter to James Hackett,” 23 April 1915, Women’s Studies Manuscript Collection.

Have Done in Colorado,” which conveyed how women’s suffrage benefited the state of Colorado after women had received the vote. Ben Lindsey, a former judge from Colorado, was also considered an excellent spokesman for suffrage as he had served in a long-standing suffrage state. “Colorado, better, perhaps, than any other State,” wrote Lindsey, “affords an opportunity for [women to succeed].”<sup>18</sup> Supporters like Roosevelt, Creel, and Lindsey reinforced the perceptions British suffragists had about American men, and their examples were used to “emphasize the difference between the way in which women were treated in America and in England.”<sup>19</sup>

British suffragists failed to recognize how much of the male support of suffrage was connected to a national anxiety surrounding “the erosion of [America’s] exceptionalism.” In several suffrage states, white women were given the vote to prevent minority groups from becoming a big enough voting bloc to overrule the native-born white male majority. They gave very little attention to the South, where the suffrage debate centered on issues of white supremacy and voting rights for African American women. The National American Women Suffrage Association (NAWSA) allowed their southern chapters to actively discriminate against African American women to gain support amongst segregationist men. Unlike Britain, race rather than class was the dividing line in American society.<sup>20</sup>

### **Political Opportunity Structure of the United States**

British suffragists believed that the political structure of American government afforded American suffragists with greater opportunities to further the cause of enfranchisement for women. In 1909, the International Woman Suffrage Alliance published “Suffrage in Many Lands.” This pamphlet gave particular attention to the movement in America, “for its germs lay in the Declaration of Independence.”<sup>21</sup> Constitutionalists and militants had drastically different interpretations of the American political system. Millicent Garrett Fawcett, head of the NUWSS, once stated that the United States Constitution was the “most conservative” in the world, because it took an extensive period of time to get any legislation passed.<sup>22</sup> Many constitutionalists shared her opinion and dismayed at the “grave difficulty in altering the [Constitution].”<sup>23</sup> They believed the most pragmatic way to achieve suffrage gains was through the state campaigns. In contrast, militants viewed the American government as “favorable to women, acknowledging and protecting their rights far more than in any European country.”<sup>24</sup> Militant suffragists in Britain

---

<sup>18</sup> George Creel and Ben Lindsey, “What Women Have Done in Colorado,” *Votes for Women*, Sept. 15, 1911.

<sup>19</sup> Harrison, *Connecting Links*, 182.

<sup>20</sup> Bolt, *Feminist Ferment*, 26, 29, 26.

<sup>21</sup> Alice Zimmern, *Women’s Suffrage in Many Lands*, 1909, Suffragette Fellowship Collection, Microfilm.

<sup>22</sup> Lucy Dunlap, *The Feminist Avant-Garde: Transatlantic Encounters of the Early Twentieth Century* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 69.

<sup>23</sup> “Foreign News: United States,” *Common Cause*, July 24, 1914.

<sup>24</sup> Constance Elizabeth Maud, “Mrs. Ward Howe: A Veteran Suffragist,” *Votes for Women*, March 11, 1910.

attributed the success of American suffragists to the entire political structure, which they believed contributed to the “wonderful energy of the American nation” and allowed for greater acceptance of reform.<sup>25</sup>

However, it was the state suffrage campaign that drew the most attention, for this was a format of representative democracy that was the most foreign to British suffragists. *Votes for Women* once referred to the United States as “that strange conglomeration of States.”<sup>26</sup> For the British suffragists, there was nothing in Britain to compare with American states. For them, the major issue was how to convert localized support “into a specific bill that a government would allow to pass.”<sup>27</sup> In contrast, American women had an additional opportunity to gain suffrage rights through state ratification. The complexity of American government produced a divide between supporters of state ratification and a federal amendment. This was not a new debate in the American suffrage movement, but it took a particular potency after 1890 with the merging of the National Woman Suffrage Association and the American Woman Suffrage Association into a single organization.<sup>28</sup>

For the most part, British suffragists were more supportive of the state campaign than the federal campaign because of their own lack of success in persuading Parliament to enact a law for the United Kingdom. They were also supportive because they had seen the success of a gradual approach to enfranchisement in the colonies that became the states of the new Commonwealth of Australia in 1901. In 1910, Washington became the first American state in fourteen years to grant women’s suffrage, followed in quick succession by eight more states in four years.<sup>29</sup> British suffragists viewed these successful campaigns as victories for their own country, where the Liberal government “refused to receive women on the question of suffrage.”<sup>30</sup>

One of the many ways that British suffragists monitored the progress of the state campaign was through a map of America entitled “Map of the Suffrage States.” Each time a new state enfranchised women, British suffrage periodicals would publish an updated map showing the progression of suffrage in America. In 1912, *Votes for Women* ran the map under the headline “Victory!” stating, “there is now a continuous chain of enfranchised States reaching north and south from Canada to the Gulf of Mexico, and east and west from the Missouri River to the Pacific Ocean.”<sup>31</sup> In 1913, *Votes for Women* ran the same map under the headline

---

<sup>25</sup> “The Biggest Nation in the World,” *Votes for Women*, June 2, 1911.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>27</sup> Smith, *The British Women’s Suffrage Campaign, 1866-1928*, 16.

<sup>28</sup> Harrison, *Connecting Links*, 32.

<sup>29</sup> Caroline Daley and Melanie Nolan, *Suffrage and Beyond: International Feminist Perspectives* (New York: New York University Press, 1994), 394-396.

<sup>30</sup> Harrison, *Connecting Links*, 129.

<sup>31</sup> “Map of the Suffrage States,” *Votes for Women*, Nov. 22, 1912.

“Real Democracy in U.S.A.,” this time with question marks and dates listed by states where suffrage campaigns were being debated.<sup>32</sup> In 1914, *The Suffragette* published the suffrage map with an article, “Votes for Women in America,” about the growing progress of women’s suffrage.<sup>33</sup> “There is no doubt that the law of votes for women will soon run throughout the whole of the territory of the United States,” stated *Votes for Women*.<sup>34</sup> As a result, Militant suffragists were more drawn to the state campaign than constitutionalists because they viewed it as a unique alternative for American women suffragists, one that was unavailable to them in Britain.

British suffragists perceptions of the state campaign were not always accurate. Even as British suffragists triumphed over the support of American lawmakers like William Borah, who believed women’s participation in the voting process was “for the benefit of politics and society,” they failed to completely grasp the reality behind the decision to enfranchise women.<sup>35</sup> Women’s suffrage in western America was a matter of practicality born out of fears surrounding racial inclusion, the spread of polygamy, and political expediency. In many western states, men outnumbered women and, therefore, women were enfranchised because they were not viewed as enough of a political threat to outvote the men who lived in those areas. Furthermore, British suffragists did not realize that enfranchising women in the West was part of a larger campaign to relieve the “surplus” population of women in the East and encourage women to move West, where the male to female ration was overwhelmingly male. This phenomenon continued several decades following the American Civil War.<sup>36</sup>

British suffragists were not completely ignorant of the state campaigns or the political structure of American government. *Common Cause*, *Votes for Women*, and *The Suffragette* all watched the debate in America that played out in headlines such as “Alaska Enfranchises Women,” “The Campaign in California,” and “News Abroad: Illinois.”<sup>37</sup> The papers published news articles about the establishment of suffrage committees, passing of referendums, and explanations of the American legislative process, all of which were common reading material of the British suffragists. The British suffragists also monitored the impact that enfranchisement had on the suffrage states. Alva Adams wrote, “Colorado has no regrets for having given woman what belongs to her.”<sup>38</sup> Ethel Mobray Dowsen followed suit in 1913

---

<sup>32</sup> “Victory,” *Votes for Women*, Nov. 22, 1912.

<sup>33</sup> “Real Democracy in U.S.A.,” *Votes for Women*, June 30, 1913.

<sup>34</sup> “Votes for Women in America,” *The Suffragette*, April 3, 1914.

<sup>35</sup> “Idaho and Women’s Votes,” *Votes for Women*, Oct. 7, 1910.

<sup>36</sup> Beverly Beeton, “How the West Was Won for Woman Suffrage,” in *One Woman, One Vote: Rediscovering the Woman Suffrage Movement*, ed. Marjorie Spruill Wheeler (Troutdale: New Sage Press, 1995), 99, 103.

<sup>37</sup> “Alaska Enfranchises Women,” *Votes for Women*, March 28, 1913; “The Campaign in California,” *Votes for Women*, Sept. 29, 1911; “News From Abroad: Illinois,” *Common Cause*, Jan. 9, 1914.

<sup>38</sup> Alva Adams, “Foreign News: America,” *Common Cause*, May 20, 1909.

with “What Women Have Done with the Vote in California” published in *Common Cause*. “Although Californian women have only been enfranchised about twenty months,” stated Dowsen, “they have already accomplished much. Men have been quick to recognize the power of the women’s vote.”<sup>39</sup> These articles are evidence that British suffragists believed that American women’s demands for state suffrage provided for “women all over the world a voice and influence in the government of their own lands.”<sup>40</sup>

British suffragists did not monitor the federal level of American government to the same extent as the state campaigns, but they did have opinions on the effort to gain a federal suffrage amendment added to the United States Constitution. In a speech to NAWSA, Emmeline Pankhurst remarked, “it seems strange to me, that it should be necessary to have an amendment to your Constitution at all to admit women to citizenship. It seems to me that it is imbedded in the Constitution itself.”<sup>41</sup> Stated *Common Cause* in 1913, “decisions on the Suffrage claim must rest with the States.”<sup>42</sup> Regardless of the fact that the attempts for a federal amendment were repeatedly unsuccessful, British suffrage periodicals continued to monitor the occasional action taken in Congress regarding women’s suffrage, for “the debate was even more remarkable in some ways than the vote.”<sup>43</sup> For British suffragists, the endless struggles to gain a federal amendment to the United States Constitution were all too reminiscent of their own attempts to gain national enfranchisement from Parliament. British suffragists saw the American federal leaders’ attitudes to be mirror images of the leaders in their own country. Because of their own experiences with failed efforts to secure a broad-reaching suffrage law, British suffragists believed a federal amendment to the United States Constitution would be unsuccessful and were more optimistic about the state campaigns.

### **The Militancy Debate in America**

From 1900 to 1914, American suffragists had only one main organization to serve as the guiding force of the movement. NAWSA was formed out of the ashes of a Reconstruction-era feud that split suffragists on the issue of voting rights for African American men. As a result, the American movement was considered unified in leadership, purpose, and action. However, NAWSA President Carrie Chapman Catt saw an opportunity for renewing the federal suffrage amendment and asked Alice Paul and Lucy Burns to chair the Congressional Committee. British suffragists were no strangers to Paul and Burns.<sup>44</sup> In 1909, *Votes for Women* ran the following by-lines about their activism in London, “Miss Lucy Burns, who has always been a believer in Woman Suffrage, became connected with the

<sup>39</sup> Ethel Mobray Dowsen, “What Women Have Done with the Vote in California,” *Common Cause*, July 19, 1913.

<sup>40</sup> Alice Zimmern, *Women’s Suffrage in Many Lands*. Suffragette Fellowship Collection.

<sup>41</sup> “Speech of Mrs. Emmeline Pankhurst,” 23 November 1913, National Woman’s Party Collection, Microfilm.

<sup>42</sup> “Suffrage in Foreign Countries in 1912,” *Common Cause*, Jan. 17, 1913.

<sup>43</sup> “News from Abroad: United States,” *Common Cause*, April 17, 1914.

<sup>44</sup> Stansell, *The Feminist Promise*, 91.

movement during a visit to London a year ago. . . . Miss Alice Paul was struck by the contrast between the academic interest in Woman's Suffrage in America and the living character of the movement here."<sup>45</sup> Paul and Burns advocated for a change in policy from one of compliance to one of mild militancy. Paul believed that with militancy, "the slow and tedious process of winning the vote . . . could be shortened by the direct cut of federal action."<sup>46</sup> While constitutionalists were reserved in their opinions of NAWSA's platform shift, militants jumped at the opportunity to demonstrate their influence on the American movement. Emmeline Pankhurst stated, "whatever helps [British women] is going to help women all over the world."<sup>47</sup> American suffragists aligned with Paul and Burns wrote to militant British suffragists claiming, "you have taught us what women might dare to do."<sup>48</sup> However, not all American suffragists believed in militancy. Alice Stone Blackwell, daughter of nineteenth century suffragists Lucy Stone and Henry Blackwell, wrote, "American suffragists regret some of the forms that [the militants'] indignation takes."<sup>49</sup> Blackwell was not alone. Several American suffragists spoke against militancy, which initiated a tense period of transatlantic observation between the American and British movements.<sup>50</sup>

Yet even militant British suffragists agreed that there was little need for militancy in America. This was mostly due to their belief that universal suffrage was built into the Constitution. "Americans happily," stated *Votes for Women*, "have not that strange fear of freedom which still holds in its grip large masses of opinions in this country."<sup>51</sup> *The Suffragette* also acknowledged that militancy was an unnecessary component of American suffrage, but there was no doubt America had benefited from British militancy, for "the United States may boast of her subjects not having to resort to such extreme measures as those of the militant Suffragettes, but the fact is much of [their] progress [has been] caused by the fight."<sup>52</sup> Emmeline Pankhurst remarked that "the best way to distinguish me from Miss Paul: . . . I am militant, Miss Paul is not – so far."<sup>53</sup> In the minds of British suffragists, American militancy in the style organized by Paul and Burns was not true militancy as practiced in Britain. "Were I a woman in America," proclaimed a British suffragist to *Votes for Women*, "I would surely be in the movement, but like most of American women in the movement I would refrain from militancy."<sup>54</sup>

---

<sup>45</sup> "The Arrests," *Votes for Women*, July 2, 1909.

<sup>46</sup> "Miss Alice Paul's Release," *Votes for Women*, Oct. 22, 1909.

<sup>47</sup> National Council of U.S.A. Women Voters, "Common Cause," September 5, 1913; Emmeline Pankhurst, "Why We Are Militant," A Speech Delivered in New York, October 21, 1913, 15, published in *Connecting Links* by Patricia Harrison, 196.

<sup>48</sup> "Our Debt to the Militant Women: A Message from America," *The Suffragette*, April 17, 1914.

<sup>49</sup> Alice Stone Blackwell, "Woman Suffrage in America," *Votes for Women*, Feb. 28, 1913.

<sup>50</sup> Suffragists associated with the National American Woman Suffrage Association tended to frown upon militancy whereas those associated with the National Woman's Party were more supportive.

<sup>51</sup> "The Most Significant Thing," *Votes for Women*, March 6, 1914.

<sup>52</sup> "Militancy in America," *The Suffragette*, May 8, 1914.

<sup>53</sup> Harrison, *Connecting Links*, 196.

<sup>54</sup> "American Impressions: How the Woman's Movement is Understood," *Votes for Women*, Feb. 10, 1911.



## Conclusion

From 1900 to 1914, the British and American suffrage movements engaged in a wide-ranging observation of each other's actions and achievements. In coverage and commentary on events and campaigns in the U.S., British suffragists continuously revealed their perceptions of America and American suffragists. Newspapers produced by British suffragists provide a glimpse into how they viewed their American sisters. In *Common Cause*, *Votes for Women*, and *The Suffragette*, historians can see what British suffragists found to be important about the American movement, how well they understood the events taking place in America, the blind spots they had in regard to the movement, and to what extent the British placed their own internal values on the American movement.

In an episode from the third season of the television docudrama *Downton Abbey*, the transatlantic connection between British and American suffragists continues to play out for contemporary audiences on both sides of the Atlantic Ocean. Lord Grantham, a British aristocrat portrayed by Hugh Bonneville, his suffragist daughter, Edith, and his heir, Matthew, discuss the American suffragist movement at the breakfast table:

Lord Grantham: Tennessee is going to ratify the Nineteenth Amendment.

Matthew: Meaning –

Lord Grantham: All American women will have the vote.

Edith: Which is more than they do here.<sup>55</sup>

Edith is a character representative of the transatlantic observation between British and American suffragists. In the end, British women would gain a suffrage victory before American women. In 1918, women over thirty won suffrage rights. Two years later, in 1920, British suffragists would watch as their American sisters gained full enfranchisement, something their own movement would not achieve for another eight years.

---

<sup>55</sup> *Downton Abbey*, season 3, episode 4, "Part Four," directed by Andy Goddard, DVD.



# Spy Games: German Sabotage and Espionage in the United States, 1914-1916

Tracie Provost  
Middle Georgia State University

Although the United States and Germany did not enter a state of belligerence until April of 1917, Imperial Germany waged an unofficial war on American soil beginning as early as 1914. Soon after the guns of August began their hideous cacophony, Germany began receiving reports that while America professed to be neutral, its attitude and actions showed favoritism toward Britain and France. America was in essence supplying the Allied war machine. German reservists and others returning from America urged the German government to take action against the factories producing war materiel.<sup>1</sup>

While the German political authorities were wary of political complications that might arise from sabotage attacks, the military had no such qualms. In their minds they were fighting a war that had to be won and America's professed neutrality was a detail that could be ignored. The fact that the allies were prepaying for their war materiel helped calm any moral qualms. It was already allied property even if it was still in the US.<sup>2</sup> The German government in Berlin telegraphed direct orders to its embassy in Washington, D.C. on 24 January 1915, to initiate clandestine activities.

For Military Attaché: People fit for sabotage in the United States and Canada can be ascertained from the following persons: 1) Joseph MacGarrity, 5412 Springfield, Philadelphia, Pa.; 2) John P. Keating, Maryland Avenue, Chicago; 3) Jeremiah O'Leary, 16 Park Row, New York.

No. 1 and 2 absolutely reliable and discreet, No. 3. Reliable but not always discreet. Persons have been named by sir Roger Casement. In United States sabotage can reach all kinds of factories for war deliveries; railroad, dams, bridges must not be touched there. Under no circumstances compromise Embassy, and equally Irish-German propaganda.

-Acting General Staff

(Sgd.)

Nadolny<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Mixed Claims Commission, United States and Germany, *Before the Mixed Claims Commission United States and Germany. Organized under the Agreement of August 10, 1922 between the United States and Germany. The United States on behalf of Lehigh Valley Railroad Company, Agency of Canadian Car and Foundry Company, limited, American Underwriters, et al., v. Germany. Oral Arguments April 1929*, (N.P.: Washington, 1932), 48 (hereafter *Oral Arguments April 1929*).

<sup>2</sup> *Oral Arguments April 1929*, 77-78.

<sup>3</sup> Mixed Claims Commission, United States and Germany, *Opinions and Decisions in the Sabotage Claims Handed Down June 15, 1939 and October 30, 1939, and Appendix*, (Washington, D.C.: US Gov't. Print office, 1940), 25 (hereafter *Mixed Claims 1939*).

The first sabotage incidents did not target the U.S., they were merely launched from America. The German Government admitted after the war that they had used the United States as a convenient base to plan and execute sabotage expeditions against Canada. Later acts of sabotage, specifically the arson of the Black Tom Terminal and the Kingsland Munition Plant, damaged not only U.S. property but took American lives. Despite intercepted telegrams and incriminating documents confiscated by the British and Americans, as well as the confessions of several German agents, the German government denied many of these activities until the Second World War. Captain Rudolf Nadolny was the Chief of the Liaison office between the political section of the Oberste Heeresleitung (OHL)<sup>4</sup> and the Foreign Office and sent the order to commence sabotage activity. Major Hans Maguerre, head of the Political Section of the OHL admitted in 1930 that he had sent agents to America with the commission of stopping US war material production. Marguerre, however, claimed that these agents were only to act if the US become a belligerent.<sup>5</sup>

When the first World War ended, America and Germany signed the Treaty of Berlin. Among other things, this document called for the creation of a Mixed Claims Commission to be established for the purpose of settling legal claims between the two nations. Among these claims were the so called sabotage cases involving the explosions at Black Tom and Kingsland. These cases were originally heard between 1927 and 1929. After an initial ruling in favor of Germany, new evidence and charges of witness and evidence tampering came to light. These cases dragged on for another ten years, periodically being reheard with new evidence until final judgements were handed down in June and October of 1939 in favor of the United States.<sup>6</sup>

Germany faced serious problems in following this sabotage directive. America had never been considered especially important either diplomatically or militarily by the Germans. Thus there were very few intelligence operatives in place on the eve of the First World War. Those who were stationed in the US worked independently of one another and no overarching structure was in place. Because Germany had no active spy network in the U.S. as of 1914, one had to be created from the ground up. One spy ring operated out of the embassy in Washington. On the East Coast the naval attaché Karl Boy-Ed directed shipboard sabotage on munitions transports to the Allies, military attaché Franz von Papen also directed spies and sabotage agents in the U. S. and Canada, and commercial attaché Dr. Heinrich Albert raised money and tried to buy as much war material as possible. It is unclear what role German Ambassador Graff von Bernsdorff played in the espionage activities. He

---

<sup>4</sup> German military high command.

<sup>5</sup> Memo re: German Exhibit CXXIII, being a translation containing 35 pages of a transcript of the Examination of Hans Marguerre taken in Berlin July 30 and August 1, 1930, file 5, p. 2; Memorandum File of The American Agent's Council, M.M. Martin, 1929; Records relating to sabotage Claims filed with the Commission; International Claims Commission Records relating to the claims against the Central Powers, Mixed Claims Commission, U.S. and Germany, 1922-1929, Record Group 76, National Archives College Park, College Park, Md.

<sup>6</sup> *Mixed Claims 1939*, 1-15.

authorized the distribution of false passports, even justifying the activity in his memoirs but steadfastly denied participation in any sabotage activity. West Coast operations were conducted by Franz von Bopp, the German Consul General in San Francisco.<sup>7</sup> These men were also in charge of fomenting indigenous uprisings in India from the U.S., and passport falsification. A second cell of saboteurs and spies was established by Captain Franz von Rintelen. Attached to the German Admiralty in 1914 Rintelin was injected into America in 1915 and worked under direct orders from the OHL. His network dabbled in various areas, including organizing workers' strikes, manufacturing cigar bombs, and tying up raw materials used in manufacturing ammunition. His presence was resented by the embassy group, who viewed him as an interloper. Even after Rintelen's recall by German officials, the network he developed continued its sabotage work and expanded it to the demolition of numerous buildings and piers as well as Black Tom Depot and the Kingsland Munition plant.<sup>8</sup>

The spy ring based out of the German Embassy in Washington had to walk a very fine line of legality. While they did enjoy diplomatic immunity, taking overt action against the US could cause a declaration of *persona non grata* and expulsion from the country. Yet they had been tasked sending reservists safely back to Germany and stanching the flow of war materiel to the Allies. Bernstorff was shielded from as much of this activity as possible. The responsibility for these actions accordingly fell to the military and naval attachés as well as the privy councillor. To complete their missions Papen, Boy-Ed, and Albert often operated in a hazy grey area between strictly legal and strictly illegal.<sup>9</sup>

In the summer of 1914 when the nations of Europe went to war, thousands of German army reservists lived in the U.S.. Once British ships blockaded the European continent, these men had no safe way to report back to Germany for duty. The British blocked all shipping to Germany and detained belligerent nationals. To circumvent this problem, the German Embassy set up a network to buy and then alter neutral passports to be given to returning military reservists. Franz von Papen and Karl Boy-Ed contacted a well-connected New York lawyer, Hans von Wedell, to assist in procuring the passports. It soon became clear that it would not be possible to inconspicuously obtain enough neutral passports and they concentrated on assisting only officers back to Germany.<sup>10</sup> "In consequence of the instruction sent to me [Bernstorff] by private letter from the [?] and officially to

---

<sup>7</sup> Henry Landau, *The Enemy Within; the Inside Story of German Sabotage in America*, by Captain Henry Landau, profusely Illustrated with Photographs and Photostatic Copies of Original Documents (New York: G.P. Putnam and Sons, 1937), 4-5, 23.

<sup>8</sup> Franz von Rintelen, *The Dark Invader; Reminiscences of a German Naval Officer* (Hammondsworth Middlesex, England: Penguin Books, Ltd., 1938), 81, 129-131.

<sup>9</sup> Landau, 15.

<sup>10</sup> Franz von Papen, *Memoirs*, trans. Brian Connell (New York: E.P. Dutton and Company, 1953), 35.

Herr Papen to send home the largest number of German officers, it was necessary to furnish the latter with false passports.”<sup>11</sup>

Unlike those who worked out of the embassy, Germany’s other ringleader did not enjoy diplomatic immunity and took a far more active role in the discharge of his orders. Captain Franz von Rintelen was attached to the Admiralty Staff in Germany at the outbreak of the war. Previous to this he was director of the Deutsches Bank in Germany. Having spent several years in New York working for the banking firm of Landerburg, Thalmann and Co., he was a member of the New York Yacht Club and mingled with the Newport and Fifth Avenue social circles.<sup>12</sup> Because of his extensive contacts in America, Rintelen was chosen to travel to the U.S. with half a million dollars to prevent powder and ammunition shipments to the Allied Governments. His orders were to “bomb, burn, and destroy.”<sup>13</sup> To avoid the British blockade, the German agent procured the neutral Swiss passport of Emile V. Gaché. This enabled him to arrive in New York Harbor unmolested.<sup>14</sup>

After disembarking on 3 April 1915 in the U.S., Rintelen’s first assignment was to contact Malvin Rice, a shareholder and board member of the Dupont de Nemours Powder Company. Rice had demonstrated pro-German sympathies by offering his services to Germany and the Imperial government hoped that he would assist Rintelen in his quest to buy powder and ammunition. Rice did not rendezvous with Rintelen however and the German agent was left to his own devices.<sup>15</sup>

Rintelen set about completing his mission to prevent American-made shells from reaching Europe. With the Dupont route closed to him, the agent presented himself to several other firms hoping to buy powder, thus denying it to the allies. He soon found that it was impossible to acquire enough to make a difference. “Daily production was so great that if I bought up the market on Tuesday there would have been an enormous fresh supply on Wednesday.”<sup>16</sup> Understanding that he could not buy enough finished product, Rintelen decided to play havoc with Allied supply. The firm of E.V. Gibbons was formed by Rintelen and began procuring orders for armaments from Allied nations. Through the use of one of his many connections, Rintelen, under the guise of E.V. Gibbons, was introduced to the Russian military attaché colonel Count Ignatieff. After gaining his confidence through the ruse of owning an import-export firm needing advice on fine claret, Rintelen proposed that the firm might be of some service to the Russian government. As the Russians needed all manner of military supplies, a well-established import-export firm could serve well as a clearinghouse for the material. Count Ignatieff referred “Gibbons”

---

<sup>11</sup> Cited in Landau, 15.

<sup>12</sup> John Price Jones, *America Entangled* (New York: A.C. Laut, 1917), 142.

<sup>13</sup> *Oral Arguments April 1929*, 70.

<sup>14</sup> Rintelen, 74.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, 81.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, 84.

to a Russian purchasing agent in New York. After considerable haggling and name dropping, E.V. Gibbons Inc. was awarded by the Russian purchasing agent orders for saddles, bridles, mules, horses, tinned meat, field kitchens, shoes, boots, underwear, gloves, and small arms ammunition.<sup>17</sup>

After the contracts were signed between Rintelen and the Russian Government, Rintelen used them to obtain three million dollars in advances from a local bank. The money was deposited in a secret account at another bank. Part of the order was rushed and within two weeks, the tinned meat and small arms ammunition was loaded onto a steamer in New York Harbor along with thirty cigar bombs. Within days at sea the *S.S. Pheobus* had caught fire and the crew was forced to abandon it. Rintelen again promised to obtain the needed supplies at the Russians pleadings. He did so, loading two ships bound for Russia. These ships met the same fate as the first when cigar bombs placed in their holds ignited. There were further mishaps, including two ammunition-laden barges keeling over in New York Harbor. The Russians then demanded the delivery of the other consigned goods. Rintelen put them off for as long as possible, citing transportation problems, workers strikes, and scarcity of raw material, and then finally informed the Russian agents that the goods would not be delivered. E.V. Gibbons Inc. was dissolved before the Russians could take legal action.<sup>18</sup>

As well as sabotaging the E.V. Gibbons Inc. shipping, Rintelen conspired to prevent other shipments from reaching their destinations. Soon after E.V. Gibbons Inc. set up shop, Dr. Walter Scheele introduced himself to Rintelen. Scheele had developed a time-detonated bomb. A hollow lead tube about the size of a cigar was split into two chambers by a copper disk. One chamber was filled with chloride of potash and the other with sulfuric acid. The acids would eat through the copper disk, combine, and ignite. The detonation was regulated by the thickness or thinness of the copper disk.<sup>19</sup>

Rintelen bought this technology from Scheele and set about manufacturing these bombs. He did not want them made on U.S. territory. This problem was surmounted by the presence of German ships interned in American harbors, ships full of German sailors and officers sitting idle. The ship *Friedrich der Grosse* was chosen for the production site. Rintelen provided the lead pipe purchased through E.V. Gibbons Inc.<sup>20</sup> Under the cover of night, the pipe was cut to size and fit with the copper disk by the crew of *Friedrich der Grosse*. From there the bomb castings were transported to Dr. Scheele's laboratory by Ernest Becker, the chief electrician

---

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, 125.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, 129-131.

<sup>19</sup> *Mixed Claims Commission 1939*, 92.

<sup>20</sup> Rintelen, 107.

of the *Friedrich der Grosse*, where they were filled with acid. Once complete, the bombs were distributed to Irish dock workers to be placed on outgoing ships.<sup>21</sup>

The workers found it easy to place the bombs among the crates when they loaded the ships. "Our dockers had of course only put the detonators in the holds which contained no munitions, for we had no intention of blowing up the ship from neutral territory. If we had wished to do so we could have used different means, but we achieved our purpose without cost of human life."<sup>22</sup> Rintelen watched the newspapers for word of the ships' sinking. In many cases fires broke out and the hulls were flooded, rendering the cargoes worthless, but about half the time the ships made it safely to their destinations.<sup>23</sup>

Rintelen's activities were not confined to New York. When Captain Erich von Steinmetz arrived from Vladivostok shortly after the outbreak of the war, dressed as a woman, he was sent to New Orleans to begin sabotage activities there. With the help of E.J. Conners, this cell was effective and well hidden.<sup>24</sup> Rintelen also expanded his activities to Baltimore. Here he contacted Paul Hilken, the son of the German council in Baltimore. Hilken was a representative of the North German Lloyd Line in Baltimore and he became the paymaster for this operation. He introduced Rintelen to Fredrich Hinsch, the captain of the *S.S. Neckar*, which was a North German Lloyd ship interned in Baltimore Harbor. Hinsch had numerous contacts among the dockworkers and he soon recruited a fair sized band to place cigar bombs on ships in Baltimore Harbor. Hinsch also used this group to start fires with "dumplings." These were fast working devices about the size of an egg filled with acid and producing a hot flame. The dumplings were put around wheat and cotton on the docks and in warehouses. Numerous fires including No. 9 Pier in Baltimore, the 13 June 1916 elevator fires at Canton, and one fire in Norfolk were ignited in this manner.<sup>25</sup>

Boy-Ed contacted Rintelen in August 1915 and informed him that Berlin was recalling him. Rintelen had to wind up his affairs quickly, leaving them in the hands of Boniface, Hilken, Hinsch, and Steinmetz. Using the same passport he had used to enter the United States, Rintelen sailed for Germany aboard the Holland-America Lines *Noordam*. Just off the coast of England he was removed from his ship by the British Navy. The German agent was detained for several days. On 13 August 1915, Rintelen was allowed to re-board the ship only to be taken off again. This time he was transported to Scotland Yard. Again it looked like he might be released but he now knew that the American government wanted him for his sabotage activity. Rintelen realized that at any moment the British were going to

---

<sup>21</sup> Thomas Tunney, *Throttled! The Detection of the German and Anarchist Bomb Plotters*, by Thomas J. Tunney . . . as told to Paul Merrik Hollister (Boston: Small, Maynard and Company, 1919), 162.

<sup>22</sup> Rintelen, 121.

<sup>23</sup> Tunney, 128,157; Jones, 159.

<sup>24</sup> Landau, 46-47.

<sup>25</sup> *Mixed Claims Commission 1939*, 102.



find out exactly who he was, so he turned himself in as a prisoner of war to Admiral Sir Reginald “Blinker” Hull, Chief of British Naval Intelligence. By doing this he hoped to avoid extradition to the U.S. But as soon as America declared war on Germany, Rintelen was returned to the States to stand trial. He was tried under the Sherman Act and imprisoned until 1921.<sup>26</sup>

Rintelen’s departure did not in any way slow the German saboteurs. The enterprise in Baltimore was left in the capable hands of Paul Hilken who also acted as paymaster for all North American agents. In February of 1916, Hilken traveled to Berlin for a meeting with Major Hans Marguerre and Rudolph Nadolny, liaison officer from the German Foreign Office to the OHL. Also present were Fredrich Herrmann and Dr. Anton Dilger, both Americans of German descent who engaged in espionage activities. Hilken was instructed at this briefing to continue the sabotage work and administering payment to the German operatives, and he was given the legitimate job of overseeing u-boat service.<sup>27</sup> Nadolny and Maguerre authorized strikes in the U.S. and suggested the Niagra Falls Power Plant in Canada and the Tampico Oil Fields in Mexico as possible sabotage targets.<sup>28</sup>

While Rintelen was still in the United States he also dabbled unsuccessfully in inoculating horses and mules with glanders.<sup>29</sup> Before Erich von Steinmetz went to New Orleans he supervised this enterprise. Steinmetz had brought the glanders cultures with him from Vladivostok, Russia. After inoculating several shipments of cows, horses, and mules without success, the captain took the cultures to the Rockefeller Institute for testing. He was informed that all the cultures were dead.<sup>30</sup>

In Baltimore, Hinsch and his group began shipment tampering. With germs sent out of Germany with American Dr. Anton Dilger in 1915, his band began to inoculate cattle, mules, and horses bound for the Allies with anthrax and glanders. Working from a laboratory in Chevy Chase, Maryland known as “Tony’s Lab,” the germs were cultured by Dilger and forwarded to Hinsch or, if he was unavailable, Ahrendt in Baltimore.<sup>31</sup>

A group of fifteen to twenty black stevedores under J. Edward Felton carried out the actual inoculations. Glass bottles, stoppered with a needle-bearing cork, were distributed to men who traveled throughout the country. The anthrax and glanders was spread either by jabbing the animals with the stopper or spreading the germs

---

<sup>26</sup> Rintelen, 193-195, 286.

<sup>27</sup> The Germans had launched a commercial u-boat service to ferry goods between the U.S. and Germany.

<sup>28</sup> Mixed Claims Commission, United States and Germany, *Report of Robert W. Bonyngue, agent of the United States before the Mixed Claims Commission, United States and Germany*, (US Gov’t Print office, Washington, 1935), 188.

<sup>29</sup> Glanders is a highly contagious disease that attacks the nose and nasal passages in animals.

<sup>30</sup> Landau, 47.

<sup>31</sup> Memo re: Whereabouts of Anton Dilger as indicated in the record, 9/15, 32, file 4, pp. 2-3. Memorandum File of the American Agent’s Council, M. M. Martin, 1929; Records relating to sabotage Claims filed with the Commission; International Claims Commission Records relating to claims against the Central Powers, Mixed Claims Commission, U.S. and Germany, 1922-1924, Record group 76, National Archives College Park, College Park, Md.

in their feed and water.<sup>32</sup> Several of the stevedores came forward after the war and provided affidavits to their actions. George Turner and John Grant worked inoculating animals for over a year starting in late 1914 or early 1915. Both men also used “dumplings” and incendiary pencils to start fires in Baltimore, Norfolk, and Newport News.<sup>33</sup>

As the war progressed in Europe, Germany grew desperately short of war material. The cigar bombs and strikes stopped only a small amount of ammunition bound for the Allies. Therefore German agents, most likely Hinsch and Herrmann, drew up a daring plan to cripple East Coast munitions shipments. The New Jersey Terminal on Black Tom Island in New York Harbor offered the perfect spot for sabotage. While isolated in the harbor, this terminal had easy, unfenced, and unlit access from the mainland. More importantly it served as the key point for East Coast ammunition transport. Numerous piers and warehouses were connected by miles of railroad tracks. Barges carried munitions to ships waiting in the harbor. Millions of pounds of explosives moved through the depot every day.<sup>34</sup>

On the night of Saturday, 29 July 1916, three German saboteurs infiltrated the New Jersey Terminal. Lothar Witzke and Kurt Jahnke arrived by boat shortly before midnight. They brought with them time fuses, incendiary devices, and explosives provided by Herrmann and Hinsch. A third accomplice, Michael Kristoff, arrived by land. Together they set several small fires and timed explosive devices in boxcars containing TNT. More timed explosives and incendiary devices were placed on the barge Johnson 17, already laden with explosives and tied to the pier. The three men then left in the same manner in which they had arrived at Black Tom.<sup>35</sup>

A fire was noticed in one of the boxcars by a barge watchman shortly after midnight. When he was unable to find the watchman for the Lehigh Valley Railroad Company, the barge watchman put out the fire himself.<sup>36</sup> At 12:12 AM a second fire was spotted by Barton Scott on Pier 7. The fire already appeared to be out of control. The Lehigh Valley Railroad watchman stated, “The Fire had started in the center of a string of cars on shore near the land end of the pier. . . . I ran to a telephone and called for the yard engines to come and pull the other cars away, and within a few minutes after the discovery of the fire, shrapnel shells of the smaller caliber began to explode.”<sup>37</sup> The fire spread to the other railroad cars in the line, setting off a chain reaction of small round ammunition explosions. A fire alarm alerted the American District Telegraph Company, its monitoring company,

---

<sup>32</sup> Landau, 72-73; *Mixed Claims Commission 1935*, 189.

<sup>33</sup> *Oral Arguments September 1930*, 184.

<sup>34</sup> Landau, 78.

<sup>35</sup> *Oral Arguments April 1929*, 181-185.

<sup>36</sup> Jules Witcover, *Sabotage at Black Tom: Imperial Germany's Secret War in America, 1917-1917* (Chapel Hill: Algonquin Books of Chapel Hill, 1989). 161.

