LEGACY

A Journal of Student Scholarship

Volume 2 **2002**

A Publication of the Sigma Kappa Chapter of Phi Alpha Theta
& the Southern Illinois University Carbondale History Department

LEGACY

Volume 2 **2002**

A Journal of Student Scholarship

The Editorial Staff would like to thank all those who supported this issue of ***Legacy,*** especially our History Alumni, the Undergraduate Student Government, the SIUC History Department, the students who submitted papers, and the faculty mentors, Drs. Jo Ann E. Argersinger, Kay J. Carr, James Downhour, John Haller, and Mary McGuire.

A Publication of the Sigma Kappa Chapter
of Phi Alpha Theta
& the History Department
Southern Illinois University Carbondale
http://www.siu.edu/~histsiu/index.html

LEGACY

A Journal of Student Scholarship

Volume 2 **2002**

Table of Contents

Katrina S. Blasingame

Christianity Has Pagan DNA: Mystery Religions and Early Christianity in the Roman Empire

"The earth, which once fed you, will now eat you."[1] This traditional Greek Orthodox (Christian) funerary chant is used at what was once Eleusis in Greece. Christianity, a late comer on the socio-cultural scene of the Mediterranean and born from a Middle Eastern religion (Judaism), borrowed aspects of other mystery religions in order to provide itself a much-needed belief base and an antiquity required for tolerance and acceptance by the Romans. The greater the antiquity of the religion, the more likely it would survive in the Roman Empire. When Christianity was in its developmental stage, it was considered by the Romans to be merely a new sect of Judaism. Judaism had antiquity because of its long history. As an offshoot of Judaism, Christianity shared in this antiquity, thus providing the Christians a certain amount of protection. When the Christians began to separate themselves from the Jews after their revolt in 66 C.E., they lost this protection. In order to protect themselves with another sort of borrowed antiquity, Christianity began to adopt, whether consciously or unconsciously, certain rituals, beliefs, and iconography from contemporary mystery religions. The separation of the Christians from the Jews, along with the secrecy of the Christians and the rituals of the cults, caused the Romans to see the new "sect" as something different from Judaism. They saw in the first Christians a new mystery cult.

The Romans were an intensely religious people. They were very conservative and preferred to practice their religions as their ancestors had before them. At the same time, Roman religion could be syncretic because many deities of the ancient Mediterranean could be easily seen in the deities of other cultures. For example, the Greek Demeter was identified with the Roman Ceres and the Egyptian Isis, all of whom controlled agricultural fertility. The Romans readily accepted the gods of others as simply another form of their own pantheon. By embracing the religions of other cultures and allowing the conquered to worship as they wished, the Romans eliminated one potential problem in maintaining their rule: the clash of religions. As long as conquered peoples paid their taxes and paid the proper respect to the emperor, they had little problem with the Romans.

Mystery cults existed long before the Romans had established their Republic around 509 B.C.E.[2] Roman interest in them reached its height during the Imperial Age, just after 180 C.E. People from all backgrounds and cultures practiced mystery religions, including those that were not

even from their own cultures. Greeks practiced the Mysteries of Isis, the Romans practiced the Mysteries of Mithras, and the Egyptians followed the Temple of Asclepius. With some exceptions, everyone could practice any mystery religions.

The mystery religions served a very important purpose in the ancient world. The mythologies of the Greeks, Romans, and Egyptians portrayed death and the underworld as a shadow of this world. In this shadow world, admittance to places like the Elysian Fields/Island of the Blessed was restricted to kings, pharaohs, heroes, or some other people who had influence with the gods. The truly evil and despicable people went to Tartaros, but everyone else just existed in the underworld, talking about what it was like to be alive. Initiation into a mystery cult gave people a connection to the gods that the initiate needed to get into places like the Elysian Fields. Thanks to a remembered phrase, a ritual object buried with an individual, or the proper magical inscriptions upon tomb walls, they were assured a place in paradise.

Yet none of these dying/savior gods/heroes were portrayed as dying to redeem other people. Many of these myths and the mystery cults that were inspired by them were allegorical in nature. They were representative of seasonal cycles. The rites that were practiced ensured the fertility and success of the year's crops. However, they also gave hope of discovering the secrets to a more enjoyable and comfortable afterlife. The most popular and widespread of the mystery cults that came out of Imperial Rome was Christianity. To provide converts to Christianity with a familiar base, the Christians adopted rituals and doctrines that were associated with other mystery cults.[3]

The mystery cults had a central image that they shared with one another. This image is the archetype of the dying god/hero. The dying god is also known as the savior god. There are numerous dying/savior gods throughout world mythology. There are even some dying goddesses. These savior deities are usually gods or goddesses that are sacrificed and then are resurrected to the mortal plane or ascend to the realm of the gods (Dionysus, Asclepius). Sometimes, they are gods that have been dragged to the underworld by other gods (Kore/Persephone). Then, there are those dying/savior gods that descend willingly to the underworld to rescue some other person or deity (Orpheus). Jesus, called Christ, can be seen essentially as a dying god/savior. The only differences between Christianity and the other mystery cults was that in Christianity, Jesus came specifically to redeem sinners (that would eventually lead to a bodily resurrection). He also came to ensure that his followers would go to heaven and partake of an afterlife far happier than the present life. This was the main draw of Christianity — the divine as a diligent, responsive savior. The active,

purposeful, and concerned savior was a far cry from the other mystery cults in which the worshipper made offerings, or promises of offerings, in order to gain the assistance and favor of the gods.[4]

One of the most famous and widely followed of the fertility cults was the Greek Eleusinian Mysteries. Their events were related in Homer's Hymn to Demeter. The goddess Kore (representative of new grain) is kidnapped and raped by the Lord of the underworld, Hades. Her mother, the goddess Demeter, goes on a frantic search in hopes of finding her lost daughter. When Demeter discovers, with the help of Hecate, that Zeus is the author of her daughter's kidnapping, Demeter essentially goes on strike and will not allow any plant to grow or tree to produce fruit, thus making it necessary for the other gods to bend to her will and return her daughter to her side. In the process she brings not winter, as is commonly thought, but the barren period before the planting is created.[5] The Eleusinian Mysteries were a prototype religion. The concept of a true redemption seems to have been absent. The closest redemptive aspect found in the Eleusinian Mysteries is the assurance that the initiated would dwell in the Elysian Fields/Island of the Blessed after death. Information on the Eleusinian Mysteries is a bit sparse. The Eleusinian Mysteries were so secret and considered so important to all the people of ancient Greece that to reveal its mysteries was an offense punishable by death.[6] It was thought that if the mysteries were revealed, the earth would no longer bear fruit. This idea was so strongly held that, by the time the Eleusinian Mysteries were absorbed into Christianity, no one had yet to reveal the secrets of its mysteries. Though it is difficult to know the original rites practiced in the Eleusinian Mysteries, evidence has been left of the rites performed when Athens ruled Eleusis. According to Clement of Alexandria, the formula that initiates were required to follow was represented by an exclamation of "I have fasted; I have drunk the kykeon; I have taken from the chest; having done the work, I have placed in the basket and from the basket into the chest."[7] This means that the initiates had already performed the necessary fast; they had drunk the kykeon (a type of barley drink that Demeter drinks during her search for her daughter), and have performed the mysterious rituals with the sacred objects.[8]

That which Christianity most obviously borrowed from the Eleusinian Mysteries (and also from the Cult of Dionysus) is the divine child as a type of redeemer. The divine child born in the Eleusinian Mysteries is Iacchos/Plutus/Dionysus. He is charged by Demeter to go into the world and teach mortals to farm and store food for the year. Thus, they would be sustained through Demeter's yearly mourning, saving them from death by starvation. In this way, the divine child of the Eleusinian Mysteries was a type of redeemer. One can also see where Christianity recycled

the belief in an archetypal divine birth. Iacchos/Plutus/Dionysus was born of Demeter. Therefore, he was born of a god. In the myth, he is portrayed as almost more of a mortal than a divine, but his birth is divine in origin. There is also Kore/Persephone. Without Kore/Persephone's kidnapping, Demeter would not have founded the Eleusinian Mysteries. This is also an instance of divine birth, though it is through a mother and daughter rather than a mother and son. This is actually reflected in the Christian image of the pietá (an image in which the mother is holding the child-god in her arms). As with the Cults of Dionysus and Isis, the pietá is a common image in the Eleusinian Mysteries.

Though Dionysus (also Bacchus) was associated closely with the Eleusinian Mysteries, the Dionysiac Mysteries were based upon a different set of myths. Dionysus was the son of the god of lightening, Zeus, and a mortal woman named Semele, daughter of Cadmus. Zeus came to Semele as a mortal man and impregnated her. When Hera, Zeus's wife, found out about his extra-marital affair, she appeared to Semele as an old woman and made her doubt whether her lover was truly the god Zeus. When Semele asked Zeus for a wish, he vowed by the River Styx (the most binding oath a god can make) that she could have whatever she wanted. Semele wished to see Zeus as a god, though Zeus tried to persuade her to change her mind. In granting her wish, Semele was burned to a cinder, and the unborn Dionysus nearly died with her. Zeus, then, sewed the baby Dionysus under the skin of his thigh and carried him there until he was ready to be born three months later. Dionysus was then delivered to his aunt Ino, the queen of Orchomenus, to protect him from Hera. Hera found him and drove his adoptive parents insane. Then, Dionysus was taken in the form of a goat to be raised by the Nymphs of Nysa. When he was an adult, Hera drove Dionysus insane with the same delirium with which he would later infect his own initiates. He wandered throughout the Mediterranean world until he finally came to Phrygia and met the goddess Rhea/Cybele. Her initiates cured Dionysus of his delirium and he became an initiate of the Anatolian Mysteries of Rhea/Cybele and her lover, Attis. This was how Dionysus gained his effeminate, long-flowing robes and hair. Dionysus also borrowed the orgiastic rites and riotous music of Rhea/Cybele's followers for his own mystery cult.[9]

Though Dionysus had already died and been resurrected once during his life, according to the myth of Zagreus (who took the form of a goat), it was the Titans who killed Dionysus. Then, they consumed his flesh in a rather gross communion. Zeus incinerated the Titans and humans were sculpted from the ashes. Thus humans are partly debased and horrifying Titan and partly spiritual Dionysus. In this way, Dionysus has died and been resurrected, more than is usually required in the dying-god category.[10]

The Christians seemed to have borrowed numerous rites and beliefs from the Dionysian Cult. The most peculiar item that the Christians seemed to have appropriated was neither rite nor belief; it was an image. Dionysus is usually pictured as having a rather goatish appearance, as is the god Pan. This similarity to a goat and the fact he was turned into a goat as a child could have led the early Christians to see their devil in Dionysus's image. Dionysus could also have been associated with the Christian devil because Dionysus was a deity of ritual intoxicants and sex.[11] But the most important rite that the Christians potentially commandeered from the Dionysians, and one which has become pivotal to the Christian belief system, is the rite of communion. The holy meal in which the Bacchants participate is a form of communion. It was thought that to partake of the sacrifice to the god was to partake of the god and his life. Thus, the initiate would become one with the god.[12] The Christians seemed to have borrowed this identification and oneness with the deity. It would eventually become a central doctrine to the Christians. By this borrowed belief, whether intentional or not, Christians could more easily understand their relationship with their own dying god.[13] Lastly, there is the imagery of the dying god (Jesus) as the initiate of another set of mysteries (John the Baptist's ministries).

Another Greek cult, which was closely associated with the Cult of Dionysus, was the Orphic Cult. This mystery centered upon the myth of Orpheus and his wife, Eurydice. After Eurydice's untimely death, Orpheus, a child of the Muse Calliope (the Muse of Epics), journeyed to the underworld and sang before Hades and Persephone, begging for his wife to be restored to him. His song moved Persephone and she convinced Hades to release Eurydice. Hades agreed upon one condition — that Orpheus walk ahead of Eurydice, neither speaking to her, nor turning around to look at her until they reached the surface. Orpheus agreed and he and Eurydice were off. Just before they reached the surface, Orpheus began to wonder if he had been tricked and turned to make sure that it was Eurydice behind him. As he did so, Hermes, guide of the dead, appeared and took Eurydice back to the underworld. Orpheus returned to the surface without his wife and fell into a deep melancholy. His songs were so sad that the animals wept. One night, some Bacchae were near when he began to sing. They were so sad and moved that Dionysus possessed them and they tore Orpheus limb from limb to release him from his misery.[14] The version of this myth as it appears in Ovid's Metamorphoses is darker than the original Greek myth. In the Roman version, Orpheus not only mourns throughout the entire world spreading his despair, but he also spurns any woman that attempts to console him, forbearing love. A group of these women who are also Bacchants found him singing in a Cypress

grove one night and are enraged by his refusal of their attentions. They rip Orpheus to shreds and are punished by Dionysus for their indiscretion. He turns them into trees within the same grove in which they murdered Orpheus. Yet, the end is the same. Orpheus is released from his misery and reunited with Eurydice.[15]

The Orphic Mysteries are sort of a sub-sect of the Cult of Dionysus. The Orphics had a special claim to the god Dionysus. To the Orphics, Dionysus was the divine principle, an attitude no other worshippers of Dionysus possessed. There is another version of the myth of Dionysus where he was supposed to have been ripped apart and consumed by Titans. Zeus smites the Titans for their transgression. The ashes, a combination of Titan and Dionysus, are then used to create the human race. Thus, humans were partly horrible, grotesque and cruel and partly god. The Orphics believed that the Dionysian soul could be freed from the Titanic body if the person lived a life of purity and strived to realize their Dionysian destiny.[16] Initiates of the Orphic Mysteries would then be buried with gold Orphic leaves as a symbol of success.[17] Christians appear to have borrowed the idea of original sin from the Bacchic cult. Though the story of the fall of man is located in Genesis, Judaism does not revolve around the central idea of original sin or the inherit evilness of human nature. Christianity, on the other hand, holds original sin to be the reason why Jesus came as a messiah. Original sin, at least as it is understood today, is not mentioned in the Bible. The idea appears to have emerged later and may have been influenced by the Orphic idea of the duality of human nature.

Another important Greek cult is that of Asclepius. Asclepius's cult was not really a mystery. Any person could go to a sanctuary of Asclepius, which acted as a sort of hospital, and ask the god for help. Since, Asclepius was the original physician in Greek myth, going to his sanctuary was intended for healing. Sick people would wash themselves so as not to pollute the sacred space (they also washed for health reasons), and sleep in the dormitories that were set up for devotees. Then, Asclepius would send them a dream with a cure for their diseases. The people who went to the sanctuaries of Asclepius had an amazing survival rate due, in part, to the fact that no one who was on death's door or was in labor was allowed in the sanctuary.[18]

The myth of Asclepius begins with Apollo. Apollo loved a mortal woman named Coronis. Coronis had an extra-marital affair and Apollo found out and was enraged. In his anger, Apollo smote Coronis, burning her to ashes. But, before she was completely burned, Apollo heard the small cry of a child. Apollo rescued the child from Coronis's incinerated body and healed him. (Apollo is the god of light, music, and healing.)

The child was Asclepius. Apollo left Asclepius with Chiron the Centaur, the greatest teacher in all of Greece and the immortal child of a Titan. Chiron taught Asclepius all he knew of the healing arts and Asclepius soon surpassed him. He founded his healing temples all over Greece and had several children, the most famous of whom is Hygeia who believed that keeping clean was the first step in staying healthy. Asclepius's skills in healing continued to grow as time passed until he could resurrect mortals. This angered Hades who was losing his subjects (the dead) due to Asclepius. Hades told Zeus of Asclepius's miracles and Zeus struck Asclepius down with a thunderbolt. Eventually, Asclepius was resurrected and became a god.[19]

The myth of Asclepius has some extremely close parallels with that of Jesus. Asclepius was a healer and a humanitarian, as was Jesus. Both performed "miracles." They were both the sons of a god and a mortal woman. They were also both resurrected from the dead as was foretold.[20] Due to these strong similarities, it is easy to conjecture that Christians would have felt hostility towards this older demi-god and his followers. This hostility was not focused on the followers of Asclepius only, but was applied to the other mystery religions as well. Beginning in the late fourth century C.E., pagan temples were incorporated into Christian churches.[21]

One of the most popular mysteries in the ancient world was the Mystery of Isis and Osiris. Isis was the sister/wife of Osiris. They were the prototypical rulers of Egypt. The myth says that Osiris was murdered by his brother Seth, chopped into several pieces, and then scattered all over Egypt. Isis went in search of the dismembered pieces of her lover so that she might resurrect him. Isis was a powerful goddess. She was the goddess of fertility, the moon, and magic. Eventually, Isis found all the pieces save one — Osiris's phallus. Isis put Osiris back together and then tied him in linen strips, thus creating the first mummy and initiating it as a funerary rite. Because Osiris's phallus is missing, Isis conceives by herself their son Horus. Osiris leaves to go to the underworld to become its lord while Horus grows up and, eventually, defeats the evil Seth.

The mysteries associated with Isis and Osiris date back to practically the beginning of the pharaonic rule. They originally started as a type of passion play that dramatically showed the death of the old pharaoh and the coronation of the new pharaoh. This metaphorical resurrection was a reflection of the sun's journey through the day and the night and how it was reborn with each new day. It was thought that the mummification of the old pharaoh's body would allow him to live well in the underworld. Sometime later nobles began the practice and, eventually, the common people found that the rite of mummification could save them. By the time

these mysteries were being practiced in the Greco-Roman world, they had gone from mummification to an interpersonal relationship with the goddess.[22] The worship of Isis seems to have influenced Christianity's veneration of Mary. Mary and Isis are both holy mothers of resurrected gods. Both became pregnant without the help of a man. The very reference to Mary as the queen of heaven can be seen in the worship of Isis. They are both associated with the moon and with the rose. Lastly, and the most famous borrowing of Christianity, the image of Mary and the baby Jesus, the pietá, is the same image as can be seen of Isis and Horus.[23]

Little is known of the myth behind the Roman Cult of Mithras; what is known comes mainly from archaeological monuments.[24] The cult has its origins in Persia and had been popular with the ancient Indo-Iranians for a long time before its introduction to Rome. Associations are made between Mithras and the Zoroastrian god of light, Ahura Mazda. It is known that the Mithraic Mysteries were exclusively male. They seem to have attracted soldiers, sailors, and imperial officers in particular, which makes sense since Mithras is the divine warrior of light, truth, and justice.[25] A bas-relief from Hedderheim, Germany shows the two main mythological scenes from Mithras's life. The first is Mithras as the bull slayer. Around this image are other scenes from Mithras's life. He is portrayed being born from a rock (petra) during the time of the sun's birth, which is December 25, the winter solstice. The other peripheral scene is Mithras meeting with the sun in which they depart together in the sun's chariot. The other major scene portrayed on the Heddernheim bas-relief is the holy meal that Mithras shares with the sun.[26]

Strangely enough, the Cult of Mithras is one of the few mystery cults about which some of the rites are known, though little is known about the myth that surrounds it. The initiates to the Mithraic Cult had seven stages through which they progressed: Raven (Corax), Bridegroom (Nymphus, Occult, or Cryphius), Soldier (Miles), Lion (Leo), Persian (Perses), Courier of the Sun (Heliodromus), and Father (Pater).[27] When the initiate entered the Mithraeum (which was either a natural cave, a cave dug out by the worshippers, or a building built to look like a cave), the initiate participated in various purifications, initiatory rites, and ceremonial meals.[28] The initiates, after surviving ordeals and trials of valor, were baptized in water and were then sealed on their foreheads. Justin Martyr claims the Mithraic initiates performed a communion in which they took bread and a cup of wine (wine mixed with water), which were considered to be the body and blood of the bull that Mithras had slain. These rituals were supposed to redeem and transform the initiates and make them ready for rebirth and salvation.

