



Perspectives in History

VOL. XXI, 2005-2006

PHI ALPHA THETA
ALPHA BETA PHI CHAPTER

This publication was prepared by Northern Kentucky University and printed with state funds (KRS 57.375). Northern Kentucky University does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin, sex, disability, age, religion, marital status, sexual orientation or veteran status in training activities or employment. Educational programs or activities are set forth in accordance with Title IX, Title VI, Title VII, ADA and Section 504. For more information, please contact the Office of Associate Provost for Student Success, Lucas Administrative Center 502, Nunn Drive, Highland Heights, KY 41099, (859) 572-6388, which has been designated to coordinate the school's efforts to comply with the aforementioned regulations. 10565 5/06

Perspectives

JOURNAL OF ALPHA BETA PHI
CHAPTER OF PHI ALPHA THETA

Perspectives in History

EDITOR

Eric O. Rummel

ASSISTANT EDITORS

Alvin Bartlett III

Amanda H. Campbell

FACULTY ADVISORS

Dr. Jonathan T. Reynolds

Dr. William J. Landon

Perspectives in History is an annual scholarly publication of the Department of History and Geography. Opinions expressed by contributors do not necessarily reflect the views of the NKU Board of Regents, the faculty of the university, or the student editors of the journal. Manuscripts are welcome from students and faculty.

Send all articles, essays and reviews to:

Editor, *Perspectives in History*
Department of History and Geography
Nunn Drive
Highland Heights, KY 41099

© 2006

Contents

Perspectives in History
Vol. XXI, 2005-2006

LETTER FROM THE PRESIDENT

5 *Bethany M. Richter*

FOREWORD

9 *Eric O. Rummel*

ARTICLES

13 Patriotic Dissent: The South African Conciliation Committee's
Response in the South African War, 1899-1902
Jodie N. Mader

23 Japanese Internment
Lori McEntee

37 Reagan the Man, the Myth, the Legend: The Role Reagan Played
in Ending the Cold War
James A. Pollitt

- 45 The Albigensian Crusade: A Historiographical Essay
Eric O. Rummel
- 59 The History of Battery Hooper
Baird R. Ullrey
- 67 The Four Factors: Reasons as to Why Darwinism Has Become the
Predominant View to the Question of Origin Amidst a Society
Dominated by Christians
Stephen E. Johnson

REVIEWS

- 79 *The Corset: A Cultural History*
by *Valerie Steele*
review by Jennifer Macht
- 83 *The Struggle for Mastery: The Penguin History of Britain, 1066-1284*
by *David Carpenter*
review by Terence Anthony Fleming
- 85 *Alexander*
a film by *Oliver Stone*
review by Jeffrey Perkins

89 OFFICERS

90 MEMBERS

Letter from the President

It is with great pleasure and pride that I introduce the 21st volume of *Perspectives in History*. I want to thank those whose work is being published for their outstanding research. Thank you to the professors of the History & Geography Department for encouraging your students in their research and urging them to submit their work; however, the success of this year's journal goes to the team who put it together.

Eric Rummel, the Editor of this year's journal is someone who must be thanked above all. Eric took the responsibility of being Editor to a new height this year by bringing in more people, and creating a new routine for editing the submissions and finally deciding what work to publish. Eric, you did a wonderful job and we thank you. Assistant Editors, Alvin Bartlett and Amanda Campbell also deserve thanks.

The chapter gained another Assistant Advisor, Dr. William Landon, who humbly took on the responsibility of helping with the journal. Dr. Landon also led our field trip to the Cincinnati Art Museum in March. Thank you, Dr. Landon for always having your door open and being willing to help on all occasions. Thank you to our other Assistant Advisor Professor Bonnie May for your support and efforts to help keep the chapter running smoothly. Finally, to our Faculty Advisor, Dr. Jonathan Reynolds—even though you were on sabbatical this year, we still love you.

This has been a busy and successful year for the Alpha Beta Phi chapter of Phi Alpha Theta here at NKU. The group successfully carried on with several recently established university and community engagement projects: the Mentoring Program, the Free Read Program and the Veterans' History Project. The chapter also started a new program, "Movie Nights." With the help of Dr. Burke Miller Phi Alpha Theta members and other interested students got together one Friday a month to watch a movie and then discuss the historical

significance and the authenticity of what was portrayed in the film. In the Spring Semester, we combined forces with the new Geography club, GEOS, to expand and diversify our “Movie Nights” gatherings. Additionally, our members participated in community walks for the Breast Cancer Awareness, helped with Habitat Humanity on April 1. After Hurricane Katrina, the chapter donated all proceeds from the first bake sale to the Hurricane Relief fund and raised over \$500. Phi Alpha Theta co-sponsored the Veterans’ Day Celebration that was held on campus along with the Military History Lecture Series.

This year the Military History Lecture Series went on the road and held its first ever off-campus lecture. The lecture was held at the Tri-State War Bird Museum in Ohio After months of excellent planning by Dr. François Leroy and Prof. Bonnie May the lecture was a tremendous success. Phi Alpha Theta was able to take part in the Military History Lecture Series’ wonderful accomplishment by volunteering to set up and take down the venue’s seating, etc., directing traffic and signing in those who attended the Lecture. Over ten members drove to the museum and all of them were able to claim at least a small part of the Lecture’s success.

In October five members traveled to Frankfort, KY to attend the Kentucky Association of Teachers of History Conference where three sat on a panel with Advisor, Dr. Jonathan Reynolds to discuss the Veterans History Project. In January, the Bi-Annual Phi Alpha Theta National Convention was held in Philadelphia. Eight members of the chapter attended: Eric Rummel, Stephanie Vines, Emily Keller and Bethany Richter presented their research—each student did a wonderful job.

The Spring Semester proved to be an even busier one for the chapter. The 7th Annual Spring Share Project was another success. With over ten organizations participating, we have collected over 25,000 non-perishable food items and personal care items for four local shelters. Thanks goes out to Vice President Miranda Hamrick for her tireless efforts for making the can drive a success.

On April 14, Phi Alpha Theta participated in its fourth year of Kelly Elementary CATS Meow Project. Members of Phi Alpha Theta presented three educational programs to help fifth graders prepare for the Kentucky Standardized tests. Treasurer James Pollitt took on the responsibility for gathering volunteers. Thank you James.

There are many people to thank for their support over the last year. The faculty of the History & Geography Department has always been supportive of our efforts and we could not be as successful as we are without them. Thank you, Dr. Williams for always having a door open and for always supporting us. We were able to travel to nationals with a minimum cost to students because of your financial support. I also want to thank Jan Rachford and Amy Gillespie for all of your help throughout the year. I know sometimes you saw me or another member coming and you wanted to run. I am glad that you did not. Thank you Dr. Burke Miller for volunteering to spend one Friday night a month with Phi Alpha Theta to watch a movie; you do not know how much we enjoyed these “Nights.” Also I certainly need to thank Dr James Ramage for all of his help. Even though you retired from Phi Alpha Theta two years

ago, we still come to you for advice. Thank you for your wisdom and kindness. I want to thank Dr. Leon Boothe for his support, not just for this year, but also for all of the years he has been at NKU. Dr. Boothe will be retiring this spring and the department will miss him very much. He has always supported Phi Alpha Theta and we appreciate his kindness and generosity. Dr. Boothe we will miss you but we are so glad that you and Karen will now be able to spend more time with each other and your family.

Finally, I would like to thank the officers of Phi Alpha Theta. Thank you to Rita Thomas for stepping up to the plate and becoming Historian and creating our Scrapbook. Thank you to Emily Keller for your dedication as secretary. Thank you to Eric Rummel. You made the journal a huge success. Thank you for all the hours and effort you put into this journal. Miranda Hamrick, our Vice President, I want to thank you for being not only the Vice President, but also good friend. You worked tirelessly with me to help make Phi Alpha Theta successful and you do not know how much I appreciate it. I will always cherish our friendship. Finally, thank you to our Treasurer, and my fiancé, James Pollitt. You were our treasurer and a rock for me throughout the year. Thank you for putting up with me for the last year.

If I have forgotten anyone, I apologize. Feel free to let me know if I forgot you. Thank you to everyone again, we all love you and appreciate your support and kindness over the last year. I am sure that everyone will enjoy the essays and reviews in this year's journal. Thank you and good luck to everyone.

Bethany M. Richter
President

Foreword

It is with great trepidation that I sit down to complete my final task for this year's issue of *Perspectives in History*, the Editor's Foreword. It is not that I do not know what to say, or fear that my words may not do justice to this fine collection; rather, I feel the weight of those who have held this position before me. It is my duty to carry forward a tradition of excellence, a responsibility that I hold sacred. The standard has been set high; I only humbly hope that I may measure up to the fine editions of the past. So with due diligence to the spectres of those that came before me, I am happy to present Volume XXI of *Perspectives in History*.

Now that you, the reader, are feeling warm and fuzzy, and hopefully lulled into a false sense of security, I may be permitted to thank some very important people. You may be tempted to stop reading at this point, but I urge you: do not! The following people had a tremendous impact on this issue, on me, or both. They deserve your attention and gratitude, no matter how long winded I may be.

I must begin with the authors of the works that grace this collection. It is their talent, scholarship and dedication that we should celebrate. We received over twenty submissions this year, and were able to accept nine. The competition was fierce; each essay or review was worthy of publication. While it made my job very difficult, I am continually impressed by the caliber of students at NKU. So a hearty congratulation to Jodie Mader, Lori McEntee, James Pollitt, Baird Ullrey, and Stephen Johnson for their excellent essays and to Jennifer Macht, Drew Perkins and Terry Fleming for supplying me with outstanding and insightful reviews.

No compilation like this is ever the work of a single person. Without the hard work of my assistant editors, I would have been far more cranky and nasty than I normally am. These two individuals went above the call of duty,

and contributed far more than I could have asked of them. And believe me, I can ask a lot. Alvin Bartlett was a part of the process from the beginning, and continued to play a key role even after his graduation in December. Amanda Campbell got involved after I was forced to drop the axe on an assistant editor who went missing. She stepped up and impressed me with her insight and dedication. She has been my go-to person these last few months, never wavering and always ready to help. So thank you Alvin and Amanda, this volume's success is a tribute to you both.

I had the honor to serve as this year's Editor under what has to be Phi Alpha Theta's most hard-working and devoted President ever, Beth Richter. While our chapter's Presidents have a long history of hard work, I am not exaggerating here when I say that Beth has completely blown them all away. Selfless, diligent, committed, and resourceful are words that I use to describe her. She is always busy and yet always there to help, no matter what the task may be, or what else she is working on. It has been a pleasure and an honor to work with her. Much the same must be said of our Vice President, Miranda Hamrick. Miranda is involved in more things than I can even imagine, and yet she is always there when needed. She has made my life easier in too many ways to count. Their impending graduation is a huge loss to the chapter, because for the last two years, these women were Phi Alpha Theta. I wish them both the best of luck in the future, Beth at graduate school, and Miranda at law school. I know that you both will make us proud.

Dr. Jonathan Reynolds, our faculty advisor, has been on sabbatical for the past year, and unfortunately not around campus that much. I would like to thank him though, because he has been around for me. We did a lot of this year's work via e-mail; where when not trying to outdo each other with Monty Python quotes, we actually did manage to get some work done. I am sure I must have been a pest at times, but I appreciate the time you took to answer my questions and provide guidance to me. I am also grateful that he took the time out of his writing schedule to accompany the group to the National Phi Alpha Theta Convention in Philadelphia. Without him, our attendees would never have been introduced to the august personage of Murphy, an experience that none of those present will ever forget.

With Dr. Reynolds on sabbatical, someone needed to make sure that I was not trying to burn the building down. A new addition to the faculty, Dr. William Landon stepped up and provided reason and logic for my impetuous nature. Words cannot begin to describe what a pleasure and a privilege it has been to work with him. From the very first editorial meeting, he was very clear that I was in charge, and he was there to help. This allowed me to build up my confidence and ability, while having his experience and skill to rely on. Very sneaky of him, eh? His sage advice, meticulous preparation, and friendship have all been invaluable to me. Bill Landon is a prime example of what is right about NKU. He cares about the school, and more importantly, he cares about the students.

To Dr. François Le Roy, my advisor, my mentor and my friend: You are finally rid of me! No more will you turn the corner and find me lurking near your office. Under your expert tutelage, I have not only reached my goals,

but also exceeded them. I will miss our conversations in your office. You have been an inspiration to me and I am forever in your debt. NKU is extremely fortunate to have a professor and person of your caliber. I cannot thank you enough for all that you have done for me. *Merci beaucoup!*

Phi Alpha Theta is fortunate to have the unswerving support of Dr. Jeffrey Williams, Chair of the History and Geography department. Without Dr. Williams' generosity, this journal would not be possible. Ms. Janice Rachford and Ms. Amy Gillespie are godsend. I am pretty sure that they know everything, and they have been very kind and helpful to what I am sure must have been many, many annoying questions from an Editor that shall remain nameless. I would also like to mention Dr. James Ramage, who helped me pull this all together. In his many years as Phi Alpha Theta advisor Dr. Ramage oversaw many award-winning journals and his help at critical points will be forever appreciated.

After forty-one years in higher education, Dr. Leon Boothe is retiring. It is, I am sure, a bittersweet moment for him, but it is a real loss for NKU. A skilled and dedicated educator, as well as a keen administrator, he has directly influenced the education and development of countless young men and women over the years. Dr. Boothe will be sorely missed, but his presence will always be felt at NKU. As we used to say in the Navy, "fair winds and following seas" Dr. Boothe. I want to wish you the very best in your retirement.

Last, but not least, I would like to thank my beautiful wife Amy. Amy suffered more than anyone else during the whole process, and managed not to kill me. I do believe that this bodes well for the future, as graduate school in the United Kingdom looms ahead in the autumn. Thank you, *mein Schatz*, I love you.

If you, gentle reader, are still with me, I commend your doggedness and dedication. But I will delay you no further, simply turn the page and begin your journey. Please join me in congratulating these authors on their exceptional work. I trust you will find, just as I do, that this compendium is a first-rate contribution to historiography.

Eric O. Rummel
Editor



Perspectives

Patriotic Dissent: The South African Conciliation Committee's Response in the South African War, 1899-1902

Jodie N. Mader

Today we are living in an age of war and debates about loyalty, patriotism, and race have emerged as important topics of discussion. Indeed, an essential question is whether or not one can be considered a patriot and yet be against the war in which one's country is involved. This was a challenging question particularly for some groups in Britain during the South African War (also known as the Anglo-Boer War), 1899-1902. In the South African War, an anti-war movement in Britain came out publicly against their country's war with the two independent Boer republics, the Orange Free State and the Transvaal (also known as the South African Republic). The Boers, or Afrikaners as many called them, were a mixture French, Dutch, and German descent. Many of them had lived there since the 1600s, when they had migrated from Europe because of religious persecution as well as a desire for political freedoms.



Right Honourable Cecil John Rhodes. Image courtesy of the War Museum, Bloemfontein.



General Right Honourable Viscount Kitchener. Image courtesy of the War Museum, Bloemfontein.

The anti-war activists in Britain criticized their government's stated reasons for being involved in this war in southern Africa even though it was the Boers who first declared war. These so-called "Pro-Boers" challenged the British government's claim of fighting for the cause of the Uitlanders, the British subjects (both financiers and expatriate workers) living in the Boer territories who were not afforded political rights by the Boer government. Likewise, they believed that officials in the British Colonial Office wanted to assert political and military authority over the Orange Free State and the Transvaal despite their repeated public denials.

The Boer republics, by contrast, wanted to maintain their independence, which they had earned in a previous war with the British in 1881. In the years leading up to the South African War, the Boers were increasingly distrustful of the British, as evidenced by the failed Jameson Raid of 1895. This raid was an attempt by British Uitlanders and capitalists living in the Transvaal to overthrow the Boer government in order to exert greater control over the diamond and gold mines—free from Boer interference. Furthermore, the Boers disagreed with the British and their insistence that they recognize the Uitlanders politically in their territories. The Afrikaner states thus declared war on 11 October 1899 to stop Britain from potentially encroaching on their territory and interfering in their affairs. This war lasted for three years and both sides suffered numerous setbacks and casualties. In the end, the Boers surrendered in May 1902 after running out of supplies and manpower, losing their homes, and enduring losses of thousands of loved ones in refugee camps set up by the British.¹

Most anti-war activists (known collectively as "Pro-Boers" by their enemies) who protested this war did not contest the importance or indeed the necessity of the British Empire.² Instead, they argued that Britain had subverted the imperial mission by fighting against two white, Protestant, and already politically independent states in Africa. These individuals who criticized the motives behind Britain's war with the Boers in Africa came from varied political and social backgrounds. The composition of the Pro-Boers ranged from Liberal politicians,³ such as David Lloyd George, to socialists, women's groups, suffragists, trade unionists, Quakers, and Irish nationalists. They worked through a variety of anti-war groups: domestic organizations that established themselves either before or during the war such as the South African Conciliation Committee, the Transvaal Committee, the Manchester Transvaal Peace Committee, and the Stop-the-War Committee; Irish organizations such as the Irish Transvaal Committee; religious peace societies such as the Quakers; socialist organizations such as the Fabians; women's groups such as the South African Women and Children's Distress Fund and the Women's Liberal Federation; and other peace organizations such as the International Arbitration and Peace Association and International Arbitration League. This article will focus on how the Pro-Boers contested this war and yet expressed their support of the empire by exploring the language of patriotism of one of the main Pro-Boer organizations, the South African Conciliation Committee (SACC) through an examination of their literature (mainly leaflets and pamphlets) published during the war.

Many of those who publicly protested against Britain's war endured harsh criticism and even violence. The anti-war activists were thus not only protesting the war, but also defending themselves and their reputation from accusations of non-patriotism or treason. Nevertheless, Pro-Boer men and women pushed their anti-war agenda through many avenues to reach the British public, the government, and audiences overseas. Indeed, the Pro-Boers contested Britain's war through publications, newspapers, public speeches, meetings, and petitions, insisting on the futility of a war with another white population for control of a territory so far from Britain. Between 1899 and 1902, thousands of their pamphlets and leaflets were widely circulated.⁴ While most circulated in London, others reached the provincial areas, such as Manchester and Liverpool.

The Pro-Boer movement had an uphill battle in its opposition to this war. The late nineteenth century witnessed what historian G.R. Searle has called the "apogee of imperialism," when the British Empire was reaching its height and competing with other nations, such as Germany and France, for land in Africa and Asia.⁵ Likewise, political leaders worked to galvanize support from all classes for the British Empire at the end of the century, for patriotism became linked "with conservatism, militarism, royalism, and racism."⁶ A key aspect of these developments was jingoism, which was "the transmission of notions of Imperialism, of military valour, through the music-hall and the popular newspaper..." to a broad popular audience.⁷ This was an extremely powerful element of British imperialism. Indeed, the relief of the city of Mafeking in the South African War by British Colonel Robert Baden-Powell in May 1900 ignited a flurry of jingoistic behavior in the streets of England that was seen by some as proof of widespread empire-worship. Beyond this jingoism, the Pro-Boers had to contend with various pro-empire and pro-war groups, such as the Imperial South African Association and the South African League, which attacked the anti-war activists and insisted on the necessity of this war for the prestige and grandeur of the British Empire.

Thus, one of the central issues for the Pro-Boers was patriotism. The Pro-Boers had to show they were both imperialists and patriots, but at the same time criticize this war being waged to expand the empire. One of the most prolific Pro-Boer organizations, the South African Conciliation Committee, faced this particular dilemma. The SACC, this article argues, struggled to convey an alternative and coherent patriotic discourse against the prevailing sentiments of jingoism and imperialism. As they challenged the war, their vision of patriotism was fuzzy, ill defined, and at times contradictory.

The South African Conciliation Committee (SACC) was first established a month after fighting began in November 1899. The membership of the organization included a number of prominent people: the Positivist thinker Frederic Harrison and members of Parliament Leonard Courtney, Lord Hobhouse, and Sir William Harcourt. There was also a very lively female membership that incorporated the wives of the men who were SACC members as well as single women, such as Emily Hobhouse.⁸ By the middle of 1900, the SACC had over 1000 members (both men and women), 729 associates, 30 branches in various counties, and over 20 women's branches of the SACC within the

London area.⁹ Though the SACC was a minority in Britain, its movement was widespread throughout Britain. To get their message out, this organization often collaborated with other anti-war committees. The publications (many in pamphlet form) of the SACC were aimed at the middle to upper classes as well as the working classes. Much of their literature contained reprints from articles in the daily presses and from parliamentary speeches. Their objective was to “spread truthful information respecting the conditions of South Africa, [and] the causes and necessary consequences of war.”¹⁰ By 31 March of 1900, the SACC claimed that it had sent out a total of 390,000 pamphlets and leaflets.¹¹

From its inception, the South African Conciliation Committee’s literature emphasized their high patriotism and concern to protect Britain’s reputation. In “The Capitalists in Command of the Transvaal,” the SACC asserted that “the British name... [was] at stake” if this war continued.¹² They pointed out that Britain could lose its prestige as a superpower in the eyes of other leading foreign countries, such as the United States, if it continued to fight an already politically independent Boer nation for control of southern Africa. Similarly, in another pamphlet, the organization maintained, “they prefer[ed] the name of a just, peaceful, and righteous England to that of an Empire scrambling for half a centeful and interest of cosmopolitan gamblers and speculative companies in search of bigger dividends and high premiums.”¹³

Indeed, the SACC targeted the “cosmopolitan gamblers and speculative companies” in southern Africa for inciting war feeling and jingoism for their own personal and economic gain.¹⁴ The SACC posited that the capitalists “are making cent. per cent. out of the richest gold mines in the world...Their object is to get rid of the Transvaal government...in order that they [have] freedom” to hire cheap labor and obtain favorable tax conditions.¹⁵ The SACC often cited the failed Jameson Raid of 1895 as evidence of this goal by capitalists to take control of Boer territories. British officials had links to the instigators of this failed raid, most notably Cecil Rhodes, who was a diamond mine owner in southern Africa and Prime Minister of the British-held Cape Colony.¹⁶ The South African Committee in Britain, which investigated the affair, did little to punish the guilty and this in turn led to more anger and distrust on the part of Boers. The SACC believed the Boers were justified in their suspicions and thus had understandable reasons for taking arms against the British.