<sup>37</sup> Cited in Witcover, 161.

at 12:40. They notified the Jersey City Fire Department of the alarm and three fire engines plus a fire truck were dispatched to the scene.<sup>38</sup>

At 2:08 the terminal was wracked by a huge explosion as the still uncontained fire spread to a boxcar containing black powder. The concussion was violent enough to throw people from their beds and break plate glass windows in businesses in Manhattan, Brooklyn, and Jersey City. Its effects were felt as far away as Philadelphia and Maryland, although residents there mistook the tremors for an earthquake.<sup>39</sup> A second detonation lit up the night sky at 2:40 AM. The 80-foot by 20-foot barge *Johnson 17* exploded despite desperate efforts to control the fire on board. "When the firemen arrived the deck of the barge was a furnace so hot that the men didn't get near to the potential inferno. Never was a small fire seen to burn so persistently. The water seemed to serve as fuel. The fire fighters fought hard."<sup>40</sup> In an effort to contain the fires and explosions, tugs were brought in to tow ammunition-laden barges away from the docks into the middle of the harbor. On shore, New York and New Jersey firemen spent hours trying to contain blazing boxcars and warehouses, all the while dodging exploding ordinance.<sup>41</sup> The bombardment necessitated the evacuation of nearby Bedloe and Ellis Islands. Liberty Island staff living on Bedloe were ferried to the outlying Governors Island while over 500 immigrants housed on Ellis were transported to the Immigration Center at the Battery in Manhattan.<sup>42</sup> The devastation wrought at Black Tom was tremendous. Thirteen warehouses and six piers were destroyed. Hundreds of cars and barges were consumed by the flames. The explosion of 87 railroad cars containing dynamite created a crater that extended below sea level and soon filled with water. Initial estimates of damage totaled \$20 million. At least a hundred people were injured at the site with three confirmed dead the next morning. Hundreds more were injured in the blast waves and falling debris.<sup>43</sup>

Initially investigators blamed the destruction on carelessness. Arrest warrants were issued for Superintendent Albert M. Dickman, the Black Tom agent for the Lehigh Valley Railroad; Alexander Davidson, superintendent of the National Dock and Storage Company; and Theodore B. Johnson, head of Johnson Lighterage and Towing Company. These men were charged with manslaughter. Eban B. Thomas, president of Lehigh Valley Railroad and William G. Besler, president of the Central Railroad of New Jersey were later arrested for violating federal safety regulations. The motive was if these regulations prohibiting explosives from being kept in the yard or tied up on vessels for more than twenty-four hours had been followed, the catastrophe would have been avoided. Over 200 cars loaded with explosives

---

<sup>38</sup> *Oral Arguments April 1929*, 512-518.

<sup>39</sup> Witcover, 20.

<sup>40</sup> Cited in Witcover, 17.

<sup>41</sup> Witcover, 18.

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*, 18-19.

<sup>43</sup> *Ibid.*, 21.

sat in Black Tom that night. The barge *Johnson 17* was laden with 3,125 cases of ammunition earlier on Saturday and against policy had stayed tied to the pier.<sup>44</sup>

The German saboteurs wasted no time in celebrating their victory. A large party was held at the house of Martha Held on the following Monday. One of the guests, Mena Edwards Reiss, a model and the Eastman Kodak Girl, recounted the events to the authorities several years later. "They were all talking about the success of the Black Tom explosion and a dinner party followed in honor of that success."<sup>45</sup> It would be several months before the authorities realized that Black Tom was not an accident.

Riding high on the Black Tom victory, the Germans began planning a suitable follow-up. Their next target would be the Canadian Car and Foundry Company plant in Kingsland, New Jersey. Like many companies at the outbreak of the war, the Canadian Car and Foundry quickly retooled and began accepting orders for ammunition. The main factory in Montreal was quickly inundated with orders and a second factory was built in Kingsland, New Jersey. This new factory was charged with filling an \$83 million contract for the Russians. Five million artillery shells were to be assembled at Kingsland and sent to the Eastern Front. Other orders were also received and by late 1916, the plant was assembling three million shells per month.<sup>46</sup>

In the wake of numerous industrial accidents and possible incidents of sabotage, a six-foot high fence was erected around the plant and workers were screened for proper ID as they entered the plant. For the German saboteurs to execute this job they would need a man inside. After setting up a temporary headquarters in Rutherford, New Jersey, Herrmann, Hinsch, and Woehst began cultivating suitable accomplices. The first of these was Curt Thummel, also known as Charles Thorne. Thummel already worked for Hinsch as a transatlantic courier of incendiary pencils. This work was becoming too dangerous so Hinsch found him a new job. Through various contacts, Hinsch arranged for Thummel to be hired as an assistant employment manager at Kingsland. Once in this position, Thummel had hiring and assignment power in the plant. Hinsch sent suitable men to Thummel who employed them and assigned them to various jobs throughout the plant.<sup>47</sup>

One of the men Thummel employed was Theodore Wozniak, a Pole from Austrian Galicia who had been recommended to the plant by the Russian vice consul in New York, Dimitri Florinsky. Wozniak was introduced to Herrmann by Hinsch as their possible inside man at the McAlpin Hotel. Herrmann agreed

---

<sup>44</sup> *Ibid.*, 22.

<sup>45</sup> Cited in Witcover, 163.

<sup>46</sup> Witcover, 186.

<sup>47</sup> Memo: Evidence re Thorne subsequent to the Kingsland Fire, 9/17/30, pp. 1-2; Memorandum File of the American Agent's Council, M. M. Martin, 1930; Records relating to sabotage Claims filed with the Commission; International Claims Commission Records relating to claims against the Central Powers, Mixed Claims Commission, U.S. and Germany, 1922-1924, Record Group 76, National Archives College Park, College Park, Md.

to work with Wozniak but took an immediate dislike to him. Herrmann thought a second man was needed for the job and Wozniak suggested a Puerto Rican known as Rodriguez. This second man was hired by Thummel and assigned to the bench right next to Wozniak in Building 30 where they would clean shell casings. Wozniak and Rodriguez were given incendiary pencils and paid \$40 a week. Two days after the fire Hinsch met with Rodriguez and paid him a final \$500 lump sum. Wozniak was a wily fox and began constructing a protective cover story. Soon after beginning at the Kingsland plant, he applied for Russian citizenship at the Russian embassy in Washington. After this Wozniak, as a “concerned citizen,” wrote a series of letters to General Nicholas Khrabroff<sup>48</sup> warning of dangerous conditions at the plant and the possibilities of calamitous accidents.<sup>49</sup>

This structure in place, the saboteurs acted. The Canadian Car and Foundry plant at Kingsland, New Jersey erupted in flames at 3:40 PM on 11 January 1917. A thunderous bombardment lasting more than four hours ensued as over half a million three-inch shells launched. Luckily, while the propulsion charge did ignite on these shells, they were not yet equipped with detonators. The shells launched but did not explode. Nevertheless they were still hazardous because a falling shell could kill a man whether it was detonating or not. Roofs and walls of nearby houses sustained substantial damage from the cannonade.<sup>50</sup>

The fire originating at Wozniak’s workbench was most likely begun by a rag dipped in phosphorus “prepared at Nick’s house in Rutherford.”<sup>51</sup> Wozniak had accumulated a number of rags, both clean and gasoline-soaked, on his bench. His bench was already saturated with alcohol that had been previously spilled. Someone threw a pan of liquid on the fire, spreading it to the floor and beyond. Other workers threw rags on the flames perhaps hoping to smother the fire.<sup>52</sup>

Wozniak, Rodriguez, and 1,400 other workers fled the buildings and the flames. In their panic the crowd toppled the six-foot high fence crowned with barbed wire. Few men stayed behind to fight the fire and it quickly spread through the thirty-seven building complex. The plant was totally destroyed. Over 275,000 loaded shells, a million unloaded shells, half a million fuses, 300,000 cartridge cases, 100,000 detonators, and large amounts of TNT were lost. Damage was estimated at \$17 million.<sup>53</sup>

The fire was immediately investigated. Unlike the case of Black Tom, authorities were not so willing to rule out sabotage. A company statement conceded that, “it

---

<sup>48</sup> General Nicholas Khrabroff was the president of the artillery commission of the Russian supply committee.

<sup>49</sup> Statement of Boris Srasol, 11/29, p. 5; Memorandum File of the American Agent’s Council, M. M. Martin, 1929; Records relating to sabotage Calims filed with the Commission; International Claims Commission Records relating to claims against the Central Powers, Mixed Claims Commission, U.S. and Germany, 1922-1924, Record Group 76, National Archives College Park, College Park, Md.

<sup>50</sup> Witcover, 195.

<sup>51</sup> *Mixed Claims Commission 1939*, 51.

<sup>52</sup> *Ibid.*, 55.

<sup>53</sup> Witcover, 193.

is possible, if not probable, that the fire was of incendiary origin.” Workers at the plant were questioned about the origin of the fire. Several eyewitnesses pointed to Wozniak’s workbench as its origin. Even Wozniak admitted this when he was questioned, although he initially denied deliberately setting it.<sup>54</sup>

Authorities knew where the conflagration had started but not how. In Wozniak’s statement to investigators he claimed, “The only theories which I can advance as to the cause of the flame bursting out of the shells are: Someone may have put something in the shell while it was on the table before I took it. Or someone may have put something in the rag which I used to clean it.”<sup>55</sup> Throughout his deposition, Wozniak continually tried to cast suspicion on the other workers even claiming that someone had placed matches among the shells and cleaning rags on previous occasions. Wozniak disappeared a few weeks later and investigators realized their suspicions were well founded. Authorities traced Wozniak to Mexico and in a sworn statement of 12 January 1934 he admitted to both setting the Kingsland fire and receiving money from German agents before and after the incident.<sup>56</sup>

On 1 February 1917 the Germans reinitiated their policy of unrestricted submarine warfare. Within days the United States broke off diplomatic relations with Germany. Ambassador Bernstorff left America on 14 February aboard the Danish liner *Friedrich VIII*. Upon his departure Heinrich von Eckhardt, German minister to Mexico, took over as spymaster. When America made the formal declaration of war in April, most of the German saboteurs escaped to Mexico. With America a belligerent, the price for being convicted of sabotage jumped from a prison sentence to the death penalty. Many of the German operatives relocated to Mexico and continued working for Germany. Others remained in the US but ceased their activities.<sup>57</sup>

At the end of World War I, the US did not ratify the Treaty of Versailles. It signed a separate peace, the Treaty of Berlin, in 1921. This treaty set forth provisions for a Mixed Claims Commission to be created. The Mixed Claims Commission was charged with determining financial restitution on claims brought against Germany by the U.S., acting on behalf of private citizens and businesses.<sup>58</sup> Most of the claims were quickly discharged and paid. Others, especially the so-called sabotage cases, were hotly contested. Among these cases, the incidents at Black Tom and Kingsland, New Jersey were tried and re-tried amidst allegations of evidence fraud and witness tampering. Initial findings concluded that Germany was not responsible for the two incidents. In subsequent hearings however it became obvious that

---

<sup>54</sup> Cited in Witcover, 195.

<sup>55</sup> *Ibid.*, 194.

<sup>56</sup> *Mixed Claims Commission 1939*, 86.

<sup>57</sup> Witzke Affidavit 7/17/27, German Exhibit Q, p. 4; German Exhibits, 1924-1939. Records relating to Sabotage Claims filed with the Commission; International Claims Commission Records relating to claims against the Central Powers, Mixed Claims Commission, U.S. and Germany, 1922-1941, Record Group 76, National Archives College Park, College Park, Md.

<sup>58</sup> *The Treaties for Peace 1919-1923*, vol. II (Carnegie Endowment for International Peace: New York, 1924).

the German government, under the auspices of the OHL, had introduced several agents into the U.S., provided them with funds and material, and tasked them with sabotage. It was these men or men in their hire who conducted an unrelenting, undeclared war against America from 1914 to 1917.<sup>59</sup>

The Americans found this completely reprehensible because while the majority of these events were taking place, America was professing neutrality. Most Americans disregarded the fact that the neutrality employed was in name only.<sup>60</sup> America was serving as the Allies' main arms supplier, and while the U.S. might not be sending uniformed soldiers to kill Central Powers troops, it was providing the means to do so. Early on, the Germans realized that they were not on a level playing field and took steps to even the ground and perhaps weigh the outcome in their favor. They did this by employing a highly developed network of agents to commit sabotage. This network had to be built from the ground up beginning in 1914.

The antics of the embassy group- Papen, Boy-Ed, and Bernstorff- read like a Three Stooges script. They fall over one another, have petty jealousies, are caught, and finally, at least in the cases of Papen and Boy-Ed, are declared *persona non grata* and expelled from the US. On the surface the work of these men appears highly ineffectual but in reality it was a perfect smoke screen. They did manage to send a number of reservists back to Germany, but more importantly, their actions kept the American authorities focused on them and not on the other more active and more sophisticated ring set up by Rintelen. The group that Rintelen initially set up and bankrolled evolved into a complex and formidable operation. His early actions did little to stop the flow of war material to Europe. Plans to buy large blocks of powder and shells proved impossible. Later ventures into ship destruction appear to have been slightly more successful. Rintelen's greatest achievement was the network he left behind under the direction of Paul Hilken when he was recalled to Germany.

Hilken and his associates continued on with some of Rintelen's projects but soon developed their own. The sabotage at Black Tom was a masterpiece of wartime destruction. Not only did Janhke, Kristoff, and Witzke manage to cause \$20 million in damage and destroy the largest munitions depot in the U.S., the authorities never suspected foul play. The Kingsland job was sloppy. Wozniak was an amateur who worked for money, not conviction. His carelessness led authorities to the quick conclusion of arson and allowed them to discover the Hilken spy cell as well as its connection to the Black Tom fire. The Kingsland destruction was successful in stopping armament production at that facility but the cost to the Hilken ring was enormous. For the most part it was forced to disband and flee to Mexico.

---

<sup>59</sup> *Oral Arguments April 1929*, 48.

<sup>60</sup> *Ibid.*, 50.

Clearly, Germany waged an unofficial war against neutral America between 1914 and 1917. Spies and saboteurs were sent to the States by Germany with express orders to destroy American factories. American citizens and resident aliens were recruited to facilitate these orders. This war was fought in the shadows, with most of America unaware of it. We had entered the era of total war and going to the source of arms production was now a viable option, regardless of whether or not the source was a belligerent.



# Austrian Choices, 1918-1919: Independence or Anschluss?

Kevin Mason  
*South Georgia State College*

Even though Austria is a rich country today, during the entire inter-war period, especially immediately after WWI in 1918 and 1919, it was struggling. German Austria had been fully dependent on the other parts of the Austro-Hungarian Empire for its needs. The new Austria, having inherited the poorest regions of the late Empire with few industries and few- raw materials and lacking a sea port, was so economically and politically weak that most Austrians thought it was incapable of standing on its own in the period 1918 to 1919. Any water-power would have been undeveloped at this time. With astronomically high unemployment and its livelihood in ruins, the fate of Austria after World War I hung by a narrow thread.<sup>1</sup>

Most Austrians believed that an independent Austria was not viable.<sup>2</sup> Some hoped for a trade confederation or monarchist revival. Others even turned towards Bolshevism as a possible answer. But more than anything the horrendous economic conditions served as a catalyst for the immediate postwar *Anschluss* movement. The Anschluss movement during the inter-war period was at its zenith in 1918 and 1919, when Socialists, nationalists, many conservatives, and ultimately most Austrians favored a union with Germany. The Anschluss desire was manifest in the political agenda of the main parties and Austrian leaders, election results, and reports from foreign diplomats.

## Economic Viability of Austria

The Austrian people were already starving due to the Allied blockade initiated during the Great War. Even though an armistice ending the war had been concluded on 11 November 1918, the Austrian economy continued to be crippled by severe fuel and food shortages, because the blockade remained in effect until Germany signed the Treaty of Versailles on 28 June 1919. The hundreds of thousands of returning soldiers added to Austria's problems.<sup>3</sup>

Landlocked and reduced to a third-rate power, the new Austria could not even feed or support its own population. Most of the Austrian Republic was mountainous with relatively poor and unproductive land. Before World War I, Hungary had supplied the German speaking regions with grain, and Galicia, which was ceded to Poland, had supplied potatoes, beans, peas, and eggs.<sup>4</sup> Now, without access to the Hungarian agricultural basin and other regions of the Habsburg Empire to

---

<sup>1</sup> Sir William H. Beveridge, "Interim Report by British Delegate on the Inter-Allied Commission on the Relief of German Austria," 17 Jan. 1919, *British Documents on Foreign Affairs* (hereafter *BDEFA*), part II, ser. I, vol. 9, (Frederick: University Publications of America, 1989), pp. 344, 353.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>4</sup> Sir Francis Oppenheimer, "Memorandum prepared at the request of the Chancellor of the Exchequer relative to the situation in Austria," 20 June 1919, *BDEFA*, vol. 9, p. 379.

obtain foodstuffs, the entire population of Austria was at the brink of starvation. Reporting on the conditions in Austria, Harvard Professor and member of the American Peace Commission, A. C. Coolidge, wrote that “meatless days were soon followed by meatless weeks.” The food crisis was more devastating to the lower classes than any other group, because the wealthy had connections and even resorted to smuggling from Hungary. Though the Americans were supplying food through the Allied Food Administration headed by Herbert Hoover, A. C. Coolidge contended it was not enough.<sup>5</sup>

Also adding to the economic dislocation was the fact that Austria had lost Bohemia, which had been the Empire’s most important industrial district. Bohemia, incorporated into Czechoslovakia, had been the source of 90 percent of the coal, 80 percent of the iron and steel, 90 percent of the cotton, the entire wool and ceramics trade, and 95 percent of the sugar industry in Austria-Hungary.<sup>6</sup> Industrially, Austria had no Ruhr Valley or Skoda Works, but was left with small undeveloped industrial areas in Styria and around Vienna. Waterpower would likewise be undeveloped. Due to a shortage of coal, Austria had restrictions on lighting, manufacturing, and transportation. Factories came to a standstill, and in the face of freezing winter temperatures, there was not enough coal for heating. To conserve heating, restaurants and theatres had to close early. The First Republic of Austria, now a country slightly smaller than the state of Maine, was in a state of turmoil, and the extremely high unemployment rate was conducive to a rise in support for Bolshevism.<sup>7</sup> Unemployment in the city of Vienna in 1918 and 1919 was between 90,000 to 120,000 in a city of 1.5 million.<sup>8</sup> With the lack of coal and transport, high unemployment, rampant disorder, and threat of Bolshevism, British economist Sir William H. Beveridge<sup>9</sup> concluded that Austria was in “a state of general economic paralysis,” and the Allies must immediately intervene.<sup>10</sup>

On top of these critical shortages, Austria was in deep financial trouble. The Austrian economy was saddled with debt because of the disastrous war. Having no significant sources of food and coal of its own, Austria even lacked the cash and credit needed to import these necessities from its neighbors.<sup>11</sup> The Austrian government had printed a large quantity of paper money in order to temporarily relieve its troubled condition, which led to high inflation.<sup>12</sup> Vienna’s importance,

---

<sup>5</sup> A.C. Coolidge, “The New Austria,” United States Department of State, *Foreign Relations of the United States* (hereafter *FRUS*), *The Paris Peace Conference, 1919* (Washington D.C.: United States Government Print. Office, 1942-1947), vol. 4, pp. 471-472.

<sup>6</sup> Beveridge, “Interim Report,” *BDEA*, vol. 9, p. 346.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 344-353.

<sup>8</sup> Coolidge, “The New Austria,” *FRUS*, p. 473.

<sup>9</sup> Sir William Henry Beveridge (1879-1963) was a British economist, an advocate for social improvement, and member of the Labor Party. During the Great War he was secretary for the ministry of food.

<sup>10</sup> Beveridge, “Interim Report,” *BDEA*, vol. 9, pp. 344, 349, 353.

<sup>11</sup> “Mr. Lindley to Earl Curzon,” 4 Nov. 1919, doc. 196, *BDEA*, vol. 9, pp. 396-397.

<sup>12</sup> “Minutes of the Daily Meetings of the Commissioners Plenipotentiary,” 26 May 1919, *FRUS*, vol. 11, p. 187. The meetings of the Commissioners Plenipotentiary were held daily in Paris throughout the peace talks of 1919.

lying in the heart of the Habsburg Empire as a center of transport, finance, and commerce, was gone.

Another problem that worsened the dire economic situation in Austria concerned responsibility for the war, reparations, and the assets and liabilities of the late Empire. A. C. Coolidge stated that the Austrians and Hungarians were left with the liabilities that the Czechs, Poles, and Yugoslavs did not feel any responsibility to share, like the debt that was jointly accumulated by all regions and the question of war guilt, for which the other ethnic groups blamed the German speaking Austrians. According to Coolidge, in 1918 the other ethnic groups maintained that they were innocent victims of Austria. Coolidge said the other ethnic groups considered themselves “enslaved nationalities, and that their guilty masters could not shed responsibilities in this easy way by merely changing their own name.”<sup>13</sup>

On 3 September 1919, the *Times* (London) reported that the Austrian delegates claimed that German Austria should not be held accountable for the actions of the entire Habsburg Empire. The Allies, however, rejected the Austrians’ pleas and maintained that the majority of Austrians had vigorously supported the Great War from start to finish. The *Times* stated that the people of Austria and Hungary, by initiating the conflict in Serbia, bore the “responsibility for the calamities which have befallen Europe in the last five years.” Vienna, together with Berlin, had plotted “against public law and the liberties of Europe” and now had to assume the “full measure of responsibility for the crime which had brought such misery on the world.”<sup>14</sup>

Thus, according to Coolidge, of the new states emerging from the wreckage of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, the greatly reduced and impoverished Austria was made to carry the major burden of responsibility for World War I, including the payment of reparations. However, when it came to any assets of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, like works of art and leftover weapons arsenals, everyone suddenly claimed equal share as former members of the Empire. With both Austria and Hungary landlocked, Admiral Nicholas Horthy had no choice but to take everything from Vienna that they felt they had lost since the Thirty Years War. Italy claimed many of the paintings in the Vienna art museums.<sup>15</sup> By being held responsible for the war and forced to pay reparations, not only was the Austrian economic recovery impeded, but also any postwar reconciliation with its neighbors, even though cooperative solutions to the vast economic problems they all faced would have benefited all parties.

---

<sup>13</sup> Coolidge, “The New Austria,” *FRUS*, p. 479.

<sup>14</sup> “Allies To Austria: Council’s Stern Note,” *Times*, Sept. 3, 1919.

<sup>15</sup> Coolidge, “The New Austria,” *FRUS*, pp. 479-480.

## **Political Problems and Possible Solutions**

Despite the Allied policies that sought to establish Austrian independence, in 1918 and 1919 most Austrians saw an independent Austria as unviable, mainly because of the deplorable state of the Austrian economy. Austrians considered three options: a revived Habsburg Empire, an Austrian Anschluss with Germany, or an independent Austria as part of a greater trade confederation.<sup>16</sup> Support for these policies happened along political lines. The first option was a revived monarchy. After World War I, there were traditionalists and monarchists who had no love for the Republic and desired a return to the old days of the Empire. A complete imperial revival had little hope, though, for the Empire had already collapsed from within, and each former subject ethnic group was now claiming the right of self-determination and sovereignty. Still, attempts to revive the monarchy on a more limited national scale did occur, particularly in neighboring Hungary.<sup>17</sup>

The second option was a union with Germany. Many Austrians, particularly the Socialists, the Greater German People's Party, and the communists, despised Austria's independence and longed for this alternative. The Austrian Socialists, who formed one of the largest parties, supported a merger with Germany because that would unite them with their Socialist brothers who formed the plurality party in Germany. The Austrian communists likewise supported an Anschluss, but unlike the Socialists they remained a fringe group. The Greater German People's Party, another minority group, were ultra-nationalist and wanted a union of all the German speaking lands.<sup>18</sup>

In addition, many Christian Socials wanted Austria to become part of a proposed trade association, and this third alternative was referred to as the Danube Confederation in 1918 and 1919. As proposed, the Danube Confederation would have been an economic partnership among all the former parts of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, encompassing Austria, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Romania, other Balkan states, and maybe even Poland. Politically each of the members would have remained independent, but Vienna would have maintained its importance in this confederation as the leading city of commerce.<sup>19</sup>

In November 1918 the Christian Social Reichspost avoided the Anschluss excitement of other Austrian newspapers and instead advocated a Danube Confederation. In doing so, it realistically anticipated the issue of Entente response, a foreign policy factor that would increasingly shape Christian Social politics. According to the Reichspost, "we are afraid of the threats of the Entente."<sup>20</sup> At the

---

<sup>16</sup> Political alternatives for Austria are given by A. C. Coolidge in his chapter "The New Austria." Coolidge omits Habsburg restoration as a legitimate alternative, but however unlikely it was, attempts were made in Hungary and a fraction of the Austrian populace did advocate it.

<sup>17</sup> Coolidge, "The New Austria," *FRUS*, pp. 479-480.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>20</sup> *Reichspost*, Nov. 12, 1918.

fourth Christian Social Party meeting in Vienna on 15 December 1918, the official party platform in 1918 also avoided the Anschluss issue directly and instead called for strong economic ties with the neighboring states.<sup>21</sup>

The Danube Confederation was also favored by those Austrians who harbored strong resentment towards Prussia, a resentment that reflected more than a century of deep-seated rivalries that had culminated in Prussian victory over Austria in 1866.<sup>22</sup> A union with only south Germany looked appealing to those Austrians who were anti-Prussian. But union with all of Germany meant domination of a predominately Catholic country by both Prussian Protestantism and Prussian socialism. Moreover, Vienna with its beauty and culture would become just another regional town under the authority of Berlin.

Although the Danube Confederation plan sounded advantageous to many, it was soon abandoned, despite support from the Christian Social Party and those Austrians who especially hated Prussia. The creation of a Danube Confederation depended on the cooperation of all the former regions of Austria-Hungary. However, after the dissolution of Austria-Hungary, each newly independent nation wanted to go its own way. Because of border disputes, ethnic tensions, and past grievances, relations between Austria and the surrounding countries were severely strained and the Danube Confederation proposal was doomed.<sup>23</sup>

To be viable, the Danube Confederation needed the support of Czechoslovakia in particular, because Bohemia had been Austria-Hungary's most important industrial region. However, Czechoslovakia wanted nothing to do with Austria. Finally, getting their independence after the Great War, the Czechs had absolutely no desire to join a union with Austria, even if it was just an economic one and each of the members would maintain its political sovereignty. Having inherited the main industrial regions of the late Habsburg Empire as well as the Slovak inhabited areas of northern Hungary (modern day Slovakia) that were rich in raw materials, Czechoslovakia was economically the strongest of the successor states and saw no advantage in the Danube Confederation. The Czechs possessed the two prestigious cities of Prague and Pressburg (Bratislava) and had no need for Vienna as an administrative and financial center. Furthermore, over-estimating the potential of a great land route from Constantinople to the North Sea, the Czechs hoped Prague would soon surpass Vienna as the leading city of Central Europe.<sup>24</sup>

The peace settlement left the situation in Austria so dismal that some of the most loyal German Habsburg provinces no longer desired to remain under Viennese rule following World War I, and there were many separatist movements. In February 1919 the Tyrolean *Landtag* (provincial parliament) wrote a letter to Wilson stating

---

<sup>21</sup> Robert Kriechbaumer, ed., *Dieses Österreich Retten: Die Protokolle der Parteitage der Christlichsozialen Partei in der Ersten Republik* (Vienna: Böhlau Verlag, 2006), 22.

<sup>22</sup> Coolidge, "The New Austria, *FRUS*, p. 466. This resentment survives today in parts of southern Germany.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 466-468.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 470.

that the German and Ladin populations of South Tyrol wished to remain together with the rest of Tyrol, and that they would “under no condition whatsoever” accept the partition of Tyrol.<sup>25</sup> In May 1919 the Tyrolean Landtag declared itself an independent state,<sup>26</sup> which neither the Austrian government nor Allies recognized.

Also on 11 May 1919, 80 percent of the population of Vorarlberg, a small western Austrian province, voted in favor of becoming a canton of Switzerland, which the Allies promptly forbade.<sup>27</sup> Certainly, not all the Swiss were supportive of adding Vorarlberg as another canton. The other ethnic groups in Switzerland feared a strengthening of German influence with the addition of Vorarlberg, and the Swiss German Protestants feared an expansion of Catholicism. However, at least some Swiss were upset that the Allies made the decision to forbid such a development without even once consulting them.<sup>28</sup> Deprived of the prospect of becoming part of Switzerland, Vorarlberg then cast its lot with Germany over the crumbling Viennese government, which many Vorarlbergers now perceived as coming under the control of the Socialists and turning red. On 16 December 1919, the Salzburg Landtag, which was controlled by the Christian Social Party, unanimously voted for an economic union with Bavaria, which once again the Allies promptly prohibited.<sup>29</sup>

Politically in shambles, devoid of key resources, and with its new boundaries and provinces like Tyrol, Carinthia, and Styria severely mutilated, the new Austria had little cause for hope in 1918 and 1919. There was no chance for the Danube Confederation. Austria was cut off from the rest of Europe by the deep animosity toward it among its neighbors. Austria’s upcoming harvest was inadequate to feed its population. Old channels of food and fuel were broken. Thus, the new republic was on the verge of both bankruptcy and starvation. By the spring of 1919 most Austrians, even many within the Christian Social Party, had given up on the proposed Danube Confederation.<sup>30</sup> The other two largest Austrian parties, the Socialist party and the Greater German People’s Party, had never been supportive of the Danube Confederation in the first place. Although attempts at creating a Danube Confederation would reoccur throughout the inter-war period, they continued to fail for the same reasons.

---

<sup>25</sup> “Tiroler Landesregierung an Präsident Wilson,” Innsbruck, 26 Feb. 1919, *Außenpolitische Dokumente der Republik Österreich* [Foreign Affairs Documents of the Austrian Republic, hereafter ADÖ], 1918-1938, (Vienna, 1994), vol. 12, p.465.

<sup>26</sup> Barbara Jelavich, *Modern Austria, Empire and Republic 1815-1986* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 159-160.

<sup>27</sup> In Vorarlberg 47,131 votes went in favor of joining Switzerland and 11,386 against. The plebiscite represented 70 percent of all eligible voters. The Vorarlberger Landtag was made up of twenty-two Christian Socials and eight members belonging to other parties. “Minutes of the Daily Meetings of the Commissioners Plenipotentiary” 26 May 1919, *FRUS*, vol. 11, p. 188.

<sup>28</sup> “Lord Acton to Earl Curzon,” 12 June 1919, *BdFA*, vol. 9, pp. 373-374.

<sup>29</sup> *Neue Freie Presse*, Dec. 18, 1919; Hermann Kuprian, “Tirol und die Anschlussfrage 1918 bis 1921,” *Tirol Und der Anschluss*, p. 59.

<sup>30</sup> Coolidge, “The New Austria,” *FRUS*, pp. 469-470.

The Danube Confederation plan fell through due to the lack of interest and cooperation from Austria's neighbors, who having received their independence did not want to be part of an economic federation that mirrored the hated Habsburg Empire. With few agricultural and industrial areas, no access to the sea, and a mostly mountainous terrain, Austria was the poorest of the successor states. Whereas Austria was completely dependent on its neighbors, the other states did not necessarily need Austria. Most of the successor states enforced tariffs and trade barriers against Austria in 1918 and 1919. Especially Czechoslovakia considered Austria a rival and source of competition. Moreover, in 1920-1921 Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, and Romania formed their own economic and military alliance, the Little Entente, under French influence. Besides blocking German and Bolshevik expansion, the Little Entente was formed to maintain the territorial gains of the successor states against Austria and Hungary. Created for political and strategic reasons, the Little Entente blocked the creation of a Danube Confederation and hindered possible economic stabilization in Eastern Europe.

### **The Christian Socials from Fall 1918 to February 1919**

The Christian Social Party was divided on the Anschluss question in 1918 and 1919, and it had many Anschluss supporters within its ranks.<sup>31</sup> The Reichspost asserted that during these two years Jodok Fink<sup>32</sup> and Josef Stöckler led the anti-monarchist and pro-Anschluss Christian Social movement in the Austrian provinces of Vorarlberg, Lower Austria, Upper Austria, Styria, Tyrol, and Carinthia, gaining the support of many Austrian farmers. Fink, like many Christian Socials, contended that the time of the monarchy was over.<sup>33</sup> In contrast, those Christian Socials who had monarchist leanings, like Heinrich Mataja and Kurt von Schuschnigg, were anti-Anschluss. Thus, the party was sharply divided in opinion following the defeat and collapse of the Austro-Hungarian Empire.

The German-speaking members of the Austrian parliament,<sup>34</sup> who had been elected in 1911 before the outbreak of World War I, formed the Provisional National Assembly, or *Provisorische Nationalversammlung*, on 21 October 1918. It consisted of seventy-two Christian Social Party members, forty-two Socialists, and one-hundred and two members who belonged to smaller parties, such as the German nationalist parties.<sup>35</sup> The Provisional National Assembly chose three

---

<sup>31</sup> "Mr. Bridgeman to Earl Curzon" Vienna, 2 Sept. 1919, *BdFA*, vol. 1, pp.130-135; Jelavich, *Modern Austria*, 214.

<sup>32</sup> Jodok Fink (1853-1929) became a Christian Social delegate in the Vorarlberg Landtag in 1897 and the *Reichsrat* (legislative in Vienna) 1911. In 1918 he was a member of the Austrian Provisional National Assembly. In 1919-1920 he was Vice Chancellor to Karl Renner. *Politische Akademie der ÖVP Österreichischen Volkspartei* [Austrian People's Party is a successor to Christian Social Party] Christian Social Party Archive, (Vienna), box 16.

<sup>33</sup> *Reichspost*, Nov. 19, 1918. Fink held the monarchy responsible for the Austrian political crisis in the immediate aftermath of World War I.

<sup>34</sup> This consisted of representatives from all the German speaking regions of Austria-Hungary, including Bohemia and Moravia.

<sup>35</sup> At this time the German nationalist groups were divided and the Greater German People's Party has not formed yet. Jelavich, *Modern Austria*, 151.

presidents, one from each of the three largest parties, in October 1918. Christian Hauser became one president. Franz Dinghofer<sup>36</sup> of the Greater German People's Party and Karl Seitz<sup>37</sup> of the Socialist party were the other two presidents.<sup>38</sup>

The Socialists, not the Christian Socials, had played the predominant role in bringing about the downfall of the monarchy and creating the First Austrian Republic. Socialists welcomed the immediate revolutionary period in Austria, while Christian Socials had been comfortable in the Habsburg Empire. Also, the defeat and collapse after World War I created some resentment towards those associated with the "old regime," and therefore many Austrians "turned naturally to the Socialists."<sup>39</sup> Consequently, the Socialists led the Austrian provisional government, which was formed on 30 October 1918.<sup>40</sup> Dr. Karl Renner, a moderate Socialist, became the first Austrian Chancellor, and he headed the Austrian peace delegation.<sup>41</sup> Otto Bauer, a left wing Jewish Socialist, succeeded Viktor Adler who died on November 11, as foreign minister. Fellow Socialist Julius Deutsch established the Austrian republican army, and Karl Seitz was the first Austrian federal president. From November 1918 to June 1920 the Socialist Party formed a coalition with the Christian Social Party. The Christian Socials initially agreed to compromise with the Socialists in order to prevent an even more radical left-wing government—an Austrian Soviet regime—from coming to power.<sup>42</sup>

The Austrian Provisional National Assembly also issued two shocking declarations on 12 November 1918, one day after the armistice between the Allies and Germany. With the exception of three delegates (Wilhelm Miklas,<sup>43</sup> Karl Prisching, and Athanasius Guggenberg), the Christian Socials voted for the first declaration that proclaimed Austria to be a Republic. Except for Dr. Anton Jerzabek, most Christian Socials also voted for the second declaration stating that

---

<sup>36</sup> Franz Dinghofer had also supported a customs union with Germany since 1926. *Neue Freie Presse*, Jan. 17, 1926.

<sup>37</sup> Karl Seitz (1869-1950) was a Socialist politician. He was a member of the Austrian Provisional National Assembly from 1918 to 1919, the Constituent National Assembly from 1919 to 1920, and *Nationalrat* from 1920 to 1934. He was also the provisional federal president of Austria from 1919 to 1920 and mayor of Vienna from 1923 to 1934. The Nazis sent him to the concentration camp in Ravensbrück in 1944. He survived the war and became an honorary statesman until his death. *Protokolle der Christlichsozialen Parteitage*, p. 16.

<sup>38</sup> *Ö Lexikon*, <http://www.aeiou.at/aeiou.encyclop.p/p903374.htm>.

<sup>39</sup> "Mr. Lindley to Earl Curzon" 14 June 1920, Vienna, *BDF*, p. 371. Lindley wrote this in 1920, but it discussed the situation in 1918-1919.

<sup>40</sup> Jelavich, *Modern Austria*, 151.

<sup>41</sup> Karl Renner (1870-1950) was a member of the Provisional Austrian National Assembly, 1918-1919, and member of the Constituent National Assembly, 1919-1920. He was chancellor from 1918 to 1920 and a member of the Nationalrat from 1930 to 1934. He was strongly pro-Anschluss.

<sup>42</sup> Klemens von Klemperer, *Ignaz Seipel: Christian Statesman in a Time of Crisis* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1972), 96-104, 121.

<sup>43</sup> Wilhelm Miklas (1872-1956) who had received a doctorate in philosophy became a Christian Social member of the Reichsrat from 1907 to 1918 and Nationalrat from 1920 to 1928. He was Austrian president 1928-1938. *Protokolle der Christlichsozialen Parteitage*, p. 24; see also, Anneliese Harasek, "Bundespräsident Wilhelm Miklas" (Vienna, 1967) and Hilde Verena Lang, "Bundespräsident Miklas und das autoritäre Regime 1933-1938" (PhD diss., University of Vienna, 1972).



Austria (including Bohemia and Moravia) was a part of Germany.<sup>44</sup> Therefore, immediately at the end of World War I, the Christian Social Party's official position on the Anschluss and the First Republic was similar to that of other parties.

Nevertheless, in contrast to the Socialists, the Christian Socials were not unanimous on either the Anschluss or the republican issue, regardless of their overall support of the two November declarations. The *Neue Freie Presse* maintained that the Christian Social delegate in Vienna, Franz Spalowsky, spoke out in favor of a monarchy in 1918,<sup>45</sup> at a time when the divisions within the Christian Social Party were so severe that they threatened to tear the party into two factions, with a monarchist party in Vienna and a republican party in the provinces.<sup>46</sup> In order to prevent such a rupture, Ignaz Seipel stated on 27 November 1918, that the party needed to defer crucial decisions until a functioning democratic process was in place.<sup>47</sup> Seipel was one of the main Christian Social Party leaders at this time, and he was anti-Anschluss.

There was also a strong pro-Anschluss faction within the Christian Social Party in the immediate aftermath of World War I. According to the *Reichspost*, the Christian Social-controlled Landtag in Carinthia demanded a national referendum on the Anschluss issue, while the Christian Social Party faction in the provincial assembly in Upper Austria stated the necessity of the Anschluss for the Austrian economy. Regardless of differences between the provinces and city, the Christian Social Party in Vienna also fostered a German nationalist ideology. In February 1919, the Christian Social mayor of Vienna, Dr. Richard Weiskirchner,<sup>48</sup> agreed with the Lower Austrian Farmers' League that "the Anschluss was the fulfilment of the national ideal," and he stated the "the Anschluss was the dream of the German youth for the last twenty years and the party should not stand against the Anschluss." Although in 1918 and 1919 the Christian Social Party in Vienna had strong monarchist sympathies, Weiskirchner represented an exception. However, Weiskirchner questioned the timing of an Anschluss and said an Anschluss did not necessarily have to occur immediately.<sup>49</sup> Like Weiskirchner, Christian Social

---

<sup>44</sup> Law over the form of the state and government of German Austria. Vienna, 12 Nov. 1918. *ADÖ*, vol. 1, 141-143. Article 1 of the laws established by the Provisional Assembly stated that "German Austria is a democratic republic. All public powers will be carried out by the people." Article 2 said that "German Austria is a part of the German Republic. Special laws regulate the participation of German Austria in the legislation and administration of the German Republic, as well as the extension of the area of laws and institutions of the German Republic over German Austria."