With the Cult of Mithras, it is much easier to see the rituals the Christians might have borrowed. The first would be the holy meal. This meal consisted of bread and wine just as the Christian communion is composed. The bread and the wine were supposed to have become the body and blood of the bull that Mithras had slain, which is reminiscent of the transformation of blood and bread in the mass. Then, there is the idea of Mithras being born from the rock or petra. In Christianity, the foundation of the Church and the "rock" on which it is built (Peter) is a form of petra. Moreover, Christian tradition says that Christ was born in a cave that was used as a stable. The initiates in the Mithraic cult were baptized in water, as were their Christian counterparts. Lastly, the redemptive aspect of the Mithraic Cult is very close to what the Christian doctrine preaches.

Within the Cults of Persephone and Demeter, Dionysus, Orpheus, Isis, and Mithras, there are many similarities with Christianity. Whether or not the appropriation of pagan rituals and beliefs in the early centuries of Christianity was completely conscious, it is difficult to say. Later in Christian history, it is very obvious it was a conscious decision on the part of the missionaries to borrow pagan beliefs, rituals, feast days, and even gods to further the cause of Christianity, but at this early stage, one can only guess. For example, Pope Gregory the Great in the sixth century C.E. told his missionaries (especially those in England) to appropriate pagan sanctuaries and holy places and build churches upon them.[29] There is also the Christianization of pagan holy days. All Hallow's Eve, the night before All Saint's Day, was originally the pagan New Year, Samhain. Aspects of Christmas were borrowed from the holy day of Yule of the western pagans, which centers on the winter solstice and the birth of the divine child of light and the return of light and warmth to the dark, cold world. There is also an appropriation of deities, an example of which is the Catholic St. Brigit whose origins can be seen in the goddess Brigid. This list could continue almost indefinitely. Early Christians, in borrowed rituals and beliefs from the contemporary mystery religions, created for themselves the appearance of antiquity that would allow their religion to survive. The Christians potentially used rituals and beliefs borrowed from the mystery religions to make themselves appear more like the other religions of the time. This would have been done especially to separate them from Judaism. The familiarity of the iconography and festival days borrowed from the mystery religions would have lured initiates to Christianity and kept them from slipping back into their original forms of worship. For this reason, the early Christians were seen a mystery cult.

Notes

1 This is a traditional Greek Orthodox funerary chant that is used at Eleusis in Greece. It was recorded during the filming of *The Sacred Way* narrated by Michael Wood in 1991. It was seen in Dr. Shaun O'Bryhim's CLAS 311—Ancient Mediterranean Religions class, Spring 2001.

2 This is an approximate date due to the destruction of all the Republic's records previous to 390 B.C.E. due to a Celtic invasion.

3 Marvin W. Meyer, *The Ancient Mysteries A Sourcebook: Sacred Texts of the Mystery Religions of the Ancient Mediterranean World* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1987), 226.

4 Ramsay MacMullen, *Christianizing the Roman Empire (A.D. 100-400)* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1984), 13.

5 Meyer, *The Ancient Mysteries,* 20.

6 Barry Powell, *Classical Myth* (Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1998), 239.

7 Meyer, *The Ancient Mysteries,* 18.

8 Ibid., 19.

9 Robert Graves, *The Greek Myths* (New York: Penguin Books, 1955), 104-11.

10 Meyer, *The Ancient Mysteries,* 65.

11 Powell, *Classical Myth,* 275.

12 S. Angus, *The Mystery-Religions and Christianity: A Study of the Religious Background of Early Christianity* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1928), 129.

13 Powell, *Classical Myth,* 276.

14 Graves, *The Greek Myths,* 112-14.

15 Ovid, *Metamorphoses,* trans. Mary Innes (New York: Penguin Books, 1988), 246-8.

16 Meyer, *The Ancient Mysteries,* 64-5.

17 Franz Graf, *Magic in the Ancient World* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1997), 213.

18 David G. Rice and John E. Stambaugh, *Sources for the Study of Greek Religion* (Scholars Press, 1979), 69.

19 Graves, *The Greek Myths,* 168-71.

20 Ibid., 169.

21 MacMullen, *Christianizing the Roman Empire,* 99.

22 Meyer, *The Ancient Mysteries,* 157-8.

23 Ibid., 159.

24 Ibid., 200.

25 Ibid., 199.

26 Ibid., 200-01.

27 Ibid., 200.

28 Ibid., 199.

29 Bede, *A History of the English Church and People,* trans. Leo Sherely-Price (Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1968), 86-7.

Brody T. Leiser

Cahokia, Illinois: A Comparison of Land Use Through Native American, French, and American Settlements

Native Americans established an urban setting in present day Cahokia, Illinois, and settled there until their complete abandonment of the site in the mid fourteenth century.[1] Then, in the seventeenth century, the French utilized parts of the Cahokia region and established a community long after the natives had left the area. Cahokia and the surrounding area contain certain geographical elements that make it possible for an urban community to survive. The Native Americans of the area recognized the potential of the land and utilized the different aspects in order to prosper as an early modern urban community. Cahokia and the surrounding land contained the vital elements for an urban setting and it was only a matter of time before another metropolis would emerge in the region. The European, and later American, establishment of communities in the area shared some commonalities with that of the Native Americans, but their views and ideals differed greatly about the land. In this paper I will use the Native Americans as a base or foundation from which to compare and contrast the French and American settlements in the Cahokia region. Then I will discuss the similarities in land use and ideals between the French and American settlements of the area.

Comparative methods of analyzing past cultures and communities can effectively be used to create a better understanding of both similarities and differences among the different cultures within a certain geographic region. Many comparative historians focus their concentration on two different and/or similar subjects. In this paper, I am expanding the normal comparative focus from two subjects to three subjects in order to more effectively understand the influence that a certain geographic region can have over different cultures. To effectively achieve my goal of producing a justifiable three-way comparative essay, I looked to Kay J. Carr's book *Belleville, Ottawa, and Galesburg: Community and Democracy on the Illinois Frontier.*[2] In this book, Carr utilizes a three-way comparison of three very different towns in a similar geographic region to establish a link between frontier community building and the acceptance of democratic political processes. Carr's book helped me to establish a method of effectively comparing three different cultures that share a geographic location in a justifiable manner. I am attempting to build on the comparative method approach of Carr by not only focusing on the differences among my subject groups, but also uncovering striking similarities among different cultures. Utilizing both differences and similarities has helped to create an effective comparative method for this essay.

There are certain geographical elements that make an area habitable for large groups of people. These elements make the area suitable for potential communities and societies to spawn and prosper. The surrounding area of a community must be able to produce food supplies. The quantity of wild game, water supply, and the quality of soil for agricultural production are all vital elements of a geographic region when communities are just getting established. As communities grow larger and larger, there becomes a need for transportation and trade routes. In native and early modern America, transportation and trade often depended on waterways for a means of travel. The geographic area in which society can survive must also provide accommodations for shelter or the construction of shelter. Areas along the Mississippi River in central to southern Illinois provide transportation routes and fertile land for agricultural purposes. The woodlands beyond the floodplain provide raw materials for shelter and tools along with an environment for wild game. Forests in southern Illinois helped to seclude and protect communities. These forests also provided the raw materials needed to construct shelters for community members. This area has the natural environment for the foundation of an established permanent community and this was the basis of settlement for Cahokian and, later on, French and American settlements in the region.

The Cahokia Indians were comprised of many Mississippian culture tribes. There are several characteristics that Mississippian tribes shared. They were farmers of the land, they traded with outside regions, they developed political and religious governmental systems, they established planned communities (specific locations for farming, housing and ceremonies), and they were a mound-building culture. The Mississippian tribes had been present in the Cahokia area from about 500 A.D. through the end of the fourteenth century. Examples of peoples that the Cahokian Indians traded with were the Aztalan and the Oneota tribes that were located in present-day southern Wisconsin.[3] By looking at any accurate map of the Midwest region, one can easily see the convenience of the river systems around the Mississippi for such a trade route. The forests and woodlands provided the raw materials necessary for constructing canoes/boats and paddles near the river for accessible transportation. The Cahokians were established right on the river, making travel and trade economical and accessible.

The Mississippians relied heavily on agriculture for the establishment of permanent residences, but wild game was also included in their diet. There were native plants and vegetables that grew abundantly in the area: sunflowers, sumpweed, squash, gourds, and sweet potatoes. The main crop of the native Cahokians was maize and it was grown in abundance.

Maize played a major role not only in their diet but also in their economy and culture. There have been many hoes found in the area dating back to the times of Indian occupation that were specialized for the use of maize cultivation. These hoes show the use of the native forests as raw material for the construction of agricultural tools and also the utilization of technological advances to increase agricultural production. Maize could be stored in the winter, it was abundant, it was nutritious, and it could be traded for goods and services.[4] Food storage helped to establish a solid food supply for the community to utilize for both nutrition and for trade. Storage also helped to provide a solid food supply after the harvest and through the winter months when the wild game supply decreased due to hibernation and migration of animals and when trade would not have been as economical. Storage facilities included underground pits, small caches, and wooden structures.[5] Native Americans did not have views or ideals of land ownership, but rather the ownership of such things as land use and the things produced on the land during various seasons. Common growing fields were created for the community members and the soil in the area was suitable for the native crops, mainly maize. Native Americans made no effort to establish permanent boundaries and there was no prohibition against trespassing on the land since ownership was not an issue.[6] This varies greatly from both the French and American settlers in the area as will be seen later on in the essay.

The geography of the region aided in the supply of an abundance of wild game and food supplies. Fish and mussels, along with waterfowl, were heavily accessible in rivers and lakes, while beaver, deer, and bear were plentiful in the surrounding areas.[7] During the winter months in Cahokia and its surrounding region, lakes would freeze over. This would cause waterfowl to migrate out of the area and the availability of fish and mussels would be limited to the river. Also, bear hibernate during the winter months. During the winter months, the storage system of crops became important. It was also during the winter months that boundaries became an issue for Native Americans. When game was less abundant, kin groups had the sole rights to animals caught in certain areas with informal boundaries.[8] This was done so that each family group had the opportunity to hunt and obtain a food supply. This represents changing cultural rules or ideals about the land and its use with the coming of new seasons.

These Native Americans built mounds for several purposes. Effigy mounds, which resembled the anatomy of animals, and temple mounds were constructed for religious reasons. Other mounds were created for tombs and some for the base of structures such as houses.[9] The mounds were a part of everyday life in Cahokia. There were 120 mounds discov-

ered in Cahokia and the surrounding area built by the Native Americans within a 15 square kilometer area.[10] Monk's mound is the largest mound in the area and served religious purposes. When General George Rogers Clark wrote a letter to the American Museum in 1775, he discussed the abundance of mounds in the area but failed to mention the large mound, which came to be known as Monk's Mound. The General must have noticed the mound, but may have considered the structure to be a natural landform.

In Cahokia, an early urban setting emerged among the Mississippians. Population estimates of the Native Cahokians occupation range from 10,000 to 25,000 individuals.[11] The Mississippi Indians were also toolmakers, creating hunting and agricultural tools to aid in their survival. The Mississippi River provided travel and trade routes for the Native Americans. The Cahokians built shelters using timber from the surrounding woodlands. An example of shelters constructed is a pit house. The pit house had a floor that was below ground level, with wooden wall-posts set into foundation holes extending below the floor itself.[12] These structures not only represent another use of the forest wood, but also represent the willingness to construct a settled community. A community prospered in Cahokia due to the geographic attributes and the ability of the natives to adapt to nature in order to accommodate large numbers of inhabitants. The Mississippian culture lived in the Cahokian region through the mid-fourteenth century. There are only theories to help explain what may have led to their abandonment of the area. These theories center on disease, external warfare, climatic changes, and the failure of the internal government system.[13]

Cahokia's first European presence came from the French. Jacques Marquette and Louis Joliet were initially commissioned by the French to investigate the possibilities of a waterway to the Pacific Ocean. These two men traveled the Mississippi River (the first Europeans to do so) in the early 1670s and considered natives along the way to be friendly and hospitable. Marquette and Joliet made it as far as the mouth of the Missouri River and then headed back north. La Salle was the next Frenchman to explore the mighty river and discover new land for France's benefit. La Salle descended from Canada to the mouth of the Mississippi. Louisiana was declared to be the possession of France in the name of the king and, on his way back up the river, La Salle left some of his comrades to occupy the area. This was the foundation for the villages of Cahokia and Kaskaskia in 1683.[14]

The settlement of Cahokia resembled patterns of French establishments elsewhere. There was a nuclear village set up where housing and buildings were located; a common for pasture and farmland was established

on the outskirts of the village.[15] This type of setup is consistent with that of the planned community of the Native American Cahokia, where housing and buildings were centrally located and farmland was located on the outskirts of the village/city.[16] Farming was pursued both for the supply of food to one's family and for personal gain in the French community. This is made apparent in several examples from existing documents. There was a farming agreement made between J.B. LaCroix and G. Constant in 1778. LaCroix was to furnish land to Constant to sow a set amount of wheat. About 2/3 of the harvest would go to LaCroix and 1/3 to Constant. Constant was required to furnish a pair of oxen and labor. Both men would be responsible for taking care of the wheat, harvesting expenses, and the threshing.[17] This agreement represents an example of labor used on farms in this French community. It also represents the ownership of land by LaCroix who furnished this land to be used for a mutual benefit. LaCroix granted Constant the right to use this land for the purpose of cultivating wheat. This ideal is contradictory to the views of Native Americans, who felt that no individual owned the rights to the land itself. However, from Constant's standpoint, he gained the right to the product of the land, which would reflect Native American ideals as presented by historian William Cronon. On February 18, 1780, J.B. LaCroix sued M. Levy for two cartloads of corn that he had bought at an auction of the deceased Lapierre. The corn had been held in a granary for three or four months where it had been available to rats.[18] This court record indicates the use of a granary for food storage used by the French at Cahokia. Although the storage facilities may differ, it does present similarities to storage practices used by the Native Americans who had lived in the area hundreds of years earlier.

Another source of food in the French diet was meat from both wild and domesticated animals. Remains dating back to the late eighteenth century found in the area include such animals as black bear, white-tailed deer, turkey, and pigs.[19] French Cahokians raised domesticated animals for a food source and community members took this practice seriously. One had to cooperate and comply with the standards of the community. Mr. Louis Trottier sued a Mr. Jean LaCroix for a broken fence that his pig passed through, causing it to die later in the fields. A witness, M. Beaulieu, confirmed the broken fence and evidence of pigs passing through. The court record of this lawsuit confirms the raising and importance of domesticated animals in French Cahokia. This also shows the importance and dependence of the French community on setting boundaries for individual land ownership. It was such an important issue to the French community that there were magistrates, either appointed or elected, for the fences of the meadows of the village. In 1786, the magistrates were M.

Girardin and M. DuBuque.[20] Boundaries had become such an issue that, on August 28, 1785, an ordinance was put in place against trespassing in the common fields of French Cahokia. This ordinance made it forbidden for all to enter a field that did not belong to them in order to rid the evil of robbery of crops in the fields. Punishment would include a fine and eight days in irons and the culprit would be paraded through the village.[21]

There is much evidence confirming the importance of boundaries for the French community in Cahokia and this evidence also reflects the practice of individual land ownership. This varies greatly from the Native American viewpoint that sanctioned no rules against trespassing and no ownership of the land itself. Boundaries in French Cahokia were distinguished by the use of wooden fencing. Housing and buildings were also constructed with timber. It did not take long for a timber industry to emerge in order to turn a profit after the French had established themselves in the Cahokia region. A good example of this was the growing demand for picket fences in the community. Of course, not just any wood would do. By the 1790s, the demand for red cedar picket fences drove the price for red cedar up to three times more than that of oak.[22] Forests not only provided a means for construction and fuel in this community then, but also provided an opportunity for some to harvest the timber in order to turn a profit. This process contrasts with the ideals of the Native Americans, who used the timber for practical uses and construction rather than for individual gain of wealth.

During the 1830s, American settler to the area and gazetteer writer J. M. Peck declared this land near the Mississippi River as the "American Bottom." He stated that the area was capable of cultivation and stretched about 90 miles along the river from Kaskaskia to Alton. Peck discussed the use of common fields for agricultural purposes. These fields were enclosed and each family possessed a share that was marked off and bounded. The family had the right to sell their share if they so desired. As with the French community, American settlers had individual ownership of the land. This is unlike the Native American view that land could not be owned and, therefore, trespassing could have not existed. There were also ordinances to regulate fence repair and ordinances to regulate the use of open fields in place in the American settlements. During the spring and the time of gathering crops, cattle were excluded from the fields. Then in the fall, the fields were open for the cattle to graze.[23] The ordinance of the fence repair differed greatly from Native American practices where boundaries were not established. The ordinance regulating the use of the open field for cattle grazing does present some similarities to Native American practices. As previously stated, there did exist changes among the Native American practices with the changing seasons due to the availability of food, where

certain kin groups had the rights to animals on certain lands. The similarity between the two societies is the changing regulations regarding land use with the coming of new seasons.

Peck described the soil in the Cahokian region as a "soil of exhaustless fertility."[24] This view of nature as an everlasting source of raw materials for the use of economic gain was common among Americans during the early- to mid-nineteenth century. By describing the soil in this way, it is apparent that there existed a view of utilizing the soil for one's own wants and desires without regard for the potential effects on the land. In a minor way, this resembles practices of the Mississippians near Cahokia. Both groups produced excess crops for some sort of gain. The Mississippians had established trade with other Native Americans north along the Mississippi River. European Americans grew excess crops for trade with European nations. The difference between the two groups deals with the extent to which trade was taken. The Cahokia Indians did accommodate their growing community, but did not attempt to expand their economy throughout the continent. The European Americans were gaining wealth and continued to push their growth from coast to coast. This European-American view led to the over-consumption of timber and to the exhaustion of soil all over colonial and early national America.

Wood was a hugely important commodity in early American society, and it still is today. America depended on wood for the construction of buildings, fencing, fuel, and ships, and also for the construction of wooden crates in which to ship materials. European settlers coming to the new world had not been exposed to the vast amount of forests that existed in America. Early Americans during colonial times and throughout the times of westward expansion saw these forests as being completely abundant. There were no movements for conservation of the forests initially. European Americans viewed the land as an opportunity to extract materials and resources. The importance of wood is apparent in the field notes from early federal surveys of the land. Elias Barcraft surveyed the land near and around Cahokia. Most of his entries consisted of measurements of trees and statements regarding the quality of the soil in the area. He referred to the different types of trees (oak, elm, hickory, maple, ash, cotton wood, box elder) and provided their diameter measurements in inches. Barcraft also commented briefly on the soil, usually as "first rate" or "rich."[25] These survey notes were reflections on what the land had to offer agriculturally and, therefore, economically to the American expansion. With a growing industry in timber, there were certain trees utilized for specific purposes. Barcraft was reporting the size of specific trees that would have been of interest to the lumber industry. Native Americans utilized the timber in the Cahokian region for personal and community use for such things as

buildings, tools, and boats. They did not extract timber for a national or global market as the Americans came to do. Forest products were vitally important to the establishment of the European-American economy and, as a result, the lumber industry began extracting timber at a much greater rate than it could be naturally replaced.