Likewise, the SACC strongly opposed the policies of Colonial Secretary Joseph Chamberlain and the High Commissioner of southern Africa, Alfred Milner. They believed that Chamberlain and Milner were wrongly provoking the war to annex the Boer states. The SACC portrayed Chamberlain as one who had wanted war with the Boers since 1896 and Milner as a man who lacked “moderation, prudence, and patience.”¹⁷ The SACC claimed that Milner’s diplomacy hurt the country and created “serious consequences to the Empire and so fatal to South Africa.”¹⁸ Lord Kitchener also became a target for his establishment of martial law in the Cape and for his “barbarous methods of warfare,” such as the burning of Boer farms and the corralling of Boer noncombatants, most notably women and children, into the refugee camps.¹⁹ The SACC specifically reminded British generals to uphold the honor

and valor that defined them in past wars. The SACC believed, from published reports in the press and by those returning from Africa, that the British military was breaking the rules of war by engaging in reckless and illegal conduct. This included the burning of farms and the seizure of all livestock of noncombatant Boers, mostly women and children.²⁰ This leaflet encouraged British commanders and soldiers to uphold Britain's prestige and reputation by treating noncombatants with dignity and restraint despite the difficulties they faced in southern Africa, such as the guerilla warfare tactics of the Boers as well as problems discerning who was a combatant or noncombatant.

Along with showing what was wrong with this war, the SACC offered their own patriotic alternative. The organization emphasized its desire to end the war and to "establish goodwill between the British and Dutch races in South Africa."²¹ As the committee name suggests, the SACC wanted conciliation with the Boer republics. In particular, this anti-war group wanted to create a fraternal bond between England and the Boers, based on their common European ancestry, Protestantism, and whiteness. Leonard Courtney stated in a pamphlet that England needed to make Boer men "brothers" and "not enemies."²² Many pamphlets capitalized on this theme by portraying the Boers as similar to the British in that they were patriots, Christian, and civilized.²³ One pamphlet noted that the Boers were "animated by a deep and somewhat stern religious sentiment... [as well as] unconquerable love of freedom and liberty." This piece of SACC literature further added, "Are not these qualities which commend themselves to men of English race? Are these not virtues which we are proud to believe form the best characteristics of the English people?"²⁴ It appeared the SACC organization was positing that the conflict was really a civil war between similar peoples than between two opposing races—and thus should end. They were keen to show that the Boers were not the Asians or Africans that the British had fought for empire in the past.

Interestingly, the South African Conciliation Committee's concern about the English people did not extend to the native races—the majority of Africans living in or around the Boer territories. While there were a few passages in some of the SACC publications noting that the "kaffirs"²⁵ could be better treated by the Boers as well as by the capitalists using them for their labor in the mines, there is little concern for their plight or situation. The SACC was not concerned about the Africans' lack of political rights or the fact that many Boers still held Africans as slaves and defended that controversial right in an age of anti-slavery/abolition movements. A few SACC pamphlets warned those reading their publication about potential native African uprisings if the war is not over soon—clearly revealing a fear of both African nationalist sentiments and their desire for political inclusion in Boer and British territories in southern Africa. Another SACC pamphlet emphasized that it was important to keep careful watch over Africans, as they were savage and barbarous by nature. They cautioned that African revolts could harm the white inhabitants if it was not checked.²⁶ These perceptions of the Africans by SACC were not unusual, as almost all European nations as well as the United States harbored some sort of racist sentiment and notions of racial inferiority against those of different color.

The SACC went on to promote their plan that, “no method of settlement can bring about a permanent peace in South Africa which does not give the Transvaal and Orange Free State the right to live as independent states under their own flag.”²⁷ The SACC called for total independence and rejected the possibility of another annexation of the Boer states, similar to the one of 1877 by which Britain had assumed control of the Transvaal. (The Boers later challenged this annexation in the first Anglo-Boer War of 1880-81 in which the Transvaal Boers regained their independence). The anti-war activists warned that there would be “fatal consequences” if the Boer republics were made into crown colonies, such as they were between 1877-1881.²⁸ The SACC continually insisted that “the doctrine of paramountcy on which the English based their right to intervene in the internal affairs of the Transvaal,” was wrong and “jeopardized” the independence of both republics.²⁹

The South African Conciliation Committee’s arguments, however, were hindered by contradictions in its own literature. While much of this anti-war organization’s literature called for complete and total Boer independence, some of it transmitted a very different and indeed an imperial plan for the Boer republics. Here was a patriotic vision that reinforced Britain’s superiority and presence in southern Africa, particularly in Boer territory. In pamphlet Number 56, for instance, the SACC called for “qualified independence” (but not annexation) of the Boer republics in Africa.³⁰ Specifically, this pamphlet and others emphasized that it wanted to close Boer forts, reduce their armaments, and in general reduce the state’s power as an independent republic.³¹ It added, noting their country’s superiority, “England could afford to lose South Africa, but South Africa could not afford to lose England and all that England means to us.”³² This contrasted sharply with other SACC publications that emphasized total independence for the Boers and absolute freedom from British intervention.

Moreover, the SACC was not always uniform on how they perceived the Boers and their relationship to England. On one hand, the SACC went to great lengths to show how Britons and Boers were similar to each other, thus making the Boers appear less as an enemy and more as an ally. The Boers were portrayed as civilized, Christian, and lovers of freedom and liberty like the British in much of the anti-war literature. On the other hand, however, the SACC simultaneously admitted that these two nations were fundamentally different and pointed out that the Boers were essentially unassimilable. The way of life of the Boers and Britons clearly differed, for the “Boers live on the land and by the land in South Africa, in contra-distinction to the British, the vast majority who live in the towns.”³³ Another pamphlet added, “they are not soldiers... [for they are] mostly peasants and farmers...not the kind of people you would expect to find possession of a great army and anxious to found an empire.”³⁴ With these perceived differences noted, some SACC publications speculated on how Britain’s intervention would be received, as one pamphlet acknowledged that the Boers would resist any form of subjugation.³⁵ Another SACC leaflet added that the Boers would not win the war, but would rather fight until the end than simply surrender to the British.³⁶ Many other pamphlets also hinted that any form of control of the Boers would be

nearly impossible and could result in a future rebellion. Thus, a contradictory message was thus being transmitted. The SACC wanted to make a claim that the Boers were like Britons and conciliation was possible, but at the same time, they were forced to admit that the Boers were fiercely independent and would resist any form of intervention by the British. These contrasting visions weakened their anti-war position.

Furthermore, the SACC seemed to be in agreement with the British government about its reason for pursuing the war to secure political rights for foreigners, particularly the Uitlanders. Before the war, the British government had made pleas to the Boers to make political concessions to the large Uitlander population, mostly British, in their territories.³⁷ In May 1899, before the war, Alfred Milner and the president of the Transvaal, Paul Kruger, met in Bloemfontein, South Africa to discuss the franchise issue of Uitlanders—this meeting failed as well as other negotiations on this matter leading up to the war. One of the SACC pamphlets insisted that the Boers needed to be “subject to the fair enfranchisement of all citizens.”³⁸ The SACC wanted the Boers to adopt political reforms, particularly those for all white men within those territories. While they never specifically pointed to the plight of the Uitlanders in their literature, perhaps in order to avoid any potential association with the government and its pursuit of war, the implications of such statements were obvious. The SACC wanted British subjects, particularly Uitlanders, to have political freedoms in Boer territories. Therefore, the SACC was tacitly supporting one of the reasons why Britain was at war with the Boers and revealing their desire to stay involved in the internal affairs of the Boer republics.

In conclusion, it is clear that the SACC struggled but largely failed to articulate an alternative patriotic discourse as a means of countering the prevailing imperial and jingoistic mood of the *fin-de-siècle* period. The anti-war movement indeed faced a strong pro-war and pro-empire movement in England that they had to counter in their literature. What this anti-war group offered in their discourse was at times vague, shifting, and contradictory. While the SACC tried to reach out to Boer supporters in England by offering conciliation, an understanding of brotherhood, and independence, it still retained the British ideals of superiority and imperialism. While never explicitly stating as much, the SACC perceived the Boer republics as part of the British Empire, for according to them the Boers needed Britain’s supervision and advice on political matters. Overall, as this paper has shown, the SACC waffled in their anti-war position in a myriad of ways, revealing their uneasiness as a minority group contesting this war and reflecting their inability to produce a coherent alternative patriotic vision.

ENDNOTES

1. Most historians assert that around 27,000 Boer noncombatants died in refugee camps set up by the British during the war. Some at the time referred to them as concentration camps. Many of the victims were Boer women and children. Peter Warwick, *Black People and the South African War, 1899-1902* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 1.
2. See Stephen Koss, *The Anatomy of an Anti-War Movement: The Pro-Boers* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1973), Arthur Davey, *The British Pro-Boers, 1877-1902* (Cape Town: Tafelberg, 1978), and Richard Price, *An Imperial War and the British Working Class: Working-Class Attitudes and Reactions to the Boer War 1899-1902* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1972).
3. The South African War was particularly a divisive issue for an already split Liberal Party that had parted ways over Irish Home Rule. Liberal MPs such as Leonard Courtney, David Lloyd George, and Henry Campbell Bannerman were against the war, while Liberal Imperialists, led by Lord Rosebery, supported the war.
4. See John S. Galbraith, "The Pamphlet Campaign on the Boer War," *The Journal of Modern History*, 24 (June 1952), 112.
5. G.R. Searle, *A New England? Peace and War, 1886-1918* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004), 2.
6. Hugh Cunningham, "The Language of Patriotism," in *Patriotism: The Making and Unmaking of British National Identity*, edited by Raphael Samuel (New York: Routledge, 1989), 78.
7. J.H. Grainger, *Patriotisms: Britain, 1900-1939* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1986), 148.
8. Emily Hobhouse made a name for herself during the war because of her visits to the refugee camps set up by the British for Boer women and children whose homes were burned or confiscated during the war. She was partly funded by the SACC in her travels to Africa. When she returned to London she publicized her reports in the press and they caused a sensation because of the many sick and dying women and children in these refugee camps.
9. Davey, *The British*, 80.
10. SACC, Second Annual Report to Bristol Branch, 3.
11. SACC, "Minutes of General Committee Meeting at Westminster Palace Hotel," 5 April 1900.
12. SACC, Number 63, "The Capitalists in Command of the Transvaal," 8.
13. SACC, Number 21, "The Boer Republics: A Lecture Delivered Under the Auspices of the South African Conciliation Committee."
14. SACC, "Bradford Branch: What Are We Fighting For? High Dividends: Cheap Labour," and SACC, Number 14, "How the Press Was Worked Before the War," By J.A. Hobson.
15. SACC, "What Are We Fighting For? High Dividends: Cheap Labour."
16. After the Jameson Raid, Rhodes was forced to resign as Prime Minister of the Cape Colony.

17. SACC, Number 1, "The South African Crisis. A Plain Statement of Facts," by Percy A. Molteno.
18. SACC, Number 31, "Sir Alfred Milner As A Negotiator"
19. SACC, "Mr. Leonard Courtney's Speech to the Liverpool Branch," 10 June 1902.
20. SACC, Number 76, "Field-Marshal Sir Neville Chamberlain on the Conduct of War,"
21. SACC, Number 7, Letter to Prospective Members, by Frederic Mackarness.
22. SACC, "Speech to Holmfirth Division, Liberal Association at Penistone," By S.C. Cronwright-Schreiner, 21 April 1900.
23. SACC, Number 10, "The Boers, The White Flag, and the Wounded."
24. SACC, Number 3, "The War in South Africa: Some Authoritative Sketches on the Boers By Distinguished Gentlemen," 5.
25. The word "kaffir" is today seen as a derogatory word to denote the native Africans, but Britain and other European countries used this term at the time. This reflects the strong racism of the late nineteenth century among all countries involved in empire-building.
26. SACC, Number 69, "The Petition to Parliament of the Delegates from the Cape Colony."
27. SACC, Number 17, "Reconstruction in South Africa," by F.C. Selous.
28. SACC, Number 9, "Extract of a Letter From Mr. Courtney, MP, 28 November 1899", and SACC, Number 69, "The Petition to Parliament of the Delegates from the Cape Colony."
29. SACC, Number 13, "Was there a Dutch Conspiracy Against British Rule in South Africa, or is it a Nightmare?"
30. SACC, Number 56, "A Historic Speech Against Annexation, by the Honorable John X. Merriman, Leader of the Opposition in the Cape Parliament," 3.
31. SACC, Number 56, "A Historic Speech Against Annexation, by the Honorable John X. Merriman, Leader of the Opposition in the Cape Parliament," 17.
32. *Ibid.*, 16.
33. SACC, Number 4, "The War in South Africa: Letter Contributed to the 'Times'", by FC Selous.
34. SACC, Number 26, "Sir Robert Reid on the Merits of the War: A Speech Delivered in the House of Commons, 31 January 1900."
35. SACC, Number 37, "A Petition in Favor of Peace by the Ministerial Party at the Cape."
36. SACC, Number 15, "The Committee's Manifesto: As Issued to the Public Press on 15 January 1900." SACC, Number 2, "The Crisis in South Africa. Some Answers (From Authoritative Sources) to Sir Alfred Milner's Reflections Upon Colonial Loyalty."
37. Many historians have calculated that the Uitlander population was around three quarters of the white population in the Boers territories. Others have said they were around half. See Thomas Pakenham, *The Boer War* (New York: Avon Books, 1970), xiv.
38. SACC, Number 45, "An Appeal Against the Suppression of Free Government in the Republics," 18 May 1900.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Cunningham, Hugh. "The Language of Patriotism" in *Patriotism: The Making and Unmaking of British National Identity*. Edited by Raphael Samuel. New York: Routledge, 1989.
- Davey, Arthur. *The British Pro-Boers, 1877-1902*. Cape Town: Tafelberg Publishers, 1978.
- Galbraith, John S. "The Pamphlet Campaign on the Boer War," *The Journal of Modern History*. 24 (June 1952): 111-126.
- Grainger, J.H. *Patriotisms: Britain, 1900-1939*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1986.
- Koss, Stephen. *The Anatomy of an Anti-War Movement: The Pro-Boers*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1973.
- Pakenham, Thomas. *The Boer War*. New York: Avon Books, 1979.
- Price, Richard. *An Imperial War and the British Working Class: Working-Class Attitudes and Reactions to the Boer War 1899-1902*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1972.
- Searle, G.R. *A New England? Peace and War, 1886-1918*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- South African Conciliation Committee. Pamphlets. John Burns Collection (Senate House Library, University of London) and John Johnson Collection (Bodleian Library, Oxford University).
- Warwick, Peter. *Black People and the South African War, 1899-1902*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.



Perspectives

Japanese Internment

Lori McEntee

Settlement of the United States has taken many forms since the beginning of its development. White Europeans came mostly from England and settled along the East Coast. These early settlers were the ancestors of those who would later write the Constitution. At the time the Constitution was written, the United States occupied only a small portion of the North American Continent. Except for the Africans brought in as slave labor, and the Native Americans who were being pushed out of the way, there existed no other race of people to compete with the white Europeans. Their shared background in religion and traditions, coupled with the ease with which they were able to subjugate the slaves and natives, led to a feeling of white superiority and a belief that their place, at the top of society, was ordained by God's divine providence. Serious competition from another race of people was not considered as migration west was taking place. As these white settlers met with Asian immigrants, their conditioned opinions of superiority, and a growing fear of competition, created feelings of anger and hostility toward Asians in general and later toward the Japanese in particular. Later these deep-rooted anti-Asian sentiments and subsequent discrimination would be a major factor in the mass internment of many Japanese-Americans after the attack at Pearl Harbor in December 1941.

In an effort to refill the pool of cheap labor left vacant by the ending of slavery, those in the West found a source in the Chinese who came from the impoverished peasantry in China in response to the California Gold Rush of 1848.¹ Because of Chinese laws, forbidding women to leave China, those arriving in California were there to acquire some wealth and then return home. However, by 1852, an estimated six to eight thousand Chinese men were residing in California.²

It did not take long for resentment of the Chinese to develop among the white populace. The marked differences of the Chinese, in their religion to the shape of their eyes, gave fuel to those who feared the competition of this hard working group. Anti-Chinese sentiments had resulted in legislation that had already been presented to bar additional immigration. However, this

legislation was not passed and a *New York Times* article, “News of the Day,” published on February 8, 1859 stated that the Supreme Court “pronounced unconstitutional the law prohibiting Chinese immigration.”³ Although anti-Chinese sentiments were growing, especially among the working class that was competing with them for jobs, many saw Chinese immigrants as important laborers, and recruited them en masse. In 1864, the Central Pacific Railroad Company recruited thousands to work on the transcontinental railroad.⁴ Despite the effort of some to encourage Chinese immigration, the Anti-Chinese Party was successful in enacting many laws that discriminated against the Chinese. For example, one law levied a tax on Chinese miners who were allowed to work mines only when the white owners had abandoned them. Another law prohibited the Chinese from testifying against whites in a court of law. By 1882, the Anti-Chinese Party had realized their goal with the Chinese Exclusion Act that barred any further immigration by the Chinese and denied citizenship to those already residing in the United States.⁵

In an effort to replace cheap labor to fill the void of the barred Chinese, labor contractors recruited Japanese first to Hawaii to work the sugar plantations and then, eventually, to the mainland’s West Coast. The first Japanese immigrants arrived in Hawaii in 1868. Of the 149 Japanese who arrived in Honolulu, 141 were men and eight were women and children.⁶ Although the Japanese were paid wages, poor living conditions in company housing in addition to strict punishments such as fines and whippings caused many Japanese to break their three- to five-year labor contracts. Punishments were given for offenses such as talking, smoking or pausing to stretch. Those who escaped to the mainland did so despite the possibility of imprisonment. Initial conditions were so poor that Japan refused to allow any more Japanese to leave for Hawaii until the Hawaiian government agreed to protect Japanese laborers. It was not until 1885 that Japan re-opened its ports to allow emigration to Hawaii.⁷

Although protective measures were agreed upon by the Hawaiian government, conditions did not improve much. Many of the same restrictions remained, and the immigrants’ lives were so rigidly controlled by the plantation owners that few ventured beyond the plantation on which they lived.⁸ The resulting segregation gave rise to “mini Japanese villages” within the plantations.⁹ As Japanese migration moved to the mainland the organization of mini-villages continued. This self-imposed segregation allowed the Japanese to become self-sustaining through communities whose services and businesses catered to those within the community. Although not accepted by their white counterparts, the Japanese organizations worked very hard at presenting themselves as “good and loyal citizens.”¹⁰ They accomplished this by adopting American dress and, in many cases, even converting to Protestantism.¹¹

Despite their efforts to be loyal Americans, the Japanese were, from the beginning, the focus of discrimination. Their physical similarities to the Chinese, and their willingness to accept low wages, caused them to inherit the anti-Chinese sentiments that had been brewing for decades. Like the Chinese, the Japanese were considered “ineligible to citizenship” based on the Act of

1790, which stated that “any alien, being a ‘free white person’ who shall have resided within the limits and under the jurisdiction of the United States for a term of two years, may be admitted to become a citizen thereof.”¹²

Anti-Japanese feelings quickly incited public action. In May 1892, the first anti-Japanese movement began in San Francisco.¹³ Although San Francisco’s Japanese population was small (590 in 1890), the large, settled Chinese population (25,833 in 1890), which had long been the focus of anti-Asian sentiments, caused San Franciscans to be at the forefront of the anti-Japanese movement.¹⁴ Even Hawaii, whose recruitment efforts started the immigration of the Japanese, tried to restrict emigrants from Japan, allowing them to enter Hawaii only if they had provable employment and fifty dollars.¹⁵ As the Japanese population swelled between 1900 and 1924, bringing in an additional 100,000 immigrants, hatred and fear continued to escalate.¹⁶ The general opinion of the Japanese is illustrated in an interview by E.C. Leffingwell with the mayor of San Francisco, Eugene E. Schmitz, in March 1900:

The Japanese are far more dangerous to us than the Chinese,...It is my firm belief that an exclusion act, even more stringent than the present one [Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882], should be passed in the matter of the Japanese immigrants. To one who has given the matter constant and careful attention, it is at once apparent that the Japs are to be feared more than the Chinese, primarily because of the cheapness of their labor. We may say that the Japanese is enlightened, and, this being true, his education prompts him to adopt American ways, and thus, with his cheap labor, dig at the foundation upon which rests the welfare of our people. Where a Chinese will work upon a farm at starvation wages, a Japanese has the ability to acquire the property itself. The Chinese are dangerous enough, but the Japanese would drive all competition out of business. It is the stern duty of the American citizen, and particularly of those of us upon this western coast, to scrutinize this evil and then suppress it with appropriate legislation.¹⁷

As the Japanese population increased and those already there continued to improve their situation by acquiring land or businesses, violence against them and public pressure to enact legislation for exclusion increased. In response to this pressure, Japan agreed in 1900 to stop issuing passports to laborers who wished to enter the United States. However, this did not stem the tide of Japanese immigration. They sailed from Japan to Canada, Mexico, or Hawaii—countries excluded from Japan’s agreement—and then entered the United States through those borders.¹⁸ In May 1905, San Francisco formed the Asiatic Exclusion League in an attempt to organize its efforts against all Asian people. In the same month, the San Francisco Board of Education declared a unanimous decision that they intended to support the separation of schools by removing “Mongolians” from the “promiscuous association” with white students.¹⁹

In an effort to remain on good terms with Japan and to counter Russia’s

influence in the Far East, President Roosevelt persuaded the Mayor and Board of Education in San Francisco to reverse their decision on segregated schools. In return Japan agreed to continue denying emigration to laborers who wished to come to America, and would accept the United States' right to refuse entry or force deportation of Japanese holding passports for other countries.²⁰ This Gentlemen's Agreement of 1907, however, did not stop the Japanese from entering the country because President Theodore Roosevelt agreed not to bar entry of family members of laborers who were already in residence, nor would entry be refused to laborers who had already worked in America and wished to return.