<sup>45</sup> Franz Spalowsky (1875-1938) was a Christian Social member of the Constituent National Assembly from 1919 to 1920 and the Nationalrat from 1920 to 1934. *Protokolle der Christlichsozialen Parteitage*, p. 57.

<sup>46</sup> *Neue Freie Presse*, Nov. 11, 1918.

<sup>47</sup> Berchthold: *Programme, Österreichische Parteiprogramme 1868-1966*, ed. Klaus Berchthold (Vienna, 1967), p. 355.

<sup>48</sup> Dr. Richard Weiskirchner (1861-1923) was a Christian Social mayor of Vienna from 1917 to 1918. He became a member of the Constituent National Assembly from 1919 to 1920 and Nationalrat from 1920 to 1923. In late 1919, Weiskirchner lost much influence to Seipel. *Protokolle der Christlichsozialen Parteitage*, p. 25; *Reichspost*, Feb. 4, 1919.

<sup>49</sup> *Reichspost*, Feb. 4, 1919. Also, after the success of the Socialists at the 4 February 1919 election, Christian Social delegates in Tyrol and Vorarlberg contended that only provincial referendums should decide the Anschluss issue.

Dr. Gottfried Hugelmann also offered a partial compromise to the Anschluss. Hugelmann called for a *Zusammenschluss* (partnership rather than an annexation) of Austria and Germany in the newspaper he edited, *Deutschen Volksblattes*.<sup>50</sup> A *Zusammenschluss* meant that Austria would join Germany as one state with Vienna as its capital, and as partners, Austria would not be subordinate to Germany. An opposing view was that each of the separate Austrian provinces would join Germany and Vienna would no longer have any authority over the provinces.

Clearly Seipel was aware of the enormous popularity of the Anschluss movement and predicted if a national referendum were to be held, the vast majority of Austrians, perhaps even 95 percent, would vote for the Anschluss movement in the immediate aftermath of World War I.<sup>51</sup> In February 1919, Seipel warned against an Anschluss because of the uncertain situation and spectre of revolution in Germany. He argued that, “if there is danger that the German people established a *Republic* based on terror, or a dictatorship of one party or class, then nothing should drive us into a union with Germany.”<sup>52</sup>

In addition to fear about the domestic situation in Germany, Allied pressure also certainly had a strong effect on the Christian Social Party politics. To prevent the Anschluss of Austria and Germany from occurring immediately after the Great War, the Allies could threaten Austria and Germany with an even harsher peace treaty, involving increased military occupation, cancellation of loans, higher reparations, and above all further loss of territory. On October 1918, the Austrian Christian Social *Reichspost* expressed the fear of losing other territories if an Anschluss took place:

what would the German Reich have if the union of the German Austrian Republic and the German Reich came at the price of the left-bank of the Rhine? We are responsible to the German people for not making things harder through thoughtless propaganda based on mere feelings and by adding unsolvable problems.<sup>53</sup>

Thus, the *Reichspost* reflected many Christian Socials' caution and reservations toward union with Germany, especially due to the Allied policies. Besides Seipel, Mataja, Schuschnigg, Michael Mayr, Rudolf Gschladt, and Dr. Anton Jerzabek represented Anschluss opponents. Overall, from the fall of 1918 to February 1919 the Christian Social Party was evenly divided on the Anschluss.

---

<sup>50</sup> *Protokolle der Christlichsozialen Parteitage*, 275; Dietmar Hann, *Die Stellung der Christlichsozialen Partei zum Anschluss an das Deutsche Reich 1918-1934* (Vienna: University of Vienna, 1978), 12, 27.

<sup>51</sup> Statistic from “Dr. Seipel and Austria’s Future,” *Österreichische Nachrichten*, Feb. 11, 1926. Vienna. M695: *FRUS*. Roll 8.

<sup>52</sup> Johannes Hawlik, “Die politischen Parteien Deutsch Österreichs bei der Wahl zur konstituierenden Nationalversammlung” (PhD diss., Vienna: University of Vienna, 1971), 104.

<sup>53</sup> *Reichspost*, Oct. 31, 1918.

## The Anschluss Movement in 1918-1919

With even the Christian Social Party split on the Anschluss issue, especially following the demise of any expectations for either the Danube Confederation plan or a Habsburg revival, most Austrians strongly favored an Anschluss with Germany in 1918 and 1919. Certainly many Anschluss supporters at this time were avid pro-German nationalists, while many others were simply ready to support any solution that offered relief to Austria's beleaguered economic situation.<sup>54</sup>

The pro-German nationalists were influenced by the historic and ethnic ties between Austria and Germany and asked rhetorically why not join with Germany? They both had so much in common, even a recent devastating defeat by the Allies. Moreover, as A.C. Coolidge stated: "for a period of ten centuries, Austria had been an integral portion of Germany, and had for generations furnished the German nation its Emperors."<sup>55</sup> Vienna had been a leading German and European city long before the emergence of Berlin. Only recently, since 1866, had Austria and Germany really become separate, and many pan-German Austrians never reconciled themselves to that separation.<sup>56</sup>

In fact in *Franz Joseph of Austria and his Empire*, Anatol Murad contends that even after Austria's defeat by Prussia in 1866, Emperor Franz Joseph never gave up his desire to become German Emperor, like so many of his ancestors before him.<sup>57</sup> One of the reasons that Franz Joseph agreed to the *Ausgleich* (compromise) of 1867, which created Austria-Hungary, was because he had hoped that this would more closely bind the Hungarians to the Empire and pave the way for revenge against Prussia. Likewise, in the Franco-Prussian War in 1870, Franz Joseph even considered helping Napoleon III defeat Prussia in order to regain Austrian dominance among the German states. However, the creation of the Dual Monarchy strengthened the Hungarians who did not share Franz Joseph's desires to reassert dominance among the German states or add German-speaking territories to the Empire because that would undermine their own new found authority. The *Ausgleich* further pushed Habsburg diplomacy away from the German states and eastward towards the Balkans where Austria increasingly came into conflict with Russia.

According to the Austrian pro-Anschluss perspective, an Austria excluded from German affairs had turned its energy towards maintaining its Central European Empire, which, ultimately had given it heartache. The rebellious ethnic groups had posed to Austria one insoluble problem after another. Now, the territories Austria once dominated were fragmented, and the various nationalities had departed, each

---

<sup>54</sup> *Protokolle der Christlichsozialen Parteitage*, p. 275; Hann, *Die Stellung der Christlichsozialen Partei*, 12, 27.

<sup>55</sup> Coolidge, "The New Austria," *FRUS*, p. 468.

<sup>56</sup> *Protokolle der Christlichsozialen Parteitage*, p. 275; Hann, *Die Stellung der Christlichsozialen Partei*, 12, 27.

<sup>57</sup> Anatol Murad, *Franz Joseph of Austria and his Empire* (New York, 1968).

their own way to Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Poland, and Italy. Coolidge gave his own pro-Anschluss opinion when he stated:

What was more natural and proper than that the Germans of Austria should re-join their brothers in their old fatherland? The separation from it had been accidental and a short duration. The reunion would not mean a triumph of North Germany over South. On the contrary, it would be a reinforcement of the Southern element which might thereby well regain the preponderance it had exercised at an earlier age. In the same way, it would not mean a success for Protestantism, but rather the strengthening of the Catholic element in Germany.<sup>58</sup>

The Austrian government was in shambles, and Austria badly needed Germany's strength, support, and security. The German mark would once again provide Austria with a much needed stable currency; coal from Germany would keep Austria's factories going. Under an Anschluss, Berlin would no doubt overshadow Vienna. But as Coolidge stated, "Vienna, with her splendid position on the Danube, would be the second capital of the German State, a centre of enterprise and industry, and would draw under her influence the South German regions which had always had more affinity with her than Berlin."<sup>59</sup>

The strong desire of most Austrians for an Anschluss with Germany was shown by the February elections and the policies carried out by the Austrian government, such as the secret Anschluss negotiations between Austria and Germany. And even though Austria had changed its name from German Austria (Deutsch-Österreich) to the Austrian Republic (Österreichische Republik) in early 1919 due to Allied pressure, some Austrian leaders and newspapers continued to use the term "German Austria." Indeed, until 1922 the Austrian postage stamps continued to say "German Austria." After 1922 that became simply "Austria," and only after 1945 did the stamps say "Republic of Austria."<sup>60</sup>

The Anschluss question, which concerned the future of the Austrian Republic and was considered a life or death issue, was by far the most important political issue during the post-World War I elections. The three largest Austrian parties, the Christian Social Party, the Socialist party, and the Greater German People's Party, had all sympathized with the Anschluss, though to varying degrees. The greatest support for an Anschluss came from the Socialists and Greater German People's Party.

In the elections of 16 February 1919, which were the first elections of the Austrian Republic, -the Christian Socials won in the provinces, but the Socialists triumphed in Vienna. Vienna comprised one-third of the total population of Austria.

---

<sup>58</sup> Coolidge, "The New Austria," *FRUS*, p. 468.

<sup>59</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>60</sup> Wilhelm Braunerer, *Deutsch-Österreich 1918. Die Republik entsteht* (Vienna, 2000) 216-217.

Anti-Socialists dubbed it “Red Vienna.” The Austrians had elected seventy-three Socialists, sixty-nine Christian Socials, and twenty-five Greater German People’s Party members to the Constituent National Assembly (*Konstituierende Nationalversammlung*),<sup>61</sup> which replaced the Provisional National Assembly and was the first elected legislative body of the First Republic of Austria.<sup>62</sup> The pro-Anschluss Socialists did not gain a majority, but they did gain a decisive plurality. Moreover, the two largest pro-Anschluss parties, the Socialists and German nationalists, together received a total of 60 percent of the votes in Austria.<sup>63</sup> The Austrian demand for an Anschluss in 1918 and 1919 was higher than in any other time period because it had support from both the Socialist and nationalist parties, even though they were on opposite ends of the political spectrum. Moreover, there was the sizable group within the Christian Social Party that advocated a political union with Germany as well.<sup>64</sup> This alignment of political forces did not reoccur in the 1930s because the Austrian Socialists wanted a union with a democratic Germany and opposed a union with a totalitarian, anti-Socialist, Nazi Germany.

Another important factor was that the Socialists maintained control over Austrian domestic and foreign policy after the February 1919 elections. Renner remained Chancellor and Bauer remained foreign minister until June 1920.<sup>65</sup> Both Bauer and Renner were pro-Anschluss and attempted to push Austrian diplomacy in that direction. The Socialist *Arbeiter-Zeitung* (worker’s newspaper) had supported the union since November 1918, as did the Viennese *Neue Freie Presse* and the *Wiener Mittag*.<sup>66</sup> Speaking at the *Länderkonferenz*<sup>67</sup> (provincial conference) on February 1, 1919, Renner stated that Austria could not stand alone and had to seek an Anschluss with Germany. Through the Anschluss, Vienna would be Germany’s gateway to the east and regain its commercial importance.<sup>68</sup>

In addition, in early February 1919 Bauer headed an Austrian delegation to the Constituent Assembly in Weimar to obtain favorable terms for Austria’s incorporation into Germany. Negotiations between Austria and Germany

---

<sup>61</sup> The Constituent National Assembly was formed the same day as the new elections, February 16, 1919. Fink replaced Hauser as the Christian Social President of the Constituent Assembly on 30 Oct. 1919.

<sup>62</sup> “Mr. Lindley to Earl Curzon” Vienna, 14 June 1920, *BDFÄ*, vol. 1, p. 94.

<sup>63</sup> Francis Ludwig Carsten, *The First Austrian Republic 1918-1938* (Brookfield, Vermont: Gower Publishing Company, 1986), 6, 7.

<sup>64</sup> “Mr. Bridgeman to Earl Curzon,” Vienna, 2 Sept. 1920 and 16 Sept. 1920, *BDFÄ*, vol. 1, pp. 130,135. Although this was written in 1920 it discussed events in 1918 and 1919.

<sup>65</sup> “Mr. Lindley to Earl Curzon.” Vienna, 14 June 1920, *BDFÄ*, vol. 1, p. 94.

<sup>66</sup> *Arbeiter-Zeitung*, Nov. 9, 1918; *Neue Freie Presse*, Jan. 24, 1919; Alfred Low, *The Anschluss Movement, 1918-1919 and the Paris Peace Conference* (Philadelphia: The American Philosophical Society, 1974), 101, 157. Other Austrian newspapers opposed an Anschluss.

<sup>67</sup> *Länderkonferenz* was a conference attended by the Austrian provinces, which were represented by Landtag delegates, and the Austrian Chancellor. *Österreich Lexikon*, <http://aeiou.icm.tugraz.at/aeiou.history.docs/51003.htm>.

<sup>68</sup> Siegfried Nasko, “Ein ‘Deutsch Österreichischer’ Staatsmann? Karl Renners Haltung zur Anschlußidee 1918-1938,” *Ungleiche Partner? Österreich und Deutschland in ihrer gegenseitige Wahrnehmung. Historische Analysen und Vergleiche aus dem 19. Und 20. Jahrhundert* (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1996), 403.

concerning the Anschluss then continued in Berlin from 27 February to 3 March.<sup>69</sup> On 2 March Bauer and German Foreign Secretary Count Ulrich von Brockdorff-Rantzau signed a secret Anschluss, or Zusammenschluss, agreement, despite Allied warnings against a union. Under the agreement, Austria would get representation in the *Reichstag*, and it could keep close ties to the Vatican. Germany would assume part of Austria's debt and absorb many of the Austrian civil servants into its workforce. The Anschluss agreement, which was not made public for fear of Allied retaliation, was to be certified by a state treaty and approved by the parliaments of both countries.<sup>70</sup> Then on 12 March 1919, the Austrian Constituent National Assembly renewed the declaration of the previous November, stating that Austria was a part of the German Republic. The Constituent National Assembly stated its main foreign policy goal was to bring about a union as fast as possible.<sup>71</sup> Joint Austro-German Commissions were also established to pave the way for union. A financial commission met in Vienna in April to discuss the troubled Austrian economy and a possible monetary union with Germany. A transportation committee looked at such things as a possible Rhine-Main-Danube canal and standardization of the trains, and the Austrian Minister of War met with a German general and talked about a common army.<sup>72</sup>

Nevertheless, both Germany and Austria agreed to postpone any final decisions regarding the Anschluss until after the peace settlement. The secret Anschluss agreement remained a "program for future negotiations."<sup>73</sup> However, Allied pressure and the eventual Anschluss prohibition in the peace treaties ended any hopes of an Austro-German union in 1919. On 16 May 1919, Austrians carried out protests and demonstrations in Braunau am Inn, Graz, and other cities against the anticipated peace terms and the Anschluss prohibition, even before Germany officially signed the Treaty of Versailles on 28 June 1919.<sup>74</sup>

## The Peace Settlement

Although Renner officially signed the Treaty of St. Germain on 11 September 1919, Austrian newspapers had already condemned the treaty's peace terms in June. The newspapers predicted a dismal future for the new Austrian state. The *Neue Freie Presse* called the Treaty of St. Germain "unacceptable." Also, the *Arbeiter-*

---

<sup>69</sup> "Deutsch Österreichisch-Deutsche Anschluss Verhandlungen," Berlin, 27 Feb. 1919, *ADÖ*, vol. 1, pp. 472-474; 28 February 1919, vol. 1, pp. 475-484; 1 March 1919, vol. 1, pp. 487-489; 2 March 1919, vol. 1, pp. 489-496; Staatsrat: Beschluss Protokoll zur Sitzung, 3 March 1919, vol. 1, p. 497.

<sup>70</sup> "2 March 1919," *ADÖ*, vol. 1, pp. 489-496.

<sup>71</sup> "Konstituierende Nationalversammlung für Deutsch Österreich," Vienna 15 March 1919, *ADÖ*, vol. 2, pp. 47-48.

<sup>72</sup> "Staatsamt für Äußeres an Referenten für die Anschlussverhandlungen," Vienna, 9 April 1919, *ADÖ* Deutsch Österreichisch-Deutsche Anschluss Verhandlungen, Berlin, 2 March 1919. *ADÖ*, vol. 1, pp. 489-496; Alfred Low, *The Anschluss Movement, 1931-1938* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1985), 202, 192-194, 204-206.

<sup>73</sup> Low, *The Anschluss Movement 1918-1919*, 200.

<sup>74</sup> "Deutscher Volksverein Braunau am Inn: Protestkundgebung," 16 May 1919, *Anschlussfrage* (Anschluss Question) 1918-1920, *ADÖ*, (Deutschland I/1), box (Karton) 106, pp. 109,110.

*Zeitung* said, “They have taken everything from us,” and “no peace but death for German Austria.”<sup>75</sup> Moreover, the conservative, Christian Social *Reichspost* also came out against the Peace Treaty.<sup>76</sup> At the Peace Conference Austria had made a case for the self-determination of the German Austrians, German South Tyroleans, and Sudeten Germans.

Furthermore, in response to the Allies’ infringement on Austria’s right to self-determination Renner asserted in the *Neue Freie Presse* German Austria was a country that was “left over” and “a mountainous country which cannot live and cannot die.”<sup>77</sup> Bauer likewise made the poor economic status and small size of Austria the main point in his attempts to convince the Allies of the necessity of an Anschluss.<sup>78</sup> In July 1919 Bauer resigned from office due to antagonism from France and the Habsburg successor states over his pro-Anschluss position and disappointment that his main foreign policy vision was not being achieved. Yet Bauer still maintained that an Anschluss was foreseeable in the near future.<sup>79</sup>

Most Christian Socials also opposed the peace terms. The Treaty of St. Germain, signed on 10 September 1919, both took away South Tyrol and through Article 88 forbade a union between Austria and Germany. When Austria was not only denied union with Germany but also stripped of key territories to the south, such as South Tyrol and Trieste, some Christian Socials became embittered. In protest Austrian Christian Social delegates from Styria and Carinthia left the conference hall before the treaty had been signed.<sup>80</sup> The *Neue Freie Presse* reported that in response to the official Allied prohibition of the Anschluss in the Treaty of St. Germain, the Christian Social President Johann Hauser of the Constituent National Assembly issued a protest note in September 1919 that condemned the prohibition. Hauser hoped that in the future, after war animosities had subsided, Austria would receive the same right to self-determination as given to other nationalities.<sup>81</sup> Because of the Allies’ anti-Anschluss policies, on 21 October 1919, Austria officially withdrew the Anschluss declaration of 12 November 1918.<sup>82</sup>

Then at the Fifth Christian Social Party Conference on 15 and 16 November 1919 N. N. Zuck of the Christian Social Party announced that Austria should seek an Anschluss and demand the return of lost German territories.<sup>83</sup> Nevertheless, the Christian Socials Dr. Heinrich Mataja and Rudolf Gschladt raised objections to the pro-Anschluss declaration. Mataja argued that he did not want a union with

<sup>75</sup> *Neue Freie Presse*, June 4, 1919; “Überzeugen!” *Arbeiter-Zeitung*, June 8, 1919.

<sup>76</sup> *Reichspost*, June 6, 1919.

<sup>77</sup> *Neue Freie Presse*, June 11, 1919.

<sup>78</sup> Franz Mathis, “Wirtschaft oder Politik? Zu Den ‘Wirtschaftlichen’ Motiven Einer Politischen Vereinigung Zwischen 1918 Und 1938,” *Ungleiche Partner?* p. 428.

<sup>79</sup> Low, *The Anschluss Movement*, 424-425, 428.

<sup>80</sup> Ernst Georg Baumgärtner, “Die Österreichische Presse in ihrer Stellung zur Anschlussfrage 1918-1938” (PhD. diss., University of Vienna, 1950), 120-122.

<sup>81</sup> *Neue Freie Presse*, Sept. 7, 1919.

<sup>82</sup> Nasko, “Ein ‘Deutsch Österreichischer’ Staatsmann?” *Ungleiche Partner?*, p. 405.

<sup>83</sup> *Protokolle der Christlichsozialen Parteitage*, p. 46.

a “Bolshevik Republic.”<sup>84</sup> During the early months of the Republic, the anti-Anschluss Christian Socials combated a strong Anschluss movement within their own party and among the Austrian populace.

### Germany and the *Anschluss*

A conceivable Anschluss obviously had to have the cooperation of Germany. There was a strong Anschluss movement in Germany as well, where Kurt Eisner of the Independent Socialists (USPD) had already called for a democratic and Socialist Bavarian Republic and the eventual creation of a “United States of Germany including Austria” at a workers’, peasants’, and soldiers’ council in Munich on 8 November 1918.<sup>85</sup> And in February 1919 Chancellor Friedrich Ebert SPD (Socialist Party) proclaimed,<sup>86</sup> “They [the German Austrians] belong to us, and we belong to them.”<sup>87</sup>

Similar to the Austrian case, the Allies intervened in Germany to forbid an Anschluss. On 3 September 1919, the *Times* reported that the Allies had given Germany an ultimatum to immediately remove Article 61 from its new constitution. Article 61 of the German constitution considered Austria part of the German Empire and discussed the provisions for allowing Austrian representation in the Reichstag. The Allies maintained that this was an outright violation of the peace treaty signed with Germany. Article 80 of that treaty explicitly stated that “Germany acknowledges and will strictly respect the independence of Austria” within its new boundaries set forth by the Allies. The Allies gave Germany fifteen days to withdraw Article 61 from its constitution or else suffer Allied military intervention and the expansion of its occupation in the Rhineland. Germany removed Article 61, but the desire for union with Austria certainly did not end.<sup>88</sup>

Most German parties, such as the Centre Party, Socialist Party, and national parties, favored a union because they believed the annexation of Austria would fulfill the grossdeutsch vision and speed up Germany’s return to power. The German press was likewise pro-Anschluss.<sup>89</sup> On 17 January 1919, the German press had collectively asked the German government to execute the 12 November Anschluss Resolution of the Austrian National Assembly and incorporate Austria into Germany.<sup>90</sup> But at this time Germany was not in a position to oppose the Allies over the Anschluss.

---

<sup>84</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 46-49.

<sup>85</sup> Holger H. Herwig, *Hammer or Anvil? Modern Germany 1648-Present* (Lexington, Mass.: Heath, 1994), 217.

<sup>86</sup> Germans call the Socialist Party, or Social Democratic Party of Germany, the SPD. During inter-war, there was an Independent Socialist Party that Germans called the USPD.

<sup>87</sup> Low, *The Anschluss Movement*, 167.

<sup>88</sup> “Sharp Note To Germany: A Violation of the Peace Treaty,” *Times* (London), Sept. 3, 1919.

<sup>89</sup> Summarization of the overall attitude of the German press by “Für Grossdeutschland!” *Augsburger Postzeitung*, 19 Jan. 1919, *ADÖ*, box 106, pp. 109, 110.

<sup>90</sup> Low, *The Anschluss Movement*, 4, 450-451, 454, 141, 161-162. Leading German newspapers that were pro-Anschluss included the *Frankfurter Zeitung*, *Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung*, and the *Vossische Zeitung*.



## Conclusion

Isolation and resentment from hostile neighbors added to the First Republic of Austria's many handicaps and increased Austria's desire for union with Germany. Defeated, humiliated, starving, and economically and politically broken, Austria had no one else to turn to but Germany. The prospect of joining the Fatherland looked extremely appealing for Austria, as the November declaration, the pro-Anschluss sympathies of the main political parties, the February 1919 election results, the pro-Anschluss policies pursued by Austrian leaders (like the secret Anschluss negotiations), the Anschluss demonstrations carried out in many Austrian cities, and reports from foreign diplomats showed.

Supported by parties and groups on the left, right, and center of the political spectrum, the Anschluss movement in 1918 and 1919 was stronger than in any other time period. Austrian Socialists appealed to the working classes and ardently embraced a union with Germany because the German Social Democratic Party (SPD) was the preeminent political party of the Weimar Republic. Austrian Socialists wanted to join with their Socialist comrades in Germany to solve Austria's economic and political chaos and create a Socialist experiment. The Socialists had even pointed to grossdeutsch support in Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels.<sup>91</sup> The Austrian Socialist paper *Arbeiter-Zeitung* likewise favored a union with Germany.<sup>92</sup> The Greater German People's Party fervently supported an Anschluss, as well. The Christian Social Party also had a sizeable pro-Anschluss faction within it.

The miserable economic conditions of the First Republic triggered by the sudden collapse of the Habsburg Empire and the peace treaty terms German nationalism, the Austrian identity crisis, the long-time historical ties between Germany and Austria, and the Socialist brotherhood motivated the Anschluss movement in 1918 and 1919. The fact that the majority of the inhabitants of Vorarlberg had first wanted to separate from the shattered Austrian state and become a part of Switzerland, not Germany; the fact that Salzburg had first wanted a customs union (not Anschluss) with Bavaria, and the initial popularity of the Danube Confederation plan before it collapsed, indicated the significance of the economic factor. While neither the Anschluss opponents within the Christian Social Party nor the Allies could change emotional feelings about the Treaty of St Germain, the sense of historic ties to Germany, and the lack of any indigenous Austrian national tradition, they could seek to improve the economy. This was in effect the only card they had to play, and time would thus tell to what extent diffusing the economic crisis would also diffuse Anschluss sentiment. Ultimately, supported by Socialists, nationalists, and many conservatives, the Anschluss movement ascended in 1918 and 1919.

---

<sup>91</sup> Low, *The Anschluss Movement*, 51.

<sup>92</sup> *Arbeiter-Zeitung*, May 18, 1919.



# **The Boricua Triangle: Tampa, Miami and Orlando- A Historical Overview of the Development of a Transnational Puerto Rican Diaspora in Florida**

Victor Vázquez-Hernández  
*Miami Dade College*

In April 2011 the U. S. Commerce Department released the results of the 2010 census. For Puerto Rican scholars, both stateside and on the island, the results, while not totally surprising, did raise some interesting questions. The 2010 census indicated that 4.7 million Puerto Ricans resided in the U.S. and that in Puerto Rico, which had lost population during the previous decade, wound up with 3.7 million residents. For the first time in its 114 year relationship with the United States, the data confirmed that more Puerto Ricans lived in the U.S. than on the island. For scholars like Puerto Rican political scientist Angelo Falcon, President of the National Institute for Latino Policy (NILP), Sociologist Jorge Duany from Florida International University, and historian Felix Matos Rodríguez, President Queens College of the City University of New York, it was a prediction-come-true. Falcon had argued since 2004 that according to the trend of growth the Puerto Rican Diaspora would surpass the number of those on the island within a decade; it took less than a decade.<sup>1</sup>

Another notable figure from the 2010 census, more pertinent to this article, was the population in the state of Florida. While the number of Puerto Ricans in Florida had been increasing for the previous few decades, the results for 2010 were truly spectacular, especially in the central part of the state. The census found more than 800,000 Puerto Ricans residing in the Sunshine State in 2010, making this the second largest Puerto Rican population within the U.S., surpassed only by New York State with 1.1 million Puerto Rican residents. The data also show that Puerto Ricans are the second largest Hispanic group in the state of Florida behind Cubans, who number 1.1 million. In addition, these numbers were not lost on the presidential candidates who, in 2012, fought over the unpredictable electorate of Florida.<sup>2</sup>

Who were these Puerto Ricans? Where and when did they arrive? Why did they choose specific regions in the state? These are some of the questions on which this essay attempts to shed light. The literature on Puerto Ricans in Florida is rather

---

<sup>1</sup> Angelo Falcon, *Atlas of Stateside Puerto Ricans* (Washington, DC:, 2004); Jorge Duany and Félix V. Matos Rodríguez, *Puerto Ricans in Orlando and Central Florida* (New York: Centro de Estudios Puertorriqueños, Hunter College [CUNY], 2006).

<sup>2</sup> The Obama campaign, in particular, during the 2012 presidential campaign concentrated a huge amount of resources on registering Puerto Rican voters in the I-4 corridor (Tampa-Orlando) and the effort paid off handsomely. According to Bendixen & Amandi International who conducted Election Day exit polling at sites where Puerto Rican voters were concentrated, Obama received approximately 81 percent of this vote on Election Day. The Puerto Rican vote in Florida clearly provided Obama a substantial margin of his victory in the Sunshine State.

scant, but evolving. Some of the more recent works within the last decade are worth mentioning. Significant among them is the work of Jorge Duany, whose seminal work, *The Puerto Rican Nation on the Move*, began to articulate the transnational nature of Puerto Rican migration and the role of the Puerto Rican government in creating the conditions for the growth of this Diaspora.<sup>3</sup> There is also the work of University of South Florida sociologist Elizabeth Aranda, who addresses the issue of “emotional transnationalism,” as Puerto Ricans in Florida and the U.S. generally struggle to sustain effective attachments to their homeland or, as she defines them, “the empty spaces of migration.”<sup>4</sup> Aranda’s work is also important because in addition to space, she examines the middle-class nature of the more recent Puerto Rican immigrations.

In addition, there is the work of social historian Melanie Shell-Weiss, whose book discusses the social and labor history of Puerto Rican garment workers in Miami during the 1950s and 1960s. Another important contribution to the literature on Puerto Ricans in Florida has come from anthropologist Patricia Silver and her colleague Natalie M. Underberg at the University of Central Florida. Together they created an Oral History Project on Puerto Ricans in Central Florida, 1940-1980. Silver and Duany also co-edited a volume of the 2010 *Center for Puerto Rican Studies Journal* dedicated exclusively to Puerto Ricans in Florida. This volume brought together the aforementioned authors along with numerous other scholars working on different aspects of the Puerto Rican Diaspora in Central Florida. However, very little has been written on the history of Puerto Ricans in Florida, with the exception of a handful of articles published by historian Luis Martínez Fernández of the University of Central Florida. For the most part the literature is quite limited and fairly new. This article will attempt to provide an overview of the broad contours of the history of the Puerto Rican Diaspora in Florida, a history that has been in the making for at least 125 years. Notwithstanding, much more work needs to be done; this is only a beginning.<sup>5</sup>

Who the first Puerto Ricans to arrive in Florida were is still a mystery. Some, rather comically, argue that it was Juan Ponce de Leon, who arrived in Florida in 1513, fresh from serving as Puerto Rico’s first colonial governor. What they forget is that Ponce de Leon was a Spaniard, not a Puerto Rican. Did the first Puerto Ricans in Florida arrive on 9 May 1781, when Spanish troops, reinforced with soldiers from Cuba and Puerto Rico, under the leadership of General Bernardo

---

<sup>3</sup> Jorge Duany, *The Puerto Rican Nation on the Move: Identities on the Island & in the United States* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1992).

<sup>4</sup> Elizabeth M. Aranda, *Emotional Bridges to Puerto Rico: Migration, Return Migration, and the Struggles of Incorporation* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2007).

<sup>5</sup> Luis Martínez-Fernández “La Diaspora en la Frontera: Retos y Oportunidades para el Estudio del Orlando Puertorriqueño,” *Centro Journal* 22, no. 1 (spring 2010): 33-55; Luis Martínez-Fernández “Florida’s Puerto Rican Phenomenon,” *Forum: The Magazine of the Florida Humanities Council* 36, no. 1 (spring 2012): 14-17.

de Galvez, took the City of Pensacola from the British during the American Revolution?<sup>6</sup> No one knows for sure.

Beginning in the latter part of the nineteenth century Puerto Ricans began coming to Florida in a small but steady stream that grew into a flood by the early twenty-first century. Over the course of that time period, Puerto Ricans have travelled to Florida in three significant historical waves or stages, each one of them directed to a different region of the state, and each establishing a migratory pattern that continues to this day. Throughout, Puerto Ricans have demonstrated changing settlement patterns that this essay attempts to examine.

From the latter part of the nineteenth century to about 1940, the largest number of Puerto Ricans arriving in Florida went to the Tampa-St. Petersburg region, particularly to Ybor City. Between 1940 and 1970, the migratory pattern shifted from Tampa to the South Florida region, especially to Miami. Then beginning in the 1970s until today, the bulk of Puerto Ricans have gone to the Central East region of Florida, in and around the City of Orlando. It is important to note, as I will outline later, that there are specific economic and social reasons as to why the migration of Puerto Ricans to Florida evolved throughout those decades. But it is also important to note that while certain regions of Florida became more attractive than others at different points in time, Puerto Ricans continue to this day to move to those same areas, albeit in smaller numbers. Hence, Orlando, Miami, and Tampa, and their outlying towns, cities, and counties continue to attract the bulk of Puerto Rican immigrants well into the twenty-first century.

According to Duany and Silver more than 300,000 Puerto Ricans live in Orange, Osceola, Polk, Seminole, and Volusia counties in Central Florida. In South Florida, comprised of Miami-Dade, Broward, and Palm Beach counties, the total number of Puerto Ricans is more than 200,000. In Hillsborough (Tampa) and Pinellas counties there are over 100,000 Puerto Ricans, with another 150,000 spread throughout the surrounding counties, and with an important enclave in the Jacksonville area.<sup>7</sup>

Puerto Ricans have been traveling and/or migrating to the United States for almost 200 years. During the early 1820s, Spain opened a series of consular offices in cities like New York, Philadelphia, and Boston, among others. These served to help manage the growing trade between the U.S. and the remaining Spanish possessions of Cuba and Puerto Rico. Soon the U.S. followed suit and opened a consular office in San Juan, Puerto Rico. While at first mostly merchants traveled these routes, eventually the demographics came to include students who wanted

---

<sup>6</sup> Frank de Varona, ed., *Hispanic Stories: Bernardo de Galvez* (Austin: Steck-Vaughn Co., 1991), 29.

<sup>7</sup> Jorge Duany and Patricia Silver, "The 'Puerto Ricanization' of Florida: Historical Background and Current Status," *Centro Journal* 22, no. 1 (spring 2010): 7, table 2.

to study in American universities, adventurers, workers (especially cigar makers), and even political exiles.<sup>8</sup>

By the time of the Spanish-Cuban-American War (1898), Puerto Ricans had been living among other Spanish speakers in cities like Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Key West, and Tampa for some time. Once the U.S. took over control of the island of Puerto Rico in 1898, Puerto Ricans began to emigrate in steady and increasingly larger numbers under the island's local government policies. Cigar makers as well as farm laborers were prominent among the earliest migrants. The connections drawn within the U.S. centers of cigar manufacturing, due to the artisanal nature of their craft, helped to create solidarity and migrant routes among them.

As soon as the US military occupation of Puerto Rico ended with the passage of the Foraker Act of 1900, the newly instituted civilian government, starting with the U.S. appointed Governor Charles Allen, began to view out-migration as an answer to the displacement of workers he viewed as excess population. Thus began a governmental policy of emigration that would last throughout most of the twentieth century. The first of these migratory processes began in 1900. For the next two years more than 5,000 Puerto Rican men, women, and children were sent to Hawaii as farmworkers. Over the next couple of decades thousands more Puerto Rican workers were recruited and sent to places like Arizona, New York, and other locations. In addition, port cities became an attraction for Puerto Ricans as commercial interests, particularly in sugar and tobacco, expanded maritime routes, most significantly in New York City, but also in Key West and Tampa.<sup>9</sup> It was these trade routes that Puerto Ricans followed to Florida.

### **Cigar making and the Boricua *Tampeños***

During the latter part of the nineteenth century, Puerto Rican<sup>10</sup> cigar makers often travelled the routes between Puerto Rico and Cuba, especially to Santiago. Cuban and Puerto Rican cigar makers then travelled on to cities like Key West, the site

---

<sup>8</sup> For a more comprehensive understanding of Puerto Ricans' early presence in the U.S. see Cesar A. Iglesias, ed. *Memoirs of Bernardo Vega* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1984); Jesus Colon, *A Puerto Rican in New York and Other Sketches* (New York: International Publishers, 1982); Virginia Sanchez Korrol, *From Colonia to Community: The History of Puerto Ricans in New York City* (University of California Press, 1994); Juan Flores, *Divided Arrivals: Narratives of the Puerto Rican Migration, 1920-1950* (New York: Centro de Estudios Puertorriqueños, Hunter College, 1998); German Delgado Pasapera, *Puerto Rico, Luchas Emancipadoras* (Rio Piedras: Editorial Cultural, 1984); Lorrin Thomas, *Puerto Rican Citizens: History and Political Identity in Twentieth Century New York City* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2010). For Puerto Rican migration experience outside of New York see Carmen T. Whalen, *From Puerto Rico to Philadelphia: Puerto Rican Workers and Postwar Economies* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2001); Ruth Glasser, *Aqui Me Quedo: Puerto Ricans in Connecticut* (Harford: Connecticut Humanities Council, 1997).

<sup>9</sup> For a better understanding of the Puerto Rican migration experience to Hawai'i see: Blasé Camacho Sousa, "Boricua Hawaiians," in *Extended Roots: From Hawaii to New York, Migraciones Puertorriqueñas a los Estados Unidos* (New York: Centro de Estudios Puertorriqueños, Hunter College, 1984), 24-35; Iris Lopez, "Borinkis and Chop Suey: Puerto Rican Identity in Hawai'i, 1900-2000" in Carmen T. Whalen and Victor Vazquez-Hernandez, eds., *The Puerto Rican Diaspora: Historical Perspectives* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2005).