In comparing the French and American settlements around Cahokia to those of the Native Americans, it would be valuable to address some of the similarities between the French and Americans in the area. Both communities practiced individual land ownership and both relied heavily on the setting of boundaries to distinguish this land ownership. The French community had magistrates for overseeing the fencing, along with ordinances regulating trespassing. Similarly, there existed ordinances to regulate fence repair and also to regulate the use of and trespassing in the agricultural fields. The French had regulations to exclude livestock from fields as confirmed earlier in this essay with Mr. Trottier's lawsuit over a trespassing pig. This type of regulation also existed in the American settlement, where cattle were excluded from the fields during the spring and harvest time. With the farming agreement mentioned earlier between LaCroix and Constant, it is apparent that the French community had begun to explore the options of growing excess crop for the purpose of individual economic gain. This was the intention for many American settlers who were moving westward with the expansion of the country, some viewing the land as an exhaustless opportunity for personal economic growth. In the French community, there grew a demand for red cedar picket fences, which aided in establishing a timber industry. It is widely known that America established a large timber industry during the country's westward expansion. In general, both communities had views and practices with the intent to manipulate the land of the region for the purpose of individual economic gain.

Cahokia and the surrounding area provide the geographic accommodations that are required for the establishment of a community. The Mississippi River provides transportation and fertile farming land in the American Bottom for agricultural purposes. The woodlands surrounding the area provide raw material for shelter construction and an environment for wild game. This area is ideal for the foundation of an urban setting. Native Americans were the first to take advantage of and settle in the area. French communities followed, and later on, Americans began to move into the region. The French and American practices were common to those of the Native Americans in regard to agriculture and establishment. The European-American ideals were less concerned with the health of the environment than those of the Natives, and emphasized the pursuit of economic opportunity rather than just survival. The concept

of land ownership created set boundaries where trespassers were not allowed and individuals had sole rights to the land and its use. The Native Americans had not practiced these concepts in the Cahokia region of Illinois. European Americans had begun to manipulate the land for their own benefits and economic opportunities. As America expanded west, there were more and more opportunities for the European Americans to gain economic growth through land ownership and land use. This is very apparent today where one can see, throughout all of southern Illinois, the abundance of farmland for the use of economic markets and sale, and the lack of woodlands that are now mainly restricted to protected forest preserves.

The consistencies between the French and American communities concerning land use and perception in the Cahokia region are abundant. This may be due to the land itself in this particular geographic region. This area provided fertile soil for agriculture, timbered land for raw materials, plenty of wild game, and the Mississippi river for travel routes and a water supply. For Europeans, and later on European Americans, this type of geographic region could have been viewed as sort of a gold mine. With ideals and concepts of individual land ownership and economic markets, this land would have been perceived as an economic opportunity to exploit. With these ideals and concepts already implanted in French and European American settlers, the geographic region of Cahokia provided the basis for the techniques and uses of the land in these settled communities. The similarities of land use between the two communities is directly related to ideals that already existed, such as land ownership, and also to the land itself and what the land had to offer.

Notes

1 Melvin Fowler and Biloine Young, *Cahokia: The Great Native American Metropolis* (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2000), 310.
2 Kay J. Carr, *Belleville, Ottawa, and Galesburg: Community and Democracy on the Illinois Frontier* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1996).
3 Fowler and Young, 246-7, 287, 292.
4 Ibid., 19, 111-2.
5 Mark W. Mehrer, *Cahokia's Countryside: Household Archaeology, Settlement Patterns, and Social Power* (DeKalb, IL: Northern Illinois University Press, 1995), 127.
6 William Cronon, *Changes in the Land: Indians, Colonists, and the Ecology of New England* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1983), 62-5.
7 Fowler and Young, 112.
8 Cronon, 64.
9 Fowler and Young, 2.
10 Mehrer, 5.

11 Fowler and Young, 3, 310-11.
12 Mehrer, 12.
13 Fowler and Young, 310.
14 J.M. Peck, *A Gazetteer of Illinois,* 2d ed. (1837; reprint, Bowie, MD: Heritage Books, Inc., 1993), 82-5.
15 Carl Ekberg, *French Roots in the Illinois Country: The Mississippi Frontier in Colonial Times* (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1998), 54.
16 Fowler and Young, 112.
17 John McDermott, ed., *Old Cahokia: A Narrative and Documents Illustrating the First Century of Its History* (Bellville, Il: Buechler Publishing Company, 1949), 112.
18 Clarence W. Alvord, ed. *Cahokia Records 1778-1790,* vol. 1 of *Virginia Series,* vol. 2 of *Collections of the Illinois State Historical Library* (Chicago: Lakeside Press, 1907), 39.
19 Bonnie L. Gums, *Archaeology at French Colonial Cahokia* (Springfield, IL: Illinois Historic Preservation Agency, 1988), 224-9.
20 Alvord, 123, 221.
21 McDermott, 112.
22 Ekberg, 52.
23 Peck, 5, 168-9.
24 Ibid., 5.
25 Elias Barcraft, *Illinois Survey Field Notes* (Office of the Secretary of State, 1849). This name was written in cursive and very difficult to translate. The reader should be aware that the spelling of Barcraft may be incorrect. These field notes were part of the initial federal land survey of Illinois. Barcraft began surveying the Cahokia area in 1810. Most of the notes are very brief and consist of either measurements of trees or the precise location of posts that defined township lines.

Lorri B. Swanson

Jefferson's Christianity: The Influence of Joseph Priestly

In the 1943 dedication of the Jefferson Memorial in Washington, an Episcopalian and a Roman Catholic gave the invocation and the benediction.[1] If the two priests had been Thomas Jefferson's contemporaries, it is likely that both would have charged him with being an atheist and infidel. Such were the accusations made against Jefferson throughout his life. Many ministers attributed the growth of irreligion in the early Republic to French atheism. According to historian Henry Wilder Foote, Jefferson's political opponents, namely Federalists led by Alexander Hamilton (1757–1804), used this negative generalization to denounce Jefferson as an "atheist in religion and a fanatic in politics" as well as a "Francophile, a Deist, and a leveler."[2] However, as in all of his undertakings, Jefferson would not allow for such an irrational assumption to go unchallenged.

Throughout his life Jefferson attempted to remain private regarding matters of religion stating, "I not only write nothing on religion, but rarely permit myself to speak on it."[3] Yet, in response to these allegations Jefferson wanted to prove to himself and his friends that he not only believed in God, which was quite obvious in most of his writings, but that he was also a Christian. In an 1803 letter to Philadelphia physician and humanitarian, Benjamin Rush (1745–1813), Jefferson asserted, "I am a Christian, in the only sense in which [Jesus] wished any one to be; sincerely attached to his doctrines, in preference to all others; ascribing to himself every human excellence; and believing he never claimed any other."[4] It was with this view of Christianity, what modernity might term the quest for the historical Jesus, that Jefferson was committed to clarify from its corruptions.

Jefferson's convictions were defined in large measure by his search for a "sublime and benevolent"[5] religious standard, which he felt Jesus best represented. His main influence during this search was the Unitarian minister and scientist, Joseph Priestley (1733–1804). Priestley's writings articulated what Jefferson had conceived in his mind for a number of years, but his political service and desire for privacy had kept him from recording his thoughts. Influenced by Priestley's beliefs, Jefferson wrote a syllabus of Jesus's morality, prepared an edited version of the Gospels, and claimed adherence to Unitarianism. Over a period of twenty years Jefferson matured not only as a statesman, but as a theologian, and the tenets of his faith have made a lasting imprint on the nature and context of liberal Christianity.

Both Priestley and Jefferson were children of the Enlightenment, at-

tempting to make sense of their religious tradition and the age of reason. Their individual educations paved the way for a critical examination of religious tradition. Raised by liberal Calvinists, Priestley explored Arianism and settled on Socianism[6] while attending schools such as the Daventry Academy in England. While attending William and Mary College, Jefferson studied under jurist and statesman George Wythe (1726–1806), who was a follower of English philosopher John Locke (1632–1704). Locke once wrote, "The care of every man's soul belongs to himself."[7] From this maxim, Wythe, and later Jefferson, understood religious beliefs to be a private matter between the individual and God. Jefferson would later reflect upon Wythe as someone who "neither troubled, nor perhaps trusted anyone with his religious creed, leaving the world to the conclusion that religion must be good which could produce a life of such exemplary virtue."[8] Whereas Priestley committed early to a life of preaching and writing about reformed Christianity, Wythe's influence hindered the openness necessary for Jefferson to share his beliefs. It would take his relationship with Priestley to finally reconsider this policy of privacy.

Perhaps the primary Enlightenment influence on Priestley and Jefferson's theology was a man that neither mentions as a source of theological writings: natural philosopher and mathematician Isaac Newton (1642–1727). While Jefferson referred to Newton, Locke, and philosopher Francis Bacon (1561–1626)[9] as his own personal trinity, ironically, he never explicitly refers to Newton's anti-trinitarian views that are implicit in his own views. In letters written to Locke in 1690 titled "Notable Corruptions of Scripture" (comparable to Priestley's later title *A History of Corruptions of Christianity*), Newton attributed the perversion of scripture, specifically the doctrine of the trinity, to Athanasius (293?–373 CE), Patriarch of Alexandria. Newton expressed himself as an Arian in his *Theologiae Gentilis Origines Philosophicae* and, according to historian Richard S. Westfall, viewed Jesus as "merely one more prophet, who came to restore the true religion after mankind's innate propensity for idolatry had corrupted it." The Christian religion was no more true than the religion of the children of Noah and could be summarized in the two commandments: duty to love God and the duty to love one's neighbor. According to Newton, they "always have and always will be the duty of all nations and the coming of Jesus Christ has made no alteration in them."[10] This reductionist approach can be furthermore sensed in the following statement of Newton's: "If it be said that we are not to determine what's scripture & what not by our private judgments, I confess it in places not controverted: but in disputable places I love to take up with what I can best understand. Tis the temper of the hot and superstitious part of mankind in matters of religion ever to be fond of mysteries, & for that reason to like best what they understand least."[11]

Priestley and Jefferson agreed with Newton that morality was the key to religion and that mystery and superstition corrupted its purpose. The writings of both Priestley and Jefferson would seek to extract the morals of Jesus from mysteries and superstition. However, Priestley and Jefferson would both diverge from Newton in their opinion of Jesus and his morals. While Newton contended that Jesus made no alteration in morality, Priestley, and eventually Jefferson, would affirm that Jesus made the most sublime alterations in morality humanity has ever experienced.

Priestley wrote about his objections to the trinity in several essays, pamphlets, and books including *Disquisitions Relating to Matter and Spirit* (1777), *An History of the Corruptions of Christianity* (1782), *History of the Early Opinions Concerning Jesus Christ* (1786), and *Letters to a Philosophical Unbeliever* (1787). These writings angered many Dissenting clergy, who convinced their congregations that Priestley was an agent of the Devil.[12] On the anniversary of the French Revolution, 14 July 1791, a mob burned his meetinghouse and his home, including his library and apparatus.[13] Choosing what many of the religiously oppressed in England had already chosen, Priestley migrated to Philadelphia, eventually settling in Northumberland.

Upon learning that Priestley had been in Philadelphia, Jefferson wrote the following on 21 March 1801: "Those who live by mystery... fearing you would render them useless by simplifying the Christian philosophy,— the most sublime and benevolent, but most perverted system that ever shone on man,— endeavored to crush your well-earned and well-deserved fame." Regarding Priestley's arrival in America, Jefferson concludes, "It is with heartfelt satisfaction that, in the first moments of my public action, I can hail you with welcome to our land."[14] Having suffered similar, yet not as devastating attempts to crush his fame, Jefferson could write this in sympathy with the hope Priestley would enjoy more freedom in the United States due to the laws for which Jefferson was primarily responsible.

Although damned by those who claimed to be orthodox Christians, Priestley never considered himself anything other than a Christian. He wrote to his friend, Theophilus Lindsey, in 1774, stating, "The more attention I give to the study of the Scriptures, the more attached I am to it.... At present I read chiefly with a practical view; and the attentive consideration of the facts in the gospel history has certainly the strongest tendency to impress the heart and influence the life in the most favourable manner."[15] Priestley's practical view of scripture and emphasis on its tendency to influence its reader's life in the most favorable manner helped shape his Unitarian perception of Jesus. To this same friend Lindsey, Priestley dedicated his *History of the Corruptions of Christian-*

ity, signing it, "In faith and hope of the Gospel."[16] The corruptions that Priestley exposed prevented the Gospel from fulfilling its potential as a positive influence, "For my own part, I am satisfied that it is only by purging away the whole of this *corrupt leaven*, that we can recover the pristine simplicity and purity of our most excellent and truly rational, though much abused, religion."[17]

Thus the Enlightenment foundation for simplifying the Scripture from superstition and mysteries, present in the work of Newton, was also evident in the work of Priestley. Priestley referred to the ideal as "pure Christianity (the most essential articles of which I consider to be the proper unity of God, and the proper humanity of Christ)."[18] Once he was satisfied with his refutation of those doctrines that obscured pure Christianity, he was able to focus on the person of Jesus and the moral standards he made available to all humanity. Priestley wrote, "By their fruits shall ye know them.… They cannot be bad principles with which men lead godly, righteous, and sober lives."[19] In *Socrates and Jesus Compared*, written in 1803, Priestley expounded on Jesus's superior moral principles. It was reading this text that finally gave Jefferson the motivation to commence his own writings on the morals of Jesus.

Priestley wrote that whereas Socrates had only taught upper-class men, Jesus reached all people: rich, poor, men, women, and children. "The sophisticated Socratic rhetoric could communicate very little to uneducated minds.... [Jesus's] simple parables could be understood by everybody."[20] Jesus sought to tell the simple stories of everyday life, uncorrupted by the mystery and superstitions that would later surround him. Thus, these simple stories needed to be procured from the corruption that kept them from their full potential. Jefferson very much wanted to see this done.

From his letter to Priestley on 9 April 1803, Jefferson tells of the promise he had made to Rush four years earlier to give his "view of the Christian system." Having only previously "sketched the outlines" in his own mind, following the same approach as Priestley, he would compare the deficiencies of ancient philosophers to Jesus, who:

> endeavored to bring them to the principles of a pure deism, and juster notions of the attributes of God, to reform their moral doctrines to the standard of reason, justice & philanthropy, and to inculcate the belief of a future state.... To do him justice, it would be necessary to remark the disadvantages his doctrines have to encounter, not having been committed to writing by himself, but by the most unlettered of men, by memory, long after they heard them from him; when much was forgotten, much misunderstood, & presented in very paradoxical shapes.[21]

However, Jefferson did not feel he could complete this complex project and hoped Priestley would help. Jefferson's reasoning for requesting someone else to write and publish his ideas may have come from time constraints, but may also have had foundation in his fear of public opposition or rejection of his beliefs.

The death of Priestley in 1804 kept him from assisting Jefferson in completing the project. It has been said that he died in relative obscurity; one contemporary, John Bristed, commented that "his death excited little more sensation than the dissolution of a German farmer's horse."[22] However, Priestley's death led Jefferson to reach out to others for insight into his project.

Jefferson explained the plan he introduced to Priestley in a letter to Benjamin Rush on 21 April 1803. He included a detailed outline of his intentions (which he refers to as a syllabus) mentioning Priestley's influence. "I received from Dr. Priestley, his little treatise of 'Socrates and Jesus Compared.' [T]he general view I had taken of the field, it became a subject of reflection while on the road.... The result was, to arrange in my mind a syllabus ... of the comparative merits of Christianity, as I wished to see executed by some one of more leisure and information for the task, than myself."[23]

Jefferson's "Syllabus of an Estimate of the Merit of the Doctrines of Jesus, compared with those of others" elaborates upon the failures of ancient philosophers and the Jews to develop "duties to others... peace, charity and love" which Jesus "corrected" by "inculcating universal philanthropy... to all mankind, gathering all into one family, under the bonds of love, charity, peace, common wants and common aids. A development of this head will evince the peculiar superiority of the system of Jesus over all others."[24] Yet, over the next sixteen years, this syllabus remained incomplete.

Jefferson shared the idea of the syllabus among a number of colleagues, seemingly seeking approval, perhaps of the text, perhaps of his beliefs. To New York Unitarian, Francis Van der Kemp, he wrote in 1816, "I am entirely satisfied with the disposition you made of the Syllabus.... I believe it to be the only ground on which reason and truth can take their stand."[25] In several letters to William Short, Jefferson states his aim to "justify the character of Jesus against the fictions of his pseudo-followers."[26] In contrast to Newton, Jefferson described Jesus's character as better than Moses's, reforming "the religion of the Jews, as taught by Moses," who presented God as "cruel, vindictive, capricious and unjust." Jesus taught of God's "wisdom, justice, goodness" and presented God as "worthy of... adoration."[27] Jefferson wrote to Jared Sparks in 1820 that the "genuine doctrines of Jesus, [which] so long perverted by his pseudo-priests, will

again be restored to their original purity... but too late for me to witness it."[28] This fear that his syllabus would never be fully developed is first observed in a letter to William Short on October 31, 1819, "The establishment of the innocent and genuine character of this benevolent Moralist [rescued from] the imputation of imposture... is a most desirable object, and one to which Priestley has successfully devoted his labors and learning." Referring to the syllabus, Jefferson admits he wrote "an abstract from the Evangelists of whatever has the stamp of eloquence and fine imagination of Jesus... I attempted [it] too hastily... with one foot in the grave, these are now idle projects for me."[29]

One theological project Jefferson completed was writing "The Life and Morals of Jesus of Nazareth" (1819), which extracted "what is really [Jesus's] from the rubbish in which it is buried."[30] This version of the synoptic gospels eliminated trinitarian additions that Jefferson believed corrupted Christianity and thus, highlights only the moral doctrines of Jesus. Referring to this revised edition of the Gospels in an 1816 letter to Charles Thomson, author of *A Synopsis of the Four Evangelists; or, A Regular History of the Conception, Birth, Doctrine, Miracles, Death, Resurrection, and Ascension of Jesus, in the Words of the Evangelists*, Jefferson proudly declares, "I too have made a wee little book, from the same materials, which I call the Philosophy of Jesus... made by cutting the texts out of the book, and arranging them on the pages of a blank book, in a certain order of time or subject." In this manner, Jefferson confirmed his beliefs: "It is a document in proof that I am a *real Christian*... very different from the Platonists, who call me infidel, and themselves Christians and preachers of the gospel, while they draw all their characteristic dogmas from what its Author never said nor saw."[31]

Borrowing heavily from Priestley, Jefferson developed a system of beliefs that did not have to rely on "theological subjects, as mangled by our Pseudo-Christians."[32] Instead, he relied on a cut and paste version of Jesus's morals as his religious text. According to historian Henry Foote, Jefferson read from the book nightly, although it is unknown whether he read from the English, French, Latin, or Greek text, all of which were included.[33] Coming to terms with his beliefs about God and Jesus, Jefferson claimed it was Calvin who was the "atheist," for his belief in a false God. An "atheist," Jefferson wrote to John Adams in 1823, is something that he could "never be."[34]

True to himself and his own beliefs, in 1819, Jefferson wrote to Ezra Stiles Ely, "I am of a sect by myself."[35] Yet, there was one other person with whom Jefferson felt that he shared a common faith. "I have read [Priestley's] *Corruptions of Christianity*, and *Early Opinions of Jesus*, over and over again; and I rest on them... as the basis of my faith.... I cling to

their learning, so much superior to my own."[36] The congruity Jefferson felt toward Priestley's beliefs led him to consider Priestley's religious tradition of Unitarianism. In 1822, Jefferson wrote a letter to James Smith, a theologian, thanking him for "pamphlets on the subject of Unitarianism.... Priestley's learned writings on it are, or should be, in every hand."[37] He asked Smith to keep his interest a secret in an attempt to avoid controversy. According to Henry Foote, in some states Unitarianism had been classed with atheism as a felony punishable by loss of employment.[38] By 1822, legal punishment was not a concern, but the loss of tranquility in his old age did concern Jefferson. However, he continued to confide in friends and work toward greater acceptance of Unitarianism within Virginia. Having attended Unitarian services in Philadelphia in which "Doctor Priestley officiated to numerous audiences," Jefferson hoped missionaries could be sent to Virginia. "That doctrine has not yet been preached to us," he wrote to Benjamin Waterhouse on 22 July 1822, "but the breeze begins to be felt."[39] While he thought that there was not a young man living in the U.S. who would not eventually die a Unitarian,[40] for the time being he was "contented to be a Unitarian"[41] by himself.