However, the Gentlemen's Agreement was not the solution that the Anti-Japanese groups sought. The year 1906 saw violence, boycotts, and propaganda aimed at creating fear and distrust against these Asian immigrants. The Asiatic Exclusion League organized a boycott of Japanese owned "American Food" restaurants in October. In December, a letter to the editor of the *New York Times*, from 'One who knows Japan', shows how deep mistrust was turning into hysteria:

Six thousand young men are now at Yokohama [sic] ready to sail for Honolulu.... are [they] not in reality soldiers without uniform in the disguise of "laboring men"? It would be a great advantage to Japan, in case she has the idea of war with the United States floating somewhere in her bonnet, to have on the ground at the time of outbreak trained soldiers of the Mikado in Hawaii ready to meet Japanese battleships and cruisers when she thinks it opportune to seize those islands....²¹

In response to this growing tension, the President issued an executive order stopping migration of the Japanese from Hawaii and Mexico. Nevertheless, even these measures did not go far enough for many. California continued to be the guiding force with its anti-Asian policies. In 1909, a bill, which required that aliens purchasing land must be able to become citizens within five years or forfeit their property, was presented to the State Assembly.²² This bill was rejected, but the disappointment was temporary for the anti-Asianists. In 1913, an Alien Land Law formally barred aliens 'ineligible to citizenship' from owning agricultural property. Although this law made it difficult for the Japanese to retain control of their property, there were loopholes that allowed them to place the deeds in the names of their native-born children. To tighten the law further, a new Alien Land Law was issued in 1920.²³ Fearing that Japanese families would leave California to settle in areas with fewer restrictions, states such as Texas, Arizona, Washington and Oregon enacted their own Alien Land Laws by 1923.²⁴

Despite the hardships created by the restrictive measures placed upon them—including the Immigration Act of 1924 which essentially barred legal entry of any more Japanese into the United States—they were able to settle down and start families.²⁵ Instead of resenting anti-Japanese sentiments, most were loyal to their new home and tried to show it through patriotic acts.

Yoshiko Uchida described her father's pride in his adopted homeland:

My father cherished copies of the Declaration of Independence, the Bill of Rights, and the Constitution of the United States, and on national holidays he hung with great pride an enormous American flag on our front porch, even though at the time, this country declared the first generation Japanese immigrants to be "aliens ineligible for citizenship."²⁶

By 1940, there were 127,000 Japanese living in the United States. Of these 37% were Issei, or first generation, those born in Japan; and 63% were Nisei, or second generation, who were born in the United States and, as such, were American citizens. Of this population of Japanese, 90% were living along the west coast.²⁷ The Nisei, because of the Gentlemen's Agreement that allowed Asian children to attend school with white children, became Americanized. Yoshiko Uchida reflected:

In spite of the complete blending of Japanese qualities and values into our lives, neither my sister nor I, as children, ever considered ourselves anything other than Americans. At school we saluted the American flag and learned to become good citizens. All our teachers were white, as were many of our friends. Everything we read was in English, which was, of course, our native tongue.²⁸

Despite the assimilation of the Nisei, they could not gain acceptance by the general public and, even if college educated, were forced to take low paying jobs working as servants for the white middle and upper classes, or for Japanese businesses which could not pay as much as businesses owned by whites.²⁹

Tension with Japan continued to escalate from the late 1920s through the 1930s. Internal pressures in Japan such as an economic crisis and a militarily controlled government contributed to the growing distaste Japan felt for the discriminatory acts against those of Japanese ancestry in the United States, which culminated with the Exclusion Act of 1924. This Act created bitter tension between the two nations. When the United States and Britain implemented an oil embargo against Japan in response to their joining the Axis powers, many speculated about what Japan's next move would be.³⁰

The Federal Government, in an attempt to assess the possible dangers to the United States from those of Japanese ancestry, commissioned Curtis B. Munson, Special Representative to the State Department, to evaluate America's Japanese population. In the Munson Report issued in October and November of 1941, he stated:

the aim of this report is that all Japanese Nationals in the continental United States and property owned and operated by them within the country be immediately placed under absolute Federal control. The aim of this will be to squeeze control from the hands of the Japanese Nationals into the hands of the loyal Nisei who are American citi-

zens... It is the aim that the Nisei should police themselves, and as a result police their parents.³¹

Although he stated the aim of the commission, he reported that there was very little threat to national security by the continued presence of Japanese on the West Coast. In fact, he says of the Issei, whose majority was 55 to 65 years of age; they were loyal and would become citizens if allowed and would be willing to give up their religion and ancestors. The only real tie to Japan was generally a romantic nostalgia. The Nisei were considered even less dangerous. He believed they were 90-98% loyal to the United States. They willingly enlisted in the Army and saw themselves as American in every way. Munson also warned that any negative action against them could turn their patriotism to disloyalty. The only sub-group of Japanese that he had any reservations about was the Kibei. These were second generation Japanese who received part or all of their education in Japan. Within this group, he was only slightly concerned about the ones who received all of their education in Japan. Of the ones whose early education was in the United States, he said their time in Japan caused them to be Americans that are more loyal because they were treated like foreigners by the Japanese in Japan. Munson also believed the Japanese were no threat because their physical appearance made them easily recognizable, thus eliminating the threat to guarded facilities.³²

On the day before the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor, it was reported in the *New York Times* that out of an estimated 2,000 Japanese nationals in the New York area, 100 had returned to Japan and 132 more had requested to return to Japan. This migration back to Japan was prompted by yet another governmental action against them. President Franklin Delano Roosevelt had ordered the bank accounts of most foreigners to be frozen. While this affected other ethnic groups, it was clearly focused on the Japanese nationals in an attempt to block funds from returning to Japan during the time leading to the US entry into World War II.³³

Even before “the day that will live in infamy,” internment of Japanese was being considered. In August 1941, John Dingell, House Representative from Michigan, sent a letter to FDR suggesting the incarceration of 10,000 Japanese Americans to ensure “good behavior” on the part of Japan.³⁴ On November 12, 1941, fifteen Japanese American executives and community leaders were picked up by FBI raids. They were released only after they declared their loyalty to the US.³⁵ Despite these and similar acts, First Lady Eleanor Roosevelt issued a statement (four days before the attack on Pearl Harbor) under the official sanction of the State Department and the Department of Justice, assuring Japanese residents and other non-citizens not to worry about being deported or interred if they had a “good record,” meaning no criminal or anti-American record.³⁶ Even as thousands of Japanese, German, and Italian nationals were being rounded up for detention and questioning, Attorney General Francis Biddle was quoted in a *New York Times* article, “At no time...will the government engage in wholesale condemnation of any alien group.”³⁷ In addition, in another article he said, “a comparatively small number would be taken into custody.”³⁸

Japanese-American reaction to the attack on Pearl Harbor was a mixture of shock, patriotic fervor, and concern for how they would be treated by the government. Many Issei were worried about being viewed as loyal to Japan, so they destroyed many treasured items that might tie them to Japan. Many Nisei considered joining the Army. Charles Kikuchi, a student at Berkeley, recorded his reaction to the news that Pearl Harbor was bombed by Japan: "We are at war!...the Japs bombed Hawaii and the entire fleet has been sunk. I just can't believe it....we will all be called into the Army right away....I will go and fight even if I think I am a coward and I don't believe in wars but this time it has to be." Despite his resolve to fight for his country if called upon, he could not help but be worried about U.S. reaction to the resident Japanese as he wrote on December 8, 1941, "I am afraid that there will be violence and it is a hell of a mess. I should have confidence in the democratic procedures, but I'm worried that we might take a page from Hitler's methods and do something drastic towards the Issei."³⁹

When the President declared war on Japan, the opportunity that the anti-Japanese had been waiting for presented itself. The view that now was the time, to pass legislation resolve the Japanese problem, was expressed in a barrage of letters to Congressmen and leading politicians. In a letter to Attorney General Francis Biddle, a Los Angeles resident wrote, "No Jap should be permitted to remain in America....no such opportunity as now exists may ever again be presented to us, in all our future history, to ship them back to Japan...."⁴⁰ O.L. Scott, a leading official with the Grower-Shipper Vegetable Association, expressed his view on the subject to Congressman John Z. Anderson:

If it were not for the "white-skinned Japs" in this country there wouldn't be any Japanese question. What can you suggest that I do and thousands of Californians be led to do, that may make it possible to get rid of all Japs, sending them back to Japan either before or after the war is won. I am convinced that if it is not done or at least the action completed before the war is over, it will be impossible to get rid of them....The Japanese cannot be assimilated as the white race [and] we must do everything we can to stop them now as we have a golden opportunity now and may never have it again.⁴¹

Public pressure won out over Munson's report and the President issued Executive Order 9066, which gave the Secretary of War the power to declare military zones and remove any person at his discretion. Although the order does not specifically name Japanese residents, it was well known that they were the intended target. In an effort to justify the round up of Japanese American citizens, the Senate Report 1496 on June 18, 1942, titled "Custody of Japanese Residing in the United States," argued that Japanese Law stated that any person born to a father who was a Japanese citizen, that person, regardless of where born, would also be a Japanese citizen until formally renouncing Japanese citizenship and acquiring a foreign nationality. Since all Issei were ineligible to become citizens of the United States, it followed, that according to the Japanese Law, none of their children could be U.S. citizens

either, and therefore those children were not protected by the Constitution.⁴²

The first action taken by General John L. DeWitt as the commander of the evacuation was to declare Military Zones along the West Coast. Initially, General DeWitt encouraged Japanese residents in these areas to leave voluntarily for locations farther inland. Unfortunately, most had no relatives or friends outside their community and had little choice but to stay put. As it became apparent that over 100,000 Japanese residents remained, DeWitt began to implement an evacuation under the supervision of Army personnel. During the spring of 1942, one area after another was issued Civilian Exclusion Orders that directed the Japanese to prepare for evacuation. In most cases, these individuals were only given a matter of days to arrange for their personal property. Since they were allowed to bring only what they could carry, it left many in a vulnerable position. Dealers swept in and carted off family heirlooms for next to nothing. They knew the Japanese had few choices and would offer them ridiculously low prices that they could not refuse. It was either sell it for what you could get or leave it behind and get nothing for it.

Once their property was disposed of, they were transported to hastily prepared assembly centers. Many of these centers were originally fairgrounds and racetracks. Families were forced to live in the animal stalls and, in most cases; the stalls had not been properly cleaned and still smelled of manure. Conditions were dreadful; hundreds of people became sick from food poorly prepared in unsanitary kitchens.

The stay in these assembly centers was temporary. By June of 1942, residents were moved to one of the ten permanent relocation centers that were run by the War Relocation Authority (WRA). Despite assurances from DeWitt that they would be "allowed to lead their lives with a minimum of restraint," where they were to be relocated, all relocation centers were surrounded by barbed wire fences and manned by armed guards.⁴³ At the height of internment, close to 120,000 people of Japanese ancestry were held in relocation centers.⁴⁴ The population included Japanese nationals and American-born Japanese of all ages.

Individuals of Japanese ancestry were not the only ones interned during U.S. involvement in World War II. Italians and Germans were also interned, sometimes in the same relocation centers as the Japanese. The number of Germans interned reached 11,000.⁴⁵ The official number of Italians who were detained was put at 264 in a report of the U.S. Commission on Wartime Relocation,⁴⁶ but other sources put the total anywhere from 250 to more than 1,500. However, Italian and German internment was on a much smaller scale than Japanese internment. According to the 1940 census, there were 126,947 Japanese or Japanese-Americans living in America. German and Italian populations were 1,237,772 and 1,623,580 respectively. Japanese, having the smallest resident population, had the largest internment population, almost 95%. German and Italian internment was less than 1% of their population and was almost exclusively nationals or prisoners of war.⁴⁷

Although the Japanese made up the majority of the internment population, they were not free from discrimination. Nurses and doctors who were hired to work in the internment camps were mostly white and their work at the

camp was voluntary and well paid. To meet the health needs of such a large population, the camps could not rely only on white workers alone, and, out of necessity, employed Nisei doctors and nurses, but at a much lower wage. An example of the wage differences came from Velma Kessel, a white RN who worked at Heart Mountain Relocation Center. She was paid \$150.00 per month, while her Nisei counter part was paid \$20.00 per month.⁴⁸ Although the Nisei were needed to fill the demand for workers, they could not hold supervisory positions. Camp administration and authority remained in white hands.

In a few of the internment camps, Japanese were confined with German and Italian prisoners. In these camps, the Germans and Italians received preferential treatment, such as eating first or washing first. During the period just before evacuation when the curfew was imposed on all enemy aliens, Japanese residents could not gain exemptions from the curfew. If a Japanese person was employed in a night job, they were forced to give up their job because of the curfew. But, German and Italian enemy aliens were encouraged to seek exemptions. These exemptions allowed the Germans and Italians to go about their business with few restrictions.

Discrimination inside the camps was also created between the Issei and the Nisei. This form of discrimination was promoted through camp rules that denied Issei the right to be elected to camp government or leadership roles in camp organizations. Camp administration encouraged Nisei to spy on their elders and placed the Nisei in a guardianship role over the Issei. The switching of power disrupted the traditional patriarchal system that the Japanese family had lived by. Older men, who had been strong community leaders and heads of families, were placed in submissive roles to their children.

The evidence points to discrimination as the major factor in the decision of the United States Government to place over 100,000 Japanese residents in internment camps during World War II. Anti-Japanese fervor had been building since the Japanese began immigrating to the mainland and replaced the Chinese as cheap labor, then becoming a major competitor with the white working class for available jobs. As the Japanese population increased, so too did tensions with the whites. A series of anti-Japanese laws that had been passed did not go far enough for many and the war with Japan created the perfect opportunity to gain popular support for wholesale discriminatory legislation. Public pressure pushed the President to issue an executive order to allow the mass internment of mostly American Citizens. Although it was stated that the decision for internment was for national security, many reports prior to the attack and after the attack on Pearl Harbor acknowledged that Japanese residents were no threat to national security.

Over 100,000 Japanese and Japanese-Americans were held in detention camps. At the onset of evacuations, it was assured that each person would receive a hearing to determine their loyalty. Nevertheless, once they were placed behind bars, it was easy to delay the hearing indefinitely.

Almost as soon as the war was over and the relocation camps were closed, many began to express regret that such an injustice had occurred. However, it took over 20 years for any formal recognition of wrongdoing. This came

first with the repeal of Executive Order 9066 in 1970. Then in 1980, the Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians determined that Japanese residents were victims of discrimination by the Federal Government. Lastly, in 1988, President Ronald Regan signed the Civil Liberties Act which formally apologized to the Japanese internees and offered \$20,000 in reparations to internees still living.

ENDNOTES

1. "Chinese Historical Society of Southern California: Time Line," <http://www.chssc.org/timeline.html> (accessed July 15, 2004)
2. "The Chinese in California," *New York Times*, July 29, 1852, 2: *Proquest Historical Newspapers*<http://proxy1.nku.edu:2133/pqdweb?index=1&did=000000087837998&SrchMode=1&sid=3&Fmt=10&VInst=PROD&VType=PQD&RQT=309&VName=HNP&TS=1090099069&clientId=42585> (accessed July 18, 2004).
3. "News of the Day," *New York Times*, February 8, 1859, 4: *Proquest Historical Newspaper*,<http://proxy1.nku.edu:2133/pqdweb?index=11&did=000000078884567&SrchMode=1&sid=3&Fmt=10&VInst=PROD&VType=PQD&RQT=309&VName=HNP&TS=1090100346&clientId=42585> (accessed July 18, 2004).
4. "Chinese Historical Society: Time Line"
5. "Chinese Historical Society: Time Line"
6. Brian Niiya, ed., *Japanese American History: An A to Z Reference from 1868 to the Present*, s.v. "Introduction" (New York: Facts on File, Inc., 1993), 1.
7. Dennis M. Ogawa and Glen Grant, "The Japanese in Hawaii'i," <http://www.hawaiiiguide.com/origins/japan.htm>, (accessed July 19, 2004).
8. The Library of Congress/American Memory, "Immigration: Japanese – Hawaii: Life in a Plantation Society," <http://memory.loc.gov/learn/features/immig/japanese2.html>, (accessed July 19, 2004).
9. David Levinson and Melvin Ember, *American Immigrant Cultures: Builders of a Nation*, s.v. "Japanese" vol. 1 (New York: Simon & Schuster Macmillian, 1997), 496.
10. Levinson, *American Immigrant Cultures*, 498.
11. Stephen S. Fugita and Marilyn Fernandez, "Religion and Japanese Americans' Views of Their World War II Incarceration," *Journal of Asian American Studies* 5.2 (2002): 115: *Muse*, http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/journal_of_asian_american_studies/v005/5.2fugita.html, (accessed July 8, 2004).
12. Niiya, *Japanese American History*, 25.
13. Niiya, *Japanese American History*, 31.
14. University of Virginia Library, "Census Data for the Year 1890", <http://fisher.lib.virginia.edu/cgi-local/censusbin/census/cen.pl> (accessed July 14, 2004)
15. Niiya, *Japanese American History*, 31.
16. The Library of Congress/American Memory, "Japanese", <http://memory.loc.gov/learn/features/immig/japanese3.html> (accessed July 14, 2004)
17. The Library of Congress, "San Francisco's Mayor Wants Exclusion Act to Bar the Japs", [http://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/r?ammem/rbpe:@field\(DOCID+@lit\(rbpe0020220a\)\)](http://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/r?ammem/rbpe:@field(DOCID+@lit(rbpe0020220a))) (accessed July 14, 2004).
18. Houghton Mifflin, "The Reader's Companion to American History: Gentlemen's Agreement," http://college.hmco.com/history/readerscomp/rcah/html/ah_035600_gentlemensag.htm, (accessed July 19, 2004)
19. "Schools to Bar Mongolians: San Francisco Board Urges Plan for Separate Instruction," *New York Times*, May 8, 1905, 10: *ProQuest Historical Newspapers*,

<http://proxy1.nku.edu:2133/pqdweb?index=5&did=000000101413195&srchMode=1&tsid=1&fmt=10&VInst=PROD&VType=PQD&RQT=309&VName=HNP&TS=1090350564&clientId=42585>, (accessed July 20, 2004).

20. Houghton Mifflin, "Gentlemen's Agreement," (accessed July 19, 2004).
21. "Japanese in Hawaii: Is There a Deep Design Behind Organized Immigration?" Letter to the Editor, *New York Times*, December 16, 1906, 6: *ProQuest Historical Newspapers* (accessed July 19, 2004).
22. Niiya, *Japanese American History*, 39.
23. Levinson, *American Immigrant Cultures*, 496.
24. Niiya, *Japanese American History*, 44.
25. Levinson, *American Immigrant Cultures*, 498.
26. Yoshiko Uchida, *Desert Exile: The Uprooting of a Japanese American Family* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1982), 6. Quoted in: Bryan J. Grapes, ed., *Japanese American Internment Camps* (San Diego: Greenhaven Press, Inc. 2001), 14.,
27. Dorothy Swaine Thomas, Charles Kikuchi, and James Sakoda, *The Salvage* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1952), 3.
28. Uchida, *Desert Exile*, 36,40. Quoted in: Grapes, *Japanese American Internment Camps* 15.
29. Levinson, "*American Immigrant Cultures*," 498.
30. "Japanese History: Militarism and World War II," <http://www.japan-guide.com/e/e2129.html>, (accessed July 21, 2004).
31. Michi Weglyn, *Years of Infamy* (New York: Morrow Quill Paperbacks, 1976) 33-35. <http://www.geocities.com/Athens/8420/generations.html>, (accessed July 21, 2004).
32. Weglyn, <http://www.geocities.com/Athens/8420/generations.html>, (accessed July 21, 2004).
33. "Japan Institute Here is Closing," *New York Times*, December 6, 1941, 1. *ProQuest Historical Newspapers*, <http://proxy1.nku.edu:2133/pqdweb?index=4&did=000000104311208&srchMode=1&tsid=2&fmt=10&VInst=PROD&VType=PQD&RQT=309&VName=HNP&TS=1090451786&clientId=42585> (accessed June 29, 2004)
34. Niiya, "*Japanese American History*," 53.
35. Niiya, "*Japanese American History*," 53.
36. "No Seizure is Due for 'Good' Aliens," *New York Times*, December 4, 1941, 27. *ProQuest Historical Newspapers*, <http://proxy1.nku.edu:2133/pqdweb?index=4&did=000000087695635&srchMode=1&tsid=6&fmt=10&VInst=PROD&VType=PQD&RQT=309&VName=HNP&TS=1090452883&clientId=42585>, (accessed June 29, 2004).
37. Robert F. Whitney, "Only 2,971 Enemy Aliens are Held," *New York Times*, January 4, 1942, sec E, p. 8. *ProQuest Historical Newspapers*, <http://proxy1.nku.edu:2133/pqdweb?index=0&did=000000085504277&srchMode=1&tsid=8&fmt=10&VInst=PROD&VType=PQD&RQT=309&VName=HNP&TS=1090457149&clientId=42585>, (accessed June 29, 2004).
38. Thomas J. Hamilton, "Japanese Seizure Ordered by Biddle," *New York Times*, December 8, 1941, 1. *ProQuest Historical Newspapers*, <http://proxy1.nku.edu:2133/>

pqdweb?index=0&tid=000000105167931&SrchMode=1&tsid=6&Fmt=10&VInst=PRO
D&VType=PQD&RQT=309&VName=HNP&TS=1090457019&clientId=42585, (accessed
June 29, 2004).