<sup>10</sup> Boricua is a term of endearment that Puerto Ricans use to self-identify. It is derived from the word *Boriken* which is the term used by the native population that inhabited the island, the Tainos, when the Spaniards began their colonization of the island in 1508. *Tampeños* is the way Spanish speakers from Tampa identify themselves.

of significant cigar manufacturing during the last third of the nineteenth century.<sup>11</sup> When Martínez Ybor moved his cigar making factory from Key West to Tampa in 1886, he did so because the latter provided better conditions: a deeper port and a railroad connection to the rest of the state. Martínez Ybor also brought 200 cigar makers along with him, some of whom were Puerto Rican.<sup>12</sup> Tampa, particularly the section of the city that would become Ybor City, became a vibrant center in this time period and made the city a prominent attraction for foreign labor.<sup>13</sup> It was there that at first dozens, and later hundreds of Puerto Ricans, many of them cigar makers, would migrate in the later decades of the nineteenth century, and the early twentieth century. Anthropologist Susan Greenbaum was the first to document the presence of Puerto Ricans in Florida in her important essay on Afro-Cuban cigar makers in Ybor City. In her study of the centennial of Afro-Cubans in Ybor City, 1886-1986, Greenbaum highlights the Afro-Puerto Rican Casellas family.<sup>14</sup>

The Casellas brothers, Pedro and Catalino, were prominent among Puerto Rican cigar makers in Tampa during this time period. They moved to Tampa from Puerto Rico in the late nineteenth century. Pedro Casellas was the first to arrive in 1888; his brother Catalino followed in 1891. The story of this family begins to sketch a portrait of early migration from Puerto Rico to Florida, of settlement patterns, and employment and other economic opportunities in Tampa in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

This migration to Florida of Puerto Ricans such as the Casellas family characterizes the early working-class nature of this group. One of the reasons Tampa's cigar manufacturing attracted foreign workers during this period was the salaries paid at the time. A *Tampa Journal* article, cited by Gary Mormino and George Pozzetta in their book on Ybor City, points out that the Ybor factory alone, for instance, had a weekly payroll of \$4,000 in 1888, the year Pedro Casellas arrived. By 1894, weekly paychecks for workers at twelve cigar factories averaged \$12.50, and by 1895 all cigar makers of Tampa combined were pulling in more than \$5 million in salary. This was a lot more than many industrial workers were making at the time.<sup>15</sup> The study of the Casellas family is also illustrative because they were black Puerto Ricans and tended to live among the Afro Cubans, who

---

<sup>11</sup> Angel Quintero Rivera, *Worker's Struggle in Puerto Rico: A Documentary History* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1976) 8.

<sup>12</sup> Gary Mormino and George Pozzetta, *The Immigrant World of Ybor City: Italians and their Latin Neighbors, 1885-1985* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1985), 22.

<sup>13</sup> Gary Mormino and George Pozzetta, *The Immigrant World of Ybor City*, 23.

<sup>14</sup> Susan D. Greenbaum, *Afro-Cubans in Ybor City: A Centennial History* (Tampa: Tek Type Printing, 1986).

<sup>15</sup> Greenbaum, *Afro-Cubans in Ybor City*, 16; United States Manuscript Census, 1900, Enumerator District # 64, Sheet No. 2B provides the arrival dates for both Pedro and Catalino Casellas, [www.Ancestry.com/CensusVotersLists/USFederalCensusCollection](http://www.Ancestry.com/CensusVotersLists/USFederalCensusCollection); Mormino and Pozzetta, *The Immigrant World of Ybor City*, 69.

constituted a smaller but important enclave in Ybor City.<sup>16</sup> These early Puerto Ricans concentrated predominantly in the fifth, sixth, and seventh wards of the city.<sup>17</sup>

The establishment of the Casellas brothers in Tampa and the subsequent generations of Puerto Ricans in the City require further investigation, but it is important to note that this family developed deep roots in the community and participated in the cultural and organizational life of the city. The Casellas brothers founded their own cigar making shops, *chinchales*, as they were called, places that also served to train new cigar makers. Some of the Casellas women were also involved in cigar making and manufacturing. Such was the case of Loretta, Pedro Casella's wife, and Lizzie, Catalino Casella's wife. Catalino's daughters, Juanita, Petronila, and Maria were all listed as cigar makers in the 1920 census and in the 1921 and 1925 City Directories.<sup>18</sup> Their nephew Juan Casellas was a prominent member of La Union Marti-Maceo, the Cuban Mutual Aid Society formed in Ybor City in 1904. In 1917, Juan Casellas became the president of the group, and was still a member well into his seventies. In fact, 90 percent of Puerto Rican women in Tampa listed in the 1910-1940 manuscript censuses who had jobs were in the cigar industry.<sup>19</sup>

Tampa, with its cigar industry and related industries, was a hub of labor and political action, attracting other well-known labor leaders, anarchists, and socialists. Prominent among these were Luisa Capetillo, the early twentieth century Puerto Rican feminist and anarchist organizer and writer. In 1913 Capetillo spent some time in Tampa among the cigar makers. She lived in Tampa and worked as a reader in a cigar factory while she finished writing a second edition of her book.<sup>20</sup> This was a particularly distinctive job in the cigar factories because it was an important part of the cigar makers' culture to have an individual read to them twice a day as they worked; usually from newspapers in the mornings and from novels in the afternoons. The cigar makers themselves collected the money to pay the readers. Also, there were other Puerto Ricans who worked in the cigar industry in other capacities. One such person was Manuel de J. Parrilla, who is listed in the 1920 US Census as a reader in a cigar factory in Ybor City. Parrilla is also noteworthy because of the Puerto Rico-Tampa-New York connection, and the circular nature

---

<sup>16</sup> Race among Puerto Rican migrants is the subject of a few studies by scholars like Clara E. Rodriguez, among others, but very little work has been done for this earlier time period, especially in the Jim Crow South. For works on Puerto Ricans in the United States related to race see Clara E. Rodriguez, *Changing Race: Latinos, the Census, and the History of Ethnicity in the United States* (New York: New York University Press, 2000); Clara E. Rodriguez, *Puerto Ricans: Born in the U.S.A.* (Boston: Unwin Hyman, 1989).

<sup>17</sup> US Census, Manuscript Census, 1910, Enumerator District #554, Sheet No. 7B, [www.Ancestry.com/CensusVoters Lists/US Federal Census Collection](http://www.Ancestry.com/CensusVoters Lists/US Federal Census Collection).

<sup>18</sup> United States Manuscript Census, 1920 Enumerator District #48; Sheet No.; Polk City Directory for Tampa 1921, 1924 and 1925 lists the occupations for Loretta, Lizzie, Petronila, Juanita and Maria Casellas as cigar makers, [www.Ancestry.com/CensusVoters Lists/US Federal Census Collection](http://www.Ancestry.com/CensusVoters Lists/US Federal Census Collection).

<sup>19</sup> Greenbaum, *Afro-Cubans in Ybor City*, 20.

<sup>20</sup> Yamila Azize, *The Unionist*, Social Services Employees Union Local 371-DC 37 AFSCME AFL-CIO, (New York: vol. 32 Num. 10 Nov. 2002) 2, 8.



of Puerto Rican migration. In 1910 Parrilla lived in Tampa, but by 1930, the US Census found him living in the Bronx. In 1942, his World War II draft card indicated he was living in Rio Piedras, Puerto Rico. By 1945 he was traveling aboard the S.S. Cape Beal and listed his address as 529 W. 169th Street in New York City.<sup>21</sup>

Changes in the production of cigars began to affect the industry seriously beginning around 1920. The most prominent changes occurred with the introduction of the cigar making machine. The Casellas family, like other *tampeños*, was probably affected by the downturn in cigar manufacturing during that period. The changes prompted job loss and the out migration of many cigar makers. During the Great Depression, about one fourth of the foreign-born white population of Tampa left the city and about one half of all foreign-born blacks left as well. Most Latino tampeños headed north to New York, Philadelphia, and other cities.<sup>22</sup> Some, like Parrilla, moved back to Puerto Rico. His World War II draft card lists him as living on the island in 1942. By September 1945 he was on the SS *Monterey* in route from Puerto Rico to New York City; the ship's manifest listed his address in Manhattan.<sup>23</sup>

Eventually some of the tampeños made their way back to Tampa, and others from northern cities and from Puerto Rico continued to move to Tampa. However, more work needs to be done on the Puerto Rican Diaspora in Tampa. Judging by the current celebration of the Annual Puerto Rican Day Parade in that city, which has been held for the last several decades, and the number of Puerto Rican residents previously cited who have lived in that region, the community has continued to grow to this day. The Diaspora in Tampa awaits researchers who can focus on documenting the history of the community.

### **Miami Dreams: Investors, Farmworkers, Garment Workers and Professionals Are Drawn to the Magic City**

The Great Depression had a significant impact on Puerto Rican migration to the U.S. Migration halted and, in fact, reversed during the early years of the Great Depression, with more Puerto Ricans returning to the island than leaving. By the middle of the 1930s, as the economic situation deteriorated on the island the exodus to the U.S. resumed. Florida seemed primed to welcome and encourage Puerto Ricans to move there. In 1933, Robert Gore, a Floridian and a supporter of Franklin D. Roosevelt, was appointed by the President as Governor of Puerto Rico. From the beginning of his tenure, Governor Gore expressed his opinion that the state of Florida was an excellent place to send unemployed Puerto Rican laborers,

---

<sup>21</sup> US Manuscript Census 1920, Enumerator District #49, Sheet No. 11, [www.Ancestry.com//CensusVoters Lists//US Federal Census Collection](http://www.Ancestry.com//CensusVoters Lists//US Federal Census Collection); US Manuscript Census 1930, Enumerator District # 340, Sheet No. 5A, [www.Ancestry.com//CensusVoters Lists//US Federal Census Collection](http://www.Ancestry.com//CensusVoters Lists//US Federal Census Collection); WW II Draft Card Registration Cards, 1942, [www.Ancestry.com](http://www.Ancestry.com). April 27, 1942; Baltimore Passengers Lists, 1860-1964, Roll T 844, SS Cape Beal, San Juan to Baltimore, MD, October 2-7, 1945, [www.Ancestry.com](http://www.Ancestry.com).

<sup>22</sup> Greenbaum, *Afro-Cubans in Ybor City*, 19.

<sup>23</sup> World War II draft card and ship's manifest located in [www.Ancestry.com](http://www.Ancestry.com).

where there was a need for workers, especially in agriculture. Letters written to Governor Gore during his tenure made it evident that islanders were well aware of his promotion of the Sunshine State and many indicated their willingness to relocate.<sup>24</sup> Unemployed Puerto Ricans were not the only islanders who became interested in the prospects of Florida during this time period. Island industrialists and owners of major sugar plantations who began looking to invest overseas were also attracted to Florida. It was in the 1930s that a group of Puerto Rican investors first purchased land South of Lake Okeechobee in Palm Beach County for development of agriculture.<sup>25</sup>

Another factor that contributed to facilitating migration to Miami at this time was air travel, which expanded in the late 1920s and early 1930s. Wealthy Puerto Ricans began to fly between Miami and the island. Pan Am was the first airline to offer flights between the island and Miami. The first flight left Puerto Rico bound for Miami on 29 January 1929. The flight was quite challenging because it flew from San Juan to Belize, then on to Managua, Nicaragua before arriving in Miami.<sup>26</sup> Miami and South Florida in general became more attractive for Puerto Ricans, and in the early 1940s migration to Florida shifted from Tampa to the Magic City.

There are several reasons for this shift. The military servicemen stationed in the city and the surrounding region found the environment attractive, as did wealthy Puerto Rican investors, farm laborers, garment workers, and those attracted to work in the burgeoning hotel industry. Between 1940 and 1960, the Puerto Rican population in Miami increased from less than 200 to more than 30,000. At the same time the number of Puerto Ricans in Florida increased dramatically from about 300 in 1940, to over 3,000 statewide in 1950, and almost 47,000 by 1970.<sup>27</sup>

Puerto Ricans had been traveling to and settling in Miami-Dade County since the early twentieth century, however the numbers began to pick up dramatically during and after World War II. During the War, a number of Puerto Ricans serving in the US armed forces were stationed in and around Miami. This served to familiarize them with the area, and some returned after the War. Also, some American GIs serving in Puerto Rico during the War married Puerto Rican women, and some moved to the Miami area to continue their service or retire in Florida. This is particularly true of South Florida and Central Florida veterans.

An article in *El Mundo*, one of the Puerto Rico's major newspapers at the time, dated 14 October 1945, announced the investment of more than five million dollars of Puerto Rican private capital in the purchase of 80,000 acres of land in the

---

<sup>24</sup> Letters to Governor Gore, General Archives of Puerto Rico, San Juan, fondo: Oficina del Gobernador, tarea: 96-20, box 269.

<sup>25</sup> Santiago Rosas, "The Island's Agriculture Flourishes in Florida: Puerto Ricans Own 80,000 Acres near the Everglades," *El Mundo*, (San Juan, Puerto Rico), 14 Oct. 1945.

<sup>26</sup> Maria T. Padilla, *Orlando Latino*, <http://orlandolatino.blogspot.com>, 19 Oct. 2010. Padilla is editor of *La Prensa Latina* (Orlando).

<sup>27</sup> Melanie Shell-Weiss, *Coming to Miami: A Social History* (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2009), 152.

western part of West Palm Beach. Puerto Rican investors had already established a sugar mill called Central Fellesmore in the region south of Lake Okeechobee in the mid-1930s. The list of investors read like a *Who's Who* of the island's richest landowners and industrialists, and included the Roig family of Humacao, as well as the Ferre and Serralles families of Ponce. Many of those families, including a son of the Ferre family named Maurice, who would become the first Hispanic mayor of Miami, settled in the Brickell section of Miami during the 1940s. Along with other Puerto Rican investors and bankers, they created a neighborhood called Little San Juan in Brickell. The land, located west of Palm Beach, was purchased not only for the cultivation of sugar, but for cattle grazing and other agricultural production as well, as indicated by Juan B. Garcia Mendez, a member of the political clan of the island and a former Senator in Puerto Rico. Mendez had been living in Miami for some time and helped to found the Okeechobee Growers Association, headquartered in the Congress Building located in downtown Miami.<sup>28</sup>

In addition to capital investments in the Everglades and South Dade County, Puerto Rican investors bought up prime real estate in Miami. Another 1945 article in *El Mundo* indicated that at least \$1.3 million had been spent by these investors in acquiring several office and apartment buildings, as well as hotels. The article also mentioned Puerto Ricans who traveled back and forth between Miami and Puerto Rico and stayed for short periods of time. Some of those Puerto Ricans also owned homes in the city. It was estimated that at the time, Puerto Ricans owned more than 100 homes in Miami, valued at between \$10,000 and \$20,000 dollars each. Meanwhile, the working-class Puerto Rican population of the city was estimated to be approximately 500.<sup>29</sup>

While these Puerto Rican industrialists made an economic and social impact on the City of Miami, other Puerto Ricans arrived to work in the outlying farms, and some began to live in a section of the city called Wynwood. By the early 1950s newspaper articles were referring to the growing Puerto Rican "ghetto" in Miami. On 18 February 1952, a *Miami Herald* article translated and re-published in *El Mundo* made reference to Puerto Rican farmworkers living in squalid conditions in this neighborhood. As far back as the 1930s, Puerto Ricans had been coming to Florida to work in agriculture, but it was after World War II that they began arriving in larger numbers during the late 1940s and early 1950s. By 1953 there was a steady stream of Puerto Rican farmworkers entering Florida's agricultural labor force. That year, reported *El Mundo*, there were 3,000 Puerto Rican farmworkers in

---

<sup>28</sup> "Puerto Ricans Own 80,000 Acres near the Everglades – Gov't Provides Stimulus and Support" *El Mundo* (San Juan, Puerto Rico), 1; 15 October 14, 1945; "Boricuas Acquire Make Homes and Properties in Miami: Investments in One Office Building Alone Is \$1.3 Million – No Less than 500 Puerto Ricans Work in Miami," *El Mundo*, Nov. 18, 1945.

<sup>29</sup> "There is a Puerto Rican Ghetto in Miami – 50 Farm Workers Live in Two Houses," *El Mundo*, Feb. 16, 1952.

the state. This number represented 25 percent of the farmworkers hired to work in Davie, Broward, and Palm Beach counties. Many also worked in farms in Florida City and Homestead in Dade County.<sup>30</sup> Many of these farmworkers returned to the island after their contracts expired, or traveled to other parts of the US where growing seasons began after the Florida season ended. Increasingly more stayed in Miami and in other parts of South Florida to work in the city's growing number of garment factories and hotels. Many farmworkers discovered that there were other, better paying jobs in the cities, with better working conditions than those found on the farms. Also, moving to Miami allowed these migrants to bring their families. This is how the Puerto Rican enclave of Wynnwood began.

During the late 1940s and early 1950s, garment manufacturers from the North began relocating to the South, particularly to Miami's Wynnwood area, as well as to Hialeah. While garment factories in cities like New York often employed hundreds of workers, those in Miami tended to hire 60 or fewer workers each. The garment district in Miami, bound by Northwest Fifth Avenue, stretching on up to Hialeah, became known as Garment Row; it was also bounded by Twenty-seventh Avenue, where the corner became known as the southern version of Manhattan's Seventh Avenue.<sup>31</sup> Puerto Ricans made up 40 percent of all garment workers in New York City and New Jersey in the 1950s, and the percentage was almost the same in Miami. Around this time two Puerto Rican women, Dorothy "Dottie" Quintana and Dr. Alicia S. Baro, who would become leaders of the community in subsequent decades, moved to Miami from New York City. Quintana was born in Ponce, Puerto Rico in 1909, and moved to New York with her mother and brothers in 1927. She lived in the city until 1950, when she moved to Miami with her husband Efrain and their daughter. She moved to Wynnwood in 1957, where she lived until her death in 2010, at 101 years of age. Dottie, as she was known to all, was a firebrand organizer and defender of the community. She also worked in the garment factories of Wynnwood.<sup>32</sup>

Dr. Baro was born in San Lorenzo, Puerto Rico in 1919 and moved with her family to New York in the 1930s. She eventually received a bachelor's degree from the City University of New York's Hunter College, and in 1951 she moved to Miami with her husband Jose Antonio, where they lived until her death in 2012. Both Quintana and Dr. Baro were involved the struggles and evolution of Puerto Ricans in Miami for more than 50 years. Many of the Puerto Rican organizations in the city, such as Aspira Inc. of Florida, part of a national Latino leadership organization, and the Miami Chapter of National Conference of Puerto Rican Women (NACOPRW), came out of Wynnwood; Dr. Baro had a hand in

---

<sup>30</sup> James Cunningham, "American Employers Land Puerto Rican Laborers in Florida: Reveal the Great Success in Creation of Job Opportunities in Eastern Portion of the State," *El Mundo* (San Juan, Puerto Rico) July 22, 1953.

<sup>31</sup> Shell-Weiss, *Coming to Miami*, 140-141.

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*, 144; interview with Dr. Alicia S. Baro, by author, Kendall, 20 May 2008; interview with Dorothy Quintana by author, Wynnwood, 8 May 2008.

founding almost every one of these organizations. The oldest of these groups, the Organización de Demócratas Puertorriqueños (Organization of Puerto Rican Democrats, or ODP), was founded in 1955, initially to address the civil rights of Puerto Rican farmworkers in Homestead. The ODP led a campaign to improve the lives and living conditions of Puerto Rican farmworkers in Homestead and Wynnwood.<sup>33</sup>

The growth of the Puerto Rican Diaspora in Miami was felt politically. In the 1950s and 1960s Puerto Ricans were considered an important voting bloc because they were U.S. citizens.<sup>34</sup> In 1967 Maurice Ferre, the son of one of the investor families in Miami, was elected State Representative in a special election. In 1972 he was elected the first Hispanic Mayor of the City of Miami. Ferre's election opened the doors for other Latino politicians, especially for Cubans who followed him into the mayoralty. Also, the ODP continued to play a key role in the electoral arena, helping other Puerto Rican and Cuban politicians get elected, such as the future mayor of Hialeah, Raul Martinez, who was a member of the ODP.<sup>35</sup>

While Puerto Ricans continued to migrate to Miami and South Florida, the decline in the number of farmworkers from the island beginning in the 1970s, and the decline of the garment manufacturing industry around the same time, limited the job opportunities of both these groups. These changes, coupled with the availability of cheap land, job opportunities in Central Florida from the expansion of the National Aeronautics Space Agency (NASA) in the 1960s, and the construction of Walt Disney theme parks in the 1970s, provided more attraction for Puerto Rican migrants than did South Florida.

### **Disney and NASA – New York Meets San Juan in Orlando**

U.S. Manuscript Census data indicates that Puerto Ricans have been traveling to and residing in the City of Orlando since at least the 1920s. Although their numbers were small during these years, they are important because of the implications for Puerto Ricans who were interested in moving to Orlando before Disney. There are several cases of Puerto Ricans who married Americans and migrated to the Orlando area, stayed for a few years, then migrated again while others remained. The relationship or connection the later Puerto Rican migrants have, if any, to those earlier Puerto Rican migrants, is unknown at this time, but the question is intriguing. The following are a few examples of those early Puerto Rican sojourners to Central Florida who arrived before the mass migration of the 1980s and beyond.

In 1930, a Puerto Rican woman named Angeles Collado, and her Spanish-born husband Modesto, owned and operated an ethnic restaurant in Kissimmee. They lived at 1004 Market Street. Collado, who was born in Mayaguez, Puerto Rico,

---

<sup>33</sup> Alicia S. Baro, interview.

<sup>34</sup> Shell-Weiss, *Coming to Miami*, 142.

<sup>35</sup> Interview with Raul Martinez, former Mayor of Hialeah, by author, 11 Oct. 2008; telephone interview with former Miami Mayor Maurice Ferre, by author, 24 Feb. 2014.

had a son John, and took in a Cuban boarder, Rosario Diaz. It is not clear when the Collados moved to Florida or how long they stayed.<sup>36</sup> But when one considers the existence of this establishment in Kissimmee, a city that currently has a large Puerto Rican presence, the restaurant may have been a sign of things to come. Another Boricua sojourner during this time was Ralph Diaz, an entertainer who worked in nightclubs. He lived in Orlando in the 1930s with his wife Katherine, who was from Pennsylvania, and their son Ralph Jr., who was born in New York. By 1940, however, Ralph and his family had moved back to New York City and there they settled in Spanish Harlem. It is unclear when Ralph moved to Orlando or how long he stayed, he was there in 1935. He might have been lured there by an early tourist attraction. He was, after all, an entertainer.<sup>37</sup>

Aurora V. Dobbins lived in and owned an apartment house near Pine Street in Orlando in the 1940s. She had been living in New York in 1935. Exactly when and why she moved to Orlando is not known at this time. In the 1940 U.S. Federal Census and in the 1945 Florida State Census she is listed as the proprietor of the dwelling where she lived, along with Elsie Ramirez, her adopted Puerto Rican daughter.<sup>38</sup> Clara D. de Parker lived in Orlando for several decades beginning around 1920. Clara was married to Edgar Parker Jones, and in 1910 they lived in the Sabana Seca section of Toa Baja, Puerto Rico where he was the manager of an orange farm. By 1920 Clara, her husband, and their son Roberto were living on Andrews Street in Orlando, where her husband was the manager of a business.<sup>39</sup> Another example was Consuelo Lee Tapia, granddaughter of the famous Puerto Rican nineteenth-century writer, Alejandro Tapia y Rivera. She lived in Orlando in 1940 with her husband Robert Hooper Jr., and their children Virginia and Robert.<sup>40</sup> The connections, if any, these early Puerto Rican residents in Orlando had to those who arrived later has yet to be explored. More work needs to be done in this respect, but it is interesting to note the existence of these early Puerto Rican migrants who lived in Orlando and Kissimmee before the major boom of Puerto Rican migration began in the 1970s.

Puerto Rican women who married US servicemen are yet another example of Puerto Ricans who lived in the Orlando area during World War II. There were also some Puerto Rican GIs stationed in the Orlando area during World War II.

---

<sup>36</sup> US Manuscript Census, 1930, Enumerator District # 49-1; Sheet N0. 19-B, [www.Ancestry.com//CensusVoters Lists//US Federal Census Collection](http://www.Ancestry.com//CensusVoters Lists//US Federal Census Collection).

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid.*, 1940, Enumerator District # 20; Sheet No. 2A, [www.Ancestry.com//CensusVoters Lists//US Federal Census Collection](http://www.Ancestry.com//CensusVoters Lists//US Federal Census Collection).

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*, Enumerator District # 48-5; Sheet No. 12 A, [www.Ancestry.com//CensusVoters Lists//US Federal Census Collection](http://www.Ancestry.com//CensusVoters Lists//US Federal Census Collection); 1945 Florida State Census S1371, Roll 29 p. 68 Line 25.

<sup>39</sup> US Manuscript Census, 1920, Enumerator District #18, Sheet No. 18; US Manuscript Census 1940 Enumerator District # 5; Sheet No. 1A and 1945 Florida State Census S 5, Roll 20, p. 27 Line 12, [www.Ancestry.com//CensusVoters Lists//US Federal Census Collection](http://www.Ancestry.com//CensusVoters Lists//US Federal Census Collection). The census does not specify the type of business he was in, but one could speculate that it might have been oranges because this is what he was doing in Puerto Rico in 1910, and because oranges was one of the largest business activities in Orlando at the time.

<sup>40</sup> US Manuscript Census 1940, ED 48-15; Sheet N. 5 A; US Manuscript Census 1930 Enumerator District 60-402; Sheet No. 4 B, [www.Ancestry.com//CensusVoters Lists//US Federal Census Collection](http://www.Ancestry.com//CensusVoters Lists//US Federal Census Collection).

One such case was that of Gonzalo Feliciano and of Sandalio Ayala, both born in Puerto Rico and serving the US Army in Orlando during the 1940s. While it is hard to determine how long they served or remained in the area, Ayala did come back at a later date because he is listed as having died in 1991 in St. Petersburg, Florida.<sup>41</sup> There were at least two other Puerto Rican migrants who were married to US Army personnel at this time and residing in Orlando. Gabby Brown was married to Captain. Roy Brown and Olga Rice, was married to Army Colonel Ola Rice, both stationed in Orlando during the war. After the war, the Browns returned to Puerto Rico where their son, Roy Jr. who was born in Orlando, grew up and became a leading folk singer and political voice for the island's pro-independence movement in the 1970s. In the 1950s, land developers in Orlando targeted local military bases to recruit retiring veterans, and attempted to convince them to remain in the region. These developers also had offices in San Juan, Puerto Rico, and promoting settlement in Orlando. Patricia Silver argues that the transformation of the Orlando area from cattle ranches and orange groves to theme parks and aerospace complexes helped to create conditions that increased the number of Puerto Ricans in Orlando.<sup>42</sup>

The mass movement of Puerto Ricans to Orlando from New York and other US locations, as well as directly from the island, began in the 1960s, but essentially took off after 1980. As early as the mid-1960s, land developers were selling plots in Florida to Puerto Ricans who lived in New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and on the island, among others. In 1971 my parents bought a plot in a development called Montura Ranch, south of Lake Okeechobee. One of the selling points made to my mother and many other Puerto Ricans by developers was that the soil at the Ranch was very fertile, like most of Puerto Rico's. Buyers, they argued, could plant avocados, bananas, and other products consumed by Puerto Ricans. In the decades since, the Puerto Rican population of Orange, Seminole, and Osceola counties has increased nearly thirty-fold.<sup>43</sup> At first Puerto Rican farmworkers were attracted to the area, especially the farm labor camps around Delray Beach. By 1960 there were almost 7,000 Puerto Ricans living in Orlando, many of them farmworkers. Some were attracted by the growing service and entertainment industry. However, the biggest attraction was the opening of Disney's first theme park in 1971. During the 1960s more Puerto Ricans also moved to Orlando to retire, and as a result of the increasing promotion of the area.<sup>44</sup> In addition, land speculation agents in cities

---

<sup>41</sup> Florida State Census, 1945 S1371, Roll 37 p. 58 Line 4 for Feliciano and p. 35 line 42 for Ayala, [www.Ancestry.com/CensusVoters Lists/US Federal Census Collection](http://www.Ancestry.com/CensusVoters Lists/US Federal Census Collection).

<sup>42</sup> Jorge Duany and Patricia Silver, "The 'Puerto Ricanization' of Florida: Historical Background and Current Status," *Centro Journal* 22, no. 1 (spring 2010): 16; Patricia Silver, "Culture is More Than Bingo and Salsa: Making Puertorriquenidad in Central Florida," *Centro Journal* 22, no. 1 (spring 2010): 60.

<sup>43</sup> Luis Martínez-Fernández, "Florida's Puerto Rican Phenomenon," *Forum: The Magazine of the Florida Humanities Council* 36, no. 1 (spring 2012): 14.

<sup>44</sup> Duany and Silver, "The 'Puerto Ricanization,'" 17-18.

like New York and other Puerto Rican enclaves sold plots of land and promoted Central Florida.

As the number of Puerto Rican college graduates increased on the island in the 1960s and 1970s, recruiters from the U.S. began to hire them to move to the States. Among the larger recruiters was NASA, which hired dozens of engineers.<sup>45</sup> Disney also recruited in Puerto Rico during this time. Silver points out that many respondents in her oral history project indicated that they had first learned of the possibilities of living in Orlando from trips to Disneyworld.<sup>46</sup>

Another significant wave of Puerto Ricans moved to Orlando in the 1980s. They were pushed by deteriorating conditions exemplified by deindustrialization affecting large cities like New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, and Hartford, among others.<sup>47</sup> In Orlando, Kissimmee, and other areas, Puerto Ricans founded numerous community and cultural organizations. One of the oldest is La Asociación Boriqueña, founded in Orlando in April 1977. Puerto Ricans gather at the Asociación for social and political events. Newspapers like *La Prensa*, started by Dr. Manuel A. Toro, were instrumental in keeping people informed. *La Prensa* circulated from Tampa to Daytona Beach. Since then dozens of groups, businesses, and cultural and commercial organizations have evolved as well.<sup>48</sup>

In terms of a political presence, Puerto Ricans in the Orlando-Kissimmee region have had modest success. Since the early 1980s they have elected their own to political officeholders. The first elected commissioner in the region was Mary Johnson, who was born in New York to a Cuban father and a Puerto Rican mother. She was first elected to the Orlando City Council in 1980 and elected Commissioner in Orange County in 1992. Several State Representatives have also been elected from this area over the course of the last couple of decades including Democrat Tony Suarez (1999) and Republican John Quinones (2004). In 2012 Puerto Ricans from Orlando elected the first Boricua to the State Senate, Darren Soto, an attorney originally from New Jersey who had served in the State House of Representatives in Tallahassee since 2007.<sup>49</sup>

## **Conclusion**

The Puerto Rican presence in Florida continues to grow. If present rates are an indicator, it could reach the one million mark during this decade. What is clear is that Puerto Ricans born on the island and those born in the Diaspora have brought with them a diversity of histories and cultural traits, imaginings of Puerto Ricanness according to Patricia Silver, and blended them with the diverse Anglo,

---

<sup>45</sup> Silver, "Culture is More than Bingo and Salsa," 65.

<sup>46</sup> *Ibid.*, 61.

<sup>47</sup> Martínez-Fernández, "Florida's Puerto Rican Phenomenon," 15; Silver, "Culture is More than Bingo and Salsa," 73.

<sup>48</sup> Silver, "Culture is More than Bingo and Salsa," 76.

<sup>49</sup> <http://orlandosentinel.com/1992-06-16> June 1991; Michael Griffin, *Orlando Sentinel*, Jan. 7, 2000; Mark Pizer, *Orlando Sentinel*, Feb. 17, 2013; all at [www.orlandosentinel.com](http://www.orlandosentinel.com).



African American, and other Caribbean and Latino cultures “forged out divergent experiences of race, gender, class, and migration.”<sup>50</sup> There is still much work to be done on the history of this Diaspora. As this essay demonstrates, by using census data and other primary and secondary sources (including oral histories), a better connection can be made among the different waves of migration and community building experiences of this Diaspora in Florida. This is particularly true for the early migration of Puerto Ricans during the latter part of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. This essay has identified some of the key trends in this migration and hopefully more light can be shined on the different groups of Puerto Rican pioneers who have come to Florida. From the triangle encompassing Tampa, Miami, and Orlando, a new history of Puerto Ricans in the southeastern United States has begun to emerge.

---

<sup>50</sup> Silver, “Culture is More than Bingo and Salsa,” 58.



# **An Archaeological Perspective on East Florida's Loyalist Influx: The Excavation of a Loyalist Refugee Vessel Lost at St. Augustine on 31 December 1782**

Chuck Meide

*Lighthouse Archaeological Maritime Program (LAMP)*

## **The Loyalist Influx of East Florida: 1775-1783**

The first Loyalist refugees displaced by the American Revolution and seeking haven in East Florida arrived in late 1775 from Virginia.<sup>1</sup> This coincided with a November 1775 proclamation issued by East Florida's Governor Patrick Tonyn at the order of George III offering asylum and land grants to Loyalists displaced by the rebellion. In addition to Tonyn's proclamation, which was distributed throughout the southern colonies, rebel governments themselves encouraged Loyalists to flee to St. Augustine, with laws passed in Georgia and the Carolinas forcing free male inhabitants unwilling to swear allegiance to the revolutionary cause to sell their property and emigrate.<sup>2</sup> As the war progressed, the numbers of Loyalist refugees making their way to East Florida steadily increased in the face of hostilities across the southern backcountry, so that the white population of St. Augustine grew from its pre-war figure of 1,000 to over 4,500 by late June 1782.<sup>3</sup>

After the fall of Yorktown in October 1781, as hinterland skirmishes and rearguard actions supplanted pivotal battles, treaty negotiations took precedence for the remainder of the war. Rumors abounded that Britain was planning to end the war and abandon her colonies to the vengeful rebels, along with any loyal subjects unable to get out. In March 1782 these rumors were validated in Savannah when public notice was given that an agent was available to meet with "refugees who are desirous of going to East Florida to settle there, agreeable to the encouragement contained in Tonyn's proclamation."<sup>4</sup> Throughout the summer and fall of 1782, both the lives of southern Loyalists and the efforts of colonial authorities were dominated by the problems of evacuation.

As there were simply not enough ships available for the emptying of more than one major port at a time, Savannah, considered the most vulnerable to enemy attack, was the first to be evacuated. Starting on 11 July 1782, all available military transports in North America, some 11,014 tons of shipping, were utilized to remove troops, supplies, slaves, and civilians from the city. Of the assembled transports almost a fifth, or seven ships totaling 1,880 tons, were bound for St. Augustine

---

<sup>1</sup> Roger Clark Smith, "The Fourteenth Colony: Florida and the American Revolution" (PhD diss., University of Florida, 2011), 262.

<sup>2</sup> Linda K. Williams, "East Florida as a Loyalist Haven," *Florida Historical Quarterly* 54, no. 4 (April 1976): 465.

<sup>3</sup> Robert Stansbury Lambert, *South Carolina Loyalists in the American Revolution* (Clemson: Clemson University Digital Press, 2010), 187; Smith, "Fourteenth Colony," 262, 271.

<sup>4</sup> Lambert, *South Carolina Loyalists*, 178.

with 485 white refugees, 748 slaves, provisions, and “Indian presents.” Even with five additional ships chartered by Lieutenant Governor John Graham, there were not enough vessels to handle the required volume of humanity and many more Loyalists had to make their way to St. Augustine on “canoes, boats, and such small craft.”<sup>5</sup> Wilbur Siebert calculates that some 5,148 individuals arrived in St. Augustine from Savannah by 18 July, doubling the white population of East Florida and increasing the black population by one fourth or more.<sup>6</sup>

The evacuation of Savannah, followed by that of Charleston, opened the floodgates, heralding a demographic explosion in St. Augustine, which had beforehand been the smallest provincial capital in British North America. East Florida, already described as “an asylum for refugees,” was of course the closest safe haven for southern Loyalists.<sup>7</sup> Many from Georgia and the Carolinas, particularly planters and slave-owners, preferred Florida to the Canadian colonies due to its similarity in climate, which was more suitable for the slave-based plantation economy under which they had prospered.<sup>8</sup> It was also a relatively short move, and many evacuees likely saw East Florida’s proximity as a potential opportunity to re-take possession of their lost properties should the war take a miraculous turn in their favor or if the nascent republic fell apart shortly after its birth, as was commonly anticipated by many diehards.<sup>9</sup>

Charleston was the next port city to be evacuated.<sup>10</sup> It was a much greater logistical challenge, and planners estimated it would take three times as much tonnage to evacuate as was used in Savannah.<sup>11</sup> By the middle of August more than 4,200 Loyalists had registered their intent to participate in the evacuation, including almost 2,500 women and children, along with almost 7,200 slaves.<sup>12</sup> Because of the sheer volume of people and supplies, the evacuation of Charleston took place in two distinct stages. After months of planning, enough ships were finally assembled for the first evacuation fleet by the end of September, though it would not set sail until the second week of October. Among those departing for East Florida was the new military commander for St. Augustine, Lt. Colonel

---

<sup>5</sup> “General Sir Guy Carleton to Lord Shelburne, 15 August 1782,” British National Archives (BNA), CO 5/106, fols. 166-169; Wilbur H. Siebert, *Loyalists in East Florida, 1774 to 1785: The Most Important Documents Pertaining Thereto Edited with an Accompanying Narrative* (Deland: Florida State Historical Society, 1929), 1:107; David Syrett, *Shipping and the American War 1775-83: A Study of British Transport Organization* (London: Athlone Press, 1970), 236-237.

<sup>6</sup> Siebert, *Loyalists in East Florida*, 1:105-106, 109. Siebert’s breakdown of the Savannah evacuation is: 1,042 Loyalists (503 men, 269 women, and 270 children), 1,956 slaves, at least 500 loyal militiamen, 350 Choctaw and Creek Indians, and 1,300 regular troops.

<sup>7</sup> American Manuscripts Commission, *Report on American Manuscripts in the Royal Institution of Great Britain* (Dublin: His Majesty’s Stationary Office, 1906), 2:527.

<sup>8</sup> Smith, “Fourteenth Colony,” 279; Carolyn Watterson Troxler, “Loyalist Refugees and the British Evacuation of East Florida, 1783-1785,” *Florida Historical Quarterly* 60, no. 1 (July 1981): 21.

<sup>9</sup> Lambert, *South Carolina Loyalists*, 186; Smith, “Fourteenth Colony,” 279; J. Leitch Wright, “Lord Dunmore’s Loyalist Asylum in the Floridas,” *Florida Historical Quarterly* 49, no. 4 (April 1971): 377.

<sup>10</sup> Joseph W. Barnwell, “The Evacuation of Charleston by the British in 1782,” *The South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine* 11, no. 1 (January 1910): 1-26.

<sup>11</sup> “Carleton to Shelburne, August 15, 1782,” BNA, CO 5/106, fol. 166.

<sup>12</sup> Lambert, *South Carolina Loyalists*, 182.