Joseph Priestley's last published writings were the final four volumes of his *General History of the Christian Church* (1802–1803). Eighteen months before his death, Priestley dedicated them to Jefferson. "My high respect for your character," Priestley wrote to Jefferson, "as a politician and a man, makes me desirous to connect my name in some measure with yours."[42] Priestley's name should forever be connected to Jefferson's religious writings and beliefs. Jefferson is widely recognized as a great political philosopher, yet his interest in saving Christianity from trinitarian corruption does not always receive the esteem it deserves from theologians or historians. Although Jefferson shied away from publicizing his beliefs during a time that was hostile to critical theology, in the later period of so called "higher criticism," Jefferson's writings provided theologians and historians a precedent for understanding the historical Jesus. Jefferson, though wanting to maintain privacy about his beliefs hoped he would leave a legacy: "We must leave therefore to others, younger and more learned than we are, to prepare this euthanasia for Platonic Christianity, and its restoration to the primitive simplicity of its founder."[43]

Notes

1 Henry Wilder Foote, *The Religion of Thomas Jefferson* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1947), 23.

2 Ibid., 46.

3 Thomas Jefferson, *The Life and Morals of Jesus* (New York: Wilfred Funk, Inc., 1940), ix.

4 Letter to Benjamin Rush, 21 April 1803, in Adrienne Koch and William Peden, eds., *The Life and Selected Writings of Thomas Jefferson* (New York: The Modern Library, 1944), 567.
5 Letter to John Adams, 13 October 1813, in Koch and Peden, eds., 632.
6 Arianism is derived from Arius (256-336 B.C.E) who held the belief that Jesus was not co-eternal with God but pre-existed before he appeared in the flesh. Socinianism is derived from Socinus (1539-1604) and applies to anti-trinitarian beliefs that Christ was human which transformed into Unitarianism.
7 Quoted in Foote, 4.
8 Quoted in Foote, 13.
9 In a letter to Benjamin Rush written on 16 January 1811, Jefferson tells the following. "The room [the dining room in Monticello] being hung around with a collection of the portraits of remarkable men, among them were those of Bacon, Newton and Locke, [Alexander] Hamilton asked me who they were. I told him they were my trinity of the three greatest men the world had ever produced, naming them." (italics mine). Koch and Peden, eds., 609.
10 Westfall quoted in David C. Lindberg and Ronald L. Numbers, eds., *God & Nature: Historical Essays on the Encounter between Christianity and Science* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986), 230.
11 Newton quoted in Lindberg and Numbers, eds., 231.
12 http://www.woodrow.org/teachers/chemistry/institutes/1992/Priestley.html .
13 Ira V. Brown, ed., *Joseph Priestley: Selections from His Writings* (University Park: Pennsylvania State Press, 1962), 70.
14 Letter to Joseph Priestley, March 21, 1801, in Koch and Peden, eds., 562.
15 Quoted in G. Adolf Koch, *Religion of the American Enlightenment* (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1968), 222.
16 Quoted in Brown, ed., 282.
17 Priestley quoted in Koch, 223.
18 Brown, ed., 300.
19 Priestley quoted in Daniel J. Boorstin, *The Lost World of Thomas Jefferson* (New York: H. Holt, 1948), 155.
20 Priestley quoted in Boorstin, 158.
21 Letter to Joseph Priestley, April 9, 1803, in Kerry Walters, *The American Deists* (Lawrence: University of Kansas, 1992) 118-9.
22 Bristed quoted in Boorstin, 236.
23 Letter to Benjamin Rush, April 21, 1803, in Koch and Peden, eds., 567.
24 Letter to Benjamin Rush, April 21, 1803, in Koch and Peden, eds., 568-70
25 Letter to Francis Van der Kemp, July 30, 1816, in Walters, 130.
26 Letter to William Short, August 4, 1820, in Walters, 132.
27 Letter to William Short, August 4, 1820, in Walters, 132.
28 Letter to Jared Sparks, November 4, 1820, in Walters, 135-6.
29 Letter to William Short, October 31, 1819, in Koch and Peden, eds., 695.
30 Letter to William Short, October 31, 1819 Koch and Peden, eds., 694.
31 Letter to Charles Thomson, January 9, 1816, in Walters, 129.
32 Letter to Francis Van der Kemp, July 30, 1816, in Walters, 130.
33 Foote, 64.
34 Letter to John Adams, April 11, 1823, in Koch and Peden, eds., 705.
35 Letter to Ezra Stiles Ely, June 25, 1819, in Walters, 132.
36 Letter to John Adams, August 22, 1813 in Paul Leicester Ford, ed., *The Writings of Thomas Jefferson*, vol. 9. (New York: G.P Putnam's Sons, 1898), 418.

37 Letter to James Smith, December 8, 1822 in Koch and Peden, eds., 703.
38 Foote, 35.
39 Jefferson quoted in Foote, 71.
40 Letter to Benjamin Waterhouse, June 26, 1822, in Walters, 136.
41 Letter to Benjamin Waterhouse, January 8, 1825, in Foote, 76.
42 Brown, ed., 324.
43 In a letter to John Adams, October 12, 1813, in Walters, 124.

Holly A. Newcomb

The 1832 Anatomy Act: Reactions and Implications

England's Anatomy Act of 1832 was a hallmark in the field of what was then called surgery. During this time, surgeons were at the bottom of the medical hierarchy and were seen as little more than butchers. The general feeling toward dissection at the time was very negative due to many factors. Superstitions and long held beliefs about the dead and a strong respect for them caused people to be opposed to tampering with the body. One of the strongest held beliefs at this time was that of resurrection of the whole body[1] which lessened the fear of death and made it a celebration,[2] but also required a whole undisturbed body. It was these kinds of beliefs coupled with the fact that dissection had long been associated with crime and punishment that caused such anxiety for people. Beginning in the sixteenth century, dissection was allowed on hanged felons. In the eighteenth century, it became a punishment, a means of execution, for serious crimes such as murder.[3] These centuries during which only condemned criminals could be dissected took a toll on the image of dissection and those involved.[4] Dissection became associated with the worst crimes and even spurred a few of its own.[5] The Act to Regulate Schools of Anatomy of 1832 was designed to help convert the image of dissection into a more positive light. The act, while good for some, was bad for others. People on both sides of the issue, however, had similar reactions, although for different reasons. The overall public reaction to the act was negative, as would be expected, but the reactions of many surgeons were also negative, despite the fact that the act was designed to help them.

The Anatomy Act was passed in August of 1832 for various reasons; however, it was not passed in order to further the knowledge of anatomy and medicine as might be thought. The immediate purpose of the act was to alleviate the shortages of cadavers allowed to surgeons by law and to put a stop to the illegal activities that these shortages caused.[6] Up until the eighteenth century, only six bodies per year were allowed to surgeons and this was only increased by a 1752 act that allowed dissection as a punishment for criminal activity.[7] But the legal supply of bodies was still greatly short of the demand.[8] In order to supplement this supply many illegal activities were employed. Grave robbing was profuse at this time. The earliest grave robbers were surgeons or their students.[9] Eventually, however, grave robbing became a fairly lucrative profession. There were different methods employed to stop the "resurrectionists," as they were called, including posting guards or allowing the body to

begin decomposition before burial.[10] The practice of selling bodies was common. According to one source, until the Anatomy Act was passed, in order to procure bodies to dissect, anatomy schools relied heavily on their students, undertakers, and local resurrectionists.[11] Some people even resorted to murder to get into the lucrative body selling trade. The most famous of these murders were committed by William Burke and William Hare who killed fifteen people and sold their bodies; but they were not the first or the last people to do this.[12] Killing people for such a purpose became known as "burking." Knowledge about burking cases in London helped to push the anatomy bill through Parliament.[13]

The main group originally behind the Anatomy Act was the surgeons. The surgeons had long wanted something to be done to improve the acceptance of anatomical science in England, and the act was supposed to help them achieve this goal. Surgeons were to be those most affected by the law, and there were multiple reasons why the surgeons wanted an act of this kind passed. One of these reasons was to further the knowledge and study of anatomy and surgery. The study of anatomy was known to be beneficial in improving the performance and safety of surgery.[14] This is a theme repeated by many surgeons who believed that, without a more knowledge of anatomy, medicine could descend into quackery.[15] The British surgeons also wanted to further the knowledge of anatomy because the knowledge and acceptance of anatomy was much greater on the continent than it was in England. This embarrassed the surgeons and made them feel that the medical community in England was at a loss because of inadequate knowledge.[16]

Another reason the surgeons wished for this act was to help clean up their image. Dissection's long association with crime and punishment had greatly tarnished its image in the eyes of the public. A third reason had to do with the existing law. According to the law prior to 1832, it was actually illegal to have a human body in your possession for the purposes of dissection; but it was required to have dissected a body before one could be declared a surgeon. This created a huge contradiction in the law. One could not legally perform surgery without having dissected, but was subject to fine or imprisonment if found to possess a disinterred body.[17]

The main reason, however, that surgeons wished for the passage of the Anatomy Act was to increase the number of cadavers available to them for dissection. As mentioned previously, the shortage of cadavers was a major problem, not just for the surgeons, but for society as a whole. Prior to this act, there were no regulations or provisions applied to surgeons themselves or to dissection in general. According to one source, in 1829, out of about 700 anatomy students, only around 450 cadavers

were dissected per year. These numbers figure to about half a body per anatomy student. The estimates put forth by various surgeons called for anywhere from three to ten bodies per student per year to be dissected.[18] The difference is painfully obvious.

In August of 1832, the Anatomy Act became law. It did much to try to help regulate schools of anatomy, their students and teachers, and the procuring of subjects for dissection; but the Act in itself was simple and loosely defined. According to the law, there were to be appointed, for one year terms, or until they were removed, "not fewer than Three Persons to be Inspectors of Places where Anatomy is carried on."[19] Licenses were issued to practice anatomy, and schools were now subject to periodic investigations. The biggest change to the previous system caused by the new law was in the area of body procurement. Under the law, all bodies were possibly subject to dissection. The act stated that, "any Executor or other Party having lawful Possession of the Body of any deceased Person" made the decision to send the body for dissection.[20] This applied to any lawful possessor, regardless of relation or association. Certificates of death had to accompany any body sent for dissection, and all bodies removed for dissection had to be "decently interred in consecrated Ground, or in some public Burial Ground… and… a Certificate of Interment… transmitted to the Inspector of the District Six Weeks after the Day on which such a Body was received [for original examination]."[21] Punishment for the possession of human bodies for purposes of dissection was suspended, and dissection was no longer a legal means of punishment for criminals.[22]

As dictated by the act an Inspector of Anatomy was appointed. James Sommerville, who was himself a surgeon and had provided evidence to the Select Committee on Anatomy to help form the act, was given this position. Sommerville was inspector for the first ten years of the act's operation, and he did the job alone.[23] He had the difficult job of laying the foundation for his office and for the operation of the law itself, even though by being the sole inspector the law was, in essence, already being broken. In the 8 September 1832 issue of the *Lancet*, Sommerville outlined the duties of anatomy teachers and also the duties of his position, which included inspection of schools and reporting of any irregularities. He also outlined the duties of surgeons telling them they must "obtain a license... receive with the body a certificate from [the person] who attended the person during the illness of which he died... give notice... of every place where it is intended to practice anatomy... that every body... be decently interred."[24] He did this as a good faith gesture to show he was desirous to work with the anatomists and that he was willing to receive any advice or information from surgeons. He also told the surgeons that any correspondence "shall be considered by me strictly secret and

confidential," but that it was his duty to "report to the Secretary of State any irregularities or offences against the Act."[25]

Sommerville had to deal not only with his ill-defined role, but also with reluctant parochial authorities who did not want to send people to be dissected, anatomical monopolies that led to disproportional distribution of bodies, and those who did not abide by the law. According to historian Ruth Richardson, Sommerville's correspondence shows his manipulation of power, name-dropping, and use of strong-arm tactics.[26] He was put into a very difficult position and, despite his attempts to regulate the supply of bodies, he still fell short of demand. In the end, he did not increase the supply of bodies and only managed to do as well as the resurrectionists had done before him.[27] The problem with Sommerville's position was that he basically had no provisions and no precedents to follow. The law did not define the mechanics of his position, and he had to contend with the overwhelmingly negative attitude of the general public. He was also technically doing the work of three men and, after his stint as inspector, he was in fact replaced with three people.[28] Sommerville's problems, coupled with his use of illegal or questionable tactics, seemed to create even more difficulties with the act.

The basic premise of the Anatomy Act was to use for dissection the unclaimed bodies of paupers who died while under government support. These bodies included those of people in workhouses, charity hospitals, and prisons. The overall public reaction to this was decidedly unfavorable. Most of this reaction, however, was actually prior to the act's passage. The poor first learned about the act's proposed dictates when the bill was first introduced to Parliament in 1828 and 1829, which was when most of the reactions occurred. There were instances of upheaval and disturbance in many workhouses at this time. Those people in the workhouses were the ones that would be subject to dissection if the act was passed, and people became fearful of ending up there. Burial clubs, organizations into which people paid dues in order to have a proper burial, became very popular.[29] By the time the act was passed, the poor were so terrified of ending up in workhouses that many went to extreme measures to avoid them, including prostitution, starvation, emigration, and even suicide.[30] This is really about all that is known about the working-class reaction to the act. Little evidence has survived, and in reality, there was probably little to begin with.[31]

The Anatomy Act also held implications for society as a whole. The very fact that only the bodies of the poor were subject to dissection under the act shows a gross disregard for their class. Some objected to this charge, however. Many of the surgeons dismissed this idea as a falsehood. They claimed that the bill expressly included persons of all classes and

not just the poor.[32] However, despite the fact that no class was expressly excluded from possible dissection, it stands to reason that an aristocrat or a middle-class person was not going to end up in a situation where he or she would be subject to dissection under this law. Because of this oversight, the Anatomy Act increased the degradation of poverty and showed that such laws as this that antagonized the poor were relatively easy to pass.[33] Many surgeons also dismissed the fears of the working classes, citing instances where the poor had gone to hospitals where dissection was known to be performed on those who died while in the hospital. Surgeons believed that the only reason the poor were opposed to their dissection was because of their lack of knowledge about it and that once a person had been thoroughly exposed to dissection they would gladly submit.[34] The fact that a burial provision was included in the act was supposed to lend to it a more humanitarian aspect and show the working classes that their remains would be treated in a customary manner. James Sommerville noted "how important it is for the satisfaction of the public mind, that the natural feelings of human nature should be consulted… the 13th section of the Act, which provides for the decent interment of bodies after they have undergone anatomical examination."[35] The burial clause showed the poor that they were being treated in a superior manner after their dissection, unlike murderers in previous times.[36] It was thought that providing for the eventual burial of the body would alleviate working-class opposition to the act.

Despite the fact that the new law was designed to aid the surgeons in their study of anatomy and that many surgeons dismissed public fears and opposition, many surgeons themselves were not satisfied with the law. It did manage to decrease the illegal activities of the resurrectionists[37] and helped to improve the image of the surgeons by distancing them from the criminal element; but what it did not do was increase their supply of bodies. There were various reasons why the surgeons were unhappy with the act. One objection, as stated in an 1832 letter to the *Lancet*, was that the law did not provide for the procuring of skeletons, a valuable teaching tool.[38] While the removal of body parts was not expressly prohibited by the law (a major loophole),[39] the burial provision would, of course, not allow for the use of a person's skeleton. This was neither the first nor the last objection to the Anatomy Act.

The editor of the *Lancet*, himself a surgeon, disagreed with the provisions of the bill. He believed that it was irrational and incomplete. His first objection arose because the bill did not render the buying and selling of human bodies illegal. The fact that the law placed the traffic of these bodies into the hands of the surgeons was, according to him, a "gross insult" and he hoped it would be prohibited by medical men. This editorial was

published two days before the bill became a law, and bluntly stated, "[T]he Act cannot continue as now framed."[40] The act was not passed with a provision that prohibited the sale of dead bodies, however. The fact that these objections were being raised even before the act's passage suggests that the legislature was looking for a quick fix to the problems surrounding dissection and did not address all sides of the issues. Perhaps they were unwilling, or unable, to pass an act that had stronger provisions or restrictions. Years later, the editor of the *Lancet* recognized the fact that when the Act was passed the "Legislature was not in a temper... to sanction a law of a more extended or stringent nature," and did not believe that such a law could have been passed by a later Parliament.[41]

The Anatomy Act was not altered in any way until 1871, and the surgeons objections continued after its passing. In 1841, a petition was drawn up to affect an alteration of the act. At a meeting of the North of England Medical Association, a Mr. Morrison set forth his objections to the act. He presented many things he felt were problems. His first objection was that the act was dependent on "an ignorant and prejudiced class of persons" and that too many questions arose as to the lawful possessor of many bodies. Many of these possessors were reluctant to give up these bodies to be dissected due to their own prejudice. Mr. Morrison believed that the act should have made dissection compulsory. The petition, referred to the Association for further review, basically stated that an alteration had to be effected in the act in order to preserve the practice of anatomy because it was being almost neglected due to shortages of bodies.[42] These stringent demands for a compulsory dissection provision went too far for many surgeons. It was opposed even by the editor of the *Lancet*, who had ever been unhappy with the Act and still found it a "defective measure."[43] The mere fact that such extreme measures as compulsory dissection were being suggested, however, helps to show the level of the surgeon's dissatisfaction with the act. Although most would not go that far, it is clear that the operations of the act were seen as inadequate to the needs of many surgeons.