39. John Modell, ed. The Kikuchi Diary: Chronicle from an American Concentration Camp (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1973), 42-42.

40. J.R. Carter to Biddle, December 13, 1941. Quoted in: Morton Grodzins, Americans Betrayed: Politics and the Japanese Evacuation (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1974) 21.

41. O.L.Scott to Anderson, May 12, 1942. Quoted in: Grodzins, Americans Betrayed 20.

42. U.S. Congress Senate Committee Report. "Custody of Japanese Residing in the United States", no. 1496. 77th Congress, 2nd session, June 18, 1942.

43. "Assurances Given Aliens: 'Restraint will be Kept to a Minimum'," *The San Francisco News*, March 7, 1942, <http://www.sfmuseum.org/hist8/intern3.html>, (accessed July 3, 2004).

44. "Assurances Given Aliens: 'Restraint will be Kept to a Minimum'," *The San Francisco News*, March 7, 1942, <http://www.sfmuseum.org/hist8/intern3.html>, (accessed July 3, 2004).

45. Karen E. Ebel, *Traces: we bring History to Life!: German-American Internees in the United States during WWII: Introduction*, <http://www.traces.org/germaninternees.html>, (accessed July 13, 2004).

46. "Una Storia Segreta:Aftermath," <http://hcom.csumb.edu/segreta/aftermath.html>, (accessed July 13,2004)

47. US Census 1940.

48. Susan L. Smith, "Women Health Workers and the Color Line in the Japanese American 'Relocation Centers' of World War II," *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* 73.4, pg: 586-591.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- "Chinese Historical Society of Southern California: Time Line," <http://www.chssc.org/timeline.html> (accessed July 15, 2004)
- Ebel, Karen E., *Traces: we bring History to Life!: German-American Internees in United States during WWII*, <http://www.traces.org/germaninternees.html>. (accessed July 13, 2004.)
- Fugita, Stephen S., and Fernandez, Marilyn, "Religion and Japanese Americans' Views of Their World War II Incarceration." *Journal of Asian American Studies* 5.2 (2002): 115: *Muse*, http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/journal_of_asian_american_studies/v005/5.2fugita.html, (accessed July 8, 2004).
- Grapes, Bryan J. ed, *Japanese American Internment Camps*, San Diego: Greenhaven Press, Inc., 2001.
- Grodzins, Morton, *Americans Betrayed: Politics and the Japanese Evacuation*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1974.
- Japanese American National Museum, "Mass Incarceration Fact sheet for America's Concentration Camps: Remembering the Japanese American Experience," <http://www.janm.org/nrc/accmass.php>, (accessed March 3, 2006).
- "Japanese History: Militarism and World War II," <http://www.japan-guide.com/e/e2129.html>, (accessed July 21, 2004).
- Levinson, David, and Ember, Melvin, *American Immigrant Cultures: Builders of a Nation*, New York: Simon & Schuster Macmillian, 1997.
- Modell, John, ed, *The Kikuchi Diary: Chronicle from and American Concentration Camp*, Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1973. *New York Times*, 1852 - 1942
- Nijja, Brian, ed. *Japanese American History: An A to Z Reference from 1868 to the Present*, New York: Facts on File, Inc. 1993.
- Smith, Susan L., "Women Health Workers and the Color Line in the Japanese American 'Relocation Centers' of World War II", *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* 73.4
- The Library of Congress/American Memory, <http://memory.loc.gov/learn/features/im-mig/japanese2.html>, (accessed July 19, 2004).
- "The Reader's Companion to American History: Gentlemen's Agreement," Houghton Mifflin, http://college.hmco.com/history/readerscomp/rcrah/html/ah_035600_gentlemensag.htm, (accessed July 19, 2004).
- Thomas, Dorothy Swaine, and Kikuchi, Charles, and Sakoda, James, *The Salvage*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1952.
- Ogawa, Dennis M. and Grant, Glen, "The Japanese in Hawaii'i," <http://www.hawiiguide.com/origins/japan.html>, (accessed July 19, 2004).
- Una Storia Segreta: Aftermath*, <http://hcom.csUMB.edu/segreta/aftermath.html>, (accessed July 13, 2004).
- University of Virginia Library, "Census Data for the Year 1890," <http://fisher.lib.virginia.edu/cgi-local/censusbin/census/cen.pl>, (accessed July 14, 2004).
- U.S. Congress Senate Committee Report, Custody of Japanese Residing in the United States, no. 1496, 77th Congress, 2nd Session, June 18, 1942.
- U.S. Census 1940
- Weglyn, Michi, *Years of Infamy*, New York: Morrow Quill Paperbacks, 1976. <http://www.geocities.com/Athens/8420/generations.html>, (accessed July 21, 2004).



Reagan the Man, the Myth, the Legend: The Role Reagan Played in Ending the Cold War

James A. Pollitt

The Cold War brought to the forefront many myths and legends in the form of propaganda from both sides of the ideological divide. Both the Soviets and the Americans used these myths and legends as a way to manipulate their respective constituents in order to advance their own agenda. The Cold War is a topic in which historians have just begun to scratch the surface of knowledge. Many debated how the world would be a different and better place once the war was over. For this reason, many people tried to force an end to the



*President Ronald Reagan.
Image courtesy of the Ronald
Reagan Foundation and Presi-
dential Library.*



*Reagan meets with
Mikhail Gorbachev.
Image courtesy of
the Ronald Reagan
Foundation and
Presidential Library.*

Cold War without a nuclear holocaust. Much like other eras in history, the Cold War gave birth to heroes and presented an opportunity for ordinary people to become extraordinary. One such hero of the Cold War is Ronald Reagan.

There has been much debate in the world of academia on what role Reagan played in ending the Cold War, if any at all. Few historians dispute that even if the Cold War did not end because of Reagan's policy or because of his administration that he definitely played a role, but just how big that role was is where many historians disagree. For example, what made Reagan different from American Presidents like Kennedy, Johnson, Nixon, or Carter? What did he have that they did not? Also, was it Reagan, or would anyone in his position have been able to do the same thing? In other words, did Reagan just happen to

come to office at the right time or did the situation of the world allow the end of the Cold War to happen by coincidence?

Before one can study what role Reagan played in ending the Cold War one must first look at Reagan as a person. During Reagan's administration, he was a strong anti-communist. Reagan was not afraid to call the Soviet Union the "Evil Empire" in public, seeing communism as a cruel, power hungry movement with only one goal in sight –the creation of "one-world communist state".¹ This Communist State would throw out American ideas of freedom and morality. These were ideas of his since the early 1950s.² In an interview given in Los Angeles in 1977, Reagan expressed his view of the Cold War by saying, "We win they lose."³ Before he was elected to the presidency, it was apparent that Reagan wanted to see an end to communism. This type of rhetoric would continue into his presidency.

In a speech given in the early 1980s Reagan referred the Soviet Union by saying, "...The citizens of the society have little to say about their government than prison inmates have to say about the prison administration..."⁴ So it is not surprising that Reagan fought hard to end what he saw as an oppressive Soviet regime. Some historians argue that this was just rhetoric Reagan used to get his fellow Americans to support the end of communism, not only in the Soviet Union, but also around the world. Whether it was rhetoric or part of the plan does really matter; all that is important is that it worked. Reagan had a way of relating to the American citizens as no one else could. Most Americans saw him as genuine, down to earth, and someone they could trust and believe in. Reagan made them proud to be Americans. For Reagan, this was just another role; like many, which he had played before in Hollywood.

Reagan's ultra conservative platform that would get him elected in 1980 was not a belief system that he held his entire life. It was not until 1960 that Reagan decided that the Democratic Party was no longer the party of Thomas Jefferson and that the enemy was not big business but big government. He became a Republican shortly before he decided to run for Governor of California.⁵ Reagan even had an experience during the "Red Scare" of the 1950s. As a matter of fact, that this is how Reagan met his second wife, Nancy Davis. At the time Reagan was president of the Screen Actors Guild and Nancy was blacklisted because another Nancy Davis was thought to be a member of organizations in Hollywood which were thought to be fronts for Communist organizations. It was later discovered that it was another actress with the same name, so Reagan helped clear her name and get Nancy off the blacklists.⁶ Reagan was also questioned by the FBI because he was a member of an organization in Hollywood that was a communist front—Reagan would leave the organization soon afterwards.⁷ The thought during that time was that communists were going to take over Hollywood and use the film industry to turn the United States into a communist state. It is a little hard to believe that a supposed communist sympathizer would eventually become one of the movement's archenemies.

There are many theories on what caused the end of the Cold War. One of the main arguments is that Gorbachov recognized the warning signs and decided it was in the best interest of the Soviet Union to end the Cold War, and more

importantly, the arms race with the United States. The Soviet Union could not afford to get into a spending war with the United States. The simple reason was that the Soviets knew who was going to win that battle, and it was not going to be them. In a Politburo meeting on April 3, 1986 Gorbachov said,

Notwithstanding all the ambiguity in our relations with the United States, reality is such that we cannot do anything without them, nor them anything without us. We live on a planet. And we cannot preserve peace without America/ This is one of our strengths, that we recognize their role. Our serious theoretical and political analyses show respect for the United States.⁸

Later that same year in mid summer in another speech to the Politburo Gorbachov went on to say,

We now have a better idea of what we've undertaken. Acceleration is not just an economic goal, it concerns society as a whole...A Vital component of perestroika is democratization. We are giving rights to people. But who is going to use them? Are the people bold enough for that? The ways of democracy were drummed out of them...⁹

In this speech Gorbachov criticizes the system and claims that the Communist system was created and life was forced into it and the system itself was always the highest priority.¹⁰ All of this supports the argument that Gorbachov was ready to end the Cold War even before the talks at Iceland. Gorbachov was not the only one who could see an end to the Soviet Union and communism if something did not change. As early as 1981, a Sakharov-led team of scientist predicted, "...the combination of increase military spending and a decrepit agri-industrial base would mean Soviet collapse with in a decade."¹¹ Even the KGB, the Soviet intelligent agency, saw that if something was not done that the Soviet Union life expectancy would be shortened dramatically.¹² Even Gorbachov's advisors knew that the end was near if they did not do anything. One of Gorbachov's closest advisors, his National Security Advisor for his full term in office from 1985-1991, Chernyaev, commented at a Conference at Brown University,

[Gorbachev] learned that in order to pursue some sort of the transformation, to Improve socialism, nothing could be done unless you stop the arms race, because it is the only way to change the image of the Soviet Union in the eyes of the Western world.¹³

Tom Nichols of the Naval War College argues that both Gorbachov and his advisors knew "the Soviet Union was at the end of its robe spiritually and economically," and if the Soviet Union or "Soviet Socialism" had any hope of survival that the "American pressure had to be ameliorated somehow."¹⁴ In other words, the Soviet Union did not come to the table out of the kindness of its heart but more for self-preservation. This makes it clear that Gorbachov

was ready to come to the table to save his country.

Another important theory tells that both sides were willing to come to the table after an incident that almost resulted in global nuclear war. In September 1983, a Korean Airliner, KAL 007, was shot down by the Soviet Air Force after the airliner veered wildly off course and flew into restricted Soviet air space.¹⁵ Gorbachov describes the event the reaction as follows, "In the tense atmosphere generated by the crises and rhetoric of the past few months, the KGB center concluded that American Forces had been placed on alert—and might even begun the countdown to war."¹⁶ Historians know now that neither country really wanted to go to war because of the Mutually Assured Destruction or "MAD" Doctrine. In other words, if one country launched nuclear weapons, the other would follow suit and both countries would be destroyed. The "MAD" Doctrine would be responsible for preventing WWII for much of the Cold War.

What was it that made Reagan different from all the other Cold War American Presidents? One Historian, Russell Burgos of UCLA, argues that it "was not an ability to foresee the end of Communism, but his interest in the accelerating processes that could lead to the Soviets 'losing:'"¹⁷ Russell goes on to add that it was also "his willingness to abandon détente."¹⁸ Another Scholar claims that the "fear of SDI drove the Russians to make a deal to end the Cold War."¹⁹ The Strategic Defense Initiative, or "SDI", was a project started early during Reagan's first term in office. The main objective of the project was to develop a defensive missile that could stop incoming nuclear missiles from other countries.²⁰ This would give the United State an unfair advantage over the Soviets, who had no such system under development. Many of Reagan's critics believed that the project was too costly and a waste of time, but this was all apart of his successful negotiations strategy known as the "Negotiation from Strength."²¹ "SDI" along with development of the Pershing II missiles in Europe, which could reach Moscow in less than 5 minutes, and Volga in less than 10 minutes, would bring the Gorbachov and the Soviets to the table.²²

Shortly after Gorbachov took office, President Reagan and the New General Secretary of the Communist party in Russia began to correspond via letter discussing their views about the others respective policies. This went on for a period of months. During this time, Reagan was trying to convince Gorbachov to come to a summit in Washington, D.C., but Gorbachov refused because he did trust the United States. Finally, after some time the two parties agreed to meet at a neutral place, Geneva, Switzerland. After the first set of meetings on the first day Reagan decided to invite Gorbachov down to a little cottage so that Gorbachov and he could talk without all of their advisors present, man to man.²³ During the conversation, Reagan told Gorbachov,

...Here we are, two men who had been born in obscure rural hamlets in the middle of our respective countries, each of us poor and from humble beginnings. Now we are the leaders of our countries and probably the only two men in the world who could bring about World War III.²⁴

Regan goes on to add,

At the same, we are possibly the only two men who in the world who might be able to bring peace to the world. I think we owe it to the world to use the opportunity that has been presented us to work at building the kind of human trust and confidence in each other that could lead to genuine peace.²⁵

During this meeting, Gorbachov was told that the United States was going ahead with SDI project but was willing to share the information with the Soviets and others. The two men decided to meet for two more summits, one in Washington, D.C. and the other in Moscow.²⁶ This meeting would bring the beginning of a friendship that would last the rest of their life and end the Cold War.

Reagan himself never really claimed credit for ending the Cold War. It was not anyone of these single events that ended the Cold War but a combination of more than one event which allowed each side to come to the negotiation table for their own respective reasons. Over the course of this article, many of possible causes to the end of the Cold War were discussed. Through this discussion, we can see that although Reagan was not the sole reason the Cold War ended, it is important to recognize that Reagan played an important role in ending the Cold War. In his own words, "The house we hope to build is not for my generation but for yours. It is your future that matters. And I hope that when you are my age, you will be able to say as I have been able to say: We lived in freedom. We lived lives that were a statement, not an apology."²⁷

ENDNOTES

1. Robert Dallek. Ronald Reagan: The Politics of Symbolism. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999.
2. Robert Dallek, 130.
3. Robert MacNichol. "Reagan and the End of the Cold War" H-diplo, June 24, 2004.
4. Robert Dallek, 131.
5. Ronald W. Reagan. Ronald Reagan: An American Life. New York: Pocket Books, 1990.
6. Reagan, 121-125.
7. Ibid.
8. Orrin Schwab. "Reagan and the End of the Cold War" H-diplo, June 02, 2004.
9. Ibid.
10. Ibid.
11. Andres Kahar. "Reagan and the End of the Cold War" H-diplo, June 06, 2004.
12. Ibid.
13. Tom Nichols, "Reagan and the End of the Cold War" H-diplo, June 08, 2004.
14. Ibid.
15. Orrin Schwab, "Reagan and the End of the Cold War" H-diplo, May 18, 2004.
16. Ibid.
17. Russell Burgos, "Reagan and the End of the Cold War" H-diplo, June 28, 2004.
18. Ibid.
19. Orrin Schwab, "Reagan and the End of the Cold War" H-diplo, June 09, 2004.
20. H. W. Brands, and Martin J. Medhurst, ed. Critical Refelections on the Cold War: Linking Rhetoric and History. College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2000.
21. John Lewis Gaddis. The United States and the End of the Cold War: Implications, Reconsiderations, Provocations. New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.
22. Brian Auten, "Reagan and the End of the Cold War" H-diplo, May 19, 2004.
23. Reagan, 636.
24. Ibid., 636.
25. Ibid., 636.
26. Ibid., 636.
27. Ronald Reagan Foundation and Library, "Quotes", <http://reaganfoundation.org/Reagan/quotes> (accessed march 13, 2006).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anderson, Annelise, Martin Anderson, and Kiro K. Skinner, ed. *Reagan: A Life in Letters*. New York: Free Press, 2003.
- Auten, Brian. "Reagan and the End of the Cold War." H-diplo, May 19, 2004.
- Brands, H. W. and Martin J. Medhurst, ed. *Critical Reflections on the Cold War: Linking Rhetoric and History*. College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2000.
- Burgos, Russell "Reagan and the End of the Cold War" H-diplo, June 28, 2004.
- Dallek, Robert. *Ronald Reagan: The Politics of Symbolism*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999.
- Fitzgerald, Frances. *Way Out There in the Blue: Reagan, Star Wars and the End of the Cold War*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 2000.
- Gladdis, John Lewis. *The United States and the End of the Cold War: Implications, Reconsiderations, Provocations*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.
- Johnson, Hayes. *Sleepingwalking Through History: America in the Reagan Years*. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1991.
- Kahar, Andres. "Reagan and the End of the Cold War." H-diplo, June 06, 2004.
- MacNichol, Robert, "Reagan and the End of the Cold War" H-diplo, June 24, 2004.
- Matthewson, Tim. "Reagan and the End of the Cold War" H-diplo, June 24, 2004.
- Meese III, Edwin. *With Reagan: The Inside Story*. Washington, D.C.: Regnery Gateway, 1992.
- Nichols, Tom. "Reagan and the End of the Cold War" H-diplo, June 08, 2004.
- Reagan, Ronald W. *Ronald Reagan: An American Life*. New York: Pocket Books, 1990.
- Ronald Reagan Presidential Library Online, "Quotes", <http://reaganfoundation.org/Reagan/quotes/> (accessed March 13, 2006).
- Schwab, Orrin. "Reagan and the End of the Cold War" H-diplo, May 18, 2004.
- . "Reagan and the End of the Cold War" H-diplo, June 02, 2004.
- . "Reagan and the End of the Cold War" H-diplo, June 09, 2004.



The Albigensian Crusade: A Historiographical Essay

Eric O. Rummel

By the beginning of the 13th century an insidious heresy swept through the Languedoc region of southern France. These apostates, called Albigenses, or Cathars, preached an unorthodox 'heretical' version of the Christian faith that spread quietly and powerfully from town to town. It led to a bloody and fear-some act; one perpetrated by Europeans on fellow Europeans: The Albigensian Crusade.

This comparative historiography is a careful attempt to examine the state of scholarship on the Albigensian Crusade. With no primary sources readily available, a close inspection of a large number of secondary sources proved invaluable in gaining an understanding of this event. Even then, one is left with questions, for scholars do not always agree. Four points of contention arose from this survey: the nature of the Cathar heresy, the reason that *local* Latin Christians had no part in the persecution of the Cathars, the origin of the call for the Crusade, and finally the explanation for the strange events at Montségur.

The first of the four points deals with the nature of the Albigensian apostasy. What exactly was the heresy perpetrated by the Cathars? A close examination of the scholarship on the subject reveals exactly what the Cathars believed and why it was so infuriating to the Church in Rome.



Pope Innocent III.

Seal of Philip Augustus, King of France. Image courtesy of Archives Nationales de France.



The second point calls for an investigation into the relationships between heretics and Christians in the local community setting. An oddity revealed by the Albigensian Crusade is that the Christians who lived among them not only refused to comply in the persecution of the Cathars, but oftentimes aided them. What was it about either the Cathars or the Languedoc culture in the south of France that allowed peaceful coexistence between Christians and Cathars? Christians in other parts of Europe often took delight in the persecution of heretics, Jews, and Muslims, but they did not in the Languedoc.

The third point is concerned with the rationale and impetus behind the Albigensian Crusade. Scholars have argued for centuries about the reasoning behind the Albigensian Crusade. Why was it called? Some say Pope Innocent III, a hard line defender of the Roman Church despised heresy above all else, and convinced the French King to send his troops south. Yet others retort that it was King Phillip Augustus of France who twisted Innocent's call, and supported the Crusade for his own political gain.

The fourth point addresses the siege at Montségur. Many strange events occurred at this mountain fortress which was the final stronghold of the Cathars. The defenders of that bastion spirited away a secret treasure, whereas the crusading army acted in a very peculiar fashion on several counts. The mystery surrounding Montségur has a lot to tell about the truth behind the Crusade.