Archibald McArthur, along with a number of provincial units, and also many Loyalist families, including some “substantial” merchants and planters along with many others less affluent and without slaves. Provisions sent to East Florida for these refugees were enough for 1,000 whites and 2,000 slaves.<sup>13</sup>

An eyewitness description by a British officer provides insight into the hardships of the displaced Loyalists fleeing Charleston:

To provide in some measure for these poor wretches, the commanders of the garrisons (though contrary to their orders) protracted the evacuations as long as they possibly could without offending the Ministry. Transports were procured, and several hundreds with their personal property went to St. Augustine, in Florida, the Governor of which granted each family a tract of land upon which they sat down and began the world anew. . . . There were old grey-headed men and women, husbands and wives with large families of little children, women with infants at their breasts, poor widows whose husbands had lost their lives in the service of their King and country, with half a dozen half-starved bantlings taggling at their skirts, taking leave of their friends. Here you saw people who had lived all their days in affluence (though not in luxury) leaving their real estates, their houses, stores, ships, and improvements, and hurrying on board the transports with what little household goods they had been able to save. In every street were to be seen men, women, and children wringing their hands, lamenting the situation of those who were about leaving the country, and the more dreadful situation of such who were either unable to leave or were determined, rather than run the risk of starving in distant lands, to throw themselves upon, and trust to, the mercy of their persecutors, their inveterate enemies, the rebels of America.<sup>14</sup>

After a nine-vessel fleet bound for Halifax with troops, munitions, and including two ships carrying about 500 refugees departed on 1 November, Charleston’s final evacuation fleet was assembled and ready to sail by mid-December. A total of 111 transports departed Charleston, the last crossing the bar on 18 December 1782.<sup>15</sup> This massive fleet had been divided into five squadrons each sailing to a different destination: 48 ships bound for New York with troops and supplies, 20 ships bound for England with officials, officers, and some refugees, 5 ships bound for St. Lucia with baggage and troops, black cavalry horses, the “Frame of a Fort,” and 200 Black Pioneers (assembled from free blacks considered too “obnoxious” to remain without facing harsh retribution), 29 ships bound for Jamaica with merchandise,

<sup>13</sup> Am. Mss. Comm., *Report*, 3:220; Siebert, *Loyalists in East Florida*, 1:114, 124, 133-136; Lambert, *South Carolina Loyalists*, 182.

<sup>14</sup> Thomas Jones, *History of New York During the Revolutionary War* (New York: New York Historical Society, 1879), 2:235-236. See also Barnwell, “Evacuation of Charleston,” 1-5.

<sup>15</sup> “List of Transports appointed to receive the Garrison at Charles Town, 19 November 1782,” BNA, CO 5/108, fols. 38-41; “Abstract of the distribution of Transports, Army & Navy Victuallers, and Oat Vessels appointed to receive the Garrison of Charles Town, Stores, Inhabitants, &c, 3 January 1783,” BNA, CO 5/108, fol. 76; Lambert, *South Carolina Loyalists*, 183.

provisions, 1,260 refugees (591 men, 291 women, and 378 children), and 2,613 slaves (a total of 3,873 souls), and 8 ships registering a total of 1,387 tons bound for St. Augustine with refugees and their effects.<sup>16</sup>

There were actually many more ships leaving Charleston for St. Augustine (and also the mouth of the St. Johns River) with the evacuation fleet. The St. Augustine flotilla was escorted by the frigate HMS *Bellisarius* and a number of smaller armed galleys including *Viper* and *Rattlesnake*. There were also an unknown number of civilian vessels (not hired transports) making the voyage under protection of the convoy. The captain's log of HMS *Bellisarius* noted 120 sail in the convoy headed south (the combined squadrons bound for St. Augustine, Jamaica, and St. Lucia) suggesting that as many as 72 additional ships were sailing with the naval escorts and hired transports.<sup>17</sup> The ships bound for St. Augustine arrived safely at the bar but most met with disaster when attempting to cross it and enter the harbor. Two different visitors to St. Augustine, Elizabeth Johnston at the time of the wrecking event and Johann Schoepf just over a year later, independently noted that sixteen ships from Charleston's final evacuation fleet had wrecked while trying to enter St. Augustine, indicating that there were certainly more vessels on route to St. Augustine than the eight transports arranged by the colonial authorities.<sup>18</sup> In addition to the privately-owned vessels, the aforementioned galley *Rattlesnake* was also lost on St. Augustine's notorious bar.<sup>19</sup> While there appears to have been relatively few lives lost in these shipwrecks, a multitude of hapless refugees found themselves cast ashore in St. Augustine, destitute with the loss of all their possessions.

The sudden influx of people was unprecedented in Florida's entire colonial history, and has been analyzed in detail by Roger Clark Smith.<sup>20</sup> St. Augustine's population was already swollen from the evacuation of Savannah and the steady inflow of refugees and prisoners-of-war in the six years prior. While a wholesale prisoner exchange ordered in June 1781 reduced some of the congestion, the city's

<sup>16</sup> The names and individual tonnages of the ships departing for East Florida, along with enumerations of refugees, slaves, troops, and the nature and amount of cargo, remain a mystery. The "List of Transports" dated 19 November 1782, a month before the fleet departed, makes no mention of a Florida-bound fleet. The "Abstract of the distribution of Transports" dated 3 January 1783, a fortnight after the fleet departed, does list a total of 8 Florida-bound ships under convoy of HMS *Bellisarius*, but all of the preceding pages of this document, which should have listed these ships and their details individually, appear to be missing from the BNA.

<sup>17</sup> "Logg Book on Board His Majesty's Ship *Belisarius*, Richard Graves Esq. Commanding, from 30 August 1782 to Oct 1783," BNA, ADM 52/2161, Book 3, entry dated 19 December 1782.

<sup>18</sup> Elizabeth Lichtenstein Johnston, *Recollections of a Georgia Loyalist* (New York: M. F. Mansfield & Company, 1901), 210; Johann David Schoepf, *Travels in the Confederation* (1783-1784) (Philadelphia: William J. Campbell, 1911), 2: 227-228. For more context on Schoepf's account, originally published in 1788, see Charles Tingley, "Over the Swash and Out Again," *El Escrivano* 45 (2008): 87-122.

<sup>19</sup> "McArthur to Carleton, 9 January 1783," BNA, PRO 30/55/60/6728, p. 1. McArthur's account lists a total of only nine ships—the *Rattlesnake*, two provision ships, and six "private vessels" or hired transports—sailing "under convoy of the *Bellisarius*" that were lost on 31 December 1782. It presumably refers to the same wrecking event described by Johnston and Schoepf as involving sixteen losses (Johnston explicitly mentions the lost ships were of "the last fleet from Charlestown," which was escorted by *Bellisarius*). McArthur likely only felt the need to report the loss of military-owned and hired vessels to his superiors, and omitted mention of the loss of additional civilian ships accompanying the convoy by their own choice.

<sup>20</sup> Smith, "Fourteenth Colony," 270-276.

population still included approximately 4,500 white civilians, 4,000 slaves, and at least 600 Minorcans from the New Smyrna colony by June 1782, with more than 5,000 additional Loyalists and slaves from the Savannah evacuation the following month. The October and December evacuations of Charleston, according to Siebert, brought an additional 4,581 refugees to East Florida, including 2,018 Loyalists and 2,563 slaves.<sup>21</sup> These evacuation figures only represent those who came by ship, and it is impossible to know how many more arrived by foot or on small boats. In addition to the troops already garrisoned in St. Augustine, over a thousand provincial soldiers were evacuated from Charleston to the city, including 456 South Carolina Royalists, 302 Carolina King's Rangers, 265 Royal North Carolinians, and as many as 53 North Carolina Highlanders.<sup>22</sup> Adding even more to the burgeoning population and increasingly chaotic situation, within a week of the arrival of the final Charleston fleet a delegation of more than 6,000 Indians, representing confederations as far reaching as the Gulf of Mexico and the Great Lakes, arrived to affirm their loyalty to their British allies.<sup>23</sup> Scrutinizing these various figures, Smith makes a convincing argument that by early 1783 the population of St. Augustine and its immediate environs (including the Indian emissaries) was as high as 27,000, and potentially even greater.<sup>24</sup>

Such a flood of humanity spilled well beyond the borders of the city, and the surplus population spread out a hundred miles from the capital.<sup>25</sup> Schoepf remarked that all around the city were erected "the hastily built cabins of these poor fugitives, walled and thatched with palmetto (yucca) leaves."<sup>26</sup> North of St. Augustine a new and rapidly growing settlement, "an extensive place," according to Schoepf, sprang up near St. Johns Bluff on the St. Johns River, which was known as St. John's Town or simply St. John's.<sup>27</sup> As the St. Johns River inlet offered much safer access than that at St. Augustine, St. John's became a primary destination for the vessels evacuating Georgia and South Carolina. By the end of 1782 the nascent town saw over 300 hurriedly built frame houses, two taverns, a public house, livery stable, dry goods shop, storehouse, hardware store, a doctor and regularly visiting Anglican minister, and even a freemason's lodge. Expected to become "a place of some consequence," the town was well situated to prosper as an exchange depot for the region's most productive plantations along the St. Johns

---

<sup>21</sup> Siebert, *Loyalists in East Florida*, 1:129-130.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, 1:114; Troxler, "Loyalist Refugees," 6; Smith, "Fourteenth Colony," 272. None of these sources provides the number of North Carolina Highlanders brought to East Florida, but there were 53 stationed in South Carolina in October according to "State of the Army under the Command of His Excellency General Sir Guy Carleton, 27 October 1782," BNA, CO 5/107 fols.251-252.

<sup>23</sup> Wilbur H. Siebert, *The Legacy of the American Revolution to the British West Indies and Bahamas: A Chapter Out of the History of the American Loyalists* (Columbus: Ohio State University, 1913), 9-11.

<sup>24</sup> Smith, "Fourteenth Colony," 276.

<sup>25</sup> Siebert, *Loyalists in East Florida*, 1:119.

<sup>26</sup> Schoepf, *Travels*, 2:231.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*, 2:226. The settlement is sometimes, e.g. by Lambert, *South Carolina Loyalists*, 187, referred to as Hestertown, as the property was originally included in a 200 acre tract owned in the 1770s by William Hester, who sold individual lots as early as 1771. See Siebert, *Loyalists in East Florida*, 1:117.

River, which primarily produced naval stores and lumber for export.<sup>28</sup> Upon their initial arrival, most refugees congregated at either St. John's or St. Augustine, until arrangements could be made to secure farming tools and land.<sup>29</sup>

The promise of 500-acre land grants for incoming settlers was fulfilled by Tonyn by breaking up vast tracts of previously granted land that had never been claimed or developed, though a paucity of grant records suggests that most refugees simply built makeshift domiciles and squatted on vacant lands available throughout the region.<sup>30</sup> Notable exceptions were wealthy or elite evacuees, including Georgia's former Lieutenant Governor Graham, who claimed and, with 200 slaves, began development of 2,500 acres of land for indigo, rice, and other food produce along the Matanzas River.<sup>31</sup> Other plantations and farmsteads throughout the region cultivated potatoes, rice, corn, peas, indigo, cattle, lumber and cut spars, and naval stores, though many struggled or faced ruin after raids by rebel troops or bandits.<sup>32</sup>

St. Augustine had long maintained commercial ties with Charleston, and many Carolinian merchants and craftsmen desired to settle there to re-ignite their businesses. The population explosion vastly expanded economic activity and the city, like the surrounding region, saw a booming atmosphere of speculation, construction, and price inflation. Taverns, drinking-houses, gambling places, butchers, merchants, artisans, bakers, storekeepers, carpenters, masons, and other laborers all did a thriving business. East Florida's first book, John Tobler's *Almanack*, was published by a printer evacuated from Savannah, while William Charles Wells established the colony's first newspaper, the *East Florida Gazette*, on the press he had brought from Charleston.<sup>33</sup>

Despite the booming economy, many if not most of the Loyalists faced extreme hardships in their new home. As early as 1776 Lieutenant Governor John Moultrie warned farmers to "plant nothing but what is to go into the mouth," particularly corn, which was already selling for "six to ten shillings per bushel."<sup>34</sup> By the time of the Savannah and Charleston evacuations, prices of food, tools, clothing, and other goods became staggeringly inflated due to extreme demand. Clothing sold for six times its value in London, and flour for £7 to £9 sterling per barrel.<sup>35</sup> To prevent continued price-gouging of bread, a law was passed fixing its quality, weight, and

---

<sup>28</sup> Siebert, *Loyalists in East Florida*, 1:117-118; Williams, "Loyalist Haven," 474; Lambert, *South Carolina Loyalists*, 187.

<sup>29</sup> Am. Mss. Comm., *Report*, 3:220, 224; "Tonyn to Carleton, December 23, 1782," BNA, PRO 30/55/57/6476, p. 5; Williams, "Loyalist Haven," 474.

<sup>30</sup> Am. Mss. Comm., *Report*, 3:220; Smith, "Fourteenth Colony," 273-274; Siebert *Loyalists in East Florida*, 1:109.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, 110.

<sup>32</sup> Daniel L. Schafer, "St. Augustine's British Years 1763-1784," *El Escribano* 38 (2001): 212-217.

<sup>33</sup> Williams, "Loyalist Haven," 475; Douglas C. McMurtrie, "The Beginnings of Printing in Florida," *Florida Historical Quarterly* 23, no. 2 (October 1944): 63-65.

<sup>34</sup> Schafer, "St. Augustine's British Years," 218.

<sup>35</sup> *Ibid.*, 221.



price, tying the latter to the price of flour which was published monthly, and also mandating regular inspections.<sup>36</sup>

But many refugees, and certainly most if not all of those from the final Charleston evacuation fleet who had been victims of shipwreck, arrived destitute without the means to buy food at any price. Tonym was acutely aware of the sufferings of these refugees and championed their cause in letters to officials across the British Empire. In a 14 November 1782 letter to the Prime Minister (the Earl of Shelburne), he wrote of those “driven from their Homes, arrived in this province, without provisions, money, cloathing, or implements of agriculture”<sup>37</sup> Likewise, the following month he wrote Carleton in New York, asking the Commander-in-Chief to “take into consideration the state of the distressed Emigrants who are come here many quite destitute of the means of subsistence, and the wealthiest with only the Wreck of their Fortunes.”<sup>38</sup> These persistent efforts, along with those of McArthur and his appointed commissary of refugees, succeeded in rationing and ensuring the continued supply of provisions—beef, pork, butter, rice, oatmeal, and peas—for evacuees and their slaves through June 1784.<sup>39</sup>

Tonym and McArthur also made great exertions to provide refugees with “tools for Agriculture” so that they could establish productive farms in the country.<sup>40</sup> In addition, Tonym also issued letters of marque and reprisal to St. Augustine privateers hoping to prey on rebel shipping. Captured vessels were condemned at the city’s vice-admiralty court and much of the captured cargo was divided among residents of the town.<sup>41</sup> Even with these government policies, many in St. Augustine still had to rely on charity, and in several cases plays were performed in the state house theater by all-male casts with proceeds “for the benefit of the distressed Refugees.”<sup>42</sup>

Only four months after the arrival of the last fleet from Charleston, in April 1783, news reached St. Augustine that, by the Treaty of Paris, East Florida would be returned to Spain. Within two years residents had to sell their assets, collect their debts, and depart with their portable possessions.<sup>43</sup> Not surprisingly, the news was received with little enthusiasm and often outright hostility.<sup>44</sup> The final evacuation was compounded with difficulties and disappointments, but was well underway by the time Schoepf visited and wrote “ships are continually going out, with goods and passengers, to the West Indies or Nova Scotia. The unfortunate refugies, who

---

<sup>36</sup> Siebert, *Loyalists in East Florida*, 1:133.

<sup>37</sup> “Tonym to Shelburne, 14 November 1782,” BNA, CO 5/560, fol. 235

<sup>38</sup> “Tonym to Carleton, 23 December 1782,” BNA, PRO 30/55/57/6476, p.7.

<sup>39</sup> Siebert, *Loyalists in East Florida*, 1: 107,109,119,120-122,124-125; Williams, “Loyalist Haven,” 474.

<sup>40</sup> “Tonym to Carleton, 23 December 1782,” BNA, PRO 30/55/57/6476, p. 5; Am. Mss. Comm., *Report*, 3:222, 224.

<sup>41</sup> Schafer, “St. Augustine’s British Years,” 218; Samuel P. Turner, “Maritime Insights from St. Augustine’s British Period Documentary Records,” *El Escribano* 47 (2010): 16-17.

<sup>42</sup> *East Florida Gazette*, Feb. 22-March 1, May 10-17, 1783.

<sup>43</sup> Troxler, “Loyalist Refugees,” 3; Smith, “Fourteenth Colony,” 309-310.

<sup>44</sup> Williams, “Loyalist Haven,” 475-477.

had fled hither from the United States, are placed in the worst position. What little property they could save, most of them have fixed here in lands and houses, which they must now again give up.”<sup>45</sup> After all their trials and tribulations, over 10,000 loyal British subjects finally found their way to the Bahamas, Jamaica, Canada, and more distant British shores. Only a fraction of these, 372, would successfully receive compensation for their losses from the government.<sup>46</sup> While many of the Loyalist refugees would adjust and survive, many others faced destitution or hardships that could never be overcome.

### ***The Discovery and Excavation of the Storm Wreck, 2009-2013***

The shipwreck site known as the “Storm Wreck”<sup>47</sup> has been subjected to systematic archaeological excavation by personnel from the Lighthouse Archaeological Maritime Program (LAMP), the research arm of the St. Augustine Lighthouse & Museum, every summer since 2010.<sup>48</sup> It was originally discovered in 2009 after a survey in which LAMP archaeologists scanned the general area of the eighteenth-century inlet using a marine magnetometer and a side scan sonar.<sup>49</sup> The shipwreck site is located about a mile (1.6 km) offshore St. Augustine and about three miles (4.8 km) south of the present-day inlet, in about 25 to 30 feet (7.6 to 9.1 m) of water. Historically, this location would have been in the immediate vicinity of the relict inlet, and would have been in less than nine feet (2.7 m) of water at high tide.<sup>50</sup> The physical nature of the site can be characterized as a dense scatter of cultural material, usually buried under at least 30 to 60 cm of sand, extending across an area of at least 12 m by 11 m. The excavated portion of the site has been divided into a series of one meter square gridded units. Divers use handheld dredges to vacuum sand from within one unit at a time, exposing buried artifacts which are subsequently recorded before recovery. Conditions on the bottom are

---

<sup>45</sup> Schoepf, *Travels*, 2:240.

<sup>46</sup> Siebert, *Loyalists in East Florida*, 2:viii.

<sup>47</sup> The “Storm Wreck” is the official name of this archaeological site, as reported to the State of Florida’s Division of Historical Resources for inclusion in the Florida Master Site File. The name, which as a proper noun is capitalized, was arbitrarily assigned by the archaeologists who discovered it because the ship’s original name remains unknown. The Storm Wreck has also been assigned a formal site number, 8SJ5459. This number, following the Smithsonian trinomial system developed in the 1930s and used by most states today, indicates it is the 5,459th archaeological site to be reported in St. Johns County in Florida (the eighth state alphabetically).

<sup>48</sup> Chuck Meide, “Investigation of the Storm Wreck, a Late 18th Century Shipwreck Off the Coast of St. Augustine, Florida: Results of the First Two Excavation Seasons, 2010-2011,” in Brian Jordan and Troy Nowak, eds., *ACUA Underwater Archaeology Proceedings 2012* (Baltimore: Advisory Council on Underwater Archaeology, 2013), 17-25; Chuck Meide, Samuel P. Turner, P. Brendan Burke, and Starr Cox, “First Coast Maritime Archaeology Project 2010: Report on Archaeological Investigations,” (St. Augustine: Lighthouse Archaeological Maritime Program, 2011), 104-190; Chuck Meide, P. Brendan Burke, Olivia McDaniel, Samuel P. Turner, Eden Andes, Hunter Brendel, Starr Cox, and Brian McNamara, “First Coast Maritime Archaeology Project 2011-2012: Report on Archaeological Investigations,” (St. Augustine: Lighthouse Archaeological Maritime Program, 2014), 143-322. At the time this article was originally written and presented, LAMP archaeologists had completed four seasons of excavation, through the summer of 2013. Results of the 2014 season are included in Chuck Meide, “‘Cast Away off the Bar’: The Archaeological Investigation of British Period Shipwrecks in St. Augustine,” *Florida Historical Quarterly* 93, no. 3 (Winter 2014): 354-386.

<sup>49</sup> Samuel P. Turner and Kendra Kennedy, “LAMP 2009 Remote Sensing Survey,” in Christopher Horrell and Melanie Damour, eds., *ACUA Underwater Archaeology Proceedings 2010* (Amelia Island: Advisory Council on Underwater Archaeology, 2010), 11-16.

<sup>50</sup> Schoepf, *Travels*, 2:227, reported the inlet as being no deeper than 8 to 9 feet at high tide.

adverse to divers, often featuring heavy surge and extremely poor or non-existent visibility. Despite these challenges, in four summers of fieldwork archaeologists have successfully excavated 32 square meters of the site. By the end of the 2013 field season, a total of 398 field specimens—thousands of individual artifacts—had been collected for conservation and analysis.<sup>51</sup>

In general, artifacts are very well preserved. In some cases organic objects such as timber or even small fragments of cloth and rope have survived. Many are made of iron which has become encrusted in a rock-like material known as concretion, a by-product of the iron corrosion process and the minerals in sea water. Often several different items are concealed within one concreted mass. These conglomerates are typically impossible to identify until imaged with a CT scan or x-ray, which usually reveals items preserved within in great detail.<sup>52</sup> Concretions are then carefully cleaned using delicate pneumatic scribes. The exposed objects need further stabilization through the use of chemical or electrolytic cleaning to eliminate salts. Artifacts left to dry without first undergoing stabilization treatment will suffer accelerated degradation and eventual destruction. With an assemblage of artifacts as large as this one, conservation treatment will likely be ongoing for years after fieldwork has been terminated. At the time of this writing, preparations are underway for a fifth field season and the conservation and analysis of the artifacts is in an early stage. Nonetheless, a wide range of eighteenth-century material culture has been identified, providing insight into the final voyage of this vessel and the lives of the Loyalist refugees who were on board.

### **Reconstructing the Circumstances of the Ship's Loss**

The first clue to the final disposition of the Storm ship is its location within the confines of the eighteenth-century inlet. Like so many other vessels, it is apparent that this one ran aground on the infamous sandbar while attempting to either enter or leave St. Augustine. St. Augustine had a very notorious inlet—"unquestionably the most dangerous"—which was described in detail with dire warnings to mariners by visitors such as Schoepf and Bernard Romans.<sup>53</sup> Because of the constantly shifting sands at the mouth of the inlet, no published sailing directions or pilot books were of use for very long, and because of the shallow depth of the channel only small vessels could safely enter the harbor.<sup>54</sup>

<sup>51</sup> Since this paper was originally written, the 2014 or fifth field season has been completed, resulting in the collection of an additional 41 numbered field specimens.

<sup>52</sup> Matthew Hanks, "The Storm Wreck Concretions: A Look Beneath the Surface," in Brian Jordan and Troy Nowak, eds., *ACUA Underwater Archaeology Proceedings 2012* (Baltimore: Advisory Council on Underwater Archaeology, 2013), 32-37.

<sup>53</sup> Schoepf, *Travels*, 2:226-229, 248-249; Bernard Romans, *A Concise Natural History of East and West Florida* (Gretna, La.: Pelican Publishing Company, 1998), 239. Schoepf writes that "[w]ithout the least overstatement I daresay that every 100 paces, almost, the skeleton of a foundered ship, or its wreckage, may be seen" and "[t]he estimate is that every fortnight, or every month at least, a vessel is wrecked on this coast."

<sup>54</sup> In his analysis of a 16 month period of British port records, Turner found that 58 percent of all voyages to or from St. Augustine were made by vessels between 20 and 25 tons, and that only two voyages involved ships of 50 tons, the largest seen in the records. See Turner, "Maritime Insights," 7-10.

Archaeological evidence has lent insight into the moments immediately after the ship ran aground. One notable example was a heavy deck pump.<sup>55</sup> This large, cylindrical object, fashioned of lead, would have been situated upright on the deck, with its attached plumbing extending down to a point below the waterline. It was used to draw up clean seawater for cleaning, firefighting, or other purposes. Only two examples are known of deck pumps recovered from eighteenth-century shipwrecks.<sup>56</sup> Upon recovery, archaeologists observed very obvious hack marks in the lead piping and on the body of the pump. It was clear that this piece of equipment was hurriedly cut free from the ship using axes or cutlasses, so as to throw its heavy bulk overboard in a desperate attempt to re-float the grounded vessel. Six cannon discovered nearby were positioned in a pattern suggesting that they too were jettisoned, and the ship's bell that was in the same location was probably also thrown overboard for that purpose. A brass tap, meant to be inserted in a water cask or beer keg, was found in the open position, which might indicate that the water casks were ordered drained into the hold to be emptied by men manning the bilge pumps, which would have been the fastest way to eliminate the weight of the ship's drinking water supply. An alternate explanation is that discipline broke down after running aground, and men drained the beer keg!

Recovered objects believed to represent components of the ship's structure, including a probable hull plank and timber along with a possible iron deck stanchion, suggest that the attempt to save the ship ended in failure. Numerous small finds, too tiny to have been jettisoned for weight, also imply the ship was a total loss.

### **Identification of the Storm Wreck as Member of the Final Charleston Evacuation Fleet**

The first datable objects encountered were birdshot or lead pellets manufactured by a process first publicized in 1665. By the end of the first season a wider range of objects had been found that could be dated to the eighteenth century. Some of these, including the base of a wine glass with a plain conical foot dating to ca. 1780-1805, suggested that the wreck occurred in the final quarter of the 1700s.<sup>57</sup> In addition, many or most artifacts appeared to be of British manufacture. By the end of the 2010 field season, the primary working hypothesis was that this wreck was one of the 16 Loyalist refugee shipwrecks from the final Charleston evacuation fleet. While the ship's bell proved to be blank, with neither name nor date, two dated

---

<sup>55</sup> Michael Jasper, "Ship's Fittings and Equipment Recovered from the Storm Wreck, a Late 18th-century Shipwreck off the Coast of St. Augustine," in Brian Jordan and Troy Nowak, eds., *ACUA Underwater Archaeology Proceedings 2012* (Baltimore: Advisory Council on Underwater Archaeology, 2013), 53-55.

<sup>56</sup> They are from the Spanish vessel *San José*, lost in 1733, and HMS *Swift* lost in 1770. The Storm Wreck pump, however, looks more similar to a French example pictured in Jean Boudriot, *The Seventy-Four Gun Ship: A Practical Treatise on the Art of Naval Architecture* (Annapolis: Naval Institute Press, 1986), 2: 151-152.

<sup>57</sup> Ivor Noël Hume, *A Guide to Artifacts of Colonial America* (Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia Press, 1969), 190-191.

objects recovered in 2011 and 2012 further bolstered this hypothesis. The first was a 9-pounder carronade bearing the date 1780, and the second was a British guinea coin dated 1776. The serial number on the carronade confirms that it was cast at the Carron Iron Company in Falkirk, Scotland, on 31 July 1780, and from there was shipped to London to be sold on consignment by an agent or merchant named Robert Sinclair.<sup>58</sup> It is believed to be the second-oldest dated carronade to have survived anywhere in the world.<sup>59</sup> The 9-pounder carronade was never adopted by the Royal Navy and was thus intended for the civilian market, evidence that this ship was a merchantman, which might have been evacuating independently or could have been working as a hired transport. In all, two carronades and four long guns (probably 4-pounders) have been encountered on the wreck. Six guns was the minimum required for service as a hired transport, and carronades were allowed to replace long guns if desired.<sup>60</sup> This battery of guns seems typical for a small merchant vessel or transport of the time.

More compelling evidence came in the form of two pewter military buttons. The first bore a crown insignia over the letters “R P,” indicating it came from a Royal Provincial unit, and that its owner was without doubt a Loyalist. This was considered strong circumstantial evidence that the shipwreck had Loyalist origins. The second button was even more convincing. It was from an enlisted man’s uniform from the 71st Regiment of Foot. This Scottish regiment, popularly known as Fraser’s Highlanders, was decimated after the Battle of Yorktown, and in December 1782 its remaining 189 men departed Charleston on the final evacuation fleet.<sup>61</sup> Archaeologists are confident that this button effectively ties the Storm Wreck to the final evacuation of Charleston and, in conjunction with the entirety of the archaeological data as it is currently understood, identifies it beyond a reasonable doubt as one of the ships lost at the St. Augustine bar on or around 31 December 1782.<sup>62</sup>

### “What Little Household Goods They Had Been Able to Save”

A significant proportion of the artifact assemblage represents domestic items, which is not surprising considering the passengers were abandoning their homes and taking with them the basic necessities required to start a new household. Many

<sup>58</sup> “Carron Company Invoice Book, 1778-1781, Vol. 2,” National Archives of Scotland, GD 58/4/19/15, p. 229.

<sup>59</sup> Samuel P. Turner and Chuck Meide, “Artillery of the Storm Wreck,” in Brian Jordan and Troy Nowak, eds., *ACUA Underwater Archaeology Proceedings 2012* (Baltimore: Advisory Council on Underwater Archaeology, 2013), 26-31. In April 2014 the author learned of a 12-pounder carronade, dated 1779, located in Flekkefjord, Norway.

<sup>60</sup> Syrett, *Shipping and the American War*, 115. One of the long guns was recovered and cleaned for conservation; it is a 4-pounder, and those remaining appear to be the same size. See Turner and Meide, “Artillery,” 26-27.

<sup>61</sup> “List of Transports appointed to receive the Garrison at Charles Town, 19 November 1782,” BNA, CO 5/108, fol. 38.

<sup>62</sup> Some questions do remain, however. The 71st Regiment left Charleston for Jamaica in the Sally, and arrived there on 13 January 1783. For a reason that remains unknown, it appears that at least one of the soldiers of the 71st did not go to Jamaica but was instead shipwrecked at St. Augustine on board this vessel. It has been speculated that perhaps one or more soldiers may have been assigned guard duty on other ships, or perhaps a wounded soldier was sent on the shorter trip to St. Augustine to convalesce.

of these items are related to food preparation and consumption. Eight cast-iron cooking pots or cauldrons have been recovered, and a fragment of at least one additional cauldron was observed but not raised.<sup>63</sup> They are all the same shape, the classic pot form which is round-bottomed, round-bellied, and narrows near the top before flaring out. Each also features opposing pairs of ears on the rim to accommodate a handle or bail, and three legs, so they could have been hung over or sat on a fire. They vary greatly in size, ranging from 6.7 to 15.7 inches (17 to 39.9 cm) in height. Inside the smallest cauldron conservators discovered and carefully extracted the remains of its last prepared meal, a single, small, green pea. This food item was one of the standard provisions provided refugees, and its presence indicates that this cauldron was not a cargo item but one in use, and due to its size one in use probably by a single family. Other food preparation devices include a set of nested copper pots with flat bottoms and straight sides, and a circular, wrought-iron gridiron, meant to stand in or hang over a fire for light cooking or food warming.<sup>64</sup>

Also recovered was a large cast-iron tea kettle. It is flat-bottomed and rounded-bodied with a spout. It was probably intended to be used at the hearth for boiling water, as opposed to in the parlor for serving. By this time, colonial families of virtually all statuses were participating in the social ceremony of taking tea. Archaeologists have found porcelain teawares on farmstead sites in the Carolina backcountry, suggesting that as early as the 1750s this quintessentially British tradition with its genteel materiality was practiced well outside the stylish urban center of Charleston.<sup>65</sup> It is interesting to speculate what meaning this family ritual may have had in the circumstances of an evacuation; perhaps continuing the regular practice of teatime would lend at least a temporary sense of normalcy in an otherwise uncertain and frightening time.

Tableware items recovered include two pewter plates and eleven pewter spoons, plus an additional handle from either a spoon or a fork. A lack of makers' marks on all the pewter objects might indicate colonial origins, outside the control of guilds that regulated the manufacture and sale of metal wares in Europe. The spoons are of a variety of forms, displaying fiddleback and dog-nose style handles and rat-tail, shellback, and drop bowl attachments. Of particular interest are apparent owners' marks on two of the spoons. While owners' initials have been observed on other period spoons, in this case an "X" was crudely scratched in the back of

---

<sup>63</sup> Annie Carter, "A Wreck of a Site: An Archaeological Examination of Cauldrons from the Storm Wreck, 8SJ5459" (Undergraduate thesis, New College of Florida, 2014); Brian McNamara, "Cooking with Fire: What Cookware and Tableware Can Tell Us About an Unidentified Eighteenth Century Shipwreck," in Brian Jordan and Troy Nowak, eds., *ACUA Underwater Archaeology Proceedings 2012* (Baltimore: Advisory Council on Underwater Archaeology, 2013), 39-41.

<sup>64</sup> McNamara, "Cooking with Fire," 40, 42.

<sup>65</sup> James Deetz, *In Small Things Forgotten: The Archaeology of Early American Life* (New York: Doubleday, 1977), 60; David Colin Crass, Bruce R. Penner, and Tammy R. Forehand, "Gentility and Material Culture on the Carolina Frontier," *Historical Archaeology* 33 no. 3 (1999): 14-31. Since this paper was originally written, a single sherd of decorated porcelain, perhaps from a teabowl, has been discovered by archaeological conservators.

one handle, and an asterisk-like series of marks onto another. These have been interpreted as marks of two likely illiterate owners. At least two knives have been identified, one consisting of a wooden handle with fragmentary blade remains, and another apparent folding knife, probably not intended primarily as an eating utensil. Glassware for the table includes the aforementioned wine glass foot, the broken remains of a few bottles, possibly for wine or spirits, and a glass stopper for a decanter or bottle.

Not all household objects in the assemblage are associated with foodways. Clothing-related items include a thimble, seven clothing or flat irons, a belt or strap buckle and two shoe buckles, as many as 14 buttons of various styles (not including the aforementioned military buttons), and at least 25 brass straight pins. These latter were used to hold garments during tailoring or for daily use as an alternative for buttons.<sup>66</sup> Other household items include a brass candlestick, a brass drawer pull from a cabinet or similar piece of furniture, a padlock, and a key that appears to have been meant for winding clockworks rather than for a lock. One final item of interest is a small, flat, metal box, partially obscured by concretion. X-ray analysis revealed that it is a door lock, likely removed from an evacuee's house in Charleston or the countryside.<sup>67</sup> Stripping homes of hardware before abandonment was probably a common practice; indeed, many disassembled their entire homes and brought them for eventual reassembly. One example was William Curtis, who decided to "pull down" his recently built home in Charleston and take it with him on the final evacuation for use in St. Augustine. His house and other effects were lost, however, when his ship wrecked on the St. Augustine bar.<sup>68</sup>

### Tools of the Trade

A variety of tools and equipment have also been identified from the artifact assemblage, in many cases giving some insight into the various occupations of people on board. Three hammers have been found, all hafted with wooden handles, suggesting they were working tools rather than cargo items.<sup>69</sup> Two of these appear to be typical clawed carpenter hammers. It cannot be assumed they belonged to carpenters, as such tools would have been used by a variety of colonists or could have been part of the ship's store. The third hammer, however, is a specialized variant: a cobbler's hammer. It would almost certainly have been part of a shoemaker's equipage.

---

<sup>66</sup> Starr Cox, "Personal Items Recovered from the Storm Wreck, a Late Eighteenth Century Shipwreck off the Coast of St. Augustine, Florida," in Brian Jordan and Troy Nowak, eds., *ACUA Underwater Archaeology Proceedings 2012* (Baltimore: Advisory Council on Underwater Archaeology, 2013), 46.

<sup>67</sup> Since this paper was originally written, the door lock has been cleaned in the laboratory, revealing an iron key which was expediently stored inside the lock after it was removed from the door.

<sup>68</sup> Lambert, *South Carolina Loyalists*, 183-184.

<sup>69</sup> For example, tools being shipped to St. Augustine on board the *Industry*, lost in 1764, most notably an intact box of axe heads, were packaged together without wooden handles, which could be readily crafted upon arrival.

In addition to hammers, three axes and possibly a fourth have been identified in x-ray images. The three identifiable specimens are all hafted, indicating they were also working tools. They appear to represent felling axes, used for cutting down trees and stripping branches, as opposed to broad axes (used for dressing timber) or boarding axes (used for shipboard combat and clearing rigging or masts in emergencies).

A possible caulking iron observed in an x-ray image could have belonged to an evacuating shipbuilder or the ship's carpenter. Other marine tools, both navigational devices, include a small brass fitting identified as a sighting pinnula from an octant and a pair of dividers. A folding brass sector rule, a mathematical device, may also have been used by the ship's navigators, though it alternatively could have been carried by a soldier for use in aiming artillery.

Three small lead weights for use with a balance pan scale may have belonged to a merchant hoping to re-establish his trade in East Florida. Some bear markings which, upon cleaning, may be identifiable as assize marks, owner's or maker's marks, or weight indicators. Another tool that might have been useful in East Florida is an iron hook with a wooden handle. This appears to be a baling hook, which as an agricultural tool was in short supply given the vast numbers of refugees in East Florida struggling to set up farms. Alternatively it may have served as a cargo hook for loading and unloading boxes or casks from the ship.

One final category of vocational equipment includes the tools of the professional soldier, whose presence on board was confirmed by regimental buttons. Other military hardware from the shipwreck includes three virtually intact Brown Bess muskets. The first has been identified as a 1769 Short Land Pattern, which was produced between 1768 and 1777. X-ray imaging astounded researchers when it revealed the musket remained in the "half cock" position and was still loaded with a cartridge of buck and ball. This load consists of a .69 caliber ball along with three .32 caliber buckshot, and was intended to increase the damage inflicted by a unit's volley of fire. The second musket is a 1756 Long Land Pattern, produced from 1756 to 1790. It was also in the half cock position and loaded, not with the standard military issued buckshot but rather with smaller birdshot. These tiny lead pellets have been found in great numbers scattered across the excavation area. The final musket was not loaded. It is a 1777 Short Land pattern British musket, Produced 1777-1782. The fact that two of these firearms were ready for firing at a moment's notice underscores the real danger of privateer attacks even in these final days of the war.

### **Artifacts and Social Status**

In addition to bringing focus to various professional occupations among the passengers on board, some artifacts also allow a glimpse into social hierarchy. The departing refugees came not only from Charleston itself, among the wealthiest



and most influential of colonial cities, but also from across the backcountry and lowcountry, and encompassed every socioeconomic level and family status.<sup>70</sup> Mentioned previously, the two spoons with personal marks suggest illiteracy, and could have belonged to a sailor, impoverished Loyalist, or possibly a slave. One item that probably indicates a wealthy owner is a Queen Anne's or coat or pocket pistol, so-called because it was small enough to be hidden in a coat pocket. A breech-loading, box-lock pistol, this was a very sophisticated weapon for its time and would have been more powerful and accurate than a muzzle-loading counterpart. By the late 1700s these guns became more readily available to the general public, especially after 1780 when a plainer version evolved, sacrificing artistic elegance for mass production.<sup>71</sup> This specimen may be a transitory example, as it features the slab-sided handle of the later type but still appears in the x-ray image to have decorations on its handle, possibly even silver wire inlay.

The glass stopper probably also has an association with an elite passenger, as they were considerably more expensive than cork or other stoppers and were intended for fine glassware holding liqueur or perfume. The aforementioned gold guinea coin was also probably owned by a passenger of means.