Despite all of this obvious controversy over it, the Anatomy Act is not well known in history. The obscurity of the Anatomy Act has to do with its timing. The Reform Act was already a big issue and was passed not long after the Anatomy Act. It was thus eclipsed, from its introduction to its passage.[44] Also, by 1832, the ideas in the act were old news to the poor, who had known about them for almost four years. So the public reaction to its passage was minimal. The people who were really affected by the act were the surgeons. They were the ones who were to have benefited the most from the act's passage; but in the end they were the ones who were the most disappointed. The act did not greatly increase

the number of cadavers available to them for dissection, and the poorly defined stipulations of the act really did little to better the previous system; it just made it legal. There was a positive reaction toward the act by some surgeons. In his 1832 editorial, the editor of the *Lancet* stated that "regarding the provisions of this bill, we... differ from, we believe, the whole of our contemporaries."[45] Whether the overall reaction of the surgeons was positive or negative is not as important as the fact that there was a decidedly negative reaction by many to the act and its provisions, or lack thereof. The dissatisfied had a voice. Many of the surgeons who objected to the act, both before and after its passage, seemed to feel that it did not go far enough to solve the surgeons' problems. Although their image was improved and knowledge was increased, supply was still highly subject to fluctuation and, in many cases, was not improved.

Whether or not the Anatomy Act was a failure is in the eye of the beholder. According to many surgeons, it did fail and their practices were not greatly improved or their anxieties lessened. For the first ten years, at least, the number of cadavers for dissection was no greater than it had been under the resurrectionists; but more than half of the dissected bodies came from places, like the workhouses, stipulated under the act. Sommerville was painfully aware of the act's shortcomings[46] and perhaps he did the best he could in a poorly defined role with an act rife with loopholes. The fact that the act was altered only once in a minor way in 1871 does say something about its relative success, however, but still the surgeons were dissatisfied. Even the surgeons themselves could not agree on exactly what they thought such an act should entail. Most thought the act did not go far enough; but some, like Morrison, wanted too radical a solution. Others, like G. D. Dermott, were just dissatisfied with minor details. The dissatisfaction with the act came not only from the poor, whom it most directly affected, but also from the surgeons. This helps to show something of the nature of societal relationships in the nineteenth century. The poor, who had no say in society, could do next to nothing to stop the implementation of the act and knew that, if they died alone, they had no say over what happened to their mortal remains. The surgeons, unable to agree on the best course of action for their cause, were forced to follow a law that did little to alleviate their previous problems. Both the poor and the surgeons were at the mercy of more powerful groups sitting in Parliament who were clearly able to pass laws, despite opposition from those most directly affected. Although it was not the intent, and it received many decidedly negative reactions from different classes in society, the Anatomy Act did help to further the knowledge of anatomy, medicine, and surgery.

Notes

1 Peter C. Jupp and Clare Gittings, *Death in England: An Illustrated History* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2000), 225.
2 John Morley, *Death, Heaven and the Victorians* (London: Studio Vista, 1971), 32.
3 Ruth Richardson, *Death Dissection and the Destitute* (London: Penguin, 1988), 32-6.
4 Christine Quigley, *The Corpse: A History* (Jefferson, NC and London: McFarland and Co., Inc., 1996), 203.
5 Jupp and Gittings, 225.
6 Ibid., 225.
7 Richardson, 35-6.
8 Quigley, 293.
9 Richardson, 54.
10 Quigley, 294, 297.
11 Ibid., 293.
12 Ibid., 295-96.
13 Richardson, 194.
14 Neil Arnott, "Proofs of the Importance of Anatomy to the Practice of Medicine and Surgery," *Lancet* (1831): 668-70.
15 Neil Arnott, "History of Medicine," *Westminster Review* (1832): 78.
16 "Anatomy," *Westminster Review* (1829): 122-24
17 Ibid., 124, 136-37.
18 Ibid., 121-22.
19 "An Act for Regulating Schools of Anatomy," in *Statutes of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland* 72 (1832): 455.
20 Ibid., 456.
21 Ibid., 457.
22 Ibid., 454-59.
23 Richardson, 239.
24 Dr. James Sommerville, "Circulars," *Lancet* (1832): 716
25 Ibid., 716-17.
26 Richardson, 240-43.
27 Ibid., 245.
28 Ibid., 239.
29 Jupp and Gittings, 225.
30 Richardson, 279.
31 Ibid., 219-21.
32 "Anatomy," 140-44.
33 Richardson, 265-66.
34 "Anatomy," 141-45.
35 Sommerville, 716.
36 Richardson, 208.
37 Jupp and Gittings, 225.
38 G. D. Dermott, "Letter," *Lancet* (1832): 670.
39 Richardson, 244.
40 "Editorial," *Lancet* (1832): 537-38.
41 "Discussion on the Anatomy Act," *Lancet* (1841): 237-38.
42 Ibid., 235-36.
43 Ibid., 237.
44 Richardson, 194, 265.
45 "Editorial," 537.
46 Richardson, 240, 245, 271.

Joseph P. Keene

Robert Gould Shaw: The Man, the Myth, and the Legend

Robert Gould Shaw, a very prominent historical figure, commanded a "colored" regiment during the American Civil War, the 54th Massachusetts Volunteers. Although portrayed as a martyr after his gallant storming of Ft. Wagner, South Carolina on the night of 18 July 1863, he still possessed a racist disposition toward his soldiers early in his command of the regiment. History has whitewashed the true image of Robert Gould Shaw, characterizing him as a liberal abolitionist, who whole-heartedly fought for African-American freedoms and against social injustice directed toward them. In reality, Shaw started out as a racist individual and held little regard for the African-American struggle of this period. This type of indifference toward African Americans in this period was common both in the North and in the South. Shaw's racist attitude toward African Americans at the time was acceptable, and part of everyday life in contemporary white America, both in the North and in the South.

Contrary to images of Robert Shaw in the movie *Glory,* research shows that, while Robert Shaw was a hero, he also maintained racist ideals toward black soldiers. Only after training began and later, when they proved they could carry out orders in a search and destroy mission on Port Royal Island, South Carolina on 10 June 1863, did he begin to gain a new respect and attitude toward the 54th. On 16 July 1863, two days before the storming of Ft. Wagner, the 54th proved their bravery by saving the 10th Connecticut regiment from total devastation by the 25th South Carolina Confederate regiment. This brief skirmish would allow Colonel Shaw to gain faith in his black regiment and would lead to his decision to volunteer the 54th to lead the assault on Ft. Wagner. While Robert Gould Shaw was a visionary to many, he also perpetuated racist concepts developed from his contemporary world toward his men, the 54th regiment of Massachusetts, only discarding them towards the end of his experience with them.

Colonel Robert Gould Shaw came from a wealthy philanthropist family. According to Peter Burchard, "Robert's grandfathers, Robert Gould Shaw and Nathaniel Russell Sturgis, made millions of dollars in the West India and China importing trades of their fathers. The first Robert Shaw became Boston's wealthiest merchant operating a dry goods store, an auction and commission house, and a real estate business worth $1.5 million in 1852."[1] Born in Boston on 10 October 1837 to Blake Sturgis Shaw and Sarah Blake Sturgis Shaw, the young Robert Gould Shaw entered the

world wealthy and had the choice to enjoy life without hardship or difficulty.[2] Despite his affluence and travels, Shaw never had much contact with black people his whole life. His wealth always isolated him with only rich, white, aristocratic society.

Despite his isolation, Shaw had all the needed attributes to lead a regiment like the 54th. He tended to be an idealist, but he also realized that determined efforts to secure an idealistic end produced strife. Educated in Switzerland and at Harvard, Shaw's character was deemed as outstanding to his white peers.[3] The Shaw family's financial stability allowed him to gain rank quickly in the Union army. He served in the Army of the Potomac before his father provided the means and motive for him to receive the "colored" troops of the 54th Massachusetts regiment. A well-educated aristocrat who held the ideals of contemporary wealthy white America, he would have to face the questions of whether black Americans deserved the rights of white people, and whether or not blacks should serve as soldiers in the United States army.

According to civil war historians Eric Foner and James McPherson, racism was as prevalent in the North as it was in the South. McPherson points out that there was a strong case of Negrophobia present in the North along with racist legislation directed toward blacks, whether free or slave. The majority of the northern population, according to McPherson, held this sentiment.[4] Foner addresses the Northern Republican view toward African Americans of the time and argues that the North did not make any precise distinction between a free black person and a slave. They felt that if any white individual associated with a "Negro," it was a disgrace to the white race.[5] Northern opinion at the time upheld racism as a virtue. Even Alexis de Tocqueville commented that racial prejudice seemed to be more prevalent in the North than in the South during his tour across America.[6]

Even those who advocated freedom for African Americans displayed ambiguity. President Lincoln stated his priorities in a letter to Horace Greeley on 22 August 1862. Lincoln said, "My paramount object in this struggle is to save the Union, and is not either to save or destroy Slavery. If I could save the Union without freeing any slave, I would do it; and if I could save it by freeing all the slaves, I would do it; and if I could do it by freeing some and leaving others alone, I would also do that."[7] Although it was supposedly the Republican Party that strove for racial freedom, it possessed strong racist dispositions toward African Americans. In the 1850s many abolitionists and black leaders kept their distance from the Republican Party due to its racist ideology and bigotry.[8] Although abolitionists conveyed the idea that they wanted to help free the slaves, they held the idea that black people would never be their equals in any shape,

form, or fashion. Owen Lovejoy, a congressman from the most abolitionist district of Illinois and a brother of the abolitionist Elijah, denounced the idea of black equality. Joshua Giddings, a congressman from Ohio said, "Negroes are not the equal of white men." Benjamin Wade, another congressman from Ohio called Washington "a Nigger-ridden place."[9] These Northern sentiments influenced Robert Gould Shaw's attitudes before the Civil War.

Before Shaw commanded the 54th Massachusetts and learned that black soldiers could show bravery and valor in combat, he felt that blacks possessed subservient characteristics compared to whites, and that they would always remain inferior. Shaw felt racist comments contained humor, and he laughed and joked about African Americans for years. His cousin John told him a joke about turning "a nigger out," which probably dealt with mistreatment of an African American. In any case this cruel joke humored Shaw to the point of laughter.[10] Another letter home gives insight into Shaw's racist views and the humor he received from reading racist literature. Shaw said, "After discussing their characters, he will say 'how does anyone know whether he has enough nigger to him?' or 'are his heels long eno' for this work?' "He is very funny."[11]

Shaw's parents raised him with a strong abolitionist standpoint. Even though his parents became highly active abolitionists, Shaw did not always share their views or attributes about the question of slavery, or the rights of African Americans. He never really felt that the institution of slavery was wrong the way the abolitionists did; he never quite possessed abolitionist qualities.[12] Colonel Shaw held his attitudes toward blacks because he never had much exposure to black people. Shaw's first real contact with black people occurred when he took command of the 54th Massachusetts regiment. Shaw's attitudes toward African Americans contained racist extremes.

Shaw even displayed evidence that he did not have a concern with the issue of slavery. He only desired punishment for the South. Shaw wanted the South to pay for the crime of secession from the United States of America. If the North could avenge itself in battle against the South and then let it go with or without slavery intact, leaving the North as a separate nation, then Shaw was prepared for this type of outcome.[13] Despite his racist attitudes and his lack of concern toward ending slavery, his later image remains liberal compared to other whites of his time. Through his experiences, Shaw would learn to respect black soldiers, and he would even learn to love and trust them.

The formation of the 54th Massachusetts was due, in part, to wealthy abolitionists and philanthropists located in Boston, Massachusetts. Governor John Albion Andrew played a major role in the formation of the

regiment. He received permission from Edwin Stanton, the Secretary of War in the Lincoln administration, to raise a black regiment in January of 1863. The following letter gives insight into the permission given to Governor Andrew to form the 54th Massachusetts regiment on 26 January 1863:

> Ordered: That Governor Andrew of Massachusetts is authorized, until further orders, to raise such numbers of volunteers, companies of artillery for duty in the forts of Massachusetts and elsewhere, and such corps of infantry for the volunteer military service as he may find convenient, such volunteers to be enlisted for three years, or until sooner discharged, and may include persons of African descent, organized into special corps. He will make the usual needful requisitions on the appropriate staff bureaus and officers, for the proper transportation, organization, supplies, substinence, arms and equipment's of such volunteers.[14]

Shortly after Governor Andrew received Stanton's letter, the Governor informed Robert Shaw's father that he wanted to commission his son Colonel of the 54th Massachusetts. At the time, Shaw was Captain in the 2nd Massachusetts regiment. At first, he did not want to command the 54th regiment but eventually accepted the appointment.

Colonel Shaw and his staff officers then had the task of recruiting African-American soldiers for the regiment. The men were offered $100 bounties to serve for three years. Also, they were offered $13 a month if they served with the 54th of Massachusetts, the same pay scale of the white army soldiers of the time. Later, African Americans who joined the 54th found out they were to be paid just $10 a month, the pay scale for contraband soldiers.

After formation, the 54th reported to Camp Meigs in Readville, Massachusetts in February 1863. The regiment trained at Camp Meigs for three months. The men departed for combat in May 1863 from Boston, Massachusetts after a brief military parade in front of hundreds of Bostonians. Several prominent figures observed the 54th as it marched down the streets of Boston. These individuals included Governor Andrew, Shaw's father and other members of his family, and the great African-American abolitionist Frederick Douglass. In fact, Douglass's son fought with the 54th to prove that black soldiers possessed courage and to fight for freedom. Lewis H. Douglass served as a Sergeant Major with the regiment.

The movie *Glory,* released in 1989, chronicled Colonel Robert Gould Shaw's experiences with his African-American regiment. Although enter-

taining, the movie excludes factual information regarding Colonel Robert Shaw, as well as facts pertaining to the black troops who made up the 54th of Massachusetts. One misconception portrayed by the movie focused on Shaw's attitude toward accepting the commission as Colonel of the regiment. In the movie, he personally accepts the commission from Governor Andrew at a party in the Shaw family home in Boston, Massachusetts. In stark reality, Colonel Shaw was, at first, reluctant to take command of the 54th Massachusetts regiment due to racial prejudice. He told his father he would not take command of the 54th and wrote a letter to the governor, refusing the commission. His father tore up the letter and convinced him to take command of the unit. Also, the movie provides the viewer a free black character that is one of Colonel Shaw's best friends. The character's name is Thomas. According to the movie, the two met at Harvard. This false incident never occurred in Colonel Shaw's life.

In the movie *Glory,* Mathew Broderick, who plays Colonel Shaw, was never directed to use all the derogatory language the real Colonel used about his troops. The real Shaw showed his racist side in a letter home. Shaw wrote, "We are at home now together, he as Lieutenant Colonel of the 2nd Massachusetts Calvary, and I as nigger Colonel. For Governor Andrew has given me the command of his black regiment."[15] Colonel Shaw also downplayed the importance of the regiment's formation. He basically felt his participation with the regiment amounted to a great sham. Shaw said, "Tell him I will give him a position as chaplain if he would like to go into a good nigger concern."[16]

At first Shaw was not sure what his newly formed regiment would accomplish during combat because of perceptions about African Americans. He feared blacks perpetuated cowardice and inferior savagery that would make them run at the first taste of combat. As they began to train, the troops surprised Shaw. Shaw advised Amos A. Lawrence, "My heels are growing very fast, for I am astonished at the general intelligence these darkeys display." As time passed, Shaw's racism ebbed, and he gained greater respect for the men with whom he would fight and die.[17] As he finally realized these men deserved praise and respect, he moved to defend his men not just against military prejudices, but also against prejudices held in society at the time.

Shaw knew that if he accepted command of a colored regiment white people would despise him as a traitor to his race, no matter how much money his family possessed. Not only did Shaw have to overcome his own racial presumptions, he had to face white America's hostility and disparagement for accepting a commission to lead black troops into combat. He not only risked his reputation but also that of his family. Colonel Shaw expressed confidence in his soldiers that they would not disgrace

the Governor of Massachusetts or the white race in combat if given the chance to fight. Shaw said, "May we have an opportunity to show that you have not made a mistake in intrusting the honor of the state to a colored regiment, the first state that has sent one to the war."[18] Many whites felt that Colonel Shaw sold out his race because he provided black soldiers the opportunity to fight in combat. William James pointed out many years later, "In this new Negro-soldier venture, loneliness was certain, ridicule inevitable, failure possible, and Shaw was only twenty-five, and although he had stood among the bullets at Cedar Mountain and Antietam, he had till then been walking socially on the sunny side of life."[19] Shaw not only risked his career by leading the 54th Massachusetts, he also risked losing his life if captured in combat against the Confederacy. Jefferson Davis, president of the Confederate States of America, had issued a proclamation that any white officer who led a black regiment into combat would be cited with treason against the Confederacy and, therefore, would be hanged.[20] Despite all of the controversy and obstacles in the way of Colonel Shaw's decision to command the 54th regiment, he made the choice to lead them into the American Civil War. Although it could have damaged his career in the military, soiled his family name, and even brought a noose to his neck, Colonel Shaw chose to lead his men no matter the consequences.

Many people believe that most of the northern citizens and soldiers during the Civil War fought to protect the rights of the blacks and for the idea of crushing the institution of slavery. This assumption is false. Black troops endured racism in all aspects of society. Not only did they face racial tension from a military standpoint, but they also experienced mistreatment from Northern civilians for whom they fought. Since the war began, widespread prejudice existed in the federal ranks against the enlistment of black men. White people held the belief that African Americans would be cowardly troops.[21] The sheer reality of racism prevailed, and public opinion rose against using blacks in combat at the beginning of the war. Racial prejudice surrounded the black soldiers in every part of their army lives. When African Americans first tried to enlist, recruiters told them it was "white man's war; no blacks need apply."[22] *Glory,* in a sense, downplayed the racist attitude of the North compared to actual Northern sentiment at the time. For example, numerous white Northern troops sung the following marching song degrading the Negro soldier:

In battle's wild commotion
I won't at all object
If a nigger should stop a bullet
Coming for me direct.[23]

The image that the North promoted more liberalism toward blacks than the South became a great farce in itself.

Racism pervaded the United States, both north and south. In the southern states it went hand in hand with economics to support slavery. It gave slave owners a convenient reason for keeping their laborers in permanent bondage. Other whites, no matter how poor, liked to think that all blacks, slave or free, were less worthy than any whites. In the North most whites felt the same way about blacks. Even some abolitionists who wanted a quick end to slavery, believed blacks were not as good as whites. Restrictions, insults, and unfair treatment plagued the everyday lives of African Americans. In the north they resisted such treatment the best they could, but when they joined the army, they were not strangers to racism.[24]

Even before legislation over the use of black troops in combat went before Congress, black volunteers could sign up for the Union Army. The following quote at a congressional debate gives insight into the opinion of political leaders of the time. Mr. Saulsbury of Delaware stated, "This attempt to elevate the miserable nigger and carry on the war in this way, was never intended by the people. It would not restore the Union."[25] Fearing a backlash from the public, many deemed enlisting black troops unnecessary and too risky to have a profound effect in many Northern minds at the time.