The terms Albigensian and Albigenses are derived from Albi, a small town in the south of France. Albi, ironically, was a focal point for the Cathars, but it was at best a small part of a much larger movement. The reason that the Crusade is described as the Albigensian Crusade relates to an incident in Albi in the beginning of the 12th century. Sicard, the Bishop of Albi was determined to burn the heretics at the stake, but the townsfolk decided that the freedom to speak as one wished and to believe as one wished was far more important and liberated them.¹

The Cathars were a peaceful people who abhorred violence of any sort, and those who opposed them, the Latin Church and the French King, embraced it. The Crusaders led by Simon de Montfort and the Dominican monks of the Inquisition used violence and torture as a tool to suppress all thought that did not conform to the orthodoxy of the Roman Church. The Crusade itself was a wholesale slaughter, with thousands of innocents brutally murdered and countless homes destroyed.

What was the heresy that doomed the Cathars? To understand this, one must first be familiar with the definition of heresy. According to the *Compact Oxford English Dictionary*, heresy is simply, "1 belief or opinion contrary to orthodox religious (especially Christian) doctrine. 2 opinion profoundly at odds with what is generally accepted."² It is apparent that the beliefs of the Cathars, while nominally Christian, were significantly different from the doctrines established by the Latin Church. The Cathars were dualists, meaning that they believed in either two divine entities, or a single deity with two very different and often incompatible personalities. A dualist tradition is found all across the world and in many different eras; it was not something unique to Christianity. The specific dualist beliefs of the Cathars are generally acknowl-

edged to have come from the Bogomils of Thrace. The particulars of their belief structure are astoundingly similar to those of the Cathars. Jonathan Sumption writes, “The Bogomils rejected the Old Testament and ascribed the creation of the world to the Devil... They abstained as far as possible from meat and wine, and from sexual intercourse.”³ The Cathars believed in two deities, one a God of Good, and the other, a God of Evil. The God of Evil was said to have been responsible for the creation of the universe and everything in it. Hence, as Stephen O’Shea remarks, for the Cathars, “Matter was corrupt, therefore irrelevant to salvation.”⁴ O’Shea’s point is that to the Cathars, anything material here in this world was created by the God of Evil, and therefore, was an obstacle to eternal life.

The God of Good was, above all, a god of spirit and a god of love, “The god deserving of Cathar worship was a god of light, who ruled the invisible, the ethereal, the spiritual domain...”⁵ The righteous Cathar was supposed to renounce the material, in order to become purified and therefore earn eternal life. This is how they lived their lives, in a constant struggle with the temptations of the world around them. The term Cathar itself comes from the Greek word *καθαροί* which means “pure ones”.

The Cathars believed that the Roman Church was an abomination, citing its refusal to acknowledge the truth of a co-equal deity, one of evil to counterbalance God. According to the Cathar tradition, the Latin Christians were naïve; the Christian Satan was a poor attempt to explain the presence of evil in the world. Their theological difference centered around the Latin Christian dogma that Satan, or Lucifer was a fallen angel, and therefore lesser than God, not an equal, as the Cathars believed. They also found the overwhelming greed and violence that surrounded the Roman Church distasteful in the extreme. The Cathars felt that the Roman Church misled its adherents, believing that, “Worldly authority was a fraud, and worldly authority based on some divine sanction, such as the Church claimed, was outright hypocrisy.”⁶ The Roman Church embraced the evils of the world—competition and the violence it engendered—giving them the fortitude to come out on top in the struggle for survival between competing systems of belief.

The Church also took issue with the Cathar outlook on life after death. The Cathars held that in order to ascend to their version of heaven, one must have lived a pure life. If life was not pure, then the soul was reborn into another body and given another chance to achieve purity. Indeed, “Catharism held that men and women were one. A human being had been reincarnated many times over—as peasant, princess, boy, girl—but again what counted was one’s divine, immaterial sexless self.”⁷

The Cathar movement was divided into several different castes. There is some disagreement on how many different groups there were. However, the majority of scholars agree that two castes existed, the *perfecti* and the *revestiti*. Only Zoe Oldenbourg describes a third group, the *priori*. Yet, Oldenbourg’s narrative is unclear; it is difficult to discern much information about these *priori* and what part they may have played in Cathar society.⁸ No other source studied made mention of the *priori*, therefore their role cannot be determined in the confines of this paper.

Out of these two castes, there was no true hierarchy, no priestly class, “[*Perfecti*] were not intermediaries with God like the Catholic priesthood; they were merely teachers and exceptional holy men.”⁹ They stressed a true communion with the God of Good, a oneness with the ultimate. *Perfecti* may have been more respected in the community, or considered more devout, but it was not required to submit to their will or judgment. Being a Cathar was about an individual commitment to God, not about ceremony and pageantry. Cathars were free to live as they saw fit, without being under the watchful eye of a bishop or cardinal.

The *perfecti* were those among the Cathars ready to complete their passage into the final rapture. They had forsworn all material comforts and did not eat meat or engage in sexual intercourse. They had been purified in this, their final journey through the material world. These black-robed ascetics could be seen wandering all through the Languedoc, spreading the message of Catharism, and living it as an example to those whom they encountered.

The *perfecti* had received the one and only Cathar sacrament, *consolamentum*. *Consolamentum* was, “Baptism, confirmation, ordination, and if received at death’s door, extreme unction all rolled into one...”¹⁰ A group of at least three *perfecti* could perform the sacrament if they all judged the applicant worthy and the recipient was invested into the fold as a fellow *perfectum*. Some *perfecti* received the sacrament more than one time, as sins and human weakness played a role in their lives. Once it was completed however, if one abstained from the material, upon death they were granted passage into the afterlife, and would no longer be reincarnated.¹¹

The *revestiti* were a far larger proportion of those calling themselves Cathars. The designation *revestiti* meant simply that the person was a believer. While there was no sacrament for the *revestiti*, there was a ritual of initiation called the *covenantia*; whereby they were inducted into the faith. Unlike the *perfecti*, the *revestiti* had no rules they had to follow. They were free to eat meat, own property, and engage in procreation as they wished. The rules that the *perfecti* followed were but guidelines for them. Many chose on their deathbed to receive the sacrament of *consolamentum*, and provided they sinned no further, would be spared the fate of another reincarnation.

The *perfecti* led a difficult and lonely life. They were prohibited from owning property; they ate a strict diet, and were forbidden sexual pleasures. Most Cathars who were able chose to receive *consolamentum* did so on their deathbed. Life was difficult and most decided not to deny themselves any pleasure that could be found. Those who spent a large portion of their lives as *perfecti* were respected and admired not only by their fellow Cathars, but by their Christian neighbors as well.

In medieval Languedoc, Cathars and Christians coexisted rather peacefully until Simon de Montfort’s army arrived in the region in 1204. The Roman Church considered the Cathar heresy foul *in extremis*. Several papal bulls had been issued on the subject, all rather inflammatory in their derision towards the Cathars. It is known that these papal bulls were received by the bishops in the Languedoc region, yet no reprisals were called for, nor did parish priests rage from their pulpits about the dangerous Cathar heresy. Cities and villages such

as Albi, Narbonne, Saint-Gilles, Bézou, and Béziers among others contained a large proportion of Cathars among their mostly Christian populations. These were cities hit hard by the crusading army, yet they did not hand over the heretics in order to spare themselves.

Perhaps one reason for the general lack of animosity towards the Cathars on the part of the Christians was the support the Cathars received from powerful nobles like Count Raimon de Saint-Gilles of Toulouse. Raimon VI was not a Cathar, but that did not prevent him from favoring the Cathar Church over the Roman Church. His reason was self-serving, Raimon, "... always vigorously proclaimed his attachment to the Catholic faith, but a study of his public actions makes it difficult to form an exact idea of his true feelings. He was an unscrupulous pillager of abbeys and bishops' palaces."¹² Raimon was most certainly not above sacking a few churches for financial gain and Jacques Madaule's point was that Raimon was an opportunist. The Count of Toulouse could be counted on to do whatever would lessen the influence and power of both the Roman Church and of King Phillip Augustus of France. Raimon was denounced by the Pope several times, even excommunicated, without any real change in his actions. Only de Montfort's army arriving on his doorstep convinced Raimon to support the king and the Pope.

While Raimon of Toulouse was easily the most powerful noble in Southern France at the beginning of the 13th century, other regional nobles were not as fortunate. In fact, most nobles lived only slightly better than the peasants. In a village of one-story houses, the local nobleman may have just a two-story home; "...in the region as a whole, rigid distinctions between nobles and non-nobles were much less apparent than in the various regions of France proper."¹³ As in many parts of Europe, the local noble was often in debt to one or several of the local gentry. Yet in the Languedoc, for some reason, the nobles lacked either the will or the might to position themselves over the local populace.

So the nobles did something unheard of in France at that time, they lived among the common people. They attended festivals with them, they shared their food and, "Noble families like the de Luzenacs, at Luzenac, were content with a shepherd's diet: bread, sour wine, milk and cheese."¹⁴ They were welcome parts of the community, not perceived as some kind of vile overseer like the nobles in the north of France were. It was an egalitarian system in all but name.¹⁵

The people of the Languedoc lived in close connection with each other, noble and commoner, Cathar and Christian. This kind of close living bred a certain sense of community. It allowed the region's inhabitants to put aside differences in religious belief and social class in order to work together to survive, and even prosper, though life was difficult for them. Thus, the vast majority of the population, in a truly progressive fashion, was able to look past religious differences. In this way, they could concentrate on building better lives as a community.

But this was a time in which heresy was taken very seriously and much effort was made by the Roman Church to stamp it out, root and branch. Cathars and Christians often came from the same family, which may explain, in part,

the lack of willingness by the Christian to persecute their family member.

This still does not fully explain why the Christians of southern France tolerated the presence of the Cathars. There was one further important factor that relates to this matter. The local prelature was often as ignorant as the parishioners whom they attended to. Most priests were local men, sent off for a short time to learn the ceremonies and requirements of the Roman Church. They returned with the most basic knowledge of scripture and oftentimes these parish priests had not even learned to read.

The clergy of southern France were not the learned men of northern France, England and Rome, but rather the progeny of farmers and shepherds whose love of God was often overshadowed by greed and desire for some modicum of power. They had no scriptural or dogmatic background with which to debate the so-called evils of the Cathar heresy. This meant that they were ineffective in combating the spread of the Cathar doctrine. While bishops instructed them on what to say to their parishioners concerning heresy, most could not articulate their points and were therefore disregarded by their flocks.¹⁶

By 1208, the tension between the Cathars and the Roman Church had reached a high point. Pope Innocent III, furious at his orders being rebuffed, and seeing the growth of the Cathar heresy in the Languedoc, began to formulate a plan to silence it. If the clergy in the south of France could not be counted upon to rid the region of the Cathars, he would be forced to find someone who would.

There are two distinct lines of reasoning to explain why the Albigensian Crusade occurred. Jonathan Sumption and Stephen O'Shea paint Innocent III as the mastermind of the crusade. According to Sumption, it was Innocent's idea all along to use the King of France as his tool to mount an offensive against the heretics in the Languedoc.¹⁷ O'Shea states that because the Count of Toulouse refused to persecute his people, he forced Innocent to take a strong hand against the people of the Languedoc.¹⁸

Jean Markale disagreed with them, suggesting rather that the true architect of the Albigensian Crusade was King Phillip Augustus of France. His argument is supported by the fact that all the men who marched from town to town, burning, killing, raping and looting were from northern France. In further support of this argument, King Phillip Augustus of France was a monarch in considerable distress. He had little control of his fracticious nobles in the north, and had absolutely no control over the southern nobles. Phillip needed a way to channel the aggressive nature in the north and establish dominance in the south. The Cathar heresy provided him with the perfect reason. Markale states that it was Phillip who actually petitioned Innocent for permission to conduct the Crusade.¹⁹ While the truth is hard to discern, a closer look at both suggested reasons behind the Crusade is required.

Innocent III was in a dire position and he knew it. He was poised to lose the entire southern region of France to a heresy that riled him. Innocent knew that if the Languedoc was lost to Catharism, that it would only be the beginning. He viewed the heresy as if it were an infection, one that needed to be stopped before it spread, causing permanent harm, even though Catharism's influence migrated quite slowly throughout the Languedoc. Innocent's fear

of the Cathars may have been exaggerated, but he was a man of action, and would not tolerate this heretical incursion into his world.

Lotario di Segni (pontificate 1198-1216) was elected Pope in 1198 and chose the name Innocent III. His election to the Office of the Holy See was somewhat unexpected. He was only thirty-seven years old, a veritable child as far as Popes are concerned. The *Gesta Innocentii III* states that his election occurred because of the expansiveness of his education and the piety of his writings. A number of modern scholars disagree and claim that there were machinations occurring in the College of Cardinals and that de Segni was elected because of this conniving.²⁰

Regardless of the dubious circumstances surrounding his election, Innocent III is regarded as one of the greatest pontiffs of the Middle Ages. His reign was marked by triumphs over secular rulers: King John of England was required to submit his kingdom as a vassal to the Holy See; King Phillip Augustus of France had his marriage arranged by Innocent; and the ward of the Pope, Frederick II of Austria, secured his claim to the throne of the Holy Roman Empire.²¹ Innocent worked hard to strengthen the influence and primacy of the papacy over secular rule.

Remarkably, both *Gesta Innocentii III* and *Innocent III Church Defender* had little or nothing to say about Innocent's decision to call for the Albigensian Crusade or the subsequent Inquisition. They gloss over the events, which lasted roughly from 1209-1244, as if they were mere side notes in the life of Innocent. *Gesta Innocentii III* was written within ten to fifteen years after the end of Innocent's pontificate, placing it at roughly 1230. It is a mystery why such a defining event during his tenure as Pope would not be mentioned at all, especially considering the Crusade had been in full swing for over two decades. *Innocent III Church Defender* was published in 1951 and contains only but a few pages on the crusade.²² With all of the scholarship available, it is inexcusable to have little information on such an important event.

Perhaps to those chroniclers of Innocent's life the Albigensian Crusade was akin to an embarrassment. Thousands of people slaughtered and hundreds burned alive at the stake at their order have a tendency to cast a dark shadow of a leader, especially a Pope. Regardless, other sources provide clear accounts of Innocent's actions and plausible explanations for his rationale.

That Cathar doctrine was a heresy in the eyes of the Roman Church is not refuted by any source examined. The two dogmas were anathema to each other, and in no other place than the Languedoc could they exist side by side. To allow the Cathar heresy to continue to exist would place in jeopardy all that Innocent accomplished. It would open the door for other heretics, like the Waldensians to flourish and spread; it would also allow for the growth of Judaism and Islam in Europe. Innocent's resolve was firm, and with the chaos that unchecked heresy could bring to his beloved Church in mind, in 1203 he released a hand-picked group of papal legates led by Piere de Castelnau to squelch the Cathars.²³

The legates met with limited success. For years, they traveled around the region, preaching the doctrine of Rome and engaging Cathar *perfecti* in debates wherever possible. The legates did, however, succeed in stirring up trouble for

Raimon of Toulouse. They consistently badgered him over his policies and liberal treatment of the Cathars in his domains. Piere de Castelnau petitioned the Pope for Raimon's excommunication, citing numerous infractions against the Church. Innocent quickly granted this request and Raimon was subsequently cast out of the Roman Church.²⁴

Raimon quickly summoned Piere de Castelnau to Saint-Gilles for negotiations. After a few days, both sides could see it was hopeless. Piere packed and began his journey back to Rome. Shortly after leaving Saint-Gilles, a man on horseback rode up behind Piere and struck him through the back with a sword. Piere de Castelnau was dead, and Innocent held Raimon de Toulouse responsible.²⁵ Innocent now had his excuse to call for the invasion of the Languedoc.

King Phillip Augustus had a much simpler reason for wanting to invade southern France. All of those lands were supposed to belong to him, yet the Languedoc nobles paid him no mind. Conversely, they tended to support his enemies, namely Castile and Aragon. Phillip's power was waning, and his credibility with the northern nobles was stretched thin. He needed a way to consolidate his power base in the north, and punish his rebellious southern Lords.

The Cathar heresy gave Phillip the perfect excuse. Using the power that the church held over the northern nobles he compelled them to band together for the journey south. He used Innocent's indignation over the heresy and the assassination of Piere de Castelnau and his call for a Crusade to galvanize those nobles.²⁶ The rowdy northern nobles were all god-fearing men, and eager to earn the guarantee of admission into heaven, despite any sin, that a Crusade offered them. Phillip had no trouble recruiting a large army.

To lead them, Phillip chose a loyal member of his court, Simon de Montfort. De Montfort was a cunning and able military leader. He was also a man of great personal faith, both eager and willing to follow the orders of the papal legate who accompanied his army. "The elder Simon was a deeply devout man, respected for being straightforward in his dealings and for leading men by example."²⁷ De Montfort also abhorred any noble who did not observe proper allegiance to the king.

The previous two reasons are very distinct. Yet, it is probable that they worked in combination. Both played a considerable role in explaining why the Albigensian Crusade was called. In fact, if it were not for the intentions of both men, Innocent and Phillip, it is doubtful that the Crusade would have happened. Innocent III beseeched the spirituality of the nobles, while Phillip used Innocent's piety and hatred of heresy to further his own political aims in Europe. Appeal to a man's piety to convince his soul, but appeal to his greed to win his heart. The stage was now set for the Crusade to commence. Both Innocent and Phillip had used all powers at their disposal to justify the destruction of the Cathar heresy.

In 1209, de Montfort's army marched south into the Languedoc. It is not surprising then that one of his first stops was Toulouse, where he confronted Count Raimon de Saint-Gilles. Raimon rejected the overtures of the king, and he was also a supporter of the Cathars. However, Raimon scurried to join the

cause of the Crusade after seeing de Montfort's massive army;

At Saint-Gilles..., he submitted to a humiliating public confession of his real or supposed misdeeds. He pushed his zeal to the point of crusading himself and hence attended, from the victors' camp, at the massacre of Béziers and the capture of Carcassonne.²⁸

De Montfort continued from town to town, murdering all heretics he came across and ravaging the lands of the nobles who supported them. At Béziers, the Christians refused to turn the Cathars over to the crusading army. Perplexed, de Montfort asked the papal legate Arnaud Amalric what he should do. His reply, one that has become infamous, was, "Kill all of them; God will know his own."²⁹

One of the final stops of this Crusade was the mountain fortress at Montségur, where several hundred Cathars had barricaded themselves, along with several hundred Christians. It was now 1244 and the Cathars had endured two decades of bloody crusading and fifteen years of the Inquisition administered by the Dominican Order. The Siege at Montségur has always had an air of mystery about it. There are stories of strange behavior by the crusading army at Montségur. Raimon VI of Toulouse had given way to his son Raimon VII, who was ordered to surround and break the mountain fortress. It appears that Raimon had absolutely no intention of attacking the stronghold. In fact, he sent word to those inside the fortress to hold out until Christmas, by then it was possible that he would be able to aid them.³⁰ Raimon's odd behavior was finally discovered and he was sent home to Toulouse in disgrace. It has never been ascertained how Raimon was going to help those trapped at Montségur, or why he would take risks to aid them, but the strange fact that he wished to aid them remains.

Even after Raimon was relieved of command by Hugues d'Acris, the situation did not worsen for the besieged. D'Acris had hoped to starve them out, but the besieged were well prepared for just this sort of scenario and had plenty of food and water. The morale of the crusading army was just as bad as that of the Cathars trapped on top of the mountain.

In December of 1243, Hugues d'Acris finally took a huge gamble. Every time he sent men up the mountain to storm the fortress, he had been beaten back with severe losses. His mad idea was to have a troop of Gascon mountaineers scale a dangerous eastern ridge under the cover of darkness, and take the bastion of Roc de la Tour. His desperate ploy worked, and after ten months, the siege was finally broken.³¹

Yet the night before the Cathars surrendered, four *perfecti* climbed over the wall and escaped with a treasure. According to O'Shea, the treasure that was removed was only gold and silver. But Markale has a different idea on the subject. After extensive research into the Knights Templar and their connection with the Cathars, he claims that the treasure spirited away that night was nothing less than the Holy Grail. He bases this claim on some cave drawings found in the hills near Montségur that portray the story of *Perceval*. He links these drawings to some associations that the Knights Templar had with the

Cathars in Languedoc a century before. He believes that the Knights Templar entrusted the care of the Holy Grail which they brought out of Jerusalem to the Cathars.³²

While certainly romantic, Markale's claims hold little weight. It is far more likely that the four *perfecti* escaped Montségur with precious metal rather than the Holy Grail. His conclusions are tenuous at best, for they are leaps of faith, rather than grounded research.

The final odd occurrence at Montségur was the behavior of the leaders of the crusading army after the surrender of the Cathars. The 75 or so Christians who were in the fortress at Montségur were allowed to leave the castle unmolested. They were permitted to bring along all of their possessions and were free to return to their homes without penalty. This was inconsistent with the previous behavior of the army at places like Béziers, where the Christians were slain alongside the Cathars with whom they chose to remain. No source has yet been examined that gives an adequate reason for the leniency shown these Christians who chose to remain with the heretics, rather than follow the orders of the Roman Church.

The Cathars were also permitted to leave the castle without fear of attack. There was one caveat to their release though. They were made to appear before the Inquisition and renounce their heresy and confess their sins. Once they were cleansed of their wrongdoings and converted to Christianity, they would also be free to go on their way without fear of reprisal.