The two rectangular, Artois-style shoe buckles may also lend some insight into the social status of their owners. Buckles, particularly for upper-class persons, were considered jewelry and a testament to social status.<sup>72</sup> Neither of the Storm Wreck shoe buckles are crafted of silver or jeweled, which would have been the most extravagant and restricted to the gentry or wealthiest of merchants. The next most expensive types were brass or copper, like one of the recovered specimens. These were sometimes tinned to emulate silver, which does not seem to be the case with this example, though it is moderately decorated with raised bands and beaded lines. The next step down on the ladder, only one rung above simple iron buckles, were those fashioned of pewter.<sup>73</sup> The other shoe buckle is pewter, but elaborately decorated. It displays four raised bands separated by perpendicular ridges and four beaded bow-tie motifs garnished with tulip or shell designs. While it may have been relatively inexpensive, its elaborately cast decorations suggest that its owner, while perhaps of a lower class, had upwardly mobile aspirations.

## Conclusion

“The collective story of the Loyalist refugees is filled with suffering and tragedy,” writes Daniel Schafer, “and is often tempered by survival and recovery.”<sup>74</sup> This story, of Loyalists who sought refuge in Florida, suffering hardship after indignity

---

<sup>70</sup> Lambert, *South Carolina Loyalists*, 187.

<sup>71</sup> John W. Burgoyne, *The Queen Anne Pistol, 1660-1780* (Bloomfield, Canada: Museum Restoration Service, 2002), 52-55.

<sup>72</sup> Elzbieta Wróblewska, “Buckles from Shoes and Clothing,” in Waldemar Ossowski, ed., *The General Carleton Shipwreck, 1785* (Gdańsk: Polish Maritime Museum, 2008), 210.

<sup>73</sup> Noël Hume, *Guide to Artifacts*, 86.

<sup>74</sup> Schafer, “St. Augustine's British Years,” 216.

only to undergo a perceived betrayal by king and country and a final forced exile, is one that has been underappreciated by historians and forgotten by most of the general public. The discovery of a shipwreck from Charleston's final evacuation fleet within a mile of its destination at the nation's oldest port has brought this story back to life for both visitors and residents of St. Augustine. The value of this archaeological perspective on our understanding of the Loyalist Influx is readily apparent even at this early stage of analysis. As fieldwork, artifact conservation, and analysis continues, this brief yet significant period of Florida history will be brought into sharper focus, and with the development of a planned exhibit at the St. Augustine Lighthouse & Museum, will be shared with millions of visitors from around the world.

# Competing Voices: Political Contests over the EEOC's Sexual Harassment Policy, 1980-1981

Sheila Jones  
*Broward College*

“Sexual harassment on the job is not a problem for the virtuous woman except in the rarest of cases.”

- Phyllis Schlafly, to the Senate Labor Committee<sup>1</sup>

This article explores how the shifting political climate in the United States in the early 1980s, from a Democratic-led Congress to a Republican one, impacted sexual harassment policy. In doing so, it considers the immediate aftermath of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission's (EEOC) Guidelines on Discrimination Because of Sex, Section 1604.11 Sexual Harassment, the first federal sexual harassment policy, which the EEOC issued in 1980. The debate over this policy helps to illustrate that the current political debates in 2014 about women's roles, including those which focus on everything from the war on motherhood to abortion, have a lot in common with the debates from the early 1980s. Sadly, not much has changed regarding the rhetoric that is used as well as the divisions between liberals and conservatives or Democrats and Republicans when it comes to women's issues. The debates about sexual harassment policy can also be understood in terms of women's economic citizenship. Borrowing from the work of Alice Kessler-Harris, economic citizenship is defined as “the independent status that provides the possibility of full participation in the polity,”<sup>2</sup> or a woman's right to full participation in society. Beginning in the 1970s, feminists framed the problem of sexual harassment in terms of economic citizenship in that it prevented women from fully participating in the workforce. My essay argues that sexual harassment as an issue of economic citizenship became a casualty of the New Right's 1980s agenda, as part of its attack on feminism, its efforts to defeat the Equal Rights Amendment (ERA), and its commitment to American business interests. These factors then, in turn, reduced the overall public support for sexual harassment remedies, reopened debates that called the problem's seriousness into question, and limited the EEOC's ability to effectively enforce its sexual harassment policy.

Ronald Reagan and the Republican Party's rise to power affected the issue of sexual harassment in fundamental ways, leaving it in the hands of policymakers and activists who, unlike those who had first named the problem and raised awareness about it, were not dedicated to enforcing working women's citizenship

---

<sup>1</sup> Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources, *Sex Discrimination in the Workplace, 1981*, 97th Cong., 1st sess., 1981, 400 (hereafter *Hatch Hearings*). Testimony given 21 April.

<sup>2</sup> Alice Kessler-Harris, *In Pursuit of Equity: Women, Men, and the Quest for Economic Citizenship in 20th-Century America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001), 5.

rights. Instead, new actors appeared on the scene, including Reagan's advisers and anti-feminist leaders such as Phyllis Schlafly, who sought to un-do the work that had been done in the previous five years (following the coinage of the term sexual harassment in 1975) by contesting the framing of sexual harassment as an economic citizenship issue in order to protect their own conservative ideals of business and femininity.<sup>3</sup> After Reagan took office, his administration cut the EEOC's budget, targeted equal employment opportunity programs such as Affirmative Action, and later placed the EEOC's sexual harassment guidelines under review. Following this trend, the guidelines were a prominent part of Senator Orrin Hatch's 1981 Hearings on Sex Discrimination and his investigation into the effectiveness of federal anti-sex discrimination policies. Hatch, Chairman of the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee, also wanted to eliminate the EEOC's Office of Policy Implementation (OPI), which had issued the guidelines, in addition to his committee's recommendation of significant cuts to the EEOC's budget for the 1982 fiscal year.<sup>4</sup>

During the opening remarks of the hearings, Hatch questioned the EEOC's policy and procedures, while also voicing concerns that the guidelines burdened employers. He stated,

Is the definition of sexual harassment, as found in the regulations, too inclusive or too exclusive? Will these regulations place an undue burden on the employer? Do these regulations have the potential for infringing upon freedom of expression of others? Will they help create more employment opportunities for women, or will they be a drain on the economy? And last but not least, what assurance is there that the EEOC will make findings on complaints in an even-handed manner?<sup>5</sup>

In raising his own criticism of the EEOC in his opening remarks, Hatch demonstrated the downside of the institutionalization of sexual harassment once it became a matter of public policy. Hatch's hearings also differed from the previous Congressional hearings on sexual harassment—led by Representative James M. Hanley (D-NY), Chairman of the House of Representatives Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service—as for the first time, Congress asked the business community to weigh in on the guidelines. Hanley referred only to women's groups and government agencies for expert testimony on sexual harassment and he did not include testimony from business representatives

---

<sup>3</sup> On Schlafly's anti-feminism, see, for example, Donald T. Critchlow, *Phyllis Schlafly and Grassroots Conservatism: A Woman's Crusade* (Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2005), 217-218; Sean Wilentz, *The Age of Reagan: A History, 1974-2008* (New York: Harper Collins, 2008), 93-95; and Godfrey Hodgson, *More Equal Than Others: America from Nixon to the New Century* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004), 144-145.

<sup>4</sup> *Hatch Hearings*, 335, 375, 471. An excerpt from the Report of the Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources on the proposed budget for fiscal year 1982 is included on pages 373-375 of the *Hatch Hearings*.

<sup>5</sup> *Hatch Hearings*, 333-334.

or appear to even consider their interests over those of the women most affected by the problem.<sup>6</sup> By inviting a broad range of individuals to testify, Hatch gave the impression of supporting antifeminist perspectives to appear in the record and facilitated the Reagan administration's attack on the EEOC, ultimately altering how the issue was framed. This is most visible in Phyllis Schlafly's appearance and testimony before Hatch's committee. Much as she fought the ERA, Schlafly challenged the EEOC and its guidelines as well as the feminist framework of sexual harassment based on her opinions regarding the proper roles for women. These included whether or not American women should work outside the home, obtain abortions, or serve in the military.<sup>7</sup>

When she argued that women who are sexually harassed are essentially "asking for it" by being immoral, Schlafly highlighted the differences between feminists who argued for women's employment rights and anti-feminists such as herself who wanted to protect the idealized middle-class housewife. She made this statement when claiming that criminal acts such as statutory rape should most certainly be covered under public policy and differentiating them from "non-criminal sexual harassment on the job."<sup>8</sup> She infuriated feminists by arguing that "non-criminal sexual harassment" was "not a problem for the virtuous woman except in the rarest of cases."<sup>9</sup> Schlafly explained, "When a woman walks into the room, she speaks with a universal body language that most men intuitively understand. Men hardly ever ask sexual favors of women from whom the certain answer is 'no.'"<sup>10</sup> These statements exemplify a debate over the proper roles for women in American society, as she implied that working women were not virtuous and should be in the home. More importantly, her perspective competed with how feminists presented the problem of sexual harassment. Regardless of her intentions, her remarks raised questions about the virtue of working women in general. Schlafly's ideal womanhood reinforced classism and sexism, rather than view them as the sources of women's inequality and, therefore, also sexual harassment.<sup>11</sup> Schlafly also made

---

<sup>6</sup> See House Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, *Sexual Harassment in the Federal Government*, 96th Cong., 1st sess., 1979 (hereafter *Hatch Hearings*). Representing women-affiliated business groups and the business community at large in the 28 January Hatch hearings were: Marlene Johnson, president of the National Association of Business Owners, and Nancy Felipe Russo, president of the Federation of Organizations for Professional Women. Testifying at the 21 April Hatch hearings were: Judith Finn, an economist from Oak Ridge Tennessee (who was part of a panel with Phyllis Schlafly); Gwendolyn Jo M. Carlberg, an attorney from Alexandria, Virginia; and Kenneth McCulloch, an attorney from New York, New York. The Committee also received a statement from the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc.

<sup>7</sup> For a discussion on anti-feminists challenging feminists on these three issues, see Jane J. Mansbridge, *Why We Lost the ERA* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986), 3, 5, and 13; Ruth Rosen, *The World Split Open: How the Modern Women's Movement Changed America* (New York: Penguin Books, 2000), 39; and Chapter One of Sheila Jones, "Not 'Part of the Job': Sexual Harassment Policy in the U.S., the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, and Women's Economic Citizenship, 1975-1991" (PhD diss., Bowling Green State University, 2008).

<sup>8</sup> *Hatch Hearings*, 400.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.* and "Aide Calls Sex Harassment Cases 'Tip of the Iceberg,'" *New York Times*, April 22, 1981.

<sup>10</sup> *Hatch Hearings*, 400.

<sup>11</sup> See Chapter Two of Jones, "Not 'Part of the Job'."

it appear that women had a choice to stay at home or to work when, as many of the first women to speak out about sexual harassment claimed, this choice was not a luxury that they had.

On the other side were feminist activists who, despite the conservative turn in American politics, still fought sexual harassment, recognizing it was a real problem for countless numbers of women in the workplace and defended the EEOC's guidelines. For example, Betty Jean Hall, Director of the Oak Ridge, Tennessee, Coal Employment Project, began her testimony by telling the Committee that "sexual harassment is a serious problem which is rampant in all work settings, from underground coal mines to fancy Washington law offices to the restaurants scattered throughout the Nation's small, medium, and large-sized towns."<sup>12</sup>

When the topic of abortion was raised during Congressman Hatch's hearings on sex discrimination and sexual harassment specifically, witnesses placed it within this context of women's traditional roles as mothers. Under the heading, "Feminist Harassment of Motherhood Via Pregnancy Legislation," Schlafly including the following in her written testimony:

One of the most insidious aspects of the feminist harassment of the role of motherhood is through legislation that affects pregnancy. Under feminist demands, the Congress has passed legislation which superficially and temporarily may help mothers while at the same time serving the feminist goal of eliminating the role of motherhood. The feminist tactic is to give short-term childbirth or abortion benefits to a pregnant woman while at the same time financially or legislatively inducing the mother to return to her paid job 3+ months after her baby is born.<sup>13</sup>

In this one instance (among many in her testimony) in which Schlafly changed the word, "harassment," to mean her argument that feminists "harassed" the role of motherhood, she effectively changed the nature of the debate. Here, the question was not whether or not sexual harassment policies were adequate or necessary remedies. Instead, Schlafly questioned Congress' policies on abortion and pregnancy discrimination, issues that were very much linked to the pro- and anti-ERA campaigns, and less connected to sexual harassment. This illustrates how Schlafly opposed the feminist framing of sexual harassment as an issue of economic citizenship and then used the term for her own purposes in defending more conservative views of womanhood.

By employing such a tactic through her choice of language, Schlafly linked sexual harassment to a string of other feminist issues that her anti-feminist movement had been criticizing with the goal of preventing the ERA's passage. In particular, the issue of women in the military comprised much of Schlafly's testimony and lends

---

<sup>12</sup> *Hatch Hearings*, 501.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, 416.

further support to the notion that she used the government's sexual harassment debate, and the platform she had in testifying before Congress, to alter the course of the discussion away from the problem of sexual harassment and toward her criticism of the ERA. She not only twisted the language of sexual harassment by accusing feminists of harassing the role of motherhood, Schlafly also refused to use the term as it was originally defined except when she spoke of women in the military. Yet again, Schlafly did not discuss the issue at the heart of the hearing (examining the EEOC's policy) and instead used her appearance for her own ends in promoting her pro-family argument, including railing against the drafting of women into the military, which she believed was a feminist goal. In doing so, she revealed her objection to women's service in the military in the first place. She offered as evidence with her written testimony two different publications about women in the workplace, one depicting an office situation and the other portraying a woman in the armed forces. The first was a National Organization for Women (NOW) Legal Defense and Education Fund advertisement which depicts a man, presumably a supervisor, pinching a woman on the rear, presumably a secretary, with the caption, "He calls it fun! She calls it sexual harassment."<sup>14</sup> The second was a cover of a Defense Department publication, *SSAM: Soldier, Sailor, Airman, Marine*, with the headline "Women in Combat? . . . Let's Get Serious," and a cartoonish drawing of a woman in a bikini top brandishing a Viking-type sword.<sup>15</sup>

If Schlafly really wanted to make the sexual harassment of women in the military a core part of her testimony and justify this as the sole way she used the term sexual harassment, then there was plenty of evidence available that she could have used to indicate that sexual harassment in the military was a serious problem. In fact, during the Hanley Hearings, there was testimony to support this. Helen Lewis, Executive Director of the D.C. Commission for Women, had reported the results of a small-scale survey completed by 32 workers at Andrews Air Force Base in which all of the respondents except five replied that they had experienced some form of sexual harassment at work.<sup>16</sup> At the Hanley Hearings, Lewis' remark was reiterated by Louise Smothers of the American Federation of Government Employees, who also reported on cases of sexual harassment among employees at Army and Air Force Exchanges.<sup>17</sup> In addition, the Merit System Protection Board report, *Sexual Harassment in the Federal Workplace*, the first large-scale scientific study of sexual harassment, had also just been published the month before Schlafly testified. In the report, the MSPB found that the majority of sexual harassment victims in the federal workplace worked for Defense Department agencies, including the Air Force, the Navy, the Marine Corps, and those only identified

---

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, 423.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, 424.

<sup>16</sup> *Hanley Hearings*, 65.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, 107.

as “Other Defense Department” workplaces.<sup>18</sup> Schlafly referenced neither of these sources to support her claim that the only type of sexual harassment worth discussing was the sexual harassment of women in the armed forces. Instead, she continued to protest women’s military service by including two examples of sexual harassment in the military that conflated the issue with rape and raised questions about working women’s morality.

The crimes that Schlafly mentioned were possibly those covered under criminal or military rape statutes and were therefore a different body of law entirely. In equating sexual harassment with rape in such a manner, Schlafly was arguing for protections that women already had. Furthermore, she deflected the question of whether working women needed sexual harassment policies to protect them at work, protections that women had only had for a few months and that were clearly under assault by the Reagan administration and Senator Hatch.

As Schlafly’s second example, she discussed a specific case of sexual harassment in the Navy in which one officer was convicted of sexually harassing seven women. In describing this case, she again mentioned the theme that only “non-virtuous” women were sexually harassed. Schlafly stated, “Sexual harassment can also occur when a non-virtuous woman gives off body language which invites sexual advances, but she chooses to give her favors to Man A but not the Man B, and he tries to get his share too.”<sup>19</sup> She then noted that of the seven women harassed by this one officer, two of them “were pregnant by other men.”<sup>20</sup> Had she been interested in really pointing out that women in the military were at risk of being sexually harassed instead of arguing against women in the military in the first place or accusing those who were harassed of being loose women, her argument would have been relevant to the discussion of sexual harassment policy. Instead, Schlafly used her testimony to tell Congress, and the American public, who would read about the hearings in mainstream newspapers, that feminists were attacking motherhood, promoting abortion, and arguing that women should be drafted into the military, while the only women who were victimized by men were those who asked for it or moved beyond suitable gender roles, all of which played into her anti-ERA campaign.

In the twenty-two pages that Schlafly submitted with her testimony, she addressed the specific nature of the April 21 hearings in only three of them. When she did discuss sexual harassment and the EEOC’s policy, she began by refuting that such behavior was a problem in the first place. Instead, she argued, “The biggest problem of sex in the workplace is not harassment at all but simply the

---

<sup>18</sup> U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board, *Sexual Harassment in the Federal Workplace: Is It A Problem?* (Washington, DC: U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board, March 1981), 42. These defense agencies shared this statistic with the Departments of Labor, Transportation, Justice, Housing and Urban Development, and the Veterans Administration.

<sup>19</sup> *Hatch Hearings*, 402.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*



chemistry that naturally occurs when women and men are put in close proximity day after day, especially if the jobs have other tensions.”<sup>21</sup> Schlafly viewed this as an ongoing phenomenon and blamed women with lax morals for changing the nature of the working environment. She stated that “chemistry has always been present; what’s different today is that (a) there are many more women in the workplace, and (b) some women have abandoned the Commandments against adultery and fornication, and accepted the new notions that any sexual activity in or out of marriage is morally and socially acceptable.”<sup>22</sup> She further implied that working women were an affront to the traditional family and used the term “sexual harassment” as merely a revenge tool for when an affair went sour by stating, “Sexual harassment can be the mischievous label applied in hate or revenge when one party wants out of an extra-marital liaison between consenting adults. Neither congress nor EEOC has the competence to sit in judgment on the unwitnessed events and decide who was harassing whom.”<sup>23</sup>

In the brief instance in which Schlafly discussed the EEOC Guidelines, she stipulated, “The EEOC regulations for dealing with sexual harassment are ridiculous and unjust. They are ridiculous because there is no way to police the situation fairly, and they are fundamentally unjust because they penalize an innocent bystander, the employer, for an employee’s act over which he had no control.”<sup>24</sup> In this statement, Schlafly clearly showed her roots in the New Right by sharing this opinion, espoused by many business and corporate leaders who had written to the EEOC in response to the interim guidelines,<sup>25</sup> as well as other policymakers in the Reagan administration, who protested the guidelines because they believed that employers should not have to bear financial responsibility when their employees sexually harassed one another. She also went so far as to call the guidelines “discriminatory” because, in her reading of them, they did not equate with what she saw as the proper role for women. Schlafly explained that “although they prohibit sexual harassment by a supervisor using the power of his job to get sex, they do not prohibit an employee using the power of her sex to get job favors or promotions from her supervisor.”<sup>26</sup> Once again, Schlafly misrepresented certain facts here. While much of the text of the guidelines was devoted to outlining prohibitions of sexual harassment by supervisors and co-workers, the final draft of the guidelines did include a provision in paragraph (g) that recognized the type of discrimination Schlafly mentioned, whereby a third party employee could file a sex discrimination complaint. Paragraph (g) clearly outlines that employers were liable under Title VII in situations “where employment opportunities or benefits are

---

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, 401.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*, 402.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, 403.

<sup>25</sup> See Chapter Five of Jones, “Not ‘Part of the Job.’”

<sup>26</sup> *Hatch Hearings*, 403.

granted because of an individual's submission to the employer's sexual advances or requests for sexual favors . . . against other persons who were qualified for but denied that employment opportunity or benefit."<sup>27</sup>

Schlafly followed this misreading of the guidelines by stating her real argument in protection of "the virtuous woman" by writing, "These one-sided, discriminatory regulations are not only unjust to the employer, but they result in substantial discrimination against the virtuous woman. She doesn't have a sex problem, but she may have a job problem; she will end up being discriminated against because the job or raise or promotion may go to the female who uses her sex to get ahead."<sup>28</sup> Apparently, Schlafly refused to acknowledge that the sexual harassment of working women was a legitimate form of sex discrimination, and a serious problem for countless numbers of women in the public and private employment sectors, including more than just the military.

These remarks also had serious implications for feminists trying to uphold their idea of sexual harassment as a violation of women's economic citizenship rights. Schlafly sent a clear message to Congress, to the Reagan administration, and to the American public in which she raised doubt about how feminists had first framed sexual harassment. She concluded her brief comments about the EEOC's sexual harassment policy by asserting, "Sexual harassment in private industry no doubt causes real problems in some cases, but there isn't a shred of evidence that Congress or the EEOC can solve the problems or can even be fair in trying to cope with them."<sup>29</sup> Schlafly continued, "Both Congress and the EEOC are unjust in setting up procedures which enable unscrupulous persons to file mischievous claims in order to wring unjust settlements out of employers or to wreak revenge on a discarded lover."<sup>30</sup>

In conclusion, Schlafly was not the only anti-feminist who expressed concern over the EEOC's policy; however, she was the most recognizable due to her longstanding opposition to feminism and the Equal Rights Amendment. Her statement and role in the hearings also signified a change in which the feminists who had first politicized the problem had not only lost much of their control over how the issue was portrayed, it showed how they then faced opposition from the Reagan administration and how Schlafly's movement mobilized against how feminists had framed sexual harassment. These changes led to debates in which sexual harassment was tied to questions over women's roles in American society, with each side arguing fundamentally different viewpoints. On one side were feminist activists who argued for policies on behalf of women's right to earn a living. On the other side were anti-feminists such as Schlafly who, viewing

---

<sup>27</sup> U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. "Guidelines on Discrimination Because of Sex." *Federal Register* 45, no. 219 (Nov. 1980): 74577.

<sup>28</sup> *Hatch Hearings*, 403.

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*

women as mothers and homemakers, claimed that sexual harassment policies were unnecessary because only indecent or immoral working women were harassed. This happened just after the issue of sexual harassment became institutionalized with the 1980 EEOC Guidelines, which should have brought positive gains for the women's movement's sexual harassment framework. Instead, the political changes of the 1980s resulted in renewed challenges and opposition to federal sexual harassment policy.



# **Konoe Fumimaro and Chiang Kai-shek: Political Duel over Japan's Quest—A New Order in the Far East for An Establishment of Asia for Asia**

Kazuo Yagami  
*Savannah State University*

In the late 1930s, Japan came up with the idea of a new order in the Far East, claiming that it was designed to establish Asia for Asia by eradicating all Western presence and influence. One of the main architects of this idea was a decorated court aristocrat, Konoe Fumimaro, who served as a three-time Prime Minister during a critical period in modern Japan, 1937-1941. Believing that the successful establishment of Asia for Asia depended on China, and on Chiang Kai-shek, the head of the nationalist government of China, becoming an integral part of it, Konoe approached Chiang in late 1937, only to face outright rejection. This essay examines the rationale of Chiang Kai-shek's rejection by looking into the internal and external political circumstances Chiang had to confront.

The 1920s is known as the Decade of Democracy. It was the decade during which the world powers concluded a series of international treaties in order to make up for their failed settlement after World War I, when they attempted to stabilize the world by establishing a mechanism to maintain the status quo in world politics and the economy. Japan's reaction to this attempt was mixed. The right wing nationalists of Japan, such as the young and rising political star, Konoe Fumimaro, opposed it, interpreting this attempt by the Western powers as a gimmick to maintain their dominant positions as world powers. Despite such opposition, in the end the positions of the left wing pro-Western nationalists such as Hidehara Kijuro and Kato Tomosaburo prevailed. Japan made up her mind to go along with the other world powers, calculating that the economic and political benefits of being part of this world wide effort to establish stability would offset any disadvantages Japan might have to face.

As it turned out, the Decade of Democracy was nothing but an illusion. The stock market crash in New York in 1929 and the subsequent worldwide economic catastrophe were proof of the failure of this attempt to establish peace and stability. Instead of peace and stability, the world faced economic and political turmoil unprecedented in the modern era.

This failure turned out to be a manifestation of Konoe's belief that the political and economic conflicts in the modern era that culminated in the First World War were rooted in an unequal footing in the world economy and politics, as highlighted by the dominance of the Anglo-Saxon powers. As he wrote in his controversial article, "Reject Anglo-American Centered Peace," Konoe argued that, from this unequal footing, two classes of nations emerged: the class of Haves and the class

of Have-Nots, creating fundamental and perpetual sources of world conflict and instability.<sup>1</sup> Therefore, Konoe argued, if there were to be a true sense of peace and stability, this unequal footing of the world economy and politics had to be eliminated; not the maintenance of the status quo, but the elimination of it.

It was by this reasoning that Konoe did not oppose the outcome of the Manchurian Incident in 1931. The Japanese army stationed in Manchuria created the phony incident by purposely destroying a portion of a Japanese owned railroad and blaming China for it. Using the incident as a pretext, the Japanese army put all of Manchuria under its control and proclaimed Manchuria a new nation, Manchukuo. The following year, the League of Nations formally condemned Japan for the incident. In defiance Japan withdrew herself from the League of Nations in 1933.

Konoe opposed the way the incident took place and unfolded. Moreover, he knew the direct cause of the incident was the unbearable situation the people of Japan had to face because of the worldwide economic crisis. Among the nations that suffered from the Great Depression, Japan suffered most. World War I was an economic blessing for Japan. It created a great demand for war goods. Along with the United States Japan became one of the major suppliers of those goods, bringing an economic boost to Japan. But this economic boom quickly dissipated as the war came to an end in late 1918. Then Japan suffered from a catastrophic calamity, the Great Earthquake of 1923. It destroyed the center of Japan's economic zone, Tokyo and its hinterland, killing more than 110,000, and sending Japan into economic crisis overnight. To make matters worse, Japan faced a rapid rise of population during the 1920s. So it was beyond anyone's comprehension how much hardship the government and people of Japan had to endure during the Great Depression. It was this dire situation that led to the actions of the Japanese army in Manchuria in 1931. The young officers of Japan's army (known as Kwantung Army), believing that Manchuria's wealth in natural resources and its territory would provide a quick solution for Japan's mounting national crisis, acted unilaterally without the consent of the government.

Konoe understood these factors to be pertinent as causes, but he had a different interpretation of the Manchurian Incident. To Konoe, in addition rescuing the people of Japan from one of the worst crises ever faced in the modern era, the Incident also provided him an opportunity to initiate his quest to end the unequal footing by ending Western dominance of the world economy and politics. Konoe believed that exploration and economic development of Manchuria at the hands of the Japanese would be beneficial not only to Japan but also to China, helping to improve China's stagnant national economy, and in the process cementing the political relationship between the two countries. So, soon after the establishment of Manchukuo, Konoe took a leading role as a voice for setting up a coalition

---

<sup>1</sup> See Konoe Fumimaro, "Eibeihoni no Heiwashugi o Haisu" ("Reject the Anglo-American Centered Peace"), in Konoe Fumimaro, *Seidanroku* (Tokyo: Chikura Shobo, 1936).

among Japan, Manchukuo, and China, in order to unify East Asia and liberate Asia from Western imperialism and colonialism. Konoe hoped that the liberation of Asia would instigate progress toward his ultimate goal of ending inequality in the world's economy and politics as a fundamental source of conflict. Konoe believed the Manchurian Incident created that opportunity.

Konoe understood that if there were to be any success in the quest to establish Asia for Asia, China had to be an integral part of it, and the head of China, Chiang Kai-shek, had to take a role. In his postwar memoir Konoe recalled a conversation in the summer of 1932 with the Chinese ambassador to Japan, Chiang Zou-bing, right-hand man to Chiang Kai-shek. Chiang Zou-bing told Konoe that if the Sino-Japanese relationship continued to go on in the way it was going, Japan and China would have a major confrontation with each other and it would surely bring the United States and the United Kingdom into the conflict, leading to another world war. Chiang Kai-shek and his party, Guomindong, were the main forces in China, although there were counter forces opposed to Chiang Kai-shek and his party, and Japanese military officers in China tried to use such political and military division to prevent the establishment of national unity in China. The effort to establish unity in China under the leadership of Chiang Kai-shek was growing, and if the current situation continued, Chinese resilience against Japan would increase and there would be no solution to the current conflicts between China and Japan. Konoe wholeheartedly agreed with Chiang Zou-bing.<sup>2</sup>

There was no doubt about Konoe's desire to have Chiang Kai-shek's support, but he faced a huge obstacle in his effort to get Chiang Kai-shek on-board. The Manchurian Incident violated the Nine Power Treaty in which Japan was a signatory nation. The treaty was designed to respect and protect China's sovereignty, territorial integrity, and independence. Japan, along with the other world powers, had been China's adversary since Japan's rise to the status of a world power in the late nineteenth century, highlighted by Japan's triumph in the Sino-Japanese War of 1894-1895 and Japan's twenty-one demands in 1915. Then in the turbulent era of the 1930s Japan became second to none among the exploiters of China.

So Konoe faced a steep uphill to climb. No matter the difficulty, Konoe knew he had little choice but to pursue the policy of getting Chiang Kai-shek on-board. Konoe became Prime Minister in June 1937, then only a month later, in July 1937, there was another armed conflict between China and Japan, later known as the China Incident. Unlike the Manchurian Incident, the China Incident was caused by accident.<sup>3</sup> On the night of 7 July 1937, Japanese forces were conducting night maneuvers near the Marco Polo Bridge, located outside the city of Beijing.

---

<sup>2</sup> Konoe Fumimaro, *Ushinawareta Seiji: Konoe Fumimaro ko no Shuki* [Lost Politics: Memoir of Konoe Fumimaro] (Tokyo: Asahi Shinbunshu, 1946), 10-11.

<sup>3</sup> See Kazuo Yagami, *Konoe Fumimaro and the Failure of Peace in Japan 1937-1941: A Critical Appraisal of the Three-Time Prime Minister* (North Carolina: McFarland & Company, 2006), 45.

After the maneuvers, a Japanese soldier was noted missing, and Japanese troops made a request to search the area. A Chinese unit led by General Sung Che-yuan also joined the search. Although the man in question soon rejoined his unit, unfortunately several gunshots were fired during the search. To this day no one knows who shot at whom. Tension quickly developed between the two forces. Unlike the Manchurian Incident, Konoe was dismayed by the China Incident; it was the last thing he wanted to see. This was not a time for confrontation against China but for cooperation. Understanding the gravity of the Incident, Konoe lost no time in attempting to settle it as a local issue in order to minimize any potential damage to the already deteriorating Sino-Japanese relationship, but his attempt failed. Contrary to Konoe's desire, the Incident rapidly developed into a full-scale war.

Konoe should have known better. His attempt to settle the China Incident as a local matter had little chance from the outset. By the time of the Incident, the Japanese military, particularly the army, had established its autonomy and began to function as an almost completely separate institution from the civilian-controlled government, undermining Konoe's capacity as Prime Minister to have any coordinated policy implemented. Ignoring Konoe's wish to keep the incident as a local matter, the Japanese army took matters into its own hands and used it as a chance to further expand its involvement in China, by taking over all the major cities in the northeast, including the capital of China, Nanjing. It was in Nanjing that the Japanese army committed one of the most gruesome atrocities in the history of mankind, later known as "The Rape of Nanjing."<sup>4</sup>

These developments made it nearly impossible for Konoe to bring Chiang Kai-shek on-board. How could it be feasible to have Chiang take seriously what Konoe was about to propose, when the Japanese army was taking the major cities of China and driving him and his government out of Nanjing?

Despite this hapless and helpless situation, at the end of 1937, shortly after the fall of Nanjing, Konoe began peace talks with Chiang's regime through the German ambassador to China, Oskar P. Trutomann, and sent a proposal for peace to Chiang Kai-shek.<sup>5</sup> Chiang had no incentive to accept Konoe's proposal and he ignored it. On 16 January 1938, having waited for a month for a response from Chiang, Konoe issued a statement: "Not Dealing with Chiang Kai-shek." In the statement, Konoe said that Japan, instead of dealing with the Nanjing Government under Chiang Kai-shek, would wait for a new Chinese government with which make adjustments to the Sino-Japanese relationship in order to establish peace.<sup>6</sup>

As Konoe himself wrote in his postwar memoir, it took little time for him to realize that the statement was a mistake. He took various measures to correct it,

---

<sup>4</sup> See Iris Chang, *The Rape of Nanjing: The Forgotten Holocaust of World War II* (New York: Basic Books, 1997).

<sup>5</sup> Konoe Fumimaro, *Ushinawareta Seiji: Konoe ko no Shukii*, 17.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, 17-18.



but none succeeded. In desperation, on 3 November 1938, Konoe issued another statement in which he said that if the government of China abandoned its anti-Japan policy and prepared to work with Japan to establish a new order in the Far East, Japan would accept a Chinese government under Chiang Kai-shek. Then on 22 December, Konoe issued a follow-up statement declaring the true intention and aim of Japan in her relation with and involvement in China. It later became known as the Konoe Declaration.

In it, Konoe stated that there was a rising demand for a new era in China; Japan was ready to assist in the establishment of a new era not only in China but in the world as a whole; in order to achieve such a goal, the coalition of Japan, Manchukuo, and China had to be established and China had to discard its anti-Japan and anti-Manchukuo sentiment. Regarding Communist expansion in Far East, China had to work together with Japan to defend the Far East and also recognize the necessity of stationing Japanese troops in China and Inner Mongolia; In terms of the economy, Japan had no intention to dominate, but would cooperate with China for common economic progresses. So Konoe concluded that Japan made neither territorial demands nor demands for reparations from China, but had only respect for Chinese national sovereignty, and a desire for China's complete independence.<sup>7</sup>

Four days later, on 26 December, speaking at the weekly memorial meeting of the Central Guomindong Headquarters in Chungking, Chiang Kai-shek responded to Konoe's declaration. Regarding Konoe's argument that Japan would expect to be part of a strong coalition along with Manchukuo and China to set up a new order in the Far East, and that Japan was ready to assist China's establishment of complete independence by relinquishing Japan's right of extraterritoriality and any other special rights in China, and by encouraging other world powers to do the same, Chiang contended that all these stemmed from Japan's intent to deceive the people of China and the rest of the world about Japan's true motive. Chiang argued that Japan's true aim in the Far East was the establishment of hegemonic power over China. Regarding Japan's claims that she had neither territorial interests in any region of China, nor a desire to get reparations from China, Chiang contended that this was irrelevant because Japan intended to take China under her control in its entirety; this was an act of subtle deception by Japan. Similarly, with regard to Japan's claim that she would relinquish any Chinese concessions, and encourage the rest of the world powers to do the same, Chiang said that he did not smell anything but a sham. Chiang thought Japan was attempting to take control of all the concessions China made to the other world powers in order to turn China into a Japanese protectorate.<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> Ibid., 18-20.

<sup>8</sup> Chiang Kai-shek, "Generalissimo Chiang Assails Konoye's Statement," The China Information Committee (1939).

Regarding Konoe's claim that it was necessary to station Japanese troops in Chinese territories and Inner Mongolia in order to prevent Communist intrusion into the Far East, Chiang argued that this was only a smoke screen to hide Japan's true aim of facilitating total Japanese control of China. Chiang stated that Japan, having entered the Anti-Comintern Pact with Germany and Italy, was demanding a similar treaty with China, but Japan's true interest in these treaties was neither anti-communist nor anti-Soviet, but to use them to destroy the sovereignty of China.<sup>9</sup>

Lastly, on Konoe's demands that China provide Japan with special facilities for the economic development of north China and Inner Mongolia and also allow Japanese nationals to have the rights to reside and trade freely in those regions, and his claim that these were the minimum and only demands Japan was making to China, Chiang argued that with all these demands and claims, Japan was aiming to establish a take-over of China. And, Chiang asked, "If these are the 'minimum demands,' I would like to know what more can be asked exceeding them"<sup>10</sup>

This was an outright rejection. Chiang had no desire whatsoever to take Konoe's proposal seriously. In contemplating why, it is interesting to note that the sharp tone of Chiang's anti-Japanese sentiment and his negative view of Konoe show an acute contrast with Sun Yat-sen, Chiang's mentor and predecessor. In late 1918, two decades prior to Konoe's declaration, Sun-Yat-sen met the young political activist Konoe in Shanghai. Konoe was on his way to Paris to attend the Versailles Peace Conference as one of the Japanese delegates. According to Konoe's memoir, published in 1946, Sun was impressed with Konoe and enthusiastically agreed with his vision for eradicating Western imperialism and colonialism from Asia to establish Asian autonomy.<sup>11</sup>

One explanation for this sharp contrast between Sun Yat-sen and Chiang Kai-shek is the circumstantial differences they faced in dealing with Japan in the late 1910s and the late 1930s respectively. Although Japan was already an imperial power in opposition to China in late 1918 when Konoe met Sun, there was no particular Japanese aggression against China that might have differentiated Japan from the Western powers. Sun saw Japan merely as one of the imperial powers opposed to China. Moreover, as seen in Sun's enthusiastic agreement with Konoe's vision of Asia for Asia, and his long known stance as being pro-Japan, it is not much of a stretch to speculate that Sun might even have had sympathy for Japan, seeing Japan in a sense as a victim of Western imperialism, or that he shared with Konoe the belief that it was primarily Western imperialism that drove Japan into her own imperialism, in order to protect herself from the West.

As the circumstances changed in the 1930s, this notion of Japan as a victim was, however, becoming increasingly difficult to sustain in the minds of the

---

<sup>9</sup> Chiang Kai-shek, "Generalissimo Chiang Assails Konoye's Statement," 8.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, 10.

<sup>11</sup> Konoe Fumimaro, *Seidanroku*, 252.

Chinese. As described above, Japan was second to none in terms of exploitation of China. Japan was the first nation to violate the principles of the Nine Power Treaty by taking over Manchuria in 1931 and setting up a puppet nation. Then in 1937 when the China Incident took place, the Japanese army rampaged through northeastern China, taking most of the major cities. Instead of victim, Japan now stood as a forerunner of imperialism and colonialism against China. So it seems it was unrealistic to expect Chiang to do anything different than respond to Konoe's proposal in the way he did.

Attributing Chiang's refusal of Konoe's proposal to circumstantial differences alone, however, falls short in fully grasping why Chiang saw Konoe and his vision differently than did Sun Yat-sen. Two points need to be addressed here. One is the persistence of Western imperialism and colonialism in China. Japan was second to none with regard to exploiting and committing atrocities against China in the 1930s, and China was also fighting, along with Western powers, against Japan, as a common enemy. This does not mean, however, that Western mistreatment of China had ceased to exist. Also, in fact, it was not Japan but the Western powers that initiated the exploitation of China, before Japan became one of the exploiters. Starting with the Opium War, China suffered from a series of Western imperial and colonial actions. Although Japan joined in this Western imperialism and later became a leading exploiter and an unquestionable aggressor against China, the onus of being the architects of the exploitation of China falls on the Western powers, not Japan, as seen by such Western policies as the Open Door, or the Scramble for Concession at the turn of the century.