Four basic questions arose about the worth of the black soldier. The first question concerned whether black men could fight and whether they would fight. The second asked whether the nature of black people could remain stabilized under such constraint that they would fight in accordance with the laws of civilized warfare. Another question asked whether white soldiers would become disaffected and demoralized by the enlistment of blacks to the point of countering the possible advantage of using black troops. Finally, another question asked whether white soldiers could win the war without the help of black troops.[26] Although northern sentiment for the most part remained against the enlistment of black soldiers into the Union army, President Lincoln issued a proclamation authorizing enlistments. President Lincoln declared that emancipated slaves "of suitable condition will be employed in the armed service of the United States."[27]

Citizens of the North who supported the idea of incorporating black troops into the Union army did so for several reasons. First, they argued that blacks possessed strength, robustness, and hardiness, and acclimated well to southern weather. Secondly, they held the position that black troops had more familiarity with the country in the South than the whites themselves. Some whites also felt that blacks were discontented with

their condition and would serve in the Union army for less money than white soldiers. White people in this time also felt that blacks maintained subservient and submissive characteristics, which rendered them apt to adhere to discipline. Last, supporters of enlisted black troops in the northern army used the example of the British use of black troops. They explained that the same success that was evident in the British Army could occur in the Union army.[28]

Although many Northerners felt that it was politically and morally incorrect to employ black troops in the northern army, those opinions began to change after they saw the results of enlisting black troops. After observing the gallant efforts made by the 54th Massachusetts Volunteer Regiment and the display made by the other black regiments that followed, more respect and leniency toward enlisting black soldiers in the army followed.

The 54th regiment had many adversities and stumbling blocks to overcome. Not only did they have to show no signs of cowardice as soldiers, but they also had to demonstrate as much bravery as any white regiment involved in the war. Beyond the challenge of proving themselves to society, the 54th also had the mission to prove to themselves they hungered for the challenge at hand. Most importantly, they struggled to prove to themselves and the world that they would fight like men. Although seemingly simple, this last task would prove the most difficult.

Also, the white Europeans waited to see if these "poor wretched souls" could live up to the great expectation they set out to accomplish. Soldiers of the 54th regiment wanted to prove that they were not just slaves, mere animals, or beings that saw themselves lower than an animal. They wanted to prove that they could fight and die for a just cause like any other soldiers, like any other men. Even the 54th's most ardent supporters, including its commander Robert Gould Shaw, harbored at least momentary apprehension. The black soldiers of the 54th continued to hold great confidence that they could help determine the outcome of the war.[29]

When Colonel Shaw first took command of the 54th Massachusetts regiment, he did not understand what they could accomplish. He did not expect much from blacks, even freed men. Shaw worried that his men, untried as they appeared, would flinch at combat, but Higginson assured him that black troops would respond well on the battlefield.[30] Colonel Shaw's opinions started to change toward physical and mental aspects of black troops after he watched them train at Camp Meigs, Massachusetts. As he watched them train day after day he felt that the troops had a chance to change northern opinion about allowing blacks the same

opportunity to fight in the Civil War. By late March, Shaw believed that the 54th would become "as good a regiment as any that has marched." He had not always manifested such enthusiasm. A few weeks earlier, the Colonel bemoaned the quality of the men. Shaw told his father, "They are not of the best class of nigs."[31]

The first proving ground turned out to be Camp Meigs for Colonel Shaw. The men learned to drill and train just as well as any white regiment at Camp Meigs. After their training was completed, the regiment moved to Port Royal, South Carolina in June 1863. On June 10, the 54th won new respect during their first search and destroy mission. The men carried out orders precisely and dutifully. Ordered to fulfill a job, they executed it well. Colonel Montgomery, in command of the 2nd South Carolina and 54th Colored Regiment that day, gave the order to fire Beauford and the 54th regiment fulfilled their orders. Although Colonel Shaw became upset over the outcome of the day, he still admired his troops for carrying out the orders they received. The 54th proved that day they would and could obey commands in the field.

The final phase in which the 54th gained Colonel Shaw's respect occurred during a brief skirmish between the 54th Massachusetts, the Confederate 25th South Carolina, and the 6th and 9th Georgia regiments. On 16 July 1863, Brigadier General A.H. Colquitt, in command of the Confederate troops, attacked the 54th and the 10th Connecticut regiments. The 54th took the brunt of the assault, and they even managed to help rescue the white 10th Connecticut in the process, driving the rebels back into a retreat. This became their first real test under fire, and they did not break. This action in itself built camaraderie between Colonel Shaw and his men.

Shaw realized that the 54th wanted to prove that African Americans had fighting ability. To accomplish this, he knew he would have to fight resentment and racism to keep others from changing the regiment into an armed unit of laborers. For many this would have been a difficult task, but with the political connections Shaw possessed and the 54th's high profile, Shaw found ways to get around the military's bureaucracy and lack of interest.[32]

Shaw's decision to lead them in the face of Davis's proclamation proved his willingness to give them an opportunity to prove their equality. Also, the black troops found camaraderie with Colonel Shaw because he wrote a strong opinionated letter to Governor Andrew about a pay cut directed against the 54th. Secretary of War Stanton ordered that black troops receive $10 a month instead of the $13 allotted to white soldiers. Colonel Shaw's letter stated: "In my opinion they should be mustered out of service or receive full pay which was promised them. The paymaster

here is inclined to class us with the contraband regiments, and pay the men only $10. If he does not change his mind, I shall refuse the regiment paid until I hear from you on the subject."[33] The outcome of the situation remained the same. The 54th received the $10 allotment throughout Shaw's command of the 54th.

Robert Gould Shaw eventually risked his own life to prove the bravery of black soldiers. Although not an active abolitionist, he shared their views about slavery. Shaw's main mission was to disprove the myths and stereotypes the nation held at the time about black troops being effective soldiers.[34] On the night of 18 July 1863, Colonel Robert Gould Shaw died an honorable death while storming Ft. Wagner, South Carolina, leading his black troops, the 54th Massachusetts regiment. It was a mission for which he himself volunteered his men; this action in itself earned Shaw a martyrdom status not only to his troops, but also to the people of the North.

Colonel Robert Gould Shaw developed respect and pride for his 54th regiment. He put aside his own prejudices to help black soldiers prove themselves in combat, not only to the participants in the Civil War, but also to the entire world. Shaw would not only become a legend to those of the Civil War, but most importantly, he would become a martyr saint to the men he knew as his comrades, the 54th regiment of Massachusetts. Although Colonel Robert Gould Shaw held racist perceptions ingrained in the Northern mindset, and in the United States in general, his experiences helped to reshape his ideas. He came to realize that equality for blacks would not only help the North win the war against the South, but the lesson he learned would forever give him the status of a man who changed the roles of blacks in the military. This in itself immortalized Robert Gould Shaw, not only in history books, but in a memorial dedicated to him and the 54th Massachusetts regiment located on the Boston Common.

Notes

1 Peter Burchard, *One Gallant Rush: Robert Gould Shaw and his Brave Black Regiment* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1965), 2-3.

2 Ibid., 4.

3 Stephen R. Wise, *Gate of Hell: Campaign for Charleston Harbor 1863* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1994), 48.

4 James M. McPherson, *Battle Cry Of Freedom: The Civil War Era* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988), 88.

5 Eric Foner, *Free Soil, Free Labor, Free Men: The ideology of the Republican Party before the Civil War* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995), 266.

6 Alexis de Tocqueville, *Democracy in America* (New York: Mayer and Lerner, 1966), 315.

7 Kenneth M. Stampp, *The Causes of the Civil War* (New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1965), 151.
8 Foner, 295.
9 Hugh Hawkins, *The Abolitionists: Means, Ends, and Motivations* (Massachusetts: D.C. Heath and Company, 1972), 185-6.
10 Russell Duncan, *Robert Gould Shaw: Blue-eyed Child of Fortune: The Civil War letters of Colonel Robert Gould Shaw* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1992), 290.
11 Ibid., 289-90.
12 Russell Duncan, *Where Death and Glory Meet: Colonel Robert Gould Shaw and the 54th Massachusetts Infantry* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1999), 18.
13 Idid., 17.
14 Burchard, 2.
15 Duncan, *Robert Gould Shaw, Blue-eyed Child of Fortune,* 292.
16 Ibid., 292.
17 George E. Stephens, *A Voice of Thunder: The Civil War letters of George E. Stephens* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1997), 34.
18 Luis F. Emilio, *A Brave Black Regiment: History of the 54th Regiment of Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry* (Salem: Ayer, 1990), 30.
19 Burchard, 72.
20 Ibid., 74.
21 Ibid., 73.
22 Edwin S. Redkey, *A Grand Army of Black Men: Letters from African-American Soldiers in the Union Army, 1861-1865* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 250.
23 Burchard, 73.
24 Redkey, 250.
25 Editorial, *New York Times,* 10 July 1862.
26 Editorial, *New York Times,* 11 June 1863.
27 Editorial, *New York Times,* 9 January 1863.
28 Editorial, *New York Times,* 9 January 1863.
29 George E. Stephens, *A Voice of Thunder: The Civil War letters of George E. Stephens* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1997), 223.
30 Stephen R. Wise, *Gate of Hell: Campaign for Charleston Harbor 1863* (Columbia: University South Carolina Press, 1994), 51.
31 Stephens, 34.
32 Wise, 50.
33 Luis F. Emilio, *A Brave Black Regiment: History of the 54th Regiment of Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry* (Salem: Ayer, 1990), 48.
34 Wise, 49.

John Butler

Irish-American Nationalism and the Struggle for Irish Independence

As a result of the Great Famine in Ireland in the mid-1800s, a great wave of Irish-Catholic immigrants came to America to escape starvation and the oppressive conditions under Protestant British rule. Many perished during the Atlantic crossing. Those who did survive brought with them a deep hatred of England, and for the British who they truly believed were guilty of "genocide" for "allowing" so many to die during the Great Famine. Although these immigrants faced many hardships and discrimination in America, they quickly seized on the political liberties and economic opportunities available in their new home. They sought respect and recognition as Irish-Americans through the establishment of Irish-American nationalist groups, and simultaneously strengthened their ties with their counterparts in Ireland. These groups were used to provide financial and moral support in the cause of Irish independence. This support sometimes included the advocacy and use of armed violence. It was the children of the "famine generation" who would make Irish-American nationalism such a strong force during the 1880s.[1]

The Great Famine and the resultant Irish emigration to America figured prominently in the identities of Irish-Americans and in their pursuit of Irish independence. Between 1.1 and 1.5 million persons died of starvation or famine-related disease during the Great Famine in Ireland. A potato blight destroyed the main source of food for the majority of the Irish. Contemporary witnesses were horrified at the magnitude of the suffering. Absentee landlord Nicholas Cummins reported that the cabins on his west Cork estate were inhabited by "famished and ghastly skeletons.… Their demonic yells are still wringing in my ears." A visitor to the north midlands "saw sights that will never wholly leave the eyes that beheld them, cowering wretches almost naked in the savage weather, prowling in turnip fields, and endeavoring to grub up roots… little children… their limbs fleshless… their faces bloated yet wrinkled and of a pale greenish hue,... who never, it was too plain, grow up to be men and women."[2] Those were the conditions faced by the Catholic rural peasantry at the height of the Great Famine, and contributing to the severity of the problem was the unprecedented population growth in Ireland between 1780 and 1840 that preceded the famine. English policies had all but stopped Irish trade and manufacturing (except in Ulster), and land use laws exacerbated the hunger for land. As the population grew, Irish tenant farmers had to divide and subdivide their land to provide holdings for the new

generations. One observer noted in 1822 that "every patch produces a new family, every member of a family a new patch… . Hence a country covered with beggars — a complete pauper warren."[3]

The emigration resulting from the famine may be more accurately described as a mass migration of people fleeing from a disaster to countries where they could find food to eat.[4] More than one million Irishmen and women came to America during the famine years (1846–1854) and another two million arrived between 1860 and 1900. After 1830, Irish immigrants became a significant factor in the economic and social history of the United States, and this massive influx of the Irish immigrants also significantly altered the American political landscape.[5] The Irish realized that their numbers could not be ignored by politicians. Irish-Americans dominated the Democratic party in many areas and this positive experience helped fuel the creation of Irish-American nationalist groups. These groups gave significant support to their beleaguered counterparts in Ireland.[6]

Too often overlooked, the Devotional Revolution that took place in Ireland between 1850 and 1875 also served an important role in the success of the Irish in America. The Irish diaspora and deaths due to the famine, combined with an influx in the number of Catholic priests and nuns, greatly improved the ratio of clergy to parishioners. These priests and nuns were also younger, better educated, and adhered more strictly to Church doctrine than the older and famine-weary clergy they joined in the cities and rural villages.[7] The Irish responded favorably to the infusion of attention and resources from Rome and became practicing Catholics in one generation. There are reasons for this Devotional Revolution, and those reasons go beyond the basic reforms and increased number of clergy. The trauma of the Great Famine certainly brought many into the fold in their time of need. More importantly, the Devotional Revolution allowed the Irish to maintain and forge an identity, offering them a new cultural heritage. The Devotional Revolution that facilitated unity and identity also provided better educational opportunities for the Irish. Especially after 1860, more of the Irish who emigrated to America were literate in English, and had more of the basic skills that would allow them to succeed in their new home. Many priests and nuns also emigrated to help staff the churches and parochial schools in the United States. The Irish-Catholic identity and church organization were critical to the formation of Irish-American nationalist groups in the mid- to late-1800s.[8]

The majority of Irish immigrants settled in the cities of the northeastern United States, such as New York and Boston. For the most part, the Irish were accustomed to living in close proximity to their neighbors and wanted to settle where they had friends and relatives. Moreover, the

Irish style of community-supported subsistence farming did not provide the necessary skills to become successful farmers on the individualistic American frontier. Outside the cities of the northeast, only Chicago lured a large number of Irish immigrants, along with their sons and daughters. The growth of the Irish population in Chicago was significant between 1850 and 1890. The Irish numbered more than 70,000 by 1890, and if native-born Americans with at least one Irish-born parent were counted, the total was almost 170,000. Unofficial estimates, including the third generation and beyond, place the total at roughly 215,000 persons of Irish decent. In comparison to other American cities in 1890, Chicago ranked fourth in the number of Irish-born residents.[9]

The Irish brought with them a strong sense of community that was the result of seven centuries of enduring life in Ireland where laws were handed down by the alien English whose goal was the oppression of the Irish majority. The Irish clan structure that had flourished was based on a fierce loyalty to family ties and interfamilial relationships with little regard for formal government. According to George E. Reedy, "They were adept at forming communities and engaging in alliances that could work for the common good, while disavowing formal government and the legal structure, without being crushed by the system."[10]

The Irish immigrants faced profound discrimination, fueled by a deep-seated anti-Catholicism in an American society dominated by white Anglo-Saxon Protestants. This discrimination reinforced the immigrants' sense of community, which was already a powerful aspect of their Irish-Catholic identity. In America, this concept of family and community loyalty was a major asset for the Irish-Americans in their quest for success and acceptance, and the "community" expanded to become all those who were Irish and Catholic. Irish-Americans were able to work together, and were already trained in the nuances of political warfare. Over time they put these organizational skills to good use in America by acquiring jobs, prominence in unions, and political influence that was out of proportion to simple demographics. Associations were formed that allowed them to work together toward a common goal: to further Irish-American nationalism and support a free Irish state.[11]

The complex connections between the numerous Irish-American nationalist groups that emerged during the late-nineteenth century and their ties to Ireland must be examined in order to understand the rise of Irish-American nationalist groups and their influence on Irish and American politics. These connections ultimately led to the formation of such revolutionary groups as the Fenian Brotherhood and *Clan na Gael*, which had an especially strong presence in the city of Chicago. The origins of Fenianism can be found in the Young Ireland group's failure

to win Irish independence through violence in the 1848 uprising. Young Ireland's failure and the arrests, trials, and deportations of its members led to the founding of the Fenian Brotherhood in America, and for the first time it was Irish-American nationalism that rekindled the cause of Irish independence in Ireland.[12]

The founders of the Fenian Brotherhood in America included John O'Mahoney, Michael Doheny, Oliver Byrne, and John Roche. O'Mahoney was the principal organizer and had fled Ireland after the failure of the 1848 rebellion.[13] He also gave the organization its name. The root of *Fenian* comes from the Gaelic *fianna*, who were the ancient warriors of Irish mythology. O'Mahoney envisioned the Fenians as a group of warriors cut from the same cloth who would devote their lives to Irish independence through armed insurrection. In the fall of 1857, O'Mahoney sent word to James Stephens in Ireland asking Stephens to form an organization with the same Fenian goals of Irish independence through armed violence. Stephens sent word back to O'Mahoney that he was willing to form such a secret society, with the help of financial support from the United States. On 17 March 1858, the Irish Revolutionary Brotherhood (later known as the Irish Republican Brotherhood) was established in Dublin. With O'Mahoney as director of the Fenian Brotherhood in America, the movement gained momentum and slowly spread its sphere of influence outside New York City.[14]

The American Civil War caused a general disruption of the organization of the Fenian Brotherhood, which concentrated its efforts in the North. The exemplary performance of Irish-American units in the Union army also helped to allay anti-Irish nativist sentiments, and within five years the Fenians could be found throughout the Union, and within the Union army's ranks. The group drew up a constitution and bylaws, in part to quell the Roman Catholic Church's objections that the Brotherhood was a secret, oath-bound society. According to Michael F. Funchion, "The Brotherhood emerged from the Civil War with optimism, and hoped to capitalize on the North's anti-British sentiment to gain American support for Ireland's struggle for independence."[15]

Not only were the Irish-American nationalists able to provide support to their Irish brothers, they managed to interject their issues of naturalization and the role of ethnic voting blocs into American politics.[16] Irish politicians, including those who supported the Fenian cause, understood the strength of the voting power in crowded American cities. One difference between the Irish and many other immigrant groups was that the Irish spoke English. They also understood, even as non-participants in Ireland, the representative form of government, and appreciated the significance and power of even local political offices. They viewed politics as a mecha-

nism to becoming professionals and receiving the status and economic security that went with it.[17] These enterprising Irish-Americans believed that they would not achieve true acceptance and respect in America until the "shame of Ireland's slavery" was eliminated through independence for Ireland. This sentiment can be observed in a poem written by J. J. Giltenan, M.D., entitled *Arise, Arise, Brave Men of Ireland!* that appeared in the 13 October 1883 edition of *The Citizen*, which was a weekly Irish-American newspaper published in Chicago. The first two stanzas exalt the men of Ireland to fight for their liberty (emphasis added):

Arise, arise brave men of Ireland!
Assert your rights men, free your sireland—
Destroy the brand that stamps you slaves,
Your mother's breast can yield you graves:
Too long her breast nurs'd robber crew,
Who blood, instead of milk, it drew,
'Tis better lie 'mong Brin's dead
Than hear your children cry for bread—
For bread their sires cannot supply—
Up men, gain liberty or die!