However, none of the Cathars would submit to this. They held firm to their beliefs in the face of the crusading army and the Inquisition. All of them were burned at the stake for their heresy and refusal to recant. True to their doctrine they remained steadfast in their resolve, for they believed that by dying a martyr's death, they would be rewarded with a place in the afterlife.

The siege of Montségur was by all accounts, a strange event. From Raimon's desire to aid the Cathars, to the mystery of the four escaped *perfecti*, culminating in the extremely lenient behavior by the victorious Crusaders, Montségur continues to baffle scholars.

The Albigensian Crusade is important for more reasons than are readily apparent. One can argue that the most important thing that the Albigensian Crusade left behind is an example of the medieval Church dealing with challenges. Truth can be found in that statement. The history of the Crusade is a richly documented account of the Roman Church's struggle with heresy while attempting to increase its power base. It convincingly illustrates the Church's success in manipulating secular monarchs and bending them to its will. The strength of the Church is apparent, and its triumph over the Cathars was complete.

Yet, the Crusade also depicts some rather glaring failures. The same documents that glorify the Church's strength also reveal its depravity. The values that the Church continues to hold dear; those of love, goodwill, and peace were utterly ignored. The Crusade showed the dark side of the Roman Church. This was the side that gleefully murdered in the name of God. It is well known that the Dominican monks of the Inquisition readily and zealously used physical torture to exact revenge and coerce the unrepentant. It was the ultimate in

hypocrisy; preaching peace and love, and then murdering and torturing. This double standard was nothing short of amazing, even more amazing was the fact that this type of behavior was readily accepted by those living in the Middle Ages. This dichotomy was rationalized simply as the Church upholding the 'true' Christian faith. Still, it is difficult to accept that torturing and murdering thousands of non-violent innocents could have been considered self-defense.

While Innocent managed to attain a great victory against the Cathars, King Phillip of France was the true winner. The most important accomplishment of the Albigensian Crusade was not the subjugation of the Cathar heresy and the strengthening of the Roman Church; far greater was the establishment of strong central authority in France.

Phillip was a shrewd monarch. He realized that his northern nobles were difficult to control unless he had some type of military activity to keep them occupied. It is not that they were disloyal to him; it appears that they were simply rowdy and warlike. In the absence of a common enemy to wage war against, these nobles turned on themselves. Phillip used Innocent and the Cathar heresy for his own purposes, namely to keep the attention of the North focused not on each other's lands, but on the lands in the South.

The nobles in the South had long sided with the royal families in Castile and Aragon. Phillip was their liege lord in name only. The South blatantly ignored royal decrees and directives. Phillip needed a way not only to punish the southern Lords, but to bring all of an independent Languedoc firmly under his control. The call for a crusade from Innocent gave Phillip the pretext he needed to launch an invasion of the South. In one fell stroke he was able to bring the North solidly under his control and use those armies to re-conquer the South. What he achieved was the beginnings of a unified France. It was a precursor to the nation of today. His success against the Cathars allowed France to begin its journey towards political and religious homogeneity and began to instill a sense of identity among its citizens.

The Cathar heresy for all intents and purposes died at Montségur. Their movement was forever broken, and all that remains is their story. It is a powerful story of hatred and intolerance, of Popes and Kings, of sacrifice and loss. It is yet another example of what happens when moral values are compromised, even in such a benevolent organization as the Roman Church. In spite of the bloodshed, good can be recognized. Modern France was partially born out of this strife, and with it would come the tenets of liberty, equality and fraternity that set an example for the world.

ENDNOTES

1. Jean Markale, *Montségur and the Mystery of the Cathars*, trans. Jon Graham (Rochester: Inner Traditions, 2003), 55.
2. Edmund S. Weiner, ed., *The Compact Oxford English Dictionary* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), 506.
3. Jonathan Sumption, *The Albigensian Crusade* (London: Faber & Faber, 1978), 35.
4. Stephen O'Shea, *The Perfect Heresy: The Revolutionary Life and Death of the Medieval Cathars* (New York: Walker & Company, 2000), 10.
5. *Ibid.*, 11.
6. O'Shea, 10-11.
7. *Ibid.*, 25-26.
8. Zoe Oldenbourg, *Massacre at Montségur* (New York: Pantheon, 1961), 44-50.
9. Sumption, 50.
10. O'Shea, 23.
11. *Ibid.*, 23.
12. Jacques Madaule, *The Albigensian Crusade*, trans. Barbara Wall (New York: Fordham University Press, 1967), 54.
13. Emmanuel Le Roy Ladurie, *Montaillou* (New York: George Braziller, 1978), 15.
14. *Ibid.*, 15.
15. *Ibid.*, 17.
16. Madaule, 47-51.
17. Sumption, 75.
18. O'Shea, 54.
19. Markale, 23.
20. Anonymous, trans. James M. Powell, *The Deeds of Pope Innocent III* (Washington D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 2004), xviii.
21. Charles Smith, *Innocent III Church Defender* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1951), 1.
22. *Ibid.*, 16-18.
23. Sumption, 68.
24. *Ibid.*, 73-74.
25. O'Shea, 66.
26. Markale, 23.
27. O'Shea, 107.
28. Madaule, 64.
29. *Ibid.*, 65.
30. *Ibid.*, 112.
31. O'Shea, 217.
32. Markale, 244-68.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Costen, Michael. *The Cathars and the Albigensian Crusade*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1997.
- Bonde, Sheila. *Fortress-Churches of Languedoc*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- The Deeds of Pope Innocent III*. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 2004.
- Emery, Richard Wilde. *Heresy and Inquisition in Narbonne*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1941.
- Given, James B. *Inquisition and Medieval Society*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1997.
- Ladurie, Emmanuel Le Roy. *Montaillou*. Translated by Barbara Bray. New York: George Braziller, 1978.
- Lambert, Michael. *The Cathars*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 1998.
- Madaule, Jacques. *The Albigensian Crusade*. Translated by Barbara Wall. New York: Fordham University Press, 1967.
- Markale, Jean. *Montségur and the Mystery of the Cathars*. Translated by Jon Graham. Rochester: Inner Traditions, 2003.
- O'Shea, Stephen. *The Perfect Heresy: The Revolutionary Life and Death of the Medieval Cathars*. New York: Walker & Company, 2000.
- Oldenbourg, Zoe. *Massacre at Montségur*. Translated by Piere Green. New York: Pantheon, 1961.
- Pegg, Mark Gregory. *The Corruption of Angels: The Great Inquisition of 1245-1246*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001.
- Smith, Charles. *Innocent III Church Defender*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1951.
- Sumption, Jonathan. *The Albigensian Crusade*. London: Faber and Faber, 1978.
- Weis, René. *The Yellow Cross*. New York: Vintage, 2000.



Perspectives

The History of Battery Hooper

Baird R. Ullrey



Brigadier General Ormsby Mitchel.

Typically, when people think about the Civil War, Northern Kentucky is rarely mentioned. Names like Bull Run, Antietam, and Chickamauga are at the forefront of discussions and debates. These great battles had lasting effects on the Union and Confederate war efforts and on the outcome of the war. Cincinnati was a key railroad hub for commerce in the Union States, and considerable effort was placed on securing the area around Cincinnati. This was to ensure that the rail hubs did not fall into Confederate hands and cut off the critical supply line north. This is significant because the Northern Kentucky area is not widely known for its role in the Union's war effort. Most area residents have no idea that Northern Kentucky was involved in any way. In fact, if Cincinnati had fallen to the Confed-

erate troops in 1862, this country may be far different than it is today.

Because of this lack of recognition, important structures, earthworks and battlefields are passed by, ignored or in the case of 23 of the 28 redans (earthworks for cannons which were built for the artillery batteries located across Northern Kentucky), simply destroyed to make way for modern structures. A Civil War fortification known as Battery Hooper in Fort Wright is an important link to the past. Through literature research and archaeological excavation, local archaeologists and historians hope to uncover the history and layout of Battery Hooper as well as the events that surrounded it. The City of Fort Wright, Northern Kentucky University, and the surrounding community are all working towards preserving this local treasure.



Colonel Charles Whittlesey.

Between 1800 and 1850, Cincinnati was one of the premiere industrial and commercial cities in the North. Because of Cincinnati's advantageous location along the Ohio River, the city's industry, as well as its population exploded. In 1820, the city had a population of nine thousand six hundred and two. In thirty years, the city's population grew to one hundred and fifteen thousand four hundred and thirty eight. Several industries including riverboats, furniture making and pork processing were booming and the population of the city had to keep pace.¹

One of the main reasons for the economic and population expansion was the growing steamboat industry. By 1826, forty-eight of the one hundred and forty-three operating steamboats on the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers were produced in Cincinnati;² by 1829, the number jumped to eighty-one out of three hundred. In the 1830s and 1840s, two canals were built leading to the city. The construction of the Miami-Erie and the Whitewater canals only solidified Cincinnati's hold on the steamboat market. In 1843 alone, forty-eight steamboats were constructed. Because of large steamboat production in Cincinnati and its status as the largest inland seaport, Cincinnati earned the nickname "Queen of the West." This is most likely the origin for Cincinnati being recognized as the "Queen City."³ The steamboat industry was the main reason for Cincinnati's industrial and commercial success in the decades prior to the Civil War, but Cincinnati was not only recognized for its steamboat industry. Cincinnati was also the leading pork-packaging center in the nation by the mid-1800s.⁴ This distinction earned Cincinnati another nickname: "Porkopolis." Along with the pork packing industry, Cincinnati was the leading producer of beer and liquor. Furniture was also a growing industry in the mid 1800s.⁵

Since Cincinnati was a vital industrial producer, it held the status as the largest inland seaport. The North had a strong interest in keeping Cincinnati within its sphere of influence. Cincinnati was also a prime target for the Confederacy. The Confederacy was looking for recognition and legitimacy from countries like England and France. With several resounding victories and the Union forces having had few successes, the leaders of the Confederacy knew that if they could move into Union territory, capture a major shipping hub and industrial center and hold it, the other countries of the world may see the Confederacy as a serious entity and grant recognition. This recognition may have forced the Union to recognize the Confederacy's independence and offer peaceful terms and secession of hostilities. This placed Cincinnati in a very precarious situation.

The Union and Confederate governments both realized that Cincinnati was an early key to victory. With this in mind, in May of 1861, General George McClellan, Commander of the Union Forces, sent Lieutenant Poe of the Topographical Engineers ahead to Cincinnati to begin mapping the area to plan for the defense of Cincinnati. In September of the same year, Brigadier General Ormsby Mitchel assigned Colonel Charles Whittlesey to begin construction of the defenses. Whittlesey used maps that Poe began and expanded upon them. He built two gun emplacements overlooking the river in Ohio, one in Price Hill on the west side of Cincinnati, and one in Mount Adams on the east side

of Cincinnati, and a series of 8 artillery batteries stretching from present day Ludlow to Fort Thomas, Kentucky.⁶ The following is his description of the positions in Northern Kentucky found in a report sent to General Mitchel in November 1861, when the fortifications were completed:

The line I have selected extends in rear of the cities of Newport and Covington from the Ohio River, at Pleasant River[Pleasant Creek], 2 miles below Cincinnati across a bend of the River to a point which is 7½ miles above. It occupies the summits and ridges of the hills, which rise from 360 to 420 ft. above the low water and is (8) eight miles in length including an area of (19) square miles.⁷

When the fortifications were completed, Whittlesey and his unit, the 20th Ohio, were reassigned to guard Warsaw, Kentucky. Company K was left behind to guard the batteries and fortification until March 24, 1862. After this, many of the men in the companies were sent off to do battle in Tennessee and Mississippi. Colonel Whittlesey retired in 1862.⁸

The Union generals were correct to protect Cincinnati. Confederate officials, such as Braxton Bragg, saw the value of capturing the city. The Confederacy moved to take Cincinnati in 1862 when General Bragg, commander of the Confederate forces in the west, headed north through Tennessee and drove straight for the Ohio River.⁹ At the same time, General Robert E. Lee attacked General John Pope's Union forces in the east to suppress Pope's ability to help in the campaign for Kentucky and Cincinnati. General Bragg prepared a two-pronged offensive to take Lexington and then Louisville. General Bragg sent General Edmund Kirby Smith and a strong force of battle-hardened Confederate troops forward into central Kentucky while he himself moved towards Louisville.¹⁰ On August 29, General Smith met Union Brigadier General Mohlon Manson in Richmond, Kentucky. This was the first serious resistance that General Smith's troops faced. The Union forces were mostly new recruits and fell relatively easily. By September 2, Smith had moved on to Lexington, Kentucky. The people actually welcomed him into the city and Smith treated the situation as liberation, making a grand speech stating:

The Army of the Confederate States has entered your territory under my command. Let no one make you believe was came as invaders-to coerce your will. Far from it. The principle we maintain is that government derives its just power from the consent of the governed. Kentuckians: we come not as invaders but as liberators. We come in the spirit of your resolutions of 1798. We call upon you to take up arms and join with us in hurling back the Northern hordes who would deprive you of your liberty.¹¹

General Horatio Wright, Commander of the Union Department of Ohio, felt the pressure from the south. He quickly ordered General Lew Wallace to Cincinnati in August 1862 to prepare for the defense of the city. Wallace moved his headquarters into the Burnett house in Cincinnati and promptly placed the

city under martial law on September 2, 1862.¹² Wallace assessed his situation and called for volunteers to stand up and fight for their city. Within two days of the call, over fourteen thousand men had arrived to aid in the defense of the city. Wallace also had the 99th and 45th Ohio in Covington, who had retreated there from earlier engagements, to help with the defense of the city.¹³ By September 7 seventy two thousand men had arrived in Cincinnati to aid in the defense. Over sixty thousand were irregulars or Squirrel Hunters as they were called by the Cincinnati Army paymaster, Major Malcolm McDowell. Another source of labor was the Negro Brigade. This brigade was made up of free Negro males led by Judge W.M. Dickson. The over 700 free Negroes who made up this unit helped construct the fortifications defending Cincinnati.¹⁴ Wallace had so many men that he was at a loss as to what to do with them all. He commented "72,000 men!!! What do I do with them?"¹⁵

By September 8, Wallace had deemed the city safe enough to ease restrictions and he rescinded his martial law order. Most of his men were placed in the fortifications around the city and life returned to some semblance of normalcy. The peace did not last very long. When General Smith had attacked Frankfurt, Kentucky, he split his column into two groups and sent half of them north with General Henry Heth to scout Cincinnati. By September 10, he had made it to within one mile of Fort Mitchel. Later that evening, General Heth scouted Fort Mitchel from the rooftop of Vicker's farmhouse. General Wallace was at Fort Mitchel at the same time and saw Heth through a set of binoculars. From there, Wallace ordered, by telegraph, his picket lines to double their defenses in anticipation of trouble. Early on the morning of September 11, a skirmish ensued, causing few casualties on either side. Later that day, Wallace learned that the Confederates had captured a gristmill around Florence, Kentucky and were using it to supply their men. Wallace sent out Captain Worthington to go around the rear of Heth's Cavalry chief, Colonel Scott. The Confederates withdrew without the Union forces losing a single man. It is believed Wallace spent most of the 11th and 12th riding the defenses. Heth, however, received orders from Smith to pull out and prepare for an assault on Louisville as soon as Gen. Bragg's troops arrived from their engagement with General Buell's forces in southern Kentucky. The siege of Cincinnati ended as quickly as it started.

To prepare the area for the impending assault and siege in Cincinnati, Gen. Wallace placed Lieutenant Colonel J.H. Simpson, of the United States Engineers, in charge of building and reinforcing the defensive fortifications around the city. Simpson immediately called Colonel Whittlesey out of retirement to help improve the defenses. They used Whittlesey's original plans from 1861 and expanded on them to improve the defensive line.¹⁶ Many of the men who volunteered for the defense of the city were put to work adding to the defensive fortifications, including the five hundred men of Negro Brigade. Construction of the fortifications continued until 1863, long after the siege of Cincinnati ended. Twenty more batteries and fortifications were built during this time, including Battery Hooper.

Maintaining these batteries was not an easy task. Since the Confederate forces never advanced as far north again during the war, most of the

volunteers in Cincinnati were shipped out to fight on other battlefronts. By 1863, many of the fortifications had fallen into disrepair. In the same year, Captain M.D. McAlester, Corps of Engineers, made an inspection tour of the fortifications making remarks in his report to Colonel Simpson on repairs and upgrades the fortifications received.¹⁷ This report is very important because it speaks of a drain being installed at Battery Hooper to help stop the flooding of the powder magazine. The powder magazine was where the ammunition and gunpowder was stored for the cannon at the batteries. This drain may be the cistern found at Battery Hooper.¹⁸

Another issue arose in 1864 having to do with problems guarding the fortifications. In a series of correspondences to his superiors, Simpson requested more men to guard the batteries against bandits and renegade soldiers.¹⁹ He received only a few men for each battery and then only on a temporary basis.²⁰ In May 1865, Simpson was ordered on another inspection tour of the batteries in Northern Kentucky. He reported the lapsing and deteriorating condition of the unused fortifications. At the end of the report, since the Confederacy was no longer a threat, Col. Simpson recommended the fortifications be dismantled and the cannons returned to an armory in Pennsylvania. He also recommended that the wood used to build the fortifications be returned to the owners of the land where the fortifications were built as compensation.²¹

The events leading up to the Siege of Cincinnati and those following are important events in this region's history. Great efforts were taken to safeguard this region from capture by the Confederacy. It can be argued that the siege of Cincinnati was a turning point in the Civil War because the Confederacy never threatened a region this far north again. It is very important that history and historical evidence be preserved so we can pass down the story of a community banding together to save their towns. Local interest groups such as the NKU Foundation, the City of Ft. Wright and the Behringer-Crawford Museum have joined in an effort to preserve a piece of this history.

Of the twenty-eight artillery batteries and fortifications constructed for the defense of Cincinnati, only six remain.²² Over the years, most of the batteries have been destroyed in the name of progress. As recent as two years ago, Battery Perry was destroyed to make way for a new housing development.²³ Of the six remaining batteries, one is Battery Hooper. Battery Hooper was constructed in 1863, after the siege of Cincinnati. The battery was named for William Hooper, a prominent banker, who helped pay the men working on the battery.

Battery Hooper is located under the front lawn of the late Fern Storer's house in the city of Fort Wright, Kentucky. When she passed away in 2002, Fern left the property to the Northern Kentucky University Foundation. Rather than sell the land to developers, the foundation decided to sell the property back to the city of Fort Wright. Kathy Romero, a Fort Wright resident leading the fight to save Battery Hooper, said, "I really believe how a community respects its history is a good measure of how it values its future."²⁴ The city had the same idea as Mrs. Romero and agreed to buy the property in a city council meeting on Wednesday, August 13, 2003. The property was sold to the city for \$790,000. Romero described the situation as "win-win."²⁵

The city plans to turn the area into a passive park focusing on the area's Civil War heritage.²⁶ In order to accomplish the goal of turning the Battery Hooper site into a park, the Fort Wright City Council, NKU Foundation, and the Behringer-Crawford Museum received a Scripps Howard Foundation grant of \$32,000 to excavate, preserve, and exhibit Battery Hooper.

The Scripps Howard grant will help the supporters verify the edges of Battery Hooper and its powder magazine, pay for an archaeological dig, and an NKU student research project on the battery and Northern Kentucky's Civil War defenses and cover repairs to the late Fern Storer's two-story brick home. The home's first floor will house exhibits on the battery and Greater Cincinnati's role in the Civil War.²⁷

Dr. James Ramage, a Regents Professor of History and the man for whom the new museum is named, said the grant would be matched by the three participating partners in the project. The park opened June 30, 2005, and was dedicated on August 20, 2005.

The Fort Wright city council held a meeting on May 12, 2004 to create a master plan on how to complete the Battery Hooper Project. A short time later on Thursday, September 17, 2004, ground was broken on the first excavation units by a team of volunteer students and Central Ohio Valley Archaeological Society (C.O.V.A.S) members. Two days later on Saturday, September 19, the first public volunteers arrived to begin help with the excavation. The student teams from Northern Kentucky University returned the following Saturday with more public volunteers arriving the next Sunday. The following Thursday several local schools, again accompanied by NKU student volunteers, were allowed to visit the site. Also present that day was the Mid-States Living History Association, Inc., a group of Civil War re-enactors helping to recreate what Battery Hooper may have been like for the children who visited the site.

With the great amount of artifacts and information revealed from the research and excavation on Battery Hooper, the Fort Wright city council has allowed further excavation to take place through 2006. This community outreach program will continue with expanded excavations in the future. Dr Ramage said, "The whole project is a model of university-community relationships and partnerships."²⁸

Battery Hooper is a vital part of the Northern Kentucky's rich history. Battery Hooper played an important role in the defense of Cincinnati and the overall defense of the Northern States. In a time of crisis the Northern Kentucky community banded together to ensure its safety. Now, once again, the community has banded together to solve another crisis. Our history is very important. Our history helps us identify ourselves as a community. The destruction of many of our links to the past is making this impossible. Fort Wright has decided to preserve their past and retain part of this identity. Through careful study of the past and a strong desire to preserve it, Fort Wright, Northern Kentucky University, and countless volunteers have ensured that this precious landmark will survive.