Even during the 1920s, amid Western advocacy for democracy, highlighted by assertions of respect for China's sovereignty, territorial integrity, and independence, and during the 1930s when Japan rampaged in acts of savagery against the people of China, the Western powers were in no position to claim to be free of imperialism against China. As Konoe correctly pointed out, the Western powers, while advocating lofty assertions with regard to China's status as a true sovereign and independent nation, did nothing to end their long-established imperialist power in China.

Furthermore, it was plain that the Western powers were fighting against Japan not for the sake of defending China but primarily to protect their own rights and interests in China. It is unimaginable that Chiang Kai-shek, who was working closely with his mentor, Sun Yat-sen, in order to end Western exploitation of China (prior to the death of Sun in 1925), was unaware of this.

In addition to Chiang's clear awareness of Western imperialism and colonialism in China, Chiang Kai-shek had a solid grasp of the role of Japanese militarism with regard to Japan's aggression in China in the 1930s. Chiang wrote:

During the past decade, Japan's political leaders have passed away one after another, leaving not a single statesman who comprehends the high principles responsible for the nation's rise or fall. As a consequence, Japanese militarists have without restraint violated laws and discipline and taken things into their own hands. The greater Japan's national danger looms, the more desperate and ambitious they become.<sup>12</sup>

Thus Chiang attributed Japan's imperial and colonial acts to the surge of Japanese militarism in the 1930s, meaning Chiang understood the struggle Konoe Fumimaro had to go through as a head of the civilian government of Japan.

The contention here is that, despite Japan's atrocities against China and her people, the two points discussed above make it difficult to say that Chiang Kai-shek did not see any validity at all in Konoe's promotion of the establishment of Asia for Asia by freeing Asia from the hands of Western imperialism and colonialism.

Why then did Chiang Kai-shek, rejecting Konoe's proposal, single out Japan as the sole enemy of China, and see Konoe's proposal for China and Japan working together for the common cause of ending Western presence and influence in Asia, to establish Asia for Asia, as nothing but a ploy to deceive China and the rest of the world?

One credible interpretation is that in the late 1920s and 1930s, Chiang Kai-shek, as head of the nation, was in crisis, confronting multiple and daunting problems. Among them, the most crucial was the lack of national unity in China as reflected in Chiang's first major task as the new leader of China, that is, the elimination of warlords in order to establish national unity. The lack of unity in China was further intensified by the rising tide of communist power and the birth of the Chinese Communist Party in 1921 and its subsequent confrontation with the nationalist forces led by the Guomindong. This created an ideological partition of China, thus fundamentally threatening a national direction based on the vision of Chiang's own mentor, Sun Yat-sen. In addition to these external divisions, Chiang also had to deal with an internal division in his own party, the Guomindong. There was a challenge from Wang Qing-wei, another prominent leader of the Guomindong. Wang was originally considered to be the successor to Sun Yat-sen and unlike Chiang he was known to be pro-Japanese and very critical of the way Chiang was dealing with Japan. In fact it was Wang who was chosen by Konoe to be head of the new Chinese government in China.

Finding himself in this predicament, Chiang was desperately fighting for his political survival and seeking a way to establish national unity in China. The solution he found turned out to be a panacea for him. It was the rapidly growing anti-Japanese sentiment among the Chinese public, which was effective toward achieving unity between the Chinese Communist Party and the Guomindong

---

<sup>12</sup> Chiang Kai-shek, "Generalissimo Chiang Assails Konoye's Statement," 12.

despite their ideological incompatibility. Also, an anti-Japanese stance was effective in solidifying Western support and aid for the sake of China's fate and future. In addition, anti-Japanese sentiment was effective in his personal fight against the threat from his arch-rival, pro-Japanese Wang Qing-wei, to his hegemonic position as head of the nationalist government of China. Thus there is no doubt about why Chiang rejected Konoe's proposal. He could not afford to implement any policy that went against the raging national anti-Japanese sentiment. He needed Japan as China's adversary. To Chiang, Japan was not only an adversary, but more significantly, a political tool. While Chiang had no other reason to disagree with Konoe's vision to create Asia for Asia, to Chiang such a vision was meaningless if China failed to save itself from the futility of national destruction due to internal disorder and division.

As the contemporary scholar Yoshioka Bunroku said in his 1937 article, "Konoe Cabinet and Diplomacy toward China," Konoe failed to see this "rationality" Chiang Kai-shek was contemplating in his dealings with the Sino-Japanese relationship.<sup>13</sup> Chiang Kai-shek was essentially a militarist, not a politician. Yet it was not Konoe but Chiang who outmaneuvered his adversary.

---

<sup>13</sup> Yoshioka argues that Konoe failed in his diplomatic dealings with Chiang Kai-shek mainly due to his incapacity to see Chiang's effort to utilize anti-Japanese sentiment among the Chinese public in order to enhance a strong sense of Chinese nationalism. See Yoshioka Bunroku, "Konoe Cabinet and Diplomacy toward China," *Gaiko Jihō* (July 1, 1937).



**Special Section**  
Selected Undergraduate Articles





# **The Forgotten Minority: Pro-Unionism in Florida's Secession Crisis**

Tyler Campbell  
*University of Central Florida*

In 1862 the governor of Florida, John Milton, proclaimed in a letter to Jefferson Davis, "in Florida a very large minority were opposed to secession." However, at a glance, the overwhelming vote by the Florida Secession Convention in favor of secession would make it seem that almost all of the population were pro-secession. The secession movement was a time of great upheaval and discontent; yet even through adversity, there were those who lived in the South who did not wish to secede from the Union. By examining both state and national elections, and also the delegates to the Florida Secession Convention, it may be seen that the "large minority" Milton mentions did exist, and that the vote for secession by the Florida Secession Convention did not accurately represent the full population of the state of Florida. The main issues that will be discussed in this paper are the existence of those in the state who were against secession, the makeup of the delegates to the Florida Secession Convention, and the proceedings and subsequent vote of the Convention. The combination of these factors shows that this forgotten minority was highly underrepresented in the vote for secession and that they deserve more attention than scholars have given them.<sup>1</sup>

The Election of Abraham Lincoln hastened the road to secession. The subsequent secession of South Carolina set the tone for several states in the South to assemble conventions to discuss dissolution from the United States. Florida was among the first of these states, holding its convention beginning on 3 January 1861. Like most of the South, Florida was a slave state, with 34 percent of households owning slaves. This ranked Florida fifth according to the 1860 census. Florida was a young state that had a population of just over 140,000. Florida's population was smaller than that of Rhode Island, and barely larger than that of Delaware. Each state decided how to answer the question of secession in its own way. In Florida, Governor Madison Perry, Milton's predecessor, and the Florida legislature called for an election of delegates to form a convention. Other states held popular elections to decide if a convention was needed.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> United States, *The War of the Rebellion: A Compilation of the Official Records of the Union and Confederate Armies*, series IV, vol. 2, 92, (Washington, DC: Govt. Print. Off., 1880), written 23 September 1862.

<sup>2</sup> "Results from the 1860 Census," *The Civil War Home Page*, [http://www.civil-war.net/pages/1860\\_census.html](http://www.civil-war.net/pages/1860_census.html); "Florida - Race and Hispanic Origin: 1830 to 1990," <http://www.census.gov/population/www/documentation/twps0056/tabs15-65.pdf>; Ralph A. Wooster, "The Florida Secession Convention," *The Florida Historical Quarterly* 36, no 4 (1958): 373-385, <http://www.jstore.org/stable/30139845>, 374; Robert Hiram White, ed., *Messages of the Governors of Tennessee* 5, 272, <http://tn.gov/tsla/cwsb/1861-02-Article-10-Page19.pdf>.

There was uproar over secession at the national level as well. One political party that gained popularity from the turmoil was the Constitutional Union Party, which ran on a platform that “denounced sectionalism and called for national unity.” Their slogan, adopted from Daniel Webster, a United States Senator who stood for American nationalism in the early years of the Republic was “The Constitution and the Union, Now and Forever.”<sup>3</sup> Their platform and slogan make it clear that they stood for unity and against secession. The other political split occurred within the Democratic Party, after the Southern Democrats walked out of the Democratic Convention during the election of the candidate for president in 1860. The Southern Democrats, who were pro slavery, gained popularity among Democrats living in the South. The parties and their candidates in the 1860 election serve as a type of poll of the people and are instrumental in determining the position of Floridians during the time of secession.<sup>4</sup>

A large amount of research has been conducted on the Civil War Era. However, the secession movement and convention in the state of Florida have received little attention. James L. Abrahamson’s book *The Men of Secession and Civil War 1859-1861*, discusses the secession movement in Florida only in passing, saying, “little Unionism survived in Florida.” Abrahamson’s source for this statement is Ralph A. Wooster’s *The Secession Conventions of the South*. In his book Wooster makes a similar statement about the population of Florida, asserting that “there was very little unionism in the state in 1860.” However, these authors provide little evidence to support their claims and they ignore the large minority of Unionists in the state.<sup>5</sup>

These books lack in-depth research on Florida secession, something that is not an issue in the work of William Watson Davis, a pro-secession student of the Dunning School, which opposed Reconstruction in the south. Davis’s *Civil War and Reconstruction in Florida*, written over one hundred years ago, remains relevant. Davis discussed the movement toward secession and the Southern Democratic Party’s strong presence in the state. He argued that “[The Florida Secession Convention’s] proceedings probably reflect with fair accuracy the temper of more than the party majority.” It is important to note that Davis’s stance was typical for a Southern white man at the turn of the twentieth century, whose ancestors had lost their fortunes with abolition.<sup>6</sup>

The position of Floridians regarding the debate over secession and the results of the Florida Secession Convention have received little attention from historians.

---

<sup>3</sup> Robert North Roberts, Scott John Hammond, Valerie A. Sulfaro, *Presidential Campaigns, Slogans, Issues, and Platforms* (Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO, 2012), 106.

<sup>4</sup> “Democratic Party Platform (Breckinridge Faction) of 1860,” *The American Presidency Project*, <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=29614>.

<sup>5</sup> James L. Abrahamson, *The Men of Secession and Civil War 1859-1861* (Delaware: Scholarly Resources, 2000), 90; Ralph A. Wooster, *The Secession Conventions of the South* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1962), 79.

<sup>6</sup> William Watson Davis, *The Civil War and Reconstruction in Florida* (Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 1964), 47; Paul Ortiz, “The Not-So-Strange Career of William Watson Davis’s *The Civil War and Reconstruction in Florida*,” in *The Dunning School*, ed. John David Smith and J. Vincent Lowery (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 2013), 257.

The Florida Secession Convention voted to secede from the Union on 10 January 1861 by sixty-two to seven. The vote suggests a misleading conclusion that a vast majority of Floridians were pro-secession. An analysis of both state and national elections, as well as a closer look into the Florida Secession Convention, shows that the vote of the Florida Secession Convention is not an accurate representation of the position of Floridians; a large minority desired to remain in the Union.

The Presidential election of 1860 demonstrated the presence of the large minority of Unionists in Florida. Of the three candidates on the ballot, the strongest pro-Union candidate, Constitutional Union candidate John Bell, won 36 percent of Floridians' votes. The Southern Democratic candidate, John Breckinridge, won 62 percent. The Constitutional Unionist vote in Florida was significantly higher than the national average, just under 13 percent. The Unionist vote in Florida was also higher than in Alabama by 6 percent, a state going through a similar secession debate. This suggests the existence of a large minority of Floridians who were against secession, despite the strong push from the Southern Democratic-influenced state government and media.<sup>7</sup>

The existence of the pro-Union population in the state can also be seen in the months leading up to secession and the Civil War. Davis discusses several instances of aggression against Unionists in the state. In July of 1860, Dr. William Hollingsworth was attacked because of his anti-secession views. The attackers fired on his house where he and his son were living until Dr. Hollingsworth was badly wounded. Democratic newspapers attacked Unionists, calling them "submissionists" and "Union Shriekers." Other men were dragged from their beds, taken to the woods, and whipped under the darkness of night. These episodes of brutality show the conflict in the state over the issue of secession and how strongly people felt on both sides.<sup>8</sup>

In a correspondence from Captain Montgomery Cunningham Meigs, who was stationed in Florida on the orders of Abraham Lincoln, to General Winfield Scott of the United States Army, just a few weeks before the Florida Secession Convention, Meigs stated "I believe that the temper of the South is excited [and] Dangerous." These words foreshadow the events that were to come in Florida and other states in the South. On 26 November 1860, Governor Madison Perry and the Florida Legislature passed legislation to call for an election of delegates to the Florida Secession Convention.<sup>9</sup>

Governor Perry laid out his position on the state of political affairs in the United States in a message published in the *Floridian and Journal*, in which he states:

---

<sup>7</sup> "1860 Presidential General Election Results – Florida," *Dave Leip's Atlas of U.S. Presidential Elections*, <http://uselectionatlas.org/RESULTS/national.php?year=1860>; Reiger, "Secession of Florida from the Union," 361.

<sup>8</sup> John F. Reiger, "Secession of Florida from the Union," *The Florida Historical Quarterly* 46, no. 4 (1968): 360; Davis, *Civil War and Reconstruction*, 43-44; Ortiz, "The Not-So-Strange," 262.

<sup>9</sup> United States, *The War of the Rebellion: A Compilation of the Official Records of the Union and Confederate Armies*, series I vol. 52 pt. 1, 4, (Washington, DC: Govt. Print. Off., 1880), written 10 November 1860.

“I most decidedly declare that in my opinion the only hope the Southern States have for domestic peace and safety . . . is Secession from our faithless, perjured confederates.” He ends his message with a call for a convention “to take such action as in their judgment may be necessary to protect and preserve the rights, honor and safety of the people of Florida.” In order to assess this statement, it must be determined if the members of the Florida Secession Convention accurately represented the views of the people living in the state.<sup>10</sup>

Each county held an election to nominate representatives from their community to the Florida Secession Convention, which was held in Tallahassee in January of 1861. According to the 1860 census, only seven of the sixty-nine delegates to the convention were native Floridians. The other sixty-two were men born outside the state; twenty-two from Georgia. According to the census, there were just under 78,000 free people living in Florida. Of those, around 35,000 were native-born Floridians, which suggests that the delegates elected to the Florida Secession Convention might not be an accurate representation of native-born Floridians.<sup>11</sup>

The Florida Secession Convention assembled for the first time on 3 January 1861. The elected President of the convention, John C. McGehee, a slaveholder, said in his opening speech, “Our Government . . . is crumbling into ruins.”<sup>12</sup> This represents the tone for the Convention as a whole, which focused on how to secede rather than whether or not secession met the desires of the people of Florida, as is stated in Perry’s letter published in the *Floridian and Journal*.<sup>13</sup> A discrepancy existed between Florida’s voting patterns and the vote for secession, which suggests that the Florida Secession Convention was not an accurate representation of Floridians.<sup>14</sup>

The alignment of the delegates further separates them from the general population of Florida. The members of the Florida Secession Convention are categorized by historians into two groups, Secessionists (forty-two delegates) and Cooperationists (twenty-seven delegates). The Secessionists favored immediate secession, whereas the Cooperationists wanted secession through a “united Southern action” that would involve several Southern states seceding together. The discourse of the convention and the several votes over how secession should be carried out illustrate these positions. Therefore, although the convention was split into two general groups with opposing views, they both favored secession, differing only in the means of obtaining it. According to one newspaper the goal of the Convention was to “consider the dangers to the position of the state in the Federal Union and to

---

<sup>10</sup> “Governor’s Message,” *Floridian and Journal*, December 1, 1860, <http://ufdc.ufl.edu/UF00079928/00430/1x>.

<sup>11</sup> Wooster, “The Florida Secession Convention,” Index; Davis, *Civil War and Reconstruction in Florida*, 34.

<sup>12</sup> Reiger, “Secession of Florida from the Union,” 364.

<sup>13</sup> “Governor’s Message,” *Floridian and Journal*, December 1, 1860, <http://ufdc.ufl.edu/UF00079928/00430/1x>.

<sup>14</sup> Florida, *Journal of the Proceedings of the Convention of the People of Florida* (Tallahassee: Dyke & Carlisle, 1861), 7.

amend the constitution in any way necessary.” However, taking into consideration the large minority in the state that voted for the Constitutional Union Party in the recent national election, there was a lack of representation from those in the minority.<sup>15</sup> There was a large minority of Unionists in Florida, but they were not heard in the convention.

The Convention lasted for a total of eight days. The first several days consisted of setting the parameters for the Convention and electing members to committees. On the third day the delegates heard speeches by representatives from South Carolina and Alabama, both attempting to persuade the Convention to vote for secession. The Convention heard no speeches in favor of staying in the Union.<sup>16</sup>

On the fifth day the Convention made several important decisions that demonstrated each delegate’s position on secession. There were members of the convention who offered to put the decision for secession to a popular vote. Delegates George Ward of Leon County and A. K. Allison of Franklin County offered amendments to the Ordinance of Secession. Ward’s amendment stated “that this Ordinance shall not take effect until the Convention shall be advised of the action of the Conventions of Georgia and Alabama.” Allison, in his proposed amendment, added that if both states declined to secede, the “said Ordinance shall not take effect until it has been submitted to the legal voters of the State of Florida and ratified and affirmed by them.” After Ward’s and Allison’s proposals were defeated, the Cooperationists made one final attempt at delaying the vote for secession. George Ward proposed an amendment that stated: “the Ordinance shall not take effect until it shall have been submitted to the people and ratified by them.” All three of these proposals were defeated by those in favor of prompt secession.<sup>17</sup>

Reiger raises the question as to whether the defeat of the amendments symbolized the desire of the Convention to quickly join the Confederate cause, “or . . . [was it] because they were afraid that a popular vote would reveal a strong pro-Union undercurrent in a sea of Secession.” The question remains unanswered and requires further research. The data suggest that the goal of the proceedings of the Florida Secession convention was to ensure the secession of Florida and to prevent it from being delayed.<sup>18</sup>

For the delegates of the Convention to remove Florida from the Union they had to declare themselves the legal representation of all Floridians. Members of the convention believed that secession was legal under the US Constitution. According to the proceedings of the Convention, they claimed that the resulting opinion of the Convention represented the people and gave them the right to remove Florida from

---

<sup>15</sup> Wooster, *The Secession Conventions of the South*, 68, 70. This total includes two delegates who did not vote; Davis, *Civil War and Reconstruction in Florida*, 49; *East Floridian*, December 5, 1860.

<sup>16</sup> *Journal of the Proceedings*, 16-17.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, 31-33. The vote was forty-one to twenty-six.

<sup>18</sup> Reiger, “Secession of Florida from the Union,” 366.

the Union if they saw fit.<sup>19</sup> On 10 January 1861, the Convention decided by a vote of sixty-two to seven that Florida would secede from the union, making it only the third state to do so.<sup>20</sup>

As previously discussed, Floridians' voting patterns show a large minority of Constitutional Unionists. This pattern continued in the gubernatorial election of 1861. What is important in this election is not that the Southern Democratic Candidate won; but the fact that his winning margin was actually smaller than that in the presidential race a year earlier. John Milton beat the Constitutional Unionist candidate, Edward Hopkins, by just over 1,700 votes, Hopkins receiving 43 percent of the vote. There was a growth of support for the Constitutional Unionist Party, from 36 percent in the Presidential election of 1860 to 43 percent in the gubernatorial election of 1861. This suggests that even after the Florida Secession Convention was over, there was still a strong minority in the state in favor of preserving the Union, despite a large-scale Pro-Secession press, government support, and the fact that the state had already seceded.<sup>21</sup>

The vote suggests the existence of pro-Union sentiment in Florida even after secession, a presence emphasized in a letter written on 23 September 1862 by the Governor of Florida, John Milton, to the President of the Confederacy, Jefferson Davis. In the letter Milton says, "in many parts of the State combinations existed to adhere to and maintain the United States Government, and even now in some portions of the state there are men who would eagerly seize any opportunity that promised success to the United States."<sup>22</sup> Milton's concern over the presence of the pro-Unionists supports the idea that there was a large Unionist presence in the state, large enough to warrant the attention of the governor in his correspondence with the President of the Confederacy.

The data suggest there is a strong possibility that there was a large presence of pro-Union sentiment in the state of Florida before, during, and even after the Florida Secession Convention, a presence that Florida's vote for secession does not accurately reflect. There were many Floridians who supported secession, but it was not as large a majority as depicted in the Convention's vote. The large number of votes for candidates who ran on a platform of unity, against pressure from the heavily Southern Democrat government and its supporting newspapers, suggests that there was a substantial minority of the population of the state that opposed secession. The election of the delegates and the proceedings of the Florida Secession Convention suggest that what the delegates to the Convention claimed to be an accurate representation of Floridians' positions on secession was actually

---

<sup>19</sup> *Journal of the Proceedings*, 15; Reiger, "Secession of Florida from the Union," 365.

<sup>20</sup> Wooster, "The Florida Secession Convention," 377.

<sup>21</sup> Reiger, "Secession of Florida from the Union," 360-361; "Ordinance of Secession, 1861," *Florida Memory: Division of Library and Information Services*, <http://www.floridamemory.com/exhibits/floridahighlights/secession>.

<sup>22</sup> United States, *War of The Rebellion*, series IV, vol. 2, 92, written 23 September 1862.

inaccurate and biased. The Florida Secession Convention decided that it spoke for the people of the state, but clearly there is more to Florida's secession story than was reflected in its vote.





## May the Living Profit: Commemorating the Battle of Olustee

Lindsay Keller

*University of Central Florida*

A debate has arisen over a proposed monument to the black and white Union soldiers who fought and died at the Olustee Battlefield in Baker County, Florida. One might be surprised to know that despite the thousands of monuments commemorating Civil War soldiers, the Battlefield at Olustee has no monument to the Union dead. Several groups are fighting this proposed monument, including the United Daughters of the Confederacy (UDC) and the Sons of Confederate Veterans (SCV).<sup>1</sup> In a recent SCV newsletter, the organization's leadership exhorted all members to fight a new monument at Olustee. According to the newsletter, "in anticipation of the 150th anniversary of the battle that protected Florida's capital from falling, the Sons of Union Veterans has obtained approval from the State of Florida Parks Department for a special monument to invading Federal forces."<sup>2</sup> Furthermore, the SCV describe the monument as something unnatural that will disturb Olustee, "The plan calls for a large black Dardr Vadar-esque shaft that will disrupt the hallowed ground where Southern blood was spilled in defense of Florida, protecting Tallahassee from capture."<sup>3</sup> The SCV calls for help from citizens, stating that "in order to stop this we must win the war through citizen objection. Confederate Forces won the Battle in 1864 - but will we win the second Battle of Olustee and prevent this menacing monument from disrupting this hallowed Southern soil?" This controversy was recently reported in the *New York Times*.<sup>4</sup>

As we approach the 150th anniversary of the Battle of Olustee, advocates of the Lost Cause (the Southern version of Civil War memory) refuse to leave the battlefield, and they continue to contest the War and its memory. The Lost Cause was named in 1866 by Edward A. Pollard, editor of the *Richmond Examiner*. Although the Lost Cause is not given as much regard in the academic community as it once was, it indicates how the Civil War is remembered today, especially in the South. As complex as the Lost Cause is, five of its major tenets are specifically relevant to the memorialization at Olustee. First, state's rights, and not slavery, were considered the cause of the War. Second, slaves were all faithful to the Southern cause; forgotten are the hundreds of thousands of African Americans who served the Union cause. Third, Confederate military defeat only occurred due to the superior Union numbers and resources. Fourth, Confederate soldiers were brave and virtuous. Finally, the Lost Cause argued that women played an

---

<sup>1</sup> For more about the UDC or SCV, see [www.hqudc.org](http://www.hqudc.org) or [www.scv.org](http://www.scv.org). See also Caroline Janney, *Remembering the Civil War: Reunion and the Limits of Reconciliation* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2013).

<sup>2</sup> Michael Givens, "Battle of Olustee – action needed," *SCV Telegraph*, October, 2013, 1.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*

important role in the War; noble Southern women's wartime sacrifices were central to the Southern war effort and therefore they too should be remembered.<sup>5</sup> Understanding the Lost Cause is central to understanding commemoration at the Olustee Battlefield.<sup>6</sup>

While considering the power of the Lost Cause in Civil War memory, one must ask: Why is there no US Memorial on the battlefield of Olustee in a nation that has thousands of memorials to both Northern and Southern soldiers at hundreds of battlefields around the nation? Moreover, if the effort is not memorialized, what is commemorated at this field? Given the high numbers of Union casualties, it is surprising it has taken so long to even consider building a US monument. Partly, the delay could be attributed to Olustee's status as a state park, unlike Gettysburg or Antietam, which are administered by the federal government. Moreover, it may have been that Florida's level of importance as a participant in the Civil War was not high enough to raise awareness. Although Florida was the third state to secede from the Union, its strategic importance was limited. The state did not have many troops to offer to the Confederacy and its extended coastline was difficult for either the Confederacy or the Union to secure.

What, therefore, lay behind the Union attempt to cut Florida off from the rest of the Confederacy, which culminated at the Battle of Olustee? The peninsula supplied the Confederacy with most of its beef and salt, necessary for feeding the troops and for preserving that food. In an attempt to gain Florida politically and militarily, as well as to sever the Confederacy from a considerable food source, the Union planned an offensive into Florida in early 1864 by marching west from occupied Jacksonville. Although the Union attempted blockades and raids in Florida in earlier years of the War, this was the first time that Union and Confederate armies would participate in a battle for Florida.<sup>7</sup> Both armies, small, with barely more than 10,000 men combined, met on the battlefield at Olustee, or Ocean Pond, for a short battle of only about four hours.<sup>8</sup>

The Confederacy suffered about 18 percent casualties, the US about 35 percent. Despite Florida's seemingly insignificant role, this was a hard fought battle, as may be seen in the casualty rates. In fact, in proportion to the number of troops engaged, the Battle of Olustee ranks third among all Civil War battles on a list of highest casualties for the Union. A Confederate veteran explained that, "General Colquitt

---

<sup>5</sup> Caroline E. Janney, "The Lost Cause," *Encyclopedia Virginia*, [http://www.EncyclopediaVirginia.org/Lost\\_Cause\\_The](http://www.EncyclopediaVirginia.org/Lost_Cause_The).

<sup>6</sup> Contrasting with the Lost Cause, the following convey the Union Cause: Janney, *Remembering the Civil War*; John R. Neff, *Honoring the Civil War Dead: Commemoration and the Problem of Reconciliation* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2004); Gary W. Gallagher, *The Union War*, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2011); Barbara Gannon, *The Won Cause: Black and White Comradship in the Grand Army of the Republic* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2011).

<sup>7</sup> William H. Nulty, *Confederate Florida: The Road to Olustee* (Tuscaloosa, Alabama: University of Alabama Press, 1990), 41-52.

<sup>8</sup> Robert P. Broadwater, *The Battle of Olustee, 1864: The Final Union Attempt to Seize Florida* (Jefferson, North Carolina: McFarland & Company, 2006), 2-3.

had ordered his men out of the trenches and went for the [N]egroes and Yankees out in the open field. It was a terrible slaughter.”<sup>9</sup>

The Confederate soldier’s account may explain why this battle has been neglected, particularly by Northerners.<sup>10</sup> David Blight, in his landmark study *Race and Reunion: The Civil War in American Memory*, documents how Northerners and Southerners forgot the role of former slaves who fought for the Union during the Civil War.<sup>11</sup> Three African American units, the Eighth United States Colored Troops (USCT), Fifty-Fourth Massachusetts, and First North Carolina (whose name would change to the Thirty-Fifth USCT after the battle), were all involved in the fight. The Eighth USCT and the Thirty-Fifth USCT were very inexperienced units. The Fifty-Fourth, made famous by the movie *Glory*, was battle-hardened and experienced. Inexperience might have mattered less than the poor leadership and planning of the Union offensive. The US force ran into an entrenched Confederate force of equal size. US officers handled this attack poorly. In the Civil War that usually spelled defeat. Despite these difficult circumstances, most agree both the Eighth and the Thirty-Fifth USCT performed well, considering their inexperience. The Fifty-fourth’s efforts proved crucial; it executed a controlled retreat and allowed most other US forces to escape back to Jacksonville. The Eighth and the Thirty-Fifth both played a similar role as the Fifty-Fourth. The two regiments entered the fray to fill in the gap where the 115th New York and the Seventh New Hampshire had been before they fled the field. All three of these regiments from the USCT were left to hold the field while the white Federal troops retreated.<sup>12</sup>

The sacrifice of black troops may have gone unremembered in broader circles of historical memory, but records indicate that the loss sustained by the Eighth USCT during the Olustee campaign was one of the most severe during the Civil War. In loss in action, their’s ranked third among all 166 black regiments in the Union Army in individual battles.<sup>13</sup> According to Broadwater, of the troops left to retreat from the field, “it is estimated that some fifty wounded black soldiers were murdered on the field of Olustee that night. Considering the fact that the Confederates captured some two hundred prisoners, approximately twenty-five percent were killed after they became prisoners of war. There are several existing

---

<sup>9</sup> Lawrence Jackson, “As I saw and remembered the battle of Olustee, which was fought February 20, 1864” (Diary from Confederate Lawrence Jackson, written in 1929), University of Florida Smathers Library, Special Collection Manuscripts, 3.

<sup>10</sup> Although the role of black soldiers in the Union forces is generally marginalized, some historians have produced ample research on the topic. See Barbara Gannon, “African American Soldiers,” in *Essential Civil War Curriculum* (Virginia Center for Civil War Studies at Virginia Tech May 2014); Joseph Glatthaar, *Forged in Battle, the Civil War Alliance of Black Soldiers and White Officers* (New York: Meridian Books, 1991); William A. Dobak, *Freedom By the Sword: The U.S. Colored Troops, 1862-1867* (New York: Skyhorse Publishing, 2013). These works, amongst others, demonstrate that black Union soldiers were not an independent faction of the Federal troops, but, in reality, their contribution was instrumental in several ways.

<sup>11</sup> David W. Blight, *Race and Reunion: The Civil War in American Memory* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2001).

<sup>12</sup> Broadwater, 117.

<sup>13</sup> William F. Fox, *Regimental Losses in the American Civil War 1861-1865* (Albany, New York: Albany Publishing Company, 1889), <https://archive.org/stream/reglossescivilwar00foxwrich#page/n5/mode/2up>.

accounts of the atrocity.”<sup>14</sup> Furthermore, about a third of all Union casualties from the battle were black soldiers.<sup>15</sup>

Massacres of this type were not unusual; other battles that involved black troops, such as Fort Pillow, Milliken’s Bend, and the Crater at Petersburg, featured the massacre of Union troops, particularly of black soldiers. These battles have been the subject of book-length treatments that studied the actions of black soldiers and their treatment by Confederate soldiers. Fort Pillow is the best known and documented. General Nathan Bedford Forrest warned the garrison that if they did not surrender they would be given no quarter. A number of investigations of this battle established that there was a massacre; two book-length studies on Fort Pillow were published in the last decade.<sup>16</sup> Linda Barnickel documented the massacre at Milliken’s Bend in *Milliken’s Bend: A Civil War Battle in History and Memory*, and Kevin Levin documented the Crater in his recent study *Remembering the Battle of the Crater: War as Murder*.<sup>17</sup> In contrast, Robert Broadwater’s *The Battle of Olustee, 1864* discusses black soldiers’ bravery and conduct during the battle, commending their character and their accomplishment in proving their fighting capabilities, but not the massacre.<sup>18</sup> William Nulty’s *Confederate Florida: The Road to Olustee* argues instead that the high casualty rates for Union troops were due to poor leadership, and does not address the massacre. Nulty’s publication won the Mrs. Simon Baruch University Award, created and given by the United Daughters of the Confederacy.<sup>19</sup>

Although it is surprising that such a major battle was forgotten, it is not altogether surprising that the massacre of black troops went unnoticed. It is hardly even mentioned in contemporary Federal reports. Commander of the Union forces at Olustee, General Truman Seymour, wrote a report to Brigadier General J. W. Turner, Chief of Staff and Artillery for the Department of the South, discussing the Confederate wounded and killed, and he wrote briefly of Union losses in comparison, but he did not mention the African American loss. The report is dated 2 March 1864, and it may be that so soon after the battle, Seymour was unaware of the brutal treatment of his African American troops. He did write to Turner: “It is proper to add that an application was made to the general commanding Confederate forces to parole our wounded, which was refused.”<sup>20</sup> Seymour may have been

---

<sup>14</sup> Broadwater, 142.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, 132.

<sup>16</sup> John Cimprich, *Fort Pillow, a Civil War Massacre, and Public Memory* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2005); Andrew Ward, *River Run Red: The Fort Pillow Massacre in the American Civil War* (New York: Penguin Group, 2005).

<sup>17</sup> Linda Barnickel, *Milliken’s Bend: A Civil War Battle in History and Memory* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2013); Kevin M. Levin, *Remembering the Battle of the Crater: War as Murder* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 2012).

<sup>18</sup> Broadwater, 3-4.

<sup>19</sup> Nulty; *United Daughters of the Confederacy*.

<sup>20</sup> United States, *The War of the Rebellion: A compilation of the Official Records of the Union and Confederate Armies*, series 1, vol. 35, pt. 2, Correspondence (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1891), 3.

unaware of the fate of many of the black troops because the Confederates refused him access to the Union wounded.

A letter from First Lieutenant Oliver Willcox Norton of the Eighth USCT to his sister demonstrates that the knowledge of the massacre of black troops was not widespread immediately following the battle. On 29 February 1864 he wrote, “a flag of truce from the enemy brought the news that prisoners, black and white, were treated alike. I hope it is so, for I have sworn never to take a prisoner if my men left there were murdered.”<sup>21</sup> It is likely that the Union troops were unaware so soon after the fight that their black soldiers were murdered, though they seemed concerned about their fate. Norton did pay homage to African American troops who fought under him, “Company K went into the fight with fifty-five enlisted men and two officers. It came out with twenty-three and one officer. Of these but two men were not marked. That speaks volumes for the bravery of Negroes. Several of these twenty-three were quite badly cut, but they are present with the company. Ten were killed, four reported missing, though there is little doubt they are killed, too.”<sup>22</sup> Apart from in the content of Norton’s letters, it appears that the sacrifice made by black soldiers went unremembered for many decades after the War.

Partly, the reason that US officials did not know about the fate of African American soldiers at Olustee is the same reason that neither they nor their white counterparts were memorialized. The battlefield remained in the hands of the Southerners both immediately after the battle, when US forces retreated, and in the decades after the War. Moreover, Southern women took the battlefield, in landscape and memory, from the hands of the Confederate soldiers who fought there. Many scholars have discussed the prominent role the UDC has played in the memory of the Civil War. Since its emergence as an organization in 1894, the UDC, along with other groups, both North and South, became involved in post-wartime remembrance in their own way. The UDC, originally named The National Association of the Daughters of the Confederacy, began in Tennessee and changed its name to the United Daughters of the Confederacy a year later.<sup>23</sup> It has advocated the Lost Cause from the beginning. Its founder, Caroline Goodlett, initially started the organization in honor of Confederate veterans, and it rapidly evolved into an organization that focused largely on the women’s “Southern ideals and respect and pride in their Southern ancestry.”<sup>24</sup> Even as early as 1899, the UDC was commemorating the Lost Cause by erecting monuments and even creating children’s auxiliaries, such as the Children of the Confederacy, “to further ‘vindicate the South and her heroes, and place before the world a narrative of facts instead of the falsehoods which have

---

<sup>21</sup> Lt. Oliver Norton, “Letter from Lt. Oliver Norton: 8th United States Colored Troops, 29 February, 1864,” <http://battleofolustee.org/letters/onorton.html>, 3.

<sup>22</sup> Norton, 3

<sup>23</sup> *United Daughters of the Confederacy*, [http://www.hqudc.org/about\\_udc/index.htm](http://www.hqudc.org/about_udc/index.htm).

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*

been hitherto disseminated.’ With a concerted effort on the part of the UDC, future generations would understand the motives of their ancestors.”<sup>25</sup> The UDC wanted to impart Lost Cause ideology on future generations.

The UDC published a work on Olustee written by Ruth H. Cole for the UDC State Contest in 1929. The author declared that the public memory of Olustee would be influenced by the “action of the United Daughters of the Confederacy in memorializing the gallantry of the Confederacy by the erection of a beautiful shaft near Lake City and the highly commendable effort of the State of Florida in providing for the care of the battle grounds.”<sup>26</sup> This article reflects the tenets of the Lost Cause in that it portrays the Confederates as heroes, even after the War was long over and the states reunited. Cole’s paper also fully supports the monument erected at Olustee by the UDC for Confederate soldiers.<sup>27</sup> Cole’s article only mentions the presence of black troops once, without discussing their participation in the battle. Cole makes three arguments when assessing the battle: the Confederates were outnumbered; Seymour was a poor leader; and the Confederates courageously overcame the Federals despite the odds. It is evident that the UDC wanted only to portray one side of the battle, even sixty-five years after the end of it. When the UDC commemorates the battle of Olustee, it is from a Southern standpoint and it neglects to mention, let alone discuss, the memory of black troops and the atrocities committed against them.<sup>28</sup>

Caroline Janney, author of *Remembering the Civil War: Reunion and the Limits of Reconciliation*, examines the involvement of these women’s organizations in these efforts and she may have the answer as to why there is no US monument. These groups were likely to reject any measure of reconciliation or gesture that might have included recognition of the Union dead. Janney pointed out how the women essentially refused to move forward: “Unlike the veterans, Confederate groups like the Ladies’ Memorial Associations (LMAs) and the United Daughters of the Confederacy (UDC) rarely found any common ground with their Northern counterparts,”<sup>29</sup> including Northern women. What the UDC did at Olustee was typical of what they did elsewhere.

UDC efforts are present at several monuments at Olustee. The main monument is a tall shaft erected by the UDC. The front reads, “The Battle of Olustee was fought on this ground February 20th 1864 between 5,000 Confederate troops commanded by General Joseph E. Finegan and over 6,000 Federal troops under General Thomas Seymour. The Federals were defeated with a loss of 2,000 men.

---

<sup>25</sup> Janney, *Remembering the Civil War*, 244

<sup>26</sup> Ruth H. Cole, *The Battle of Olustee: A Description of Florida’s Major Battle in the War Between the States, Which Took Place Near Lake City, February 20, 1864* (Florida Division, United Daughters of the Confederacy, 1929), 7.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*, 7.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>29</sup> Janney, *Remembering the Civil War*, 233.