Arise, arise brave men of Ireland!
Shake the yoke oppressing sireland—
Cut off the chain your mother wears,
Cease brother's groans, dry sister's tears:
Think of your wife — of children unborn.
In being yours it meets but scorn:
If male, an exile, doomed to roam,
If female, left to weep at home;
Assert your manhood, brothers all,
Or hide behind oblivion's pall.[18]

A large difference of opinion existed among Irish-Americans about whether this independence, and thus respect, could be gained only by constitutional means, or if the use of violence was a viable option.[19] One Irish-American nationalist group that embraced the philosophy of the use of armed violence to further the cause of Irish independence was the *Clan na Gael*. The most influential of the revolutionary groups, the *Clan* was founded in New York City in 1867, and included a number of Civil War veterans. By the mid-1870s the *Clan* had eclipsed the Fenian Brotherhood as the premier Irish-American nationalist organization. Although the *Clan* was a revolutionary group, during its early years under the leadership

of Charles Stewart Parnell, it remained willing to support land reform and constitutional movements. Parnell was an Anglo-Irish landlord, who became a hero to the Irish people by championing the cause of Irish land reform, and became president of the Irish National Land League in 1879. Parnell was able to make gains in the area of land reform but was unsuccessful in the cause of Irish home rule.[20]

Although the Land Acts championed by Parnell in the mid- to late-1800s succeeded in achieving the goals of fairness of rent, fixity of land, and free sale, this was not enough to satisfy the Irish nationalist yearning for home rule. Land reform reinforced the concept of Irish nationalism, in part expressed by the freedoms enjoyed by their Irish-American brothers and sisters. Nothing short of self-representative government, universal suffrage, separation of Church and State, and the establishment of peasant proprietorship would command the support of the Irish on either side of the Atlantic. Parnell succeeded in ameliorating the landlord-tenant injustices through constitutional procedures and moral force. The Fenians believed that when the land reform movement failed to achieve the goal of home rule, armed revolt was the only other means to achieve their goal of independence from England. Fenianism looked to the United States for military assistance in the post-Civil War period, but this expectation soon faded, especially after the Fenians understood that American foreign policy did not include war with Britain. The ideological support and monies that did come from Irish-Americans were even more important in creating a nationalist mentality in Ireland.[21]

In part because of the failure of Parnell's Land League to achieve home rule for Ireland, differences among the groups widened. John Devoy, a member of the Fenians in Ireland, was imprisoned and later released on the condition of exile and in 1871 came to America where he became prominent in the *Clan na Gael*.[22] In 1878, Devoy proposed a policy known as the New Departure, which called for the Parnellites and the *Clan* to support both land reform and the use of violence in their struggle for Irish independence. Heretofore the Parnellites had resisted the use of violence, and the *Clan* had come to see constitutional agitations as diverting the nationalists from their goal of political independence. A meeting between Parnell and Devoy took place in Dublin in 1879, and afterward Devoy claimed that Parnell had agreed to the New Departure. Parnell denied agreeing to support the *Clan*'s revolutionary activities, and although tensions increased between the two groups, the *Clan* continued to lend support to the Irish National Land League. In 1880, Parnell was elected to head the Irish Parliamentary Party, and was imprisoned by the British in 1881. The *Clan* was concerned that the Parnellite movement "seemed to be falling under the control of individuals more interested in radical

land reform theories than in Irish self-government."[23]

This series of events set the stage for the *Clan* to become *the* Irish-American nationalist group dedicated to using armed violence to bring about Irish independence, and the main financiers of the Irish Republican Brotherhood in Ireland. Chicago became the center of *Clan* activity under the direction of Alexander H. Sullivan; much of the *Clan*'s power in Chicago was due to the fact that it was firmly entrenched in the city's Democratic political machine. As Democratic politicians, the *Clan* members were able to secure patronage jobs at all levels of city government, from sewer workers to judgeships. This strengthened their nationalist agenda, while at the same time enhancing their political power. Many of Chicago's Irish supported the *Clan* because large numbers of them firmly believed that their inferior status in America would improve only when Ireland was free from British oppression.[24]

A watershed event for the Irish nationalist groups on both sides of the Atlantic was the ill-conceived bombing of British Parliament on 15 March 1883 by *Clan na Gael* members. This use of terrorism drastically altered the development of organized Irish-American nationalism, and the struggle for Ireland's independence.[25] Irish-Americans did not view the fight for Irish independence as a foreign cause. Timothy J. Meagher argued that "They [Irish- Americans] thought of themselves as patriotic Americans, pursuing the basic ideals of liberty and justice that they had passionately embraced in their adopted home land."[26]

The *Clan* continued to fund and execute a series of ineffectual and sometimes aborted bombings in England, which came to be known as the Dynamite Campaign. The Irish Republican Brotherhood in Ireland had vetoed the use of terrorist attacks, fearing they would result in punitive actions against the Irish in Britain. The *Clan*, headed by Sullivan, continued to advocate violence, but refused to use armed violence without the approval of the Irish Republican Brotherhood. In 1882, however, the *Clan*'s executive committee changed its policy and decided to carry out the bombings without the Irish leaders' consent. The *Clan* considered the Irish Republican Brotherhood to be inept, and the rank-and-file *Clan* members were growing impatient with the lack of action by the Brotherhood, despite the *Clan*'s continuing supply of funds and arms to the group.[27]

The first bombing took place on 15 March 1883, at the offices of the Local Government Board in London, causing damage to the building. *The New York Times* reported that the explosion had occurred outside the building, and estimated the damage at 4,000 British pounds.[28] Also on the 15th, the *Clan* planted a bomb at *The Times* (of London) printing office, but it did not detonate. British Parliament quickly passed new legislation

restricting the use of explosives. In October 1883, the *Clan* continued its campaign by bombing the London Underground Railway, severely injuring several people and damaging trains. The bombings continued in 1884. In February, they targeted the Victoria Railway Station; they also dynamited Scotland Yard and buildings in St. James Square. In December, the *Clan* unsuccessfully attempted to bomb London Bridge. The most ambitious bombings took place on 25 January 1885, when the Tower of London, Westminster Hall, and the House of Commons were subject to the *Clan*'s terrorist acts. The bombings were halted by the *Clan* in December, a concession to Parnell's efforts in Parliament for Irish Home Rule.[29]

The bombings were given extensive coverage in such major newspapers as *The Times*, *The New York Times*, *The Chicago Tribune*, and also Chicago's weekly Irish-American Newspaper, *The Citizen*. The 20 March 1883 edition of *The Times* referred to the bombing at Westminster as an "outrage" and called for an increase in the police force. The paper reported of special precautions taken to guard the Royal Gunpowder Factory and the Royal Small Arms Factory outside of London. This paper also included a column dated 24 February 1883 written by *Clan na Gael* leader Alexander Sullivan, a driving force behind the bombings. Sullivan denied that Irishmen in America had anything to do with the bombings. He wrote of the large number of Irish living in Britain, and that it was absurd for the Irish to bomb their own people. He withheld opinion on whether the bombings were morally justifiable, and skirted the "Dynamite Policy" issue by speaking of the injustices suffered by the Irish under British rule. He maintained that Irish-American nationalists kept the cause "within the lines of fair and honorable warfare," but at the same time made a thinly-veiled threat that a few nationalists with kerosene could set London or any large English city ablaze, much like the Chicago fire did. His major defense was that it was up to the Irish, and not Irish-Americans, to decide to commit such acts that would put their own families at risk.[30]

On 17 March 1883, *The New York Times* included an editorial from *The Times* that read: "If the Irish extremists are really going to reply with dynamite to any measure they disapprove of it is certain that the day of remedial legislation is over. In Manchester, Leeds, Liverpool, and London, the feeling of the English people which was once sympathetic, has become cold. It only depends on a few more cases of dynamite outrages to turn this feeling into one of angry hostility, which the authorities will find very difficult to control." John Finerty, the publisher of *The Citizen* and Illinois Congressman-elect, also declared in the same issue, "I may say I am sorry it was not more successful. I applaud the Irish in everything they do to get rid of England and her accursed rule. England

brought this on herself, and [Prime Minister] Gladstone more than any one else, has himself to thank for it."[31] Finerty's public statement as an elected official was indicative of the strength and popularity enjoyed by Chicago's Irish-American nationalists, and their willingness to advocate armed violence in the cause of Irish independence. Finerty was obviously unconcerned with any negative ramifications that may have jeopardized his standing as an elected official.

The 5 April 1883 edition of *The New York Times* contained an editorial that approached the violence from a "social and scientific point of view." The editorial referred to the progressive and uplifting impulses of the human mind, and the advances in science, of which the Fenian and the anarchist had taken control for their evil purposes. The writer agreed with Parnellite Michael Davitt, that "even they [the Fenians] have the sense to see that the course of English reform is slow, and that they can ill afford to do anything to retard it."[32]

The bombings predictably caused a backlash among the Anglo-American community, which viewed the nationalists as subversives. Anti-Catholic sentiments, which had been softened by the patriotic service of Irish Catholics during the Civil War, reemerged. The reemerging stereotypical view of the Irish-Catholics as "papists" was exemplified by a Chicago Tribune editorial at the time that stated, "because of their loyalties to the Church, Irish-Catholics were incapable of performing their duties as United States citizens."[33] These negative reactions also tilted support back to Parnell's strategy of land reform; Chicago's Irish-Catholics established branches of the Land League, bringing Parnell's nonviolent message to a wider Chicago Irish community. The *Clan* also suffered under accusations of misuse of funds by Sullivan, and lost its former prominence and influence.[34]

The Irish immigrants in America took full advantage of the opportunities afforded them in their new home. The Irish fought to overcome prejudice and establish a reputation as hard workers, building America's railways and shipping canals. They threw off the stereotype of fanatical papists by their distinguished service in the Civil War and by the Irish police officer's sacrifices during the Haymarket riots. Through sheer numbers and an historical ability to organize, they excelled at and reveled in the American political system. They never forgot the plight of their homeland and their nationalistic ideals supported those who remained in Ireland. The radical *Clan na Gael* leaders, by carrying out their clumsy and cowardly bombing campaign, hurt the cause of Irish independence. In the eyes of the Anglo-Americans, the Dynamite Campaign brought dishonor to the Irish who loved the America that had provided them refuge, redemption, and respite from an Ireland staggering under the weight of

English domination. The indiscriminate and politically imprudent use of armed violence by the *Clan* in the early-1880s hardened British resolve, and contributed to the defeat of the Home Rule Bill of 1886. An Irish Free State was not formed until 1921, and with Northern Ireland still under British control, Ireland remains divided to this day.

Notes

1 Michael F. Funchion, *Chicago's Irish Nationalists 1881-1890* (New York: Arno Press, 1976), 67.
2 Kerby A. Miller, *Emigrants and Exiles: Ireland and the Irish Exodus to North America* (New York: Oxford Press, 1985), 284-5.
3 Thomas N. Brown, *Irish-American Nationalism 1870-1890* (Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott, 1966), 2-3.
4 George E. Reedy, *From the Ward to the White House: The Irish in American Politics* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1991), 25.
5 Funchion, *Chicago's Irish Nationalists,* 5.
6 Ibid., 20.
7 Emmet Larkin, "The Devotional Revolution in Ireland, 1850-75," *American Historical Review 77* (June 1972): 625-7.
8 Ibid., 648-52.
9 Funchion., *Chicago's Irish Nationalists,* 7- 9.
10 Reedy, 27-8.
11 Ibid., 27-8.
12 William D. Griffin, *The Irish in America 550-1972: A Chronology & Fact Book* (Dobbs Ferry, NY: Oceana Publications, 1973), 17.
13 Ibid., 17.
14 Michael F. Funchion, I*rish American Voluntary Organizations* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1983), 106-7.
15 Ibid., 107-9.
16 Ibid., 113.
17 John B. Duff., *The Irish in the United States* (Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing, 1971), 47-8.
18 *Citizen*, 13 October 1883.
19 Timothy J. Meagher, ed., *From Paddy to Studs: Irish-American Communities in the Turn of the Century Era, 1880 to 1920* (New York: Greenwood Press, 1986), 11.
20 Funchion, *Irish American Voluntary Organizations,* xv-xvi.
21 R. F. Foster, *Modern Ireland 1600-1972* (New York: Penguin Books, 1988), 390-9.
22 Ibid., 393.
23 Funchion, *Irish American Voluntary Organizations,* 76-8.
24 Meagher, 126-7.
25 Funchion, *Irish American Voluntary Organizations,* 79.
26 Meagher, 12.
27 Funchion, *Chicago's Irish Nationalists,* 82-4.
28 *New York Times*, 17 March 1883.
29 Funchion, *Chicago's Irish Nationalists,* 84.
30 *The Times*, 20 March 1883.
31 *New York Times*, 17 March 1883.
32 *New York Times*, 5 April 1883.

33 Meagher, 117.
34 Funchion, *Chicago's Irish Nationalists*, 128.

Richard Stuart

Through the Eyes of a Soldier: A Study of World War II Correspondences

In history there is very little time spent discussing the American soldiers who fought and served in various wars. Instead we study why wars came, who the major players were, and the tactics, battles, and outcomes. While these subjects should by no means be overlooked or forgotten, neither should any other essential factors that contributed to combat experiences; yet this is what happens so very often. The soldier who played an intricate part in all of these events is completely left out, except for maybe the number of wounded and killed. But who were these soldiers and what were their experiences? These are important questions, which could have significant impact on the perceptions held about the past and how we see it. I contend that the perspective of one soldier is relevant as well as invaluable, because of what it reveals about being a soldier in World War II and also what it reveals about society at that time. By studying the soldier's experiences, historians can begin to understand some of the vital aspects of who soldiers were and would become from this service.

The goal of this article is to analyze the correspondences of one World War II soldier, Raphael McDermott, and try to assemble from this information some idea of what it was like to be a soldier in World War II. This paper will deal with McDermott's basic and advanced training: the time spent stateside learning to become a soldier. From his correspondences, we can learn a variety of significant societal indicators about the time period and the people who lived in it, whether at the home front or the warfront. In discussing information retrieved from his correspondence, I hope to show what is was like for soldiers to deal with suppression of freedoms, coercion by the military, propaganda, and reactions to this new way of life. I also will identify views of the war, as well as motivation or lack of motivation for participating in the war effort.

Much of what we know about the soldiers of World War II is based on myth and false perceptions.[1] Only through studying their individual experiences can we connect them with other stories to try to develop a picture of what it was like to be a soldier in World War II. Too often in military history the focus remains on the generals and on strategies of the battles and wars. Yet in doing this historians are leaving out some of the key players in those battles. There is more to the story than a general ordering men to take a strategic hill. There were soldiers who fought and died to capture the hill. What did they do to capture this hill

and at what cost? What motivated them? These are the types of questions that help to explain every facet of the war from the ground up, so to speak. To do anything less is to condemn oneself to half-truths and to knowing only half the story. If historians were to limit themselves to studying the above-mentioned facts and nothing else, would they not be condemning themselves to knowing only some answers to a narrow range of questions?

While it is still essential to study the tactics, logistics, and leadership in World War II, it is just as essential to study the regular soldiers and their experiences. According to John Chambers, the emergence of a new military history has "already contributed to a (new) combat history emphasizing the experience of the common soldier in battle."[2] So the goal is to meld social and military history into one living, breathing collection of history. To do this, historians will need to delve into the numerous collections and memoirs of soldiers. Yet the goal is not just to recreate their words; it is to study their stories and to analyze those stories to help explain and interpret history. By studying the individuals that made up the fighting force, we can begin to understand how these units operated. And then we can compare them to see how other units' diversity or homogeneity either aided or hindered their operations.

Along this same train of thought about military unit cohesiveness, Peter Karsten argues that "military socialization is not limited to basic training or the service academies, of course. It is an ongoing, sometimes conscious, more generally unprogrammatic process inherent in the routine of barracks or shipboard life."[3] The benefits of this type of research are not limited to a single scope but many. In particular, McDermott's correspondences allows one to view many of the social interactions and events that affected him during his stint in the military. McDermott's reactions to these events also open a window into his values and beliefs, which might also reflect the popular stereotypes and sentiments of the day about topics such as gender and race. Karsten recognizes these points and calls for "a full-fledged concern with the rest of military history," everything from recruitment and training, to the war's impact on soldiers, and the connections between military and the civilian world.[4] This is an essential point to which I plan to give careful attention in this paper.

The bulk of the research was done at Southern Illinois University Carbondale. The Raphael McDermott Collection is located at Morris Library in their Special Collections division. The collection consists of correspondence between Raphael McDermott and his family, as well as some other letters to him. The collection spans McDermott's service time, from his induction into to the Army to his discharge in October 1945. A key aspect to this collection is the valuable information that it contains about McDer-

mott's experiences. McDermott's keen sense of observation, coupled with his knack for bluntness, creates the opportunity to view the past as it was happening for one soldier. When these two factors are coupled together they offer a researcher the opportunity to study various aspects of soldiers' lives and societal factors, and how these came together.

One striking example of this is exemplified by McDermott's statement "those darkies sure make good flap jacks."[5] This just begins to illustrate the kind of information provided to us by McDermott, the kind of information that brings together social factors and soldiers' lives. It is important to note that one must not try to judge him by today's standards. Instead we must look at this statement in the context of his time period. McDermott grew up in southern Illinois during the 1920s, which would expose him to these types of comments and preconceptions. This is a time period where the idea of separate but equal was still popularly embraced by many in America. This is reflected by the United States Army's stance on segregating its fighting forces and refusing to integrate them. Their justification for this was that the Army was not going to be a social laboratory.[6] Regardless of this position, the fact remained that the military was segregated.

Research from McDermott's letters reveals evidence of this segregation when he writes that all of the KP duty and cooking is done by blacks at Fort Knox.[7] McDermott again provides us with insight into America at the time when he reveals some of his stereotypes and prejudice by saying, "I bet these darkies here carry away a plenty from the mess halls."[8] McDermott was a product and reflection of American society at the time. Jim Crow was alive and well in the South and there was little dissent heard in the North from this stance except from an emerging black Civil Rights movement.[9] This type of research can yield a great expansion of the knowledge of inter-workings of American society from different perspectives. It is this type of information that McDermott provides in his collection, which allows us a glimpse into what life was like for at least one soldier in America's World War II army.

It is vital to collect from McDermott's correspondences information and to compile it, and then connect this information to the existing historical body of knowledge to create a multiple perspective history that is more diverse as well as complete. As Kohn argues in his article, "examining service in the military ought to reveal much about the American population and society and even further begin to explain the significance of that service and fix it firmly in the mosaic of American history, where it has always belonged."[10] And that is my purpose in this endeavor: to take one perspective of what it was to be a soldier in World War II and connect that to the larger framework of history.

Raphael McDermott was born on January 15, 1913 near Shawneetown, Illinois.[11] McDermott's family later moved from this farm to one by Ridgeway, Illinois, where he grew up and worked alongside his father on the family farm.[12] McDermott was a high school graduate, but never attempted any further education, even though aptitude tests that he later took in the Army showed him well above average.[13] An interesting aspect of McDermott's life that should be kept in mind is that he lived through the Great Depression.[14] This is an important aspect to remember because this would have exposed McDermott to hardships as well as to the emergence of big government. McDermott in fact does mention the WPA, although always in a derogatory way.[15] For example, McDermott drew a correlation between the structure and practices of the Army and the WPA, noting that in the Army they stand around and kill time just like in the WPA.[16] And his opinion of these two can best be typified by his observation that, "Well I'm getting fat and lazy now as this Army is getting more like the WPA every day."[17] Obviously, this raises the question how many others felt this way about these depression era programs and the Army? Only this type of research can answer that question.

McDermott, like many others about to enter the Army, was going to have new experiences different from previous experiences and in new and unfamiliar surroundings as well. Raphael McDermott was inducted into the Army on September 12, 1942.[18] He then traveled to Camp Grant near Chicago, Illinois where he received medical and aptitude tests, which were to help place him in the service branch that best suited his talents.[19] McDermott was then sent to Fort Bowie, near Brownwood, Texas, for his basic and advanced training.[20] McDermott was placed in the 745th Tank battalion, and after completing his basic training was assigned to be a truck driver; his advanced camp consisted of a truck driving school.[21] After completing this training, McDermott discovered his aptitude scores qualified him for a tank maintenance course at Fort Knox, Kentucky, which he later successfully completed.[22]

When McDermott was inducted into the military in 1942, he was taken away from everything he had ever known. Army life was for many soldiers a drastic change from what they had known to that point of their life. In Army life there are rules, regulations, and commanders who hold your very fate in their hands. McDermott was introduced to this type of life at Camp Grant, where privacy and personal space became things of the past. In the barracks the double bunks were only 18 inches apart and the latrine or restroom/shower room was open and in bad condition.[23] McDermott illustrates very well the effect these conditions had on him: "I'm just in a place where I have no freedom and never know what will happen next."[24] He even compared the mess hall and dinner to hogs eat-

ing out of a trough.[25] And he learned the disciplinary side of the Army, observing that KP duty and other forms of punishment were imposed for disobeying orders no matter how silly they were. Security was also an issue, and McDermott discussed the fences around the camp, guard dogs, and guard duty.[26] Perhaps most significant, McDermott also mentioned that most of the troops would rather be at home.[27]

The evidence revealed by this research illustrates the shock experienced by McDermott after his induction into the Army. One can only imagine that others had at least similar experiences, but only more research of this type can make this a certainty. The Army designs basic training to have this effect on the recruits, in the hopes of melding them together into one cohesive fighting unit instead of several individuals.[28] By studying these individuals we can find out if this strategy worked, how well, and what bonds were formed as well as how they held up during the duration of their experiences together.

Another important factor impacting the soldiers was the suppression of their freedoms. One example is what soldiers were allowed to say in their correspondence due to Army censorship of their letters.[29] McDermott discussed receiving a leaflet from the Army that explained the censorship of their letters. It cited specific examples of what not to write and explained that if they violated the rules, their letter would be censored or returned to them.[30] In examining his letters we discover how McDermott was educated on this censorship, and how he dealt with it.[31] McDermott again deftly illustrates this for us by rather bluntly saying: "Put up with a lot in this outfit. I have wrote this letter four times and the censors have returned it so just have to say hello and goodbye."[32] Another incident concerned the confiscation of cameras.[33] People owning cameras were forced to turn them into the quartermaster for storage or risk punishment. This clearly illustrates the loss of personal freedoms that these soldiers took for granted in their civilian life.

How do these type of security measures affect the men and their morale? Does the feeling of being trapped in a prison rather than an army camp begin to affect them and their thoughts? For some of McDermott's fellow enlisted men it did, and he noted several instances of desertion, or as he calls it, "going over the hill."[34] He mentioned one man who left on furlough and had been gone a month ("He took a real vacation"), still was not back, and then later notes the man has now been gone 35 or 40 days.[35] And in a letter from his friend Freeman, a soldier in his company, McDermott learned, "All the boys are back from over the hill and Court Martials are going good."[36] What drives a soldier to the extreme of desertion? What factors consigned them to risk imprisonment, ridicule, and disgrace? The answers to these questions can only be found in further

research into the actual experiences of these soldiers. This research will also undoubtedly raise new questions, such as how these men reacted to army life. How did the soldiers deal with this new environment and the new stresses it brought into their lives?

McDermott, for example, didn't understand why some of the men disobeyed the Army's rules and regulations. Whether they were "gold brickers,"[37] as he calls them (those who won't do any of the work) or those who disobeyed out of spite or defiance, (which could make them conscientious objectors or just lazy), McDermott's attitude toward them is one of puzzlement. Revealing a little about himself and who he is, McDermott just does what he's told, and tries to get by and make the best of it.[38] This seems to be McDermott's overall attitude about his enlistment, at least in the beginning of his training. There is a theme in his letters from this period, stated bluntly in his observation that "it is easier to do what you are supposed to do than not," and even, "That life is getting easier and I sure hope it continues that way." He also shows this by trying to stay stateside as long as possible.[39] From his letters, it is clear that McDermott has encountered the Army's rules and regulations, both written and unwritten. And even though he has doubts about that system, he decides to follow the path of least resistance. Still, his underlying fears and doubts, as well as anger, escape when he remarks, "but guess we have to take what they give us in Army and make believe we are satisfied ha!"[40]

One then begins to wonder how many other enlisted men had this somewhat half-hearted exuberance for the war: resigned to the lot that they have drawn and trying to make the best of it. While the military had designed this training to break down individuality and create cohesiveness in a unit, one must wonder if they were actually sowing the seeds of discontentment and doubt. Did the practices of the Army actually make the soldiers doubt their training as well as each other? Further study of memoirs, diaries, and correspondences might be the only way to truly discover the successes and failures of the Army and its tactics, as well as reveal a more intimate picture of Army life and the common soldier, and that soldier's responses to this new life.

McDermott also experienced and commented upon the politics of the Army. He noted one typical example: "One person tells you to do it one way another comes along and tells you to do it different that's the army."[41] His viewpoint on Army politics continues in one of his letters: "Its just like politics if a person is a good friend of the higher ups He is O.K. if not just out of luck."[42] This statement betrays the negative opinion McDermott has of politics, a cynicism supposed by many to have emerged much later in twentieth-century American society. This is an interesting

position for someone who was employed by a government agency during the Great Depression. What type of experiences or upbringing brought McDermott to this position?

Surely his experiences in the Army influenced his attitude about Army politics. For example, the red tape and bureaucracy were part of his everyday life. McDermott experienced this quite frequently, especially when working on his truck. McDermott vented some of his frustration about this red tape, with a generous helping of sarcasm, when he explained how the process worked: "You have to fill out a worksheet and have it signed by 2 or 3 guys even to get a cotter pin or washer for a truck."[43] This, in conjunction with other similar experiences, helped to cement his previous convictions. When McDermott lost a 1st sergeant to Army politics, supposedly because the barracks were not clean enough, he speculated that it was really, "Because the higher office has the authority and they have to show it once in a while that is the army."[44] After completing basic training, McDermott was sent to Fort Knox for tank maintenance school. While there, he laid careful plans for a "delay en route" furlough so that he would be able to see his family. This was a common practice and helped to make sure every man would receive a furlough. Everything was approved and the plans were set when next thing we see is that on the Friday his leave was to start it was cancelled, and he was to be on a train back to Texas by Sunday.[45] The frustration and disappointment are clear, and it is here we can see the emergence of a negative attitude towards the power structure of the Army.

McDermott voiced this sentiment quite clearly when he wrote "if all camps are run like our Battalion I don't see how they will ever win a war" and "This old Army stuff sure is a pain. I guess that is the purpose of Army to disgust the men so that they wont care if they live or die."[46] This is of distinct significance to the morale of enlisted soldiers. The uncertainty of where one stands affects how people react and perform in their tasks. "I always thought they were suppose to build up the morale of the soldiers but I think its just the opposite."[47] These are not the sort of problems one wants to be facing when going into combat.

Just how united were our armed forces during World War II? How close knit were these men who depended on each other for their lives? Did these factors play major roles in battles? Did the confidence of these men decide their fates? There is more than just strategy involved in war. These are human beings, not just soldiers, with feelings and emotions, worries and cares, some wondering why they are half way round the world and how they got there.[48] Raphael McDermott can help us to identify these factors, and in conjunction with other research possibly reveal answers to these important questions.

McDermott's view of the war is a very dim one of little hope: "[B]ut tell me what part of war isnt dangerous if one has to get in actual combat. It's all designed to kill."[49] One of McDermott's main objectives was to stay on this side as long as possible.[50] McDermott believed the war to be selfish and stated this in one of his letters: "I don't see how they ever figure to gain anything by this old war. It is only to make a few people rich at the expense of thousands of lives and discomfort of thousands of others that don't get killed."[51] I believe this reflects some of his agrarian background and the popular belief of big business and its evils.[52] He also mentions of the wasteful nature of the Army and Government: "Boy the Government sure can spend and waste the peoples money," adding that this is probably to help some of the factory owners get rich.[53] While the bombing of Pearl Harbor helped to unite the people of America for war, utterances like this raise the question of just how united they really were. Or perhaps it is an indication of something more profound. McDermott seems to be wondering aloud in one of his letters when he writes, "It looks as if the best times for this generation is past."[54]

McDermott and his reflections are very insightful and bring light to several interesting questions about American society before and during the war. Obviously, McDermott feels fairly disjointed from the war, because he believes it to not be a truly honest endeavor. While McDermott never refuses to support the war or aid its cause, it is clear that he holds some concerns about why and for what the war is being fought. And McDermott provides us with great insight into one soldier's inner struggle about the war and humanity: "It sure don't look like people in their right minds could invent so much for the destruction of human beings and property. I wouldn't want to do a wild animal like the people are doing one another in this war."[55] How many other soldiers faced these questions? And how, or did they ever, find the answers? McDermott wonders at the perseverance of other soldiers in this correspondence, "but the worry and aggravation is enough to drive one crazy. All the fellows are disgusted. Sure looks like those people that have been fighting for four years or longer would get so tired of it all that they would quit."[56] And he comes to one conclusion about humanity when he writes, "people always want to quarrel and fight so guess we will always have wars."[57]

So what did soldiers do to try to forget their current predicament? Did soldiers try to seek a degree of normalcy through social interactions, such as their letters home, the interactions between enlisted men, and their interactions with the towns around the bases? In the case of McDermott I believe there was a strong link between himself and his family. McDermott wrote on average at least two letters a week, ranging from 4 pages in length to 13 or 14 pages. In the letters there is definitely an ongoing

meaningful conversation between the correspondents. In these letters his passion for farm work comes out, as well as a sense of longing for things that are back home. In particular, there is one instance of this that captures this feeling well. "This winter sure has been a lot different than any I have ever spent," he wrote, and then reminisced about stopping by his grandfather's house and watching the butchering of the hogs and the stuffing of sausages. "Things sure have changed a lot since that time. Seems like life meant more back in those times than it does now."[58]

A running theme of McDermott's letters to his parents is his concern for them, their health, and well being; although it comes sheathed in a gloomy outlook for the future. McDermott repeatedly tells his parents "you folks take it easy and tell dad not to work too hard shucking corn and such as it may be all for nothing."[59] In a letter to his sister, McDermott wrote, "If Id known I have come to places like these I would have done different than I have. It made me feel bad to see so many people out in fields and other places working and peaceful and to think I couldnt stay way too but had be one to do such as this."[60] This persistent effort is more significant than its melancholy tone, for it reveals that he not only misses that connection but also seeks to preserve their wellbeing.

My research on the common soldier's view provides insight into the viability and necessity of this kind of research and the potential it holds for history. By looking through the perspective of one soldier, Raphael McDermott, I have uncovered some ideas of what it was like to be a soldier in World War II. By analyzing information from McDermott's letters one can make important interpretations about social and military history. It is this kind of research that can breathe a breath of life into a history that was previously just facts and dates. The perspective of a soldier brings new meaning and emotions to otherwise tedious facts and figures. Forrest Pogue stated this sentiment admirably in his forward to a collection of soldier's interviews from World War II: "I still look to participants when I want to feel the hot breath of history. Their testimony can give life to dry journals and meaning to the most constructed after action report."[61]

This brings us to a crucial point of thought about what history is and who really makes it. The answer is that people make history. They make it every day, whether they are ordinary or extraordinary. Through this type of research we find that what was once thought to be a mundane, inconsequential individual, who was considered to be of little regard, now becomes influential and an indispensable asset to history. No longer are they faceless memories, but are instead people. We see their biases, faults, as well as their inherent goodness. No longer do we just see "private first class." Instead we see Raphael McDermott, what it was like for him to be a soldier, and an idea about what it was like for others.

Notes

1 Richard Kohn, "The Social History of the American Soldier: A Review and Prospectus for Research," *The American Historical Review,* 86 (1981): 553-67.
2 John Chambers, "Conference Review Essay: The New Military History: Myth and Reality," *The Journal of Military History,* 55 (1991): 395-406.
3 Peter Karsten, "The 'New' American Military History: A Map of the Territory, Explored and Unexplored," *American Quarterly* 36 (1984): 389-418.
4 Ibid., 389.
5 Raphael McDermott to Mother, 11 May 1943, Raphael McDermott Collection, Special Collections, Morris Library, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, IL. (hereafter: McDermott Collection). All quotes are Raphael McDermott's, and have been left in the original form and language.
6 George Flynn, "Selective Service and American Blacks During World War II," *Journal of Negro History* 69 (1984): 14-25. Phillip McGuire, "Desegregation of the Armed Forces: Black Leadership, Protest and World War II," *Journal of Negro History* 68 (1983): 147-58.
7 McDermott to Mother, 13 April 1943, McDermott Collection.
8 McDermott to Mother, 7 June 1943, McDermott Collection.
9 Flynn, 14-25. McGuire, 147-58. Gregory Black Koppes, "Blacks Loyalty, and Motion Picture Propaganda in World War II," *The Journal of American History* 73 (1986):383-406. Phillip McGuire, "Judge Hastie, World War II, and Army Racism," *Journal of Negro History* 62 (1977): 351-62.
10 Kohn, 554.
11 Raphael McDermott, "Scope and Content Note," McDermott Collection. This brief overview of McDermott's life and the McDermott Collection is available in Special Collections. There is no date and there are no page numbers.
12 Ibid, n.d., n.p.
13 McDermott to Mother, 31 December 1942, McDermott Collection.
14 "Scope and Content Note," n.d., n.p.
15 McDermott's comments on the WPA are a persistent theme throughout the collection. See for example, McDermott to Mother, various dates: 19 November 1942, 27 November 1942, 17 December 1942, 5 February 1943, 28 March 1943, McDermott Collection.
16 McDermott to Mother, 27 November 1942, McDermott Collection.
17 McDermott to Mother, 14 December 1942, McDermott Collection.
18 "Scope and Content Note," n.d., n.p.
19 McDermott to Mother, 27 September 1942, McDermott Collection.
20 McDermott to Mother, 11 October 1942, McDermott Collection.
21 McDermott to Mother, 19 November 1942, McDermott Collection.
22 McDermott to Mother, 18 March 1943, McDermott Collection.
23 McDermott to Mother, 1 October 1942, McDermott Collection.
24 McDermott to Mother, 11 October 1942, McDermott Collection.
25 McDermott to Mother, 1 October 1942, McDermott Collection.
26 Raphael McDermott to Mother, 1 October 1942, McDermott Collection.
27 Raphael McDermott to Mother, 23 October 1942, McDermott Collection.
28 Karsten, 397.
29 McDermott to Mother, 9 August 1943, McDermott Collection.
30 McDermott to Mother, 9 August 1943, McDermott Collection.
31 McDermott to Mother, 9 August 1943, McDermott Collection.
32 McDermott to Mother, 25 August 1943, McDermott Collection.

33 McDermott to Mother, 19 January 1943, McDermott Collection.
34 McDermott to Mother, 8 December 1942, McDermott Collection.
35 McDermott to Mother, 25 March 1943 and 5 April 1943, McDermott Collection.
36 McDermott to Mother, 22 June 1943, McDermott Collection.
37 McDermott to Mother, 22 November 1942, McDermott Collection.
38 McDermott to Mother, 1 October 1942, McDermott Collection.
39 Quotes and additional information taken from McDermott to Mother, various dates: 8 December 1942, 27 November 1942, 18 March 1943, McDermott Collection.
40 Quotes and additional information taken from McDermott to Mother, various dates: 28 January 1943, 11 March 1943, McDermott Collection.
41 McDermott to Mother, 17 October 1942, McDermott Collection.
42 McDermott to Mother, 28 January 1943, McDermott Collection.
43 McDermott to Mother, 14 December 1942, McDermott Collection.
44 McDermott to Mother, 12 January 1943, McDermott Collection.
45 McDermott to Mother, 29 June 1943, McDermott Collection.
46 These quotations are taken from McDermott to Mother, various dates: 28 January 1943, 3 July 1943, McDermott Collection.
47 McDermott to Mother, 22 July 1943, McDermott Collection.
48 Karsten, 389.
49 McDermott to Mother, 19 November 1942, McDermott Collection. This excerpt is from a discussion about Raphael being in a tank and the relative safety it provided. His father had apparently mentioned several ways in which tanks could be destroyed. Raphael in turn retorted that he understood the dangers, but that combat "was all designed to kill".
50 McDermott to Mother, 16 March 1943, McDermott Collection.
51 McDermott to Mother, 16 March 1943, McDermott Collection.
52 Louis Galambos, "The Agrarian Image of the Large Corporation, 1879-1920: A Study in Social Accommodation," *The Journal of Economic History* 28 (1968): 341-62.
53 McDermott to Mother, 12 January 1943, McDermott Collection.
54 McDermott to Mother, 2 February 1942, McDermott Collection.
55 McDermott to Mother, 5 April 1943, McDermott Collection.
56 McDermott to Mother, 10 July 1943, McDermott Collection.
57 McDermott to Mother, 13 July 1943, McDermott Collection.
58 McDermott to Mother, 27 October 1942, McDermott Collection.
59 McDermott to Mother, 11 October 1943. McDermott's bad outlook on the future becomes a recurring theme in his letters home. See for example McDermott to Mother, various dates: 1 October 1943, 17 October 1943, 10 November 1943, 19 November 1943, 29 June 1943, 10 July 1943, McDermott Collection.
60 McDermott to Mother, 11 October 1943, McDermott Collection.
61 Forrest Pogue, Foreword to *Archives of Memory,* by Hoffman & Hoffman (Lexington, Kentucky: University Press of Kentucky 1990), xi.

Contributors

KATRINA BLASINGAME graduated Spring 2002 from Southern Illinois University Carbondale (SIUC) with a BA in Classics/History and a minor in Women's Studies. In the fall, she will begin a Master's degree in English focusing on ancient and mystical literature. Her paper was written in HIST 392 — Historical Research and Writing.

JOHN BUTLER is a senior in History with a minor in Psychology. After graduating from SIUC in December of 2002, he plans to seek employment in secondary education, and is also considering post graduate studies. His paper was written for HIST 392 — Historical Research and Writing.

JOSEPH KEENE received a BA from SIUC in Administration of Justice in 2000 and is currently a senior in History education. He will student teach in spring 2003 and graduate in May. His paper was written for HIST 392 — Historical Research and Writing.

BRODY LEISER is a senior History major. Since completing this article, he has transferred to the University of Indiana. His paper was written for HIST 392 — Historical Research and Writing.

HOLLY NEWCOMB graduated from SIUC in Spring 2002 with a BA in History. She wrote her paper for HIST 392 — Historical Research and Writing.

RICHARD STUART is a senior in History education. After graduating from SIUC in May 2003, he plans to procure a teaching position in a Southern Illinois high school. His paper was written for HIST 392 — Historical Research and Writing — and won the 2002 Edward J. O'Day Prize for best research paper by an undergraduate history major.

LORRI SWANSON will receive a second bachelor's degree in History, as well as certification to teach and a sociology endorsement this December. A recent Undergraduate Research Award supports her current project: "Teacher Education and Moral Agency." Lorri hopes to become a history teacher so she can teach about social justice issues. Her paper was written for HIST 467 — History of American Thought.

Southern
Illinois University
Carbondale