ENDNOTES

1. Louis Leonard Tucker, *Cincinnati: A Student's Guide to Localized History*. (New York: Teachers College Press Columbia University, 1969), pp.8.
2. *Ibid.*, 8.
3. *Ibid.*, 8.
4. *Ibid.*, 9.
5. *Ibid.*, 9.
6. Jeanine Kreinbrink, *Statement of Historical Context: Northern Kentucky, Defensive Fortification System, 1861-1865*, 1996, Report written to the United States Department of the Interior, pp. 3.
7. Charles Whittlesey, Report on Defenses of Cincinnati, Ohio. November 1, 1861. Submitted to Brigadier General O.M. Mitchel.
8. Jeanine Kreinbrink, Lecture, Anthropology 307, Northern Kentucky University.
9. Joseph S. Stern. "The Siege of Cincinnati", *Bulletin of the Historical and Philosophical Society of Cincinnati*, pp. 163.
10. Stern, "The Siege of Cincinnati", pp. 165.
11. *Ibid.*, 166.
12. *Ibid.*, 167.
13. *Ibid.*, 171.
14. *Ibid.*, 176.
15. *Ibid.*, 178.
16. Kreinbrink, Statement of Historical Context, pp. 4.
17. M.D. McAlester, Report submitted August 11, 1863.
18. Kreinbrink, Lecture, 2004.
19. James H. Simpson, Correspondence to General Wallace, 1864.
20. Lew Wallace, Correspondence to Lt. Col J.H. Simpson, 1864.
21. James H. Simpson, Report and recommendations written to General Mitchel, June 1865.
22. Kreinbrink, Lecture, 2004.
23. *Ibid.*, 2004.
24. Cindy Schroeder, "City approve preservation of the Civil War battery site", Cincinnati Enquirer, 14 August, 2003.
25. *Ibid.*, 2003.
26. Cindy Schroeder, "Civil War battery receives grant", Cincinnati Enquirer, 4 May, 2004.
27. *Ibid.*, 2004.
28. Cindy Schroeder, "Civil War battery receives grant", Cincinnati Enquirer, 4 May, 2004.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Barber, Russell J. *Doing Historical Archaeology: Exercises Using Documentary, Oral, and Material Evidence*. New Jersey: Prentice Hill, 1994.
- Hutchinson, Jason, Personal conversation regarding fill at battery Hooper site, 9 November 2004.
- Kreinbrink, Jeanine. Section E: *Statement of Historical Context: Northern Kentucky, Defensive Fortification System, 1861-1865*, 1996, Submitted to United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service NPS form 10-900a, OMB No. 1024-0018.
- Kreinbrink, Jeanine. Lecture in Ant 307 Historical Archaeology at Northern Kentucky University.
- Mahan, D.H. *A Treatise on Field Fortification containing instructions on the Methods of Laying out, Construction, Defending, and Attacking Intrenchments, with General Outlines also of the Arrangement, the Attack and Defense of Permanent Fortifications*. New York: John Wiley 1867.
- McAlester, M.D. Report submitted to General Joseph G. Totten, Office Chief of Engineers, Dept. of Ohio. August 11, 1863. Research collection of Jeanine Kreinbrink. *Northeast Historical Archaeology*. Boston: University of Massachusetts, 2000, vol. 29.
- Schroeder, Cindy. "City approves preservation of the Civil War battery site" Cincinnati Enquirer August 14, 2003. http://www.enquirer.com/editions/2003/08/14/loc_ky-battery14.html.
- Schroeder, Cindy. "Civil War battery receives grant" Cincinnati Enquirer. May 4, 2004. http://www.enquirer.com/editions/2004/05/04/loc_2batt.html.
- Simpson, James H. 1864 Letter to General Wright requesting more guards for Battery security.
- Simpson, James H. 1865 Final report and recommendation to General on conditions of fortifications.
- Stern, Joseph S. "The Siege of Cincinnati" *Bulletin of the Historical and Philosophical Society of Ohio*, Publication volume, number and date unknown, 163-186.
- Tucker, Louis Leonard. "The Siege of Cincinnati by a Pearl Street Rifle" *The Bulletin of the Historical and Philosophical Society of Ohio*, 20, no 4 (1962), 255-273.
- Tucker, Louis Leonard, *Cincinnati: A student's guide to localized history*. New York: Teachers College: Columbia University, 1969.
- Wimberg, Robert J. *Cincinnati and the Civil War: Off to Battle*. Cincinnati: Ohio Book Store, 1992.
- Whittlesey, Charles. 1861, Report of Defenses of Cincinnati Ohio, November 1, 1861. To Brigadier General O. M. Mitchel, Commanding Department of the Ohio. On file at the National Archives.



Perspectives

The Four Factors: Reasons as to Why Darwinism Has Become the Predominant View to the Question of Origin Amidst a Society Dominated by Christians

Stephen E. Johnson

The theory of evolution is the majority view in America as to the question of origin, in spite of the predominance of Christianity—a religion traditionally at odds with evolution. The acceptance of evolution has long been explained by pointing to scientific evidence that is continually surfacing in support of it. However, evolution has found its way into the belief system of Americans by an altogether different means. Darwinism's reception has come by way of systematically marketing it to the masses and by philosophically reconciling it with Christianity.



An anti-evolution protest. Image courtesy of Shrewsbury Museums Service.



Charles Darwin. Image courtesy of Shrewsbury Museums Service.

Though many other evolutionary theories preceded his time, Charles Darwin is undoubtedly credited for popularizing and giving an organized, working definition and survey of evolution.¹ In fact, strong arguments have been given supporting the idea that even well over 2,000 years ago, Greek philosophers proposed evolutionary theories, as unorganized as they were.² The evolutionary theory is an elaborate paradigm that seeks to answer the question of how everything began. There are numerous variations of the theory of evolution, and each variation has continued and continues to undergo much alteration. However, some basic principles of the theory emerge in each variation, most of which are inline with Darwin's particular view of evolution. All evolutionary theories maintain that all of life began with one or a few molecules. Predominately,

evolutionary theories propagate the idea that through millions and billions of years upward gradual change has ultimately resulted in what we see today with all of life having one common ancestor.³

The evolutionary process, through its form of generation-*upward gradual change*-creates new and better species as time passes and the process continues. Darwin hallmarked his variation of this process by describing it as taking place through genetics with the best species or the species most fit for survival living to pass on its "fit" genes to the next, better generation of creatures.⁴ Better and better creatures and species continue to inhabit the planet as only the fit survive to allow for this progressive generation of new species to occur.

Furthermore, evolution does maintain that man came up directly from the monkey. Darwin, tracing man's origin in *The Descent of Man*, points out when he gets to the place where the tree branches off into the Old World monkeys and the New World monkeys, which man probably came from the Old World monkeys. He writes that man probably came from the chimpanzee rather than the gorilla.⁵ The gorilla is too big and strong for Darwin to believe that it would be able to cultivate the social instincts needed for the appearance or generation of man.

In contrast to evolution, creationism maintains that the Bible and the first two chapters of Genesis in particular, are to be taken literally as explanation of the history of the universe's origin. This account holds that the earth was created in six days and everything that was created simply appeared at the sound of God's voice as he spoke them into existence.⁶ Importantly, literal creationism holds that the earth is only about 6,000 to 10,000 years old, in stark contrast to present day numbers given by evolutionists, which currently place the earth's age at 4.6 billion years.⁷ Some scientists, however, have recently attributed a lengthier age to earth, at about 5 to 6 billion years.

Another important difference made in creationism is man's position in the universe. The creationist maintains that man, instead of being an animal developed, is created by an Almighty God by separate act and placed here for His purpose.⁸ Man, in this view, is seen as being created in the very image of his Creator and made for a reason.

This second theory was undoubtedly the most accepted, even among scientists, and for thousands of years nearly the only accepted theory as to the origin of the world.⁹ Though different cultures have different variations of creation ideas, it has been creationism that dominated the beliefs of those cultures. Looking at documents, both scientific and religious, from hundreds and even thousands of years ago, we can see a clear belief in some creation story. The works of such scientists as Isaac Newton, Johann Kepler, Louis Pasteur and Michael Faraday are among the many scientists who have clearly expressed their belief in creationism.¹⁰ Religious works such as the Judeo-Christian Scriptures and the Koran also clearly posit this belief. Today, however, most people, even the religious, accept some form of evolution as the means whereby the universe began. Since organized evolutionary theories have been around only for a relatively short period (roughly three hundred years), and creation stories for thousands of years, we are begged to question

why this revolutionary idea has gained such wide appeal and why such a turn around in beliefs has resulted.

Furthermore, this question is found more significant when one considers the importance that these theories have on the core values of those who maintain them. These theories deal with one of the fundamental questions of humanity (origin) and one's view on that question brings to bear topics as varied as meaning, morality and destiny. One's view on the origin of life may determine and does lay down the framework with which an individual may build their philosophies about the meaning of life, what determines right and wrong, and what will happen after death.

One must realize that at its root, evolution begins with naturalistic presuppositions and does not attribute effects because of the action of a supernatural being, but rather the result of natural events. Ergo, evolution leads to a philosophy on meaning, morality and destiny that is altogether different from the answers to these same questions reached by creationism.

In its basic form, evolution is a view that is contradictory to that of the Christian Scripture, as previously pointed out. In essence, a belief in or insistence on evolution as the answer to the question of origin does take issue with the Scriptures in general and the first two chapters of Genesis in particular, or at least the literal interpretation of these chapters. Importantly, creationists maintain that the gospel message of Jesus Christ is rooted in the Genesis account of creation. In order to understand the meaning of Christ's coming to earth one must understand man's need for salvation, which is based upon his sinful condition, which is rooted in the fall of Adam.¹¹ This clearly demonstrates the importance placed upon the literal interpretation of Scriptures that many Christians see as necessary. It is no wonder then that many Christians are not willing to give up their view of Genesis as literal history. Nevertheless, why have so many done just that?

Evolution, undoubtedly, when first popularized, was a revolutionary idea. The majority of the world's population only fathomed some type of creation story as reason to how the world began. Darwin offered a much different view, one that rejected this long, and widely held belief. His theory maintains that "all organisms trace their lineage back to a universal common ancestor," and that "an unguided physical process can account for the emergence of all biological complexity and diversity."¹² His view was completely radical in that it not only was completely new for so many minds, but it wholly undermined the way in which the Scriptures declared that the world began. This idea cut deep into the values held by so many.

Selling new ideas, especially when they slice at the roots of moral convictions as evolution does, are no exception to this principle of marketing. People are much more hesitant to give up their deeply held beliefs than they are to give up their brand of potato peeler. Evolution was a world-shattering concept that cut deeply into the strongly held core values of so many, especially Christians, which make up a bulk of the American population.

Given the fact that literal creationism is the root of many strongly held Christian beliefs, and evolution is contradictory to that core, it must be asked, "How can so many today believe in evolution?" The answer, though missed by

many, is clear – it had to be marketed strategically and cleverly, and so it was. Through the uses of rhetoric, relating the theory to society, introducing it into education as mainstream and attempting to reconcile it with religion, strategy has created the desire needed for evolution to achieve success.

The insistence today as to why evolution has come to be the number one chosen explanation for the question of origin is on the scientific facts. Ask anyone who believes in evolution how they arrived at that decision. The response is going to be some form of “science has proven it.”¹³ Ask them how science has proven it, and then their countenance changes from an easy confidence to a puzzling stare. Science, whether it can be said to have *proven* evolution or not, has very little to do with why people accept evolution. The evidence in support of evolution is overwhelmingly not known, cared about or understood by the masses who tout this evidence as the reason to why evolution has made its way into their belief system.

Many books written on the subject of evolution deal with a myriad of scientific areas in which the authors demonstrate their learned perspective of evolutionism. Ranging from paleontology, genetics, archeology, biology, anthropology, to geology, these disciplines are utilized to educate others about scientific theories that demonstrate the process of evolution in nature. Undoubtedly, these studies are often very detailed and esoteric. Browsing through any selection of books dealing with the any of these sciences as demonstrating evolution can be mind boggling to any reader, even one highly learned in the subject area. The fact is, most people truly do not understand any one of these sciences as they pertain to evolution. Even the authors themselves are often making guesses and proposing surmised and admittedly questionable theories based upon their assumptions.

The education or knowledge of the masses in relation to sciences and history is constantly demonstrated to be lacking. A recent survey done among Ivy League students revealed these deficiencies. The survey found that only twenty-five percent of the students surveyed were able to identify Thomas Jefferson as the author of Declaration of Independence’s opening words. The same percentage was able to identify Abraham Lincoln as the author of the Gettysburg Address.¹⁴ A 1983 United States national board of education report entitled *A Nation At Risk* likened the organization of American education as one that would be considered an act of war if done by a foreign power.¹⁵ William Hayes, in response to this report, writes that twenty years of work has shown very little improvement, especially in the way of student performance both academically and behaviorally.¹⁶

One article, written to offer ways in which universities can curb dropout rates, notes that while 63% of high school graduates enroll in some sort of postsecondary education program after high school, nearly 33% drop out of college within their first two years.¹⁷ From these reports and the many others that corroborate them, we can conclude that complex scientific theories such as evolution, while accepted by most, are not known in detail. Ask even a college student (a status that we presume to be the elite or most engaged in education or studies among those of society) who believes in evolution on what scientific grounds does he hold his/her belief and undoubtedly the

response will be in some general term. “The fossil records have shown it,” or “they’ve dug up bones of evolutionary ancestors,” or something of the sort will be given. This evidence is not given, in any way, to prove any kind of extreme ignorance upon our nation’s educated. It does serve however, to demonstrate a clear lack of understanding necessary in order to advance the notion that society is well versed in evolutionary science. The evidence needed to support the idea that evolution is accepted because of the awareness of scientific evidence that prove it, simply does not exist.

Most people simply do not have interest in learning about the scientific evidence for the origin of life or the physical universe. Universities are constantly showing staggeringly low numbers of students focusing their studies in the physical sciences and more and more are leaning towards the social sciences such as psychology, sociology, and human services.¹⁸ Given this clear lack of interest in the physical sciences, it follows then that people are not going to have a deep understanding of the theories that are supported by these very sciences. The result is a clear deficiency in the very knowledge that is often claimed as the reason why people believe in or accept Darwinism. We are left then with the question of why people so overwhelmingly accept Darwin’s theory as the answer to the question of origin.

To understand the present day reception of Darwin’s theory, we must first understand that this acceptance has not always been as it is today. The subscription to evolution has been a gradual one. Tracing society’s acceptance of evolution from the time of its popularization in the 1850s, when Darwin published his famous work, *The Origin of Species*, we can see this gradation. Thomas Glick’s anthology of comparing Darwin’s acceptance among the United States and several European countries demonstrates the inundation of debates and arguments among scientists and theologians: both groups arguing with each other within their respective fields and each with the other.¹⁹ While its reception was more easily obtained in certain countries than in others (England, Darwin’s homeland, for one), it was gradual throughout the world with particular countries still today overwhelmingly rejecting Darwin, usually on religious grounds.²⁰

While no polls were conducted in the 1800s to discover what the masses thought about Darwin’s theory, we can make conclusions on other bases.²¹ General beliefs among the scientific network of Europe and America during the mid-1800s are known. Most were “ostensibly, Protestant Christians, members of the established church,” and most were concerned with “showing that science was a true supporter of religion.”²² With deduction, we can reason then that the popular belief during this time between Europe and America in particular was the Bible’s account of creation.

This belief, of course, waned as the present grew nigh. The famous Scopes trial of 1925 showed us that in 75 years from our point of reference, Darwinism was being pushed to become a part of education but importantly, not quite yet accepted.²³ Continuing with our timeline marks 1967, when evolution did become a part of Tennessee’s curriculum: a great benchmark for demonstrating Darwin’s growing acceptance. Today, evolution is the only theory taught in American public schools as to how the world began. Laughter

almost inevitably ensues when any student proposes the opposite. Additionally, lawsuits almost inevitably follow when any teacher even suggests the idea of creation.

A 2001 Gallup poll demonstrates that in America 49% of the population accept some form of evolution as the answer for the origin of the universe, with 45% accepting the Bible's account of creation.²⁴ One source, quoting from a 1999 edition of *Religion Today*, writes that 97% of the world's population does not believe that the earth was created in a literal six days as the Christian Scriptures account.²⁵ Though belief in evolution is clearly widespread, scientific awareness is not to be credited.

If this complete turn around cannot be explained by society being convinced by all the scientific facts, then how can it be explained? As spelled out previously, Darwinism was a completely radical idea, and one that deeply opposed the face of creationism, thus it, like anything revolutionary, had to be cleverly marketed in order to survive amidst such criticism and opposition as did certainly exist in the mid 1800s and even the largest or earliest part of the 20th century.

One widely used tactic of marketers is a rhetorical strategy called euphemism. Euphemisms are words used as a "substitution for more harsh or direct ones."²⁶ The purpose of their use is to label something, which is otherwise offensive, in a positive or non-offensive manner. We most widely recognize their use in the place of curse or swear words. Words such as "gosh" or "shoot" are popular examples. Oftentimes, however, euphemisms are used to gloss over or sugarcoat harsh and brutal facts in order to achieve an end with hopes of dodging the consequences of a negative reaction.

Executives, politicians, and even educators are well known for using this tactic. When Daimler Chrysler closed one of its plants, it announced an initiation of "a career alternative enhancement program." When politicians want to raise taxes they call for "an enhancement in revenues." Educators do not fail students anymore, but rather students simply "achieve a deficiency." Even hospitals are prey to this influx of terminology; People don't die at hospitals, they simply "experience a negative patient-care outcome." Some prisons have even renamed their solitary confinement as "involuntary administrative segregation," and are now calling Death Row the "capital sentences unit."²⁷

Darwin, in espousing evolution, was no exception. He realized the persuasiveness of such a strategy. Darwin was a great user of rhetorical strategies in selling his idea.²⁸ He quickly realized the so often used term coined by Herbert Spencer, "survival of the fittest" brought with it great negative connotations. The idea of creatures living only to try and survive death, and the brutal destruction that life offers for the mere purpose of passing on its "well adapted traits" to the next generation only for it to do the same, wouldn't set well with society, especially when most viewed life as a gift from the Creator with the express purpose of glorifying that Creator.

Darwin quickly adopted a different, much more euphemistic term—natural selection. This term, he would use, in the place of "survival of the fittest," while making very clear in chapter four of *Origin of Species* the term was equal in meaning to his more preferred term "natural selection."²⁹ While this new term

was the same in philosophy and process as the former, it simply sounds much more attractive. Natural selection brings with it pictures of birds singing and flowers blooming, while in actuality it means the same as “survival of the fittest”: a term that may bring a pessimistic sentiment.

The term “survival of the fittest” did serve however, as useful in relating Darwinism with societal conventions: another necessary step in getting the public to accept this revolutionary theory. Known as “Social Darwinism,” Darwin’s theory found its way, as it almost inevitably would, in the center ring of conversation among sociologists. Applying the “survival of the fittest” principle to society was easily done and readily grabbed by those who put themselves in the place of survivor.

The late Stephen J. Gould advances this notion. While he does not subscribe to this opinion, he does admit, when referencing Darwin’s concept of survival in nature that “it is beginning to look as though what Darwin really discovered was nothing more than the Victorian propensity to believe in progress.”³⁰ We can see here the clear reference to natural selection being bought as a survival concept used to justify success and progress among the elite.

The urgency to accept this theory characterized the middle and upper classes of Europe. These classes could see themselves as the “most fit” of society and could easily place themselves as the victor in the struggle of life. Why were they the elite of society? Simple - they were the most fit and therefore the best. It only followed then, that they should be the ones that ruled and/or governed in either or both legal matters or simple customs.³¹ Their prestige spoke for itself, and was the justification for their position in society. The argument is simple; progress is justification or in other terms, we are better therefore we are right, and Darwinism explained this all perfectly.

Darwin’s ideas would need to become commonplace if they were to flourish. Evolution’s integration into the education system would accomplish a much-needed familiarization. Evolution today is not, by any means, a revolutionary idea. Every student has heard about it since grade school. No one is shocked to hear that man has evolved from simpler species over millions of years. It is simply something we hear all the time. Of all that has been accomplished by the teaching of evolution in the public education system, perhaps greatest is the creation of a society accustomed to hearing Darwin’s theory as established fact.

One particular Gallup poll demonstrates the education level of an individual and its relation to that individual’s belief in evolution. The poll shows that college graduates are nearly three times more likely to believe in evolution when compared to individuals who do not have a high school diploma.³² The connection between education and a belief in evolution is quite evident. The more education one receives, the more indoctrination they receive in evolutionary theories. William J. Bryan, in the 1920s, often would refer to the studies of James Leuba, professor of psychology at Bryn Mawr, which revealed staggering numbers demonstrating the effect of college education on student’s belief in God and immortality.³³ The studies showed that nearly half of Christian young people whom, upon receiving four years of education, which proposed evolutionary theories, left college denying basic Christian theology.

Perhaps most important of the needed strategies in order to get Darwin's theory accepted is the reconciliation of evolution with Christianity. Darwinism is, at its root, naturalistic. Naturalism, by definition is antitheistic, therefore attributes all effects to natural causes, and completely rejects the very concept of a personal God.³⁴ This is in complete contradiction to the predominate view of America today, which is theistic.³⁵ This worldview, by definition, allows for the attribution of effects to a supernatural cause, God in particular.

The idea that life or the world began, no matter in what way, without a God having something to do with it could not become mainstream in a society such as ours. A society dominated by theists would hardly stand to accept such an idea. Some kind of reconciliation had to be made with this theistic philosophy and evolutionists did just that.

Various ideas were offered to appease those who would not let go of their Bibles or in the least, their idea that God had something to do with the forming of the world. These ideas are dubiously called Theistic Evolution. This theory simply adds God to the equation, allowing those whom believe in God not to be forced to let go of that belief in order to accept the notions of science.³⁶ In its basest form, Theistic Evolution maintains that God sparked the evolutionary process by being the progenitor of life and the progenitor of the first germ in particular. It is philosophically a deistic approach: Deism being a rationalistic movement of the 17th and 18th centuries holding that God, after creating the world, refrains from interfering with it. This view while holding to the existence and primary act of creation of God rejects any supernatural intervention of God with human affairs.³⁷ These beliefs accept the idea wherein God creates the first form of life and then leaves for nature to do the rest without His guiding hand or involvement.

Christians who hold on to their belief in the Bible as inspired by God and who are struggling with reconciling that belief with the scientific theory of evolution have many options from which to choose. Theistic evolutionary theories, while taking various forms, all seek to allow even the Christian to keep most of their beliefs while reconciling those beliefs with an evolutionary framework. This is done always by making some sort of change to the Scriptures.³⁸ Interestingly, all theistic evolutionary theories alter the Scriptures but never make any change to the scientific theory.

One such theistic evolutionary idea that is offered, deals with the interpretation of the Scriptures. The Bible may simply be interpreted as figurative and not literal.³⁹ This allows the Christian to accept evolution and the Bible, only the Bible is viewed as a book of metaphors that serve to bring insight to living a better life and not as a literal work.

Another such theory deals also with the way the Scriptures are interpreted – the “Day-Age Theory.”⁴⁰ This theory proposes that specifically and perhaps only the six days of creation are figurative and not literal. These days are seen to represent ages of time, which may span millions to billions of years, and not literal twenty-four hour periods, thus allowing the evolutionary process to take place during such huge spans.

Last of the major theistic evolutionary theories, is the “Gap Theory.”⁴¹ This theory suggests that an imaginary huge gap existed between the first two

verses of the first chapter of Genesis. This gap is designed to allow the necessary time needed for the evolutionary process to take place.

Looking at the Gallup polls more closely, we can see the dramatic impact these reconciliations have made on the acceptance of evolution. While 49% of the public accepts evolution, 73% of that 49% believe in some form of Theistic evolution.⁴² After doing the math, which leaves us with a number of only 12% of the population polled believes in naturalistic evolution. The impact of theistic evolutionary theories is clear. Most people who believe in evolution have done so only with the caveat of accepting some form of theistic evolution.

Though volumes of work have been written on the strengths of scientific findings that demonstrate evolution in nature, it is not these works or findings that lead us to the position in which we find ourselves today—a dominant belief in evolution. That which accounts for the popular belief that exists is rooted in the way that Darwinism's popularization has been executed. The evolutionary belief that prevails from Darwin's work is a result of clear strategy, relating it to society, introducing it to education, and reconciling it with religion. With the offerings that these steps afford, it is no wonder why such a theory, as philosophically consequential as it may be, has gained such wide and popular acclaim.

The many Christians, who have accepted the theory of evolution, saw their own religion threatened by this innovational idea. Seeing the survival of Christianity at stake because of being forced to face competition with a *more fit* proposal for the earth's origin, many have opted to adapt. In adapting the religion to align more closely with evolutionary thinking, many Christians seek to insure their faith's survival, perhaps at the cost of concession.

ENDNOTES

1. Ken Ham, *Did Adam Have A Bellybutton: And Other Tough Questions About the Bible* (Green Forest, AZ: Master Books, 1999), 121.
2. Edward Clodd, *Pioneers of Evolution: From Thales to Huxley* (New York: Books for Libraries Press, 1897, Reprinted 1972), 1-35.
3. Charles Darwin, *The Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection or The Preservation of favored Races in the Struggle for Life*, 6th ed. (New York: The Brunswick Subscription, 1915), 89, 298-299.
4. Charles Darwin, *The Descent of Man and Selection in Relation to Sex* (New York: AMS Press, 1896), 47-48.
5. *Ibid.*, 590.
6. Gen. 1:1-31 KJV.
7. Scott M. Huse, *The Collapse of Evolution*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1993), 23.
8. Gen. 1:27 KJV.
9. Huse, 23.
10. *Ibid.*, 145.
11. Ham, 71.
12. Geoffrey Simmons, *What Darwin Didn't Know* (Eugene, OR: Harvest House, 2004), 10-11.
13. Huse, 17.
14. Charles Colson and Nancy R. Pearcey, *A Dangerous Grace* (Dallas: Word Publishing, 1994), 282.
15. The National Commission on Excellence in Education, comp., *A Nation at Risk* (Cambridge, MA: USA Research, 1984), 5.
16. William Hayes, *Are We Still a Nation at Risk Two Decades Later?* (Lanham, Maryland: Scarecrow Education, 2004), 126-132.
17. John M. Braxton et al., "Understanding and Reducing College Student Departure," *Journal of College Student Development* 46.2 (2005): 213-215. www.muse.jhu.edu/ (accessed October 19, 2005).
18. Thomas Hilton and Valerie Lee, "Student Interest and Persistence in Science," *Journal of Higher Education*, Vol. 59, No. 5 (September/October 1988): 510-515. www.jstor.org/ (accessed February 17, 2006).
19. M.J.S. Hodge, "England," in *The Comparative Reception of Darwinism*, ed Thomas F. Glick (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1988), 75-80.
20. Cynthia Eagle Russett, *Darwin in America: The Intellectual Response*, (San Francisco, W.H. Freeman, 1976), 8.
21. Michele L. Alrich, "United States," in Glick, 224.
22. Michal Ruse, *The Darwinian Revolution*, (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1979), 63.

23. Peter J. Bowler, "Going to Extremes in America," *Science*, New Series 283 (January 1999): 5398. www.jstor.org/ (accessed October 12, 2005).
24. Debra Jordan Brooks, "Substantial Number of Americans Continue to Doubt Evolution as Explanation for Origin of Humans," *Gallup News Service*, March 5 2001. <http://www.unl.edu/rhames/courses/current/creation/evol-poll.htm>.
25. B.A. Robinson, "Public Beliefs about Evolution and Creation," *Religious Tolerance* (1995), http://www.religioustolerance.org/ev_publi.htm.
26. Oxford Essential Dictionary, American ed., s.v. "euphemism."
27. Colson and Percy, 320.
28. John A. Campbell, "Why was Darwin Believed?: Darwin's Origin and the Problem of Intellectual Revolution," *Configurations* 11 (Spring 2003) 2 www.muse.jhu.edu/ (accessed October 19, 2005).
29. Darwin, *Origin of Species*, 64.
30. Stephen Gould, *Ever Since Darwin: Reflections in Natural History* (New York: Norton & Company, 1977), 40-43.
31. Michael Ruse, *Can a Darwinian be a Christian?* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 181-185.
32. Robinson, 1.
33. Louis Koenig, *Bryan: A Political Biography of William Jennings Bryan* (New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1971), 607-608.
34. John MacArthur, *The Battle for the Beginning: Creation, Evolution and the Bible* (Dallas: Word Publishing Group, 2001), 11.
35. Robinson, 2.
36. Bowler, 39.
37. Webster's New International Dictionary, 3rd ed., s.v. "deism."
38. MacArthur, 63.
39. Russett, 32.
40. Huse, 48.
41. *Ibid.*, 48-49.
42. Brooks, 2.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alrich, Michele L. "United States." In *The Comparative Reception of Darwinism*, edited by Thomas F. Glick. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1988, 207-226.
- Bowler, Peter J. "Going to Extremes in America," *Science*, New Series 238 (January 1999): 5398. www.jstor.org/ (accessed October 12, 2005).
- Braxton, John M. et al. "Understanding and Reducing College Student Departure." *Journal of College Student Development* 46.2 (2005): 213-215. www.muse.jhu.edu/ (accessed October 19, 2005).
- Brooks, Debra Jordan. "Substantial Number of Americans Continue to Doubt Evolution as Explanation of Origin of Humans." *Gallup News Service*. March 5 2001. www.unl.edu/rhames/courses/current/creation/evol-poll.htm.
- Campbell, John A. "Why was Darwin Believed?: Darwin's Origin and the Problem of Intellectual Revolution." *Configurations* 11 no (Spring 2003): 2. www.muse.jhu.edu/ (accessed October 19, 2005).
- Clodd, Edward. *Pioneers of Evolution: From Thales to Huxley*. New York: Books for Libraries Press, 1897, Reprinted 1972.
- Colson, Charles and Nancy R. Pearcey. *A Dangerous Grace*. Dallas: Word Publishing, 1994.
- Darwin, Charles. *The Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection or The Preservation of Favored Races in the Struggle for Life*, 5th ed. New York: The Brunswick Subscription, 1915.
- . *The Descent of Man and Selection in Relation to Sex*. New York: AMS Press, 1896.
- Gould, Stephen. *Ever Since Darwin: Reflection in Natural History*. New York: Norton & Company, 1977.
- Ham, Ken. *Did Adam Have a Bellybutton: And Other Tough Questions about the Bible*. Green Forest, AZ: Master Books, 1999.
- Hayes, William. *Are We Still a Nation at Risk Two Decades Later?* Lanham, Maryland: Scarecrow Education, 2004.
- Hilton, Thomas and Valerie Lee. "Student Interest and Persistence in Science," *Journal of Higher Education*, Vol. 59 No. 5 (September/October 1988): 510-515. www.jstor.org/ (accessed February 17, 2006).
- Huse, Scott. *The Collapse of Evolution*, 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1993.
- Hodge, M.J.S. "England." In *The Comparative Reception of Darwinism*, edited by Thomas F. Glick. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1988, 75-80.
- Koening, Louis. *Bryan: A Political Biography of William Jennings Bryan*. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1971.
- MacArthur, John. *The Battle for the Beginning: Creation, Evolution and the Bible*. Dallas: Word Publishing Group, 2001.
- The National Commission on Excellence in Education, comp. *A Nation at Risk*. Cambridge, MA: U.S. Research, 1984.
- Robinson, B.A. "Public Beliefs about Evolution and Creation." *Religious Tolerance*. 1995. www.religioustolerance.org/ev_publ.htm.
- Ruse, Michael. *The Darwinian Revolution*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1979.
- . *Can A Darwinian Be a Christian?* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- Russett, Cynthia Eagle. *Darwin in America: The Intellectual Response*. San Francisco, W.H. Freeman, 1976.
- Simmons, Geoffrey. *What Darwin Didn't Know*. Eugene, OR: Harvest House, 2004.



The Corset: A Cultural History

Valerie Steele

Yale University Press, 2003

208 pps; illustrations; bibliography; index

Review by Jennifer Macht

A New Look at Fashion and Feminism

The old cliché “never judge a book by its cover” could not be more literally applied anywhere than to Valerie Steele’s book *The Corset: A Cultural History*. Upon first glance, this book could easily be mistaken for a fashion magazine. It is relatively the same size and the front cover shows a beautiful woman wearing an elegant corseted evening gown. If a potential reader were to flip through the pages, they would see that the book is full of photographs, illustrations and caricatures leading to the assumption that this book was written for an audience of fashion enthusiasts or costume designers. That is certainly not the case. Valerie Steele has filled this book with valuable information for cultural historians and women, as well as fashion enthusiasts, although it would provide little useful information for the costume designer. The abundance of pictures, which may seem to take away from the substance of the book at first, becomes valuable assets to the reader within the first few pages. While Steele’s occasionally animated enthusiasm for the subject can distract the reader from the informative content, it does not detract from the validity of her arguments.

In the introduction, Steele outlines some lofty goals to debunk long held myths about corsets. These myths include the devastating health effects of the corset and the sexual fetishism that is perceived to be widespread among corset supporters. She also states that the belief that most women who wore corsets had “wasp-waists” is untrue and that the corset was not an instrument of oppression forced on women by men. She immediately begins expelling myths by denouncing the commonly held belief that corsets were originally developed from an instrument of torture used in ancient Crete. She outlines a

less brutal evolution of the garment, sets each step of its development within its historical and cultural context, and provides solid documentation to support her case.

For the remainder of the book, Steele covers the history of corsets on a topical, rather than chronological basis. She has a chapter on Victorian corsets and their decline in popularity toward the end of the 19th century. Then she discusses their reappearance and proliferation throughout society and the rising popularity of tight-lacing, while debunking the myth that all women engaged in this practice. She devoted a significant portion of the book to the sexual fetishism that is often associated with the most severe tight-lacing contending that this was isolated to a very small, underground section of the culture. The book has a considerable focus on the movement led by medical professionals, feminists, and proponents of the natural body image that led to the decline in corset wearing. Finally, Steele covers the revival of the corset in contemporary fashion, stressing that it is not used as an instrument to reshape the body.

For the most part, Steele writes this book with a high level of historical methodology. She repeatedly introduces commonly held beliefs regarding corsets and corset wearers and gives her reader the evidence that supporters of that argument often cite. Steele then explains why they are wrong. She not only cites sources that support her view but also explains why the sources augmenting the other view are unreliable. Steele often utilizes letters, advertisements, editorials and other primary documents to support her case. She also seeks information from experts in the fields of fashion history and costume design to help her interpret documents that may have questionable validity. Steele often writes in a very passionate tone that may lead readers to feel that some of her judgments are based on emotion. That is why it is so important that she outlined her sources and backed them up with corroborating expert opinions that leave the reader with a sense of confidence in the information.

With a subject like fashion that is strongly rooted in appearance, pictures are a necessity and the pictures in *The Corset* play a vital role in Steele's argument. As mentioned earlier, they are throughout the book and vary in type from Victorian paintings to 19th century caricatures to advertisements from many different eras. There are also many hand drawn illustrations depicting the specific measurements of corsets that are mentioned. Each of these pictures deserves a place in the book and adds to the understanding of the material. It is difficult to understand just how unnatural a 14-inch waist looks without being able to see it. The pictures make it much easier to understand the evolution of the corset over time as well as the difference between the common use and the extreme practice of tight-lacing. Much of Steele's writing is based on the pictures as well. Keeping in mind that she is attempting to place the corset into a cultural context, understanding of the art, advertising and activism of the time is crucial. The caricatures, mostly drawn by those opposed to corsets paint a vivid picture of the issues that concerned people regarding this garment.

The only possible shortcoming of this work is its possible alienation of the

casual reader. Steele often uses highly academic language or technical terms. She even has a tendency to leave quotations written in foreign languages, mostly French, in that language making it impossible for many potential readers to understand their importance. In addition, her passion for the issue and her conviction of the validity of her argument almost verges on arrogance at certain points. This book was obviously not written for a general audience. The reader does not necessarily need to have a background in fashion or corsetry, simply a larger than average vocabulary and the patience to decipher the technical nomenclature.

These minor issues should not dissuade anyone who is interested in the history of fashion, feminism, or corsetry from reading this book. It contains a large body of information that is valuable for any of those fields. The fact that Steele has devoted the book to arguing against commonly held myths about corsets implies that it contains information on the subject that is not as readily available as the opposing arguments. Whether a reader finishes the book agreeing or disagreeing with Steele's point of view, they are sure to have a heightened interest in the subject. Certainly, that is the goal of any author who takes the time to write such an informative book as this one, including Valerie Steele.



Perspectives

The Struggle for Mastery: The Penguin History of Britain, 1066-1284

David Carpenter

Penguin Books, 2005

616 pps; genealogical tables; maps; bibliography; index
Review by Terence Anthony Fleming

Few periods of history suffer, as the Middle Ages suffer, from what E. P. Thompson called the “enormous condescension of the present to the past”. Our culture still draws inspiration from Classical Rome and Greece, but, under the continuing influence of Renaissance and Enlightenment prejudices, regards the “time in between” as “radically Other”; as barbaric and fanatical, at worst, and as quaint and faintly ridiculous, at best. Tales of dragon-slaying, of the rescue of damsels in distress and of robbing the rich to give to the poor *entertain* us still, but we treat them as mere stories—flashes of light and color in an otherwise drab and dreary landscape. It seems to us that no-one in the Middle Ages ever did anything that we can truly admire. We think of the medieval period as an interlude between two periods of civilization (the Classical and our own) in which the human spirit seemed to stall; in which progress became *regress*: a static and unvarying time in which life was, to use Thomas Hobbes’ phrase, “nasty, poor, brutish and short”.

No-one who reads David Carpenter’s book, *The Struggle for Mastery, 1066-1284* could carry on thinking like that. Within a space of time similar to that which has passed since the founding of the United States—200 and-a-bit years—the nations of the British Isles were changed out of recognition. Societies experienced wholesale restructuring from top to bottom; new towns were founded; old towns were completely rebuilt; organized religion for the first time reached down to the “grass-roots”; cash, commerce and shopping began to replace payment in kind and barter; criminal procedure, litigation and trial by jury replaced customary law and trial by ordeal; nations achieved territorial and institutional definition; ancient languages and cultures partly adapted to, partly perished from, the constant pressure of a dynamic, new,

Franco-European civilization that always wanted more and always wanted better from the societies it touched. This was the age that produced the one thing that generally *is* admired about the Middle Ages—even to excess by American lawyers—Magna Carta. Far from being a static and changeless period, the whirly-gig of time spun at a dizzying pace in the nations of the British Isles between the Norman Conquest of England in 1066 and the late-13th century English conquests of Wales and Scotland.

Having mentioned “conquests”, the question naturally arises: Is that what this book is all about, then—the same old story of conquest, castles, cavalry and chivalry? Carpenter’s book is far more than a list of obscure wars fought, won, lost and forgotten. This is not a history of “famous deeds” or a “court history” of kings and queens, either. Carpenter provides an integrated “thick description” of the medieval nations of Britain that puts social, political, economic and cultural history within a detailed narrative framework. What gives his book unity and coherence is his particular focus on the shifting twists and turns by which *power* was distributed and concentrated within and between the different national societies and polities of the British Isles during the two centuries or so he examines. The “struggle for mastery” is not just the title of the book. It is the concept Carpenter uses to explain how conflicts over power, both within and across national frontiers, affected the pattern and tempo of change in Britain in the Middle Ages.

For Carpenter the critical event in the history of medieval Britain (as a whole, and not just England) is the Norman Conquest. He thinks, however, that it should not be taken at face-value, but, rather, needs to be “unpacked”, or deconstructed, to get beyond the short-term military and political aspects of the subjugation of a country to foreign rule to see that the Normans let in gale-force winds of change in 1066 that were not at all directly under their control, and were not confined to England in effects.

Carpenter does more than give Wales, Scotland and Ireland “walk-on parts” in an Anglocentric “take.” He provides rich, detailed and textured studies of the histories of each of the nations of the medieval British Isles (something relatively rare in the historiography). Carpenter has not written a kind of “Celtic revisionist” history, however, but he consistently “de-centers” England so as to develop perspectives that, in a sense, cut England down to size, setting it in larger, All-British and European contexts. As he says, “British history in this period was the reverse of being self-contained.”



Perspectives

Alexander. Warner Bros. 2004.

Oliver Stone, director. 175 minutes. Rated R.

Principal actors: Colin Farrell, Sir Anthony Hopkins, Val Kilmer, Angelina Jolie, Christopher Plummer.

Occasional subtitles, graphic violence and some sexuality/nudity.

Review by Jeffrey Perkins

Romance and Myth versus Reality

Oliver Stone's *Alexander* (2004), despite some respectable historiography, is largely a failure in historical accuracy but proves a success in many other respects. The film's greatest weakness is its romantic portrayal of Alexander the Great as a champion of freedom and mankind. Conversely, the movie is salvaged through its technical elements, cast of characters and soundtrack.

Historical truth is often far removed from a film that seems more concerned with perpetuation of the Alexander Romance than it is with accurately portraying one who is arguably history's most salient enigma.¹ Alexandros III Philipou Makedonon (Alexander III of Macedon, 356-323 BCE), otherwise known as Alexander the Great, leaves a legacy of partial fact shrouded in myth and mystery. While he does properly address some events in Alexander's life, Stone carries the myth to new heights.

Ptolemy, whose role is played by the world-renowned Anthony Hopkins, describes Alexander as a Prometheus and friend to man.² Although Alexander might have proven to be a more temperate ruler than the Persian nobles were, he was by no means a champion of man. His first and foremost concern was conquest and preservation of his empire.³ The Macedonian hardly served the role of friend when he attacked Thebes and allowed his Greek allies to annihilate the city's inhabitants, whom historian Diodorus of Sicily claims were "subjected to outrage without limit."⁴ In addition, his exploits in India can hardly be deemed a humanist's devotion to his subjects.

One is hard-pressed to argue that Alexander was not an exceptional leader of men. He convinced his soldiers to endure a multitude of hardships over the course of several years before their eventual mutiny at the Hyphasis River. The film incorrectly depicts an Alexander rallying his forces, after the mutiny, and leading them on to his last great set-piece battle at the Hydaspes River where he is gravely wounded and almost killed. In fact, the Battle of the Hydaspes occurred before the mutiny, and Alexander was not gravely wounded until the Macedonian army encountered the Mallians after the attack upon the city of the Brahmins. The director seems to suggest that Alexander could and would always grasp victory despite the odds and forces arrayed against him. All that was necessary was that he says the right thing at the right time and all would bow to his will.

Alexander's sexual relationship with Hephaestion is not in question. What the movie probably missed was the depth and nature of the relationship and the point at which physical attraction was an issue. The two men's teenage years undoubtedly included sexual activity. There is, however, no evidence to suggest that sex was central to the relationship or that they carried such activities into their late twenties and thirties; and Alexander was physically attracted to both sexes regardless of race or ethnicity.⁵ Furthermore, their affection for each other went far beyond eroticism. They were friends since