The Confederates loss was less than 1,000.”<sup>30</sup> The back of the monument reads, “To the men who fought and triumphed here in defense of their homes and firesides this monument is erected by the United Daughters of the Confederacy aided by the state of Florida in commemoration of their devotion to the cause of liberty and state sovereignty.”<sup>31</sup> There are two more monuments, smaller, but standing near the main shaft, also erected by the UDC. They are in memory of Generals Finegan and Colquitt, Confederate leaders of the battle. After the War, Northern women focused on helping veterans and wounded and helping their men to transition back as private citizens. They continued their work as nurses; Southern women did not. Southern women immediately began to preserve the memory of Confederate soldiers. Northern women were remembered far less than Southern women after the War because they focused on helping those in need rather than building monuments and organizing memorials.

While it is understandable that immediate knowledge was not widespread, even one hundred years later, at the centennial of the Civil War, US soldiers and the Union cause remained marginalized. The program from the centennial observance of the Battle of Olustee, held in February 1964, outlines all manner of Confederate remembrance without a single mention of Union losses or the role played by black troops in the battle.<sup>32</sup> The schedule includes a salute to the Confederate flag, Southern songs, a reading of General Lee’s address to the Army of Northern Virginia, a recognition of members of the Stonewall Chapter of the Daughters of the Confederacy, and the unveiling of a Napoleon 12-pounder cannon by the great granddaughter of General Joseph Finegan, all followed by an address by the Democratic Senator from Florida, Spessard L. Holland.<sup>33</sup>

Holland’s speech articulated Lost Cause views: “We are celebrating the victory of our brave and determined Confederate forces.”<sup>34</sup> His speech echoed the familiar sound of most southern literature about Olustee; the Confederates were outnumbered, they were heroic and saved Florida from the Federal forces. Holland dedicated only one paragraph to the existence of black soldiers, and only as a part of the slightly longer portion of his speech that spoke of the Union troops. He talked about the Federal losses, and compared them to the much smaller Confederate loss. Not surprisingly, he made no suggestion that the atrocities committed after the fighting had ended were the cause of the high Federal casualty rate. Instead he focused on the Lost Cause version of Olustee: “It is appropriate that the centennial of the Battle of Olustee be observed. Its recollection brings us a full measure of

---

<sup>30</sup> Olustee Battlefield Historic State Park, “Confederate Monument,” 1912.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>32</sup> Battle of Olustee Centennial Program (Olustee, Florida: February 22, 1964), University of Florida George A. Smathers Library.

<sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>34</sup> Spessard L. Holland, “The Battle of Olustee; a draft speech prepared according to the instruction of the Honorable Spessard L. Holland” (Speech, recorded by Cornelius Murphy for the Government and General Research Division of the Library of Congress, 4 February, 1964), 1.

pride in the actions of those who brought to the cause of the South a full measure of devotion.”<sup>35</sup> The official commemoration at Olustee, even 100 years after the battle, did not include the actions of all black and white soldiers and paid homage only to Southern heritage and memory.<sup>36</sup>

There is in fact one memorial for US soldiers. It is far away from the main entrance to the park, nowhere close to the main path, and enclosed by fences and gates that make it difficult to access, in a small cemetery that features a single, simple cross-shaped monument. Appropriately, this was once the black cemetery and it may explain why a memorial for US dead, black and white, was allowed a space near the battlefield. It is rumored that the unknown dead from the battle are buried at this site.<sup>37</sup> The front reads, “To the memory of the officers and soldiers of the United States Army who fell in the Battle of Olustee February 20, 1864.” The back has a simple phrase, nothing to praise and honor the actions of one commander or any one individual: “May the living profit by the example of the dead.”<sup>38</sup> Beneath that statement is a list of participating units, white and black. Unlike the rest of the monuments at Olustee, this one was not erected by the UDC, but rather by the Union Army District of Florida in May 1991. The “Union Army District of Florida” likely refers to the men who placed the original cross there, the Union Army occupying the District of Florida after the War, and not to the men of 1991.<sup>39</sup>

It may be that the opposition to placing this monument is about more than one memorial on one battlefield; instead it is about the ongoing battle over Civil War memory. As we approach the 150th anniversary of the Battle of Olustee, the black and white soldiers should receive the recognition they deserve and a permanent place on their final battlefield and in Civil War memory.

---

<sup>35</sup> Holland, 15.

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>37</sup> Olustee Battlefield Historic State Park personnel and the Baker County, FL, Archives for the Olustee Battlefield Memorial Cemetery, <http://files.usgwarchives.net/fl/baker/cemeteries/olustee.txt>.

<sup>38</sup> Olustee Battlefield Historic State Park, “Federal monument,” 1991.

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid.*



**Florida Conference of Historians  
54th Annual Meeting  
January 31-February 1, 2014**

**Renaissance Resort and Convention Center  
St Augustine, Florida**

**Hosted by Jacksonville University**

**Local Arrangements Chair**

Jesse Hingson  
Jacksonville University

**Officers of the  
Florida Conference of Historians**

President	David Allen Harvey New College of Florida
President-Elect	Steven MacIsaac Jacksonville University
Treasurer	Jesse Hingson Jacksonville University
Secretary	David Proctor Tallahassee Community College

*FCH Annals:*

*Journal of the Florida Conference of Historians*  
Editor--Michael S. Cole, Florida Gulf Coast University

## **Thursday, January 30, 2014**

Early On Site Registration: 6:00-9:00 PM

Renaissance Hotel

The Bar at Villagio: Lounge Area (next to hotel lobby)

## **Friday, January 31, 2014**

8:00 AM-5:00 PM: Registration

Location: Pre-Convene Area of Convention Center

### **Session One: Friday, 8:30 AM-10:00 AM**

**Session 1A:** “Florida Reinvented: Shaping and Selling the Image of the Sunshine State”

Special Interest Section: Florida History

Meeting Room: Wentworth

Navigating New Worlds: Selling the Shape of Florida

Tiffany Baker, Director, Florida Legislative Research Center,

Florida Historic Capitol Museum

Building Florida’s Gateway to the Americas:

Miami’s Pan American Business Strategy in the 1930s

Josh Goodman, Tulane University

Modern Traditional: The Invention and Diffusion of Alligator Wrestling in Florida

Seminole and Miccosukee Culture

Jonathan Grandage, Archives Historian, State Archives of Florida

Chair/Discussant: Tamara Spike, University of North Georgia

**Session 1B:** “Intellectual Life and Society in Early Modern Europe”

Meeting Room: Troon

Creating a Holy Community:

The Genevan Consistory and Matrimonial Law, 1546-1557

Jenny Smith, Valdosta State University

The Transformative Process of Research in the Intellectual Work of the Early Modern English Polymath Samuel Hartlib: Sharing of Information across Cultural and Geographical Boundaries, 1630-1660

Timothy E. Miller, Georgia State University

The Renaissance Man:  
Humanist Ideas in 14th and 15th Century Educational Treaties  
Chase Kelly, Valdosta State University

Chair/Discussant: Blaine T. Browne, Broward College

**Session 1C:** “The Florida Museums Podcast”  
Special Interest Section: Florida History  
Meeting Room: Legends 1

Chip Ford  
Ella Gibson  
Katie Kelley  
Daniel Velásquez

Chair: Sean McMahon, Florida Gateway College  
Discussant: Tracy J. Revels, Wofford College

**Session 1D:** “Order and Conflict in the Anglo-Atlantic World during the Age of Revolutions”  
Meeting Room: “La Privata” (located in the Villaggio Italian Grille)

Black and White and Red All Over:  
Newspaper Coverage of Violence in Boston and Charleston, 1785-1790  
Shannon F. Campbell, University of North Florida

Refugees in the Revolutionary Mediterranean  
Joshua Meeks, Florida State University

The Battle of Havana, 1762: Context, Chronicle, and Consequences  
Shawn O’Keefe, Florida Southern College

Chair: David Allen Harvey, New College of Florida

**Session 1E:** “History and Pedagogy, I: Best Practices in Teaching the Past”  
Meeting Room: Masters Boardroom (first floor of Renaissance Hotel)

Can an Intensive Course in the History of the Cold War Significantly Improve Critical Thinking among Undergraduates?  
Alex G. Cummins, Flagler College

Best Practices for Incorporating a Panel Discussion in the Classroom  
Michael Rogers, State College of Florida, Manatee-Sarasota

Chair: Douglas Astolfi, Saint Leo University  
Discussant: Michael Rogers, State College of Florida, Manatee-Sarasota

## **Session Two: Friday, 10:15 AM-11:45 AM**

**Session 2A:** “New Approaches to Modern Combat and Soldiering”

Meeting Room: Troon

Civil War Nostalgia

R. Gregory Lande, Walter Reed National Military Medical Center

In Harm’s Way:

War Reporters and the Combat Experience in the Iraq War

Andrew McLaughlin, University of Waterloo (Canada)

Muslims in the Red Army: Perceptions of the Soviet State

Daniel Bradfield, University of Central Florida

Chair/Discussant: Rowland Brucken, Norwich University

**Session 2B:** “Revolution and Social Conflict in Modern Latin America”

Meeting Room: Legends 1

Natural Resource Exploitation in the Pilcomayo River Basin:

Impacts on the Formation of Bolivian National Identity

Brent Spencer, Florida Gulf Coast University

Al Paredón: Justice and Armed Struggle in the Cuban Revolution

Anthony Rossodivito, University of North Florida

Perón and the Guerillas:

The ERP’s Efforts to Unmask the Fascist Dictator

Steven Scheuler, Valdosta State University

From Indigenous Resistance to Regional Autonomy: Sandinista/Costeño Relations in Revolutionary Nicaragua

John-Paul Wilson, Virginia Union University

Chair/Discussant: Quinn Dauer, Indiana University-Southeast

**Session 2C:** “Connecting Movements, I: African Links in Twentieth-Century World History”

Meeting Room: Masters Boardroom (first floor of Renaissance Hotel)

Imperializing South Asian Struggles in South Africa and Canada before the First World War

Ian C. Fletcher, Georgia State University

Francophone Africans and the African American Freedom Movement, 1955-1965

Allyson Tadjer, Georgia State University

“Apartheid Goes Better With Coke”: The Coke Boycott of the 1980s

Lauren Moran, Georgia State University

Chair: Edmund Abaka, University of Miami

Discussant: Barbara Moss, Georgia Highlands College

**Session 2D:** “Indigenous Peoples, Imperial Politics, and War in Florida”

Special Interest Section: Florida History

Meeting Room: Wentworth

Reconstituting Power in an American Borderland:

Political Change in Colonial East Florida

Nancy O. Gallman, University of California, Davis

Under the King’s Protection: A Comparative Analysis of British and Spanish Sovereignty of Amelia Island, East Florida

Diane M. Boucher, Clark University

Kinfolks Diplomacy: General Jesup’s Creek Emissaries in the Second Seminole War

John T. Ellis, Columbus State University

How the Third Seminole War in Florida (1855-1858) Was Impacted By the Relationship Between the Creeks and Seminoles in Indian Territory

John D. Settle, University of Central Florida

Chair: Michael S. Cole, Florida Gulf Coast University

Discussant: Deborah L. Bauer, University of South Florida

**Session 2E:** “Storytellers and Their Tales:

The Lives of American Novelists in the Early Twentieth Century”

Special Interest Section: Media, Arts, and Culture

Meeting Room: “La Privata” (located in the Villaggio Italian Grille)

The Second Life of the Reverend J. Calvitt Clarke: Popular Novelist

J. Calvitt Clarke III, Jacksonville University, emeritus

Ernest Hemingway and His Life in Key West  
Anders Greenspan, Texas A&M University-Kingsville

Zora Neale Hurston: Studies in Voodoo  
Hope L. Black, University of South Florida, St. Petersburg

Chair/Discussant: J. Calvitt Clarke III, Jacksonville University, emeritus

### **12:00 PM-12:50 PM: Lunch (on your own)**

#### Options Close to the Meeting Site:

- Italian food buffet available to FCH participants (located within the Villagio Italian Grille Restaurant, \$13.00 per person)
- Caddy Shack Restaurant (next door to the Renaissance Hotel)

### **12:00 PM-12:50 PM: FCH Executive Council Business Meeting**

Meeting Room: "La Cortina" (located within the Villagio Italian Grille Restaurant)

### **Session Three: Friday, 1:00 PM-2:30 PM**

#### **Session 3A: "Religious Movements and Material Culture"**

Meeting Room: Masters Boardroom (first floor of Renaissance Hotel)

The Thirsty Monk and the Medieval Art of Monastic Beer Brewing  
Joshua Mayes, Brevard College

Buddhist Viharas and Monastic Art, with Reference to Buddhism in Sikkim  
Sonamla Ethenpa, Sikkim Government College, Burtuk (Sikkim, India)

"David with his Sling and I with my Bow": Michelangelo's David and the Struggle between  
Hebraism and Hellenism in Renaissance Florence  
Katelynn Riesenber, University of West Florida

Chair: Anna Smith, Jacksonville University  
Discussant: Rowena Hernández-Múzquiz, Broward College

#### **Session 3B: "Social Darwinism, Eugenics, and Genocide in the Modern World"**

Meeting Room: Troon

The Ley de Residencia: Miguel Cané and the Influence of Scientific Discourse on Argentine  
Immigration Policy, 1852-1902  
Stephen Naylor, University of South Florida

Herbert Spencer and American Eugenics:  
Claiming Superiority in the Postbellum Era, 1882-1907  
Christopher Harrison, Florida Gulf Coast University

Only the Dead Could Smile:  
Stalin's Gulag and Its Evolution as a Tool of State and Genocide  
Christopher Fair, University of North Florida

Chair/Discussant: Heather Parker, Saint Leo University

**Session 3C:** "Transitions in Political Economy since World War II"  
Meeting Room: "La Privata" (located in the Villaggio Italian Grille)

From the Japanese Occupation to the Communist Liberation:  
The Transformation of a Chinese Textile Manufacturer in the 1940s and 1950s  
Juanjuan Peng, Georgia Southern University

Public Dams, Private Power:  
Nature, Energy, and the Post-World War II US South  
Casey P. Cater, Georgia State University

Chair/Discussant: Steven MacIsaac, Jacksonville University

**Session 3D:** "Preserving and Exploring the Southern Past in Undergraduate History Programs"  
Special Interest Section: Undergraduate Research  
Meeting Room: Legends 1

The Romance has been Knocked out of the Prisoner of War Business:  
A Short Documentary on Andersonville Prison, 1864-1865  
Jennifer L. Eadie, Wesleyan College

"We are in a life and death struggle to survive":  
The Methodist Church and the Cuban Revolution, 1959-1961  
Dylan Parvin, Florida Southern College

Moving House: The Porterfield Preservation Project at Wesleyan College  
Cara Gainey, Wesleyan College

The Lives of America's Greatest Resource:  
Student Life at Florida Southern College during World War II  
Kenneth Hafner, Florida Southern College

Chair/Discussant: Karen Huber, Wesleyan College  
**Session 3E:** “The Ties That Bind: Women in United States History”  
Meeting Room: Wentworth

Spirited Victorian Performances: Emma Hardinge Britten’s use of Seances and Trance  
Lectures in Promulgating Modern Spiritualism  
Lisa Ann Howe, Florida International University

Playing With Matches: Nineteenth-Century Mock Weddings  
Sarah Jünke, University of South Florida

Florida Women: Forestry and Fire  
Leslie Poole, Rollins College

Chair/Discussant: Patricia L. Farless, University of Central Florida

### **Session Four: Friday, 2:45 PM-4:15 PM**

**Session 4A:** “Florida Dream, Florida Reality:  
Themes in Sunshine State Tourism”  
Special Interest Section: Florida History  
Meeting Room: Troon

Cypress Gardens: Promoting Racial Hierarchy in Paradise  
Katie Kelley, University of Central Florida

A Castle in the Sky: Perspectives on Florida’s Citrus Tower  
Chip Ford, University of Central Florida

A Different Dream, A Different Identity: The Florida Dream After Disney  
Daniel Velásquez, University of Central Florida

Chair/Discussant: Tracy J. Revels, Wofford College

**Session 4B:** “History and Pedagogy, II: How Technology, Common Core, and Information  
Literacy are Changing the History Classroom”  
Meeting Room: Legends 1

The Research Paper is Dead: New Strategies to Engage and Teach Undergraduate Students  
How to Conduct Research  
Andrea Vicente, Hillsborough Community College

Common Ground on Common Core: How University Faculty and Undergraduate Students  
Can Benefit from Online Resources Aligned with the Common Core Standards  
Jonathan Grandage, Archives Historian, State Archives of Florida



Comparability: How Traditional History Survey Courses are Improved with Online Components

Monica Hardin, Liberty University

Chair/Discussant: Sarah Franklin, University of North Alabama

**Session 4C:** “The Long Journey, I: The Civil Rights Movement in Local and National Perspective”

Special Interest Section: Florida History

Meeting Room: Wentworth

Jacksonville’s Greatest Generation: The Contribution of African American Veterans to the Civil Rights Movement, 1945-1960

Bryan Higham, University of North Florida

The Development of the Local Civil rights Movement in St. Augustine, Florida, 1900-1960

Jay Smith, University of North Florida

Congressman James A. Haley and the American Civil Rights Movement

Jeffrey Zines, Florida Southern College

Harry S. Truman and His Motivations for Civil Rights Reform

Christopher Meinert, Florida Gulf Coast University

Chair: Craig Buettinger, Jacksonville University

**Session 4D:** “Germany in the American Mind”

Meeting Room: Masters Boardroom (first floor of Renaissance Hotel)

A Review of the History of German Language in Florida

Ghazal Soleimanzadeh, University of Florida

Operation “Perez”: The German Attempt to Own American Newspapers in World War I

Heribert von Feilitzsch, Independent Scholar

Chair/Discussant: Nicholas Steneck, Florida Southern College

## **Session Five: Friday, 4:30 PM-6:00 PM**

**Session 5A:** “Connecting Movements, II: African Links in Twentieth-Century World History”

Meeting Room: Troon

Africa in Cuba/Cuba in Africa: A Trans-Atlantic Relationship in the Crucible of Slavery, Revolution and Decolonization

Edmund Abaka, University of Miami

Developments in Post-Independence United Nations Trust Territories: A Re-appraisal of the Africa Experience

Talla Ngarka Sunday, Taraba State University (Jalingo, Nigeria)

Post-Independence Development of National Cuisines:

A Comparative Study of Belize and Ghana

Brandi Simpson Miller, Georgia State University

Chair/Discussant: Ian C. Fletcher, Georgia State University

**Session 5B:** “Remembering Florida’s Civil War at the Sesquicentennial”

Special Interest Section: Undergraduate Research

Meeting Room: Masters Boardroom (first floor of Renaissance Hotel)

The Forgotten Minority: Pro-Unionism in Florida’s Secession Crisis

Tyler Campbell, University of Central Florida

May the Living Profit: Commemorating the Battle of Olustee

Lindsay Keller, University of Central Florida

A Young Mother’s War: Octavia Bryant-Stephens, Family Life, and Death in Northern Florida during the Civil War

James Thomas, Jacksonville University

Chair/Discussant: Daniel Murphree, University of Central Florida

**Session 5C:** “Challenges of International Dialogue and Cooperation since World War II”

Meeting Room: “La Privata” (located in the Villagio Italian Grille)

Prelude to the Peace Corps:

International Voluntary Service in the 1950s

E. Timothy Smith, Barry University

“Factual Certainty is Desired but Should Not be a Fetish”:

The Eisenhower Administration’s Aborted 1953 Human Right Offensive at the United Nations

Rowland Brucken, Norwich University

Khrushchev’s Thaw: Art, Critical Discourse, and Wilhelm Matevosyan in Soviet-Armenian Art Context

Gohar Vardanyan, Yerevan State Academy of Fine Arts (Armenia)/

Fellow at Tufts University

Back to the Future:

The Incomplete Transitions to Democracy in Spain and Portugal

Alicia Mercado Harvey, New College of Florida

Chair: Jessica Howell, Flagler College

Discussant: J. Calvitt Clarke III, Jacksonville University, emeritus

**Session 5D:** “Art, Literature, and Representations of Empire”

Special Interest Section: Undergraduate Research

Meeting Room: Legends 1

The Manifest Destiny of Violence:

Knowledge and Power in Moby Dick and Blood Meridian

Thayer Warne, New College of Florida

Frederic Remington: “Our Lovely Man From the North Country”

Deborah Shaw, Flagler University

Artistic Representations of the War on Terror

David Canfield, New College of Florida

Chair/Discussant: Anders Greenspan, Texas A&M University-Kingsville

**Session 5E:** “Florida and the New South:

Culture and Politics since the Nineteenth Century”

Special Interest Section: Florida History

Meeting Room: Wentworth

George Franklin Drew: Florida’s Yankee Redemption Governor

Seth A. Weitz, Dalton State College

Historic Preservation and New Deal Key West

Matthew G. Hyland, Duquesne University

José Martí Meets Jim Crow: Cubans in the Deep South: Tampa, Florida  
Maura Barrios, University of South Florida

Chair/Discussant: Leslee F. Keys, Flagler College

### **6:30 PM-9:00 PM: Keynote Address and Banquet**

Participants and Guests must wear their conference badges to attend the Keynote Address and Banquet

#### **6:30 PM-7:30 PM: Keynote Address**

Meeting Room: Legends 1

Introduction of Keynote Speaker:

Dr. Jesse Hingson, Jacksonville University

Dr. Sherry Johnson, Florida International University

“When Good Climates Go Bad:

Climate Change and Opportunities for Florida History”

#### **7:30 PM-9:00 PM: Banquet**

Meeting Room: Legends 2 and 3

Welcoming Remarks:

Dr. Jesse Hingson, Jacksonville University

Campbell and Clarke Awards Presentation:

Dr. David Allen Harvey, New College of Florida, FCH President

Remarks on the FCH Annals:

Dr. Michael S. Cole, Florida Gulf Coast University, Editor

Remarks on the 2015 FCH Annual Meeting in Lakeland:

Dr. Nicholas Steneck, Florida Southern College

### **Saturday, February 1, 2014**

8:00 AM-5:00 PM: Registration

Location: Pre-Convene Area of Convention Center

8:00 AM-8:30 AM: Media, Arts, and Culture, Plenary Screening

Documentary: “A Civil Rights Roundtable”

Julian Chambliss, Rollins College

Meeting Room: Legends 1

## **Session Six: Saturday, 8:30 AM-10:00 AM**

**Session 6A:** “Intellectual and Social Movements in the Atlantic World at the Turn of the 20th Century”

Meeting Room: Troon

Sunny or Hurricane Days: A Progressive Era Autopsy

Thomas J. McNerney, Metropolitan State University of Denver

Transatlantic Suffragism: British Perceptions of the American Suffrage Movement Prior to World War I

Kristina Graves, Georgia State University

Reconciling the Individual and the Collective:

Emile Durkheim, Secular Morality, Anthropology, and the Creation of Republican Positivism, 1893-1911

Khali Navarro, University of Central Florida

Filling the Well of Gender Consciousness

Patricia L. Farless, University of Central Florida

Chair/Discussant: Lela Kerley, University of North Florida

**Session 6B:** “Shipwrecked in the Atlantic World:

Native Americans, Enslaved Africans, and Jonathan Dickinson”

Meeting Room: Legends 2

Indigenous Wrecking in the Late Seventeenth Century:

The Ais’ Maritime Adaptation and Jonathan Dickinson

Peter Ferdinando, Florida International University

Jonathan Dickinson’s Itinerary from Jobe to Ais

Alan Brech, Independent Scholar

Before God’s Protecting Providence:

Rethinking Jonathan Dickinson’s Journal through Manuscript

Jason Daniels, Indian River State College

Chair: Daniel Murphree, University of Central Florida

Discussant: Denise Bossy, University of North Florida

**Session 6C: “Crucibles of War and US Power since 1898”**

Meeting Room: Legends 3

“Jingo” Ministers and Armed Intervention:

Late-Nineteenth Century Political Debates in the Pulpit

Tiffany West, Florida International University

Anti-American Sentiment and the Portuguese Opposition during the Vietnam War

Dario Macieira Mitchell, New College of Florida

The Empire Next Door: US-UK Relations in the US Invasion of Grenada

Christian Lazenby, University of North Florida

Resistance to the Government in Afghanistan’s Modern History:

A Case Study

Mohammad Attarabkenar, University of Ferrara (Italy)

Chair/Discussant: Jack McTague, Saint Leo University

**Session 6D: “World War I and Its Aftermath”**

Meeting Room: Wentworth

Impressions of Care: The Alice-Schwester, World War I, and

Images of the Red Cross

Kara Smith, Middle Georgia State College

“Native” Status: One Impact of the League of Nations’ Mandate System on East Africans

Charlotte Miller, Middle Georgia State College

Spy Games: German Sabotage and Espionage in the United States, 1914-1916

Tracie Provost, Middle Georgia State College

Austrian Choices, 1918-1919: Independence or Anschluss?

Kevin Mason, South Georgia State College

Chair/Discussant: Tracie Provost, Middle Georgia State College

**Session 6E: “Based on a True Story: Identities in the Media”**

Special Interest Section: Undergraduate Research

Meeting Room: Legends 1

Rocky, Bullwinkle and Soviet Propaganda as

Manifestations of the Cold War

Nicole Sirotaplotnikov, Saint Leo University

Finding Balance: Jidai-geki (period films) and their Influence on Postwar Japanese Identity in the Historical Context of Japan's Long Struggle for Ethnic Definition  
Andrew Kustodowicz, Flagler College

Comedy Films as Commentary on American Society  
Jacqueline McKeon, Saint Leo University

Expanding Identity: How Two Decades Contributed to Florida's Modern Tourism Industry  
Amber DV Atteberry, Flagler College

Chair/Discussant: Brendan Goff, New College of Florida

### **Session Seven: Saturday, 10:15 AM-11:45 AM**

**Session 7A:** "Debates on Labor Systems in the Atlantic World"  
Meeting Room: Legends 2

A Capitalist Solution to Slavery? Daniel Lescallier and Colonial Reform in the Last Years of the French Old Regime  
David Allen Harvey, New College of Florida

Indentured Servants as "White Slaves": Metaphor or Reality?  
Matthew Pursell, University of West Florida

Weapons of Persuasion: Saint-Domingue and Imperial in British Abolitionist Discourse  
Antony W. Keane-Dawes, University of South Carolina

Chair: Will Guzmán, Florida A&M University  
Discussant: David Allen Harvey, New College of Florida

**Session 7B:** "Thicker Than the Water Between Us: US-Cuban-Puerto Rican Networks since the Nineteenth Century"  
Meeting Room: Legends 3

Annexation, Autonomy, or Independence? The Politics of Cuban Identity in the Émigré Communities of New York and Florida, 1840s-1890s  
Evan Matthew Daniel, Queens College, City University of New York (CUNY)

Cigar-Makers and the Business of Empire: Cross-Border Business and Social Networks of Tampa and Havana, 1898-1919  
Brendan Goff, New College of Florida

A Panamerican Paradise? Cuban and Puerto Rican Migrants, Musicians, and Ethnic Social Clubs in the Making of Latino/a Miami, 1940-1960  
Christina D. Abreu, Georgia Southern University

The Boricua Triangle: Tampa, Miami and Orlando-A Historical Overview of the Development of a Transnational Puerto Rican Diaspora in Florida  
Victor Vázquez-Hernández, Miami Dade College

Chair/Discussant: Stephanie Hinnerhitz, Valdosta State University

**Session 7C:** “Buried, Sunk, and Forgotten: The Saga of East Florida’s Loyalists”  
Special Interest Section: Florida History  
Meeting Room: Legends 1

An Archaeological Perspective on East Florida’s Loyalist Influx:  
The Excavation of a Loyalist Refugee Vessel Lost at St. Augustine on 31 December 1782  
Chuck Meide, Lighthouse Archaeological Maritime Program (LAMP)

“Are They to Die in the Wilderness?” The Price of British Liberty in East Florida  
Roger Clark Smith, St. Augustine Lighthouse and Museum

Leaving the Ancient City: The Loyalist Slave Diaspora from St. Augustine  
Jennifer K. Snyder, University of South Florida, St. Petersburg/Florida Humanities Council

Chair/Discussant: James G. Cusick, Curator of the P.K. Yonge Library of Florida History at the University of Florida Library

**Session 7D:** “Gender and Social Change in the United States during the Civil Rights Era”  
Meeting Room: Troon

The Men Behind the Golden Era of the Florida Women’s Pages:  
Jim Bellows, Lee Hills, and Al Neuharth  
Kimberly Voss, University of Central Florida

Seeing “The basic similarities which define people as people”:  
The Desegregation of Agnes Scott College  
Charles H. “Trey” Wilson III, University of North Georgia

Re-educating the Movement: Race, Gender, and the Battle for Public Sector Unionism during the 1968 Florida Teacher Strike  
Jody Noll, Auburn University



Competing Voices: Political Contests over the EEOC's Sexual Harassment Policy, 1980-81  
Sheila Jones, Broward College

Chair/Discussant: Sheila Jones, Broward College

**Session 7E:** "Florida's Recent Past and Present"  
Special Interest Section: Florida History  
Meeting Room: Wentworth

"A Step to Protect the Public": Violent Crime and Drug Prevalence in Jacksonville, Florida, 1971-2012  
Kyle Bridge, University of North Florida

The Slow Road to Abolition: A History of Capital Punishment in Florida, 1972-2010  
Travis Bates, University of North Florida

GlobalJax: A Non-Profit Organization, 1990-2013  
Altaye A. Alambo, Independent Scholar

Chair: David Proctor, Tallahassee Community College  
Discussant: Seth A. Weitz, Dalton State College

## **12:00 PM-12:50 PM: Lunch (on your own)**

### Options Close to the Meeting Site:

- Mexican food buffet available to FCH participants (located within the Villagio Italian Grille Restaurant, \$13.00 per person)
- Caddy Shack Restaurant (next door to the Renaissance Hotel)

## **12:00 PM-12:50 PM: Media, Arts, and Culture Special Event, Book Signing**

Location: Pre-Convene Area outside of Troon and Wentworth  
Coffee and Dessert Available

*Ages of Heroes, Eras of Men: Superheroes and the American Experience*, Julian Chambliss (Rollins College), William L. Svitavsky (Rollins College), and Thomas C. Donaldson (Edison State College)

*Hotel Ponce de Leon: The Architecture and Decoration*, Thomas Graham (Flagler College, emeritus) and Leslee F. Keys (Flagler College)

## **Session Eight: Saturday, 1:00 PM-2:00 PM**

### **Session 8A: “Twentieth-Century American Crime and Punishment”**

Meeting Room: Wentworth

“Not a Matter of Racial Conflict”:

Homicide in Jim Crow Memphis, 1917-1926

Brandon T. Jett, University of Florida

Soccer Moms, Superpredators, and Symbolic Crusades:

Historical Perspectives on a Modern Moral Panic

Alexander Tepperman, University of Florida

Chair/Discussant: David T. Courtwright, University of North Florida

### **Session 8B: “Negotiating European Colonialism in the Americas”**

Meeting Room: Legends 2

The Mesón of Xalapa: Native Defense of Community Interests in Colonial Mexico

Michael S. Cole, Florida Gulf Coast University

European Disease, Timucuan Healing:

Contesting Colonialism through Shamanic Medicine

Tamara Spike, University of North Georgia

Chair: Michael S. Cole, Florida Gulf Coast University

Discussant: Margarita Vargas-Betancourt, University of Florida

### **Session 8C: “The Long Journey, II: The Civil Rights Movement in Florida”**

Special Interest Section: Florida History

Meeting Room: Legends 1

“Stay True to Nonviolence”:

The Tallahassee Inter-Civic Council’s Fight Against Segregation

Darius J. Young, Florida A&M University

The Battle for Justice:

Judge Bryan Simpson and the St. Augustine Uprising, 1963-1964

James M. Denham, Florida Southern College

Chair: John Paul Hill, Warner University

Discussant: Richard Buckelew, Bethune-Cookman University

**Session 8D:** “Tourism and Imagery in Florida”

Special Interest Section: Florida History

Meeting Room: Troon

I Remember: Tourism, Photography, and Iconography in Florida

Liz Murphy Thomas, Florida State College at Jacksonville

Bunny Yeager Exposed: ‘The World’s Prettiest Photographer’ as a Florida Cultural Icon

Cheyenne Oliver, Florida Atlantic University

Chair/Discussant: Kelly Enright, Flagler College

**Session Nine: Saturday, 2:15 PM-3:45 PM**

**Session 9A:** “The Transformation of Modern Great Britain”

Meeting Room: Wentworth

The Development of Radical Environmentalism in Great Britain,  
1960-2013

Ariel Szaks, University of North Florida

Shifting Identities: The Change in English National Identity in Modern British History

Michael Makosiej, Florida Atlantic University

Chair/Discussant: Blaine T. Browne, Broward College

**Session 9B:** “Rediscovering the Distant Past through Material Culture and Printed Sources”

Meeting Room: Legends 3

Jarawas of Andaman Islands

A. Meera, Government Arts College, Coimbatore (Tamil Nadu, India)

Role of Iron Technology in Urbanization in India and Nigeria:

A Comparative Analysis

Anshul Bajpai, Yobe State University (Damaturu, Nigeria)

Reception of the Delian League by 5th Century Greek Allies

Andrea Schwab, Florida Atlantic University

Mada’in Saleh: A Model of Pre-Islamic Arab Civilization

Hessa Al-Hathal, Princess Mora Bint Abdul Rahman University  
(Riyadh, Saudi Arabia)

Chair: David Proctor, Tallahassee Community College

**Session 9C:** “One Hundred Years of Health Care:  
From Europe to America”  
Meeting Room: Troon

Stuttering Treatments in Europe: A Case Study of Henry Freund, Co-Founder of the  
Stuttering Foundation of America  
Sharon M. DiFino, Jacksonville University

One Hundred Years of Dentistry: How Women Redefined Dentistry: From Therapeutic to  
Preventive Oral Health  
Lanette Merkt, Jacksonville University

An Overview of Hearing Devices and Technology  
over the Last 100 Years  
Caitlin O’Neill, Jacksonville University

The Lung Block: Epicenter of Crisis in Progressive-Era New York City  
Adrienne D. deNoyelles, University of Florida

Chair/Discussant: Sharon M. DiFino, Jacksonville University

**Session 9D:** “Leading the Sunshine State: Florida Governors during the Early Cold War  
Years”

Special Interest Section: Florida History  
Meeting Room: Legends 1

Revisiting the Legacy of Governor LeRoy Collins  
Carol S. Weissert, Florida State University

LeRoy Collins and Brown  
Michael J. Goodwin, Florida Atlantic University

Cold War Concerns at the 1963 National Governor’s Conference in Miami  
Michael Epple, Florida Gulf Coast University

His Name Was Dan McCarty  
Robert Buccellato, Independent Scholar

Chair/Discussant: Michael Epple, Florida Gulf Coast University

**Session 9E:** “Religion, Power, and Conflict in the Medieval World”  
Meeting Room: Legends 2

Jihad Propaganda during the Career of Imad al-Din Zengi  
Nicholas Belotto, Florida Atlantic University

The Cathar Heresy of Languedoc: Lay Spirituality and the Catholic Church of Southern France

Bryan E. Peterson, Flagler College

The Cross, Crescent, and Star:

Triangular Persistence into the 13th and 14th Centuries

Derrick Routier, University of North Florida

Chair/Discussant: Rowena Hernández-Múzquiz, Broward College

## **Session Ten: Saturday, 4:00 PM-5:30 PM**

**Session 10A:** “Cultures and Communities in the Modern Media Age”

Special Interest Section: Media, Arts, and Culture

Meeting Room: Legends 1

The Role of Broadcast Media in Mobilizing Youth for Political Participation: Historical Underpinnings

Halidu Yahaya, Dokuz Eylul University (Turkey)

“What Can You Expect from a Guy in Charge of Joysticks?”

The Masculine Realm and Video Games in the United States

Anne Ladyem McDivitt, George Mason University

Fairy Tales: A Decline in Violence or a Shift in Presentation?

Rebekkah Link, University of North Florida

Stark Contrasts: Reinventing Iron Man for 21st Century Cinema

Sarah Zaidan, Northeastern University

Chair/Discussant: Julian Chambliss, Rollins College

**Session 10B:** “The Cross as Rod and Scepter: The Church as Antagonist and Redeemer in Transnational Perspective”

Meeting Room: Legends 2

The Cross and the Sword:

The Catholic Church and the Armed Left in Pinochet’s Chile

Alison J. Bruey, University of North Florida

Crying out in His Name: Redemptive Justice in South Africa’s Truth and Reconciliation Commission

Chau Kelly, University of North Florida

Slavery as a Survival Mechanism: The Catholic Church in the Old South  
Justin Stuart, University of North Florida

“Deliver Us From Evil”: Religious Responses to Earthquakes in Argentina and Chile during the Long Nineteenth-Century  
Quinn Dauer, Indiana University-Southeast

Chair/Discussant: Brandi Denison, University of North Florida

**Session 10C:** “Race, Gender, and Social Control in the United States South during the Nineteenth Century”

Meeting Room: Troon

An Intersectional Perspective on Rape Trials in Antebellum Florida  
Erin Tobin, The Ohio State University

Rudimentary Eugenics in Slavery: Slave Breeding and Medical Experimentation on Black Women  
Jessica Bromfield, Florida Atlantic University

“Animal-like and Depraved”: Racist Stereotypes, Commercial Sex, and Black Women’s Identity in New Orleans, 1825-1917  
Porsha Dossie, University of Central Florida

The Enslaved and a Jury Trial in Florida  
Chris Day, Florida State University

Chair/Discussant: Heather Parker, Saint Leo University

**Session 10D:** “An Interactive Exhibit on a Forgotten Community: West Tampa”

Special Interest Section: Florida History

Meeting Room: Legends 3

Melissa Badcock, University of South Florida

Chelsea Watts, University of South Florida

Angela Ruth, University of South Florida

Paul Dunder, University of South Florida

Chair/Discussant: Brendan Goff, New College of Florida

**Session 10E:** “The Wars Within: War, Politics, and Society during the 1930s and 1940s”  
Meeting Room: Wentworth

Konoe Fumimaro and Chiang Kai-shek: Political Duel over Japan’s Quest: A New Order  
in the Far East for An Establishment of Asia for Asia  
Kazuo Yagami, Savannah State University

Nazi Persecution of Male Homosexuals in Adolf Hitler’s Germany: Section 175  
Brian Allan Little, University of North Florida

The Nazi State and Jewish Resistance  
Rhonda Cifone, Florida Atlantic University

“No Work, No Eat”: The Influence of Race on Prisoner of War Labor within the United  
States during World War II  
Adam S. Rock, University of Central Florida

Chair/Discussant: Nicholas Steneck, Florida Southern College

**Special Thanks To:**  
**Sherri Jackson, Chair, Division of Social Sciences, Jacksonville**  
**University**  
**Jenna Vallimont and the Staff at the**  
**Renaissance WGV Resort**

**Thank you for coming to the 2014 Florida Conference of Historians!**

**We hope to see you again in Lakeland for the 55th annual meeting**  
**hosted by Florida Southern College!**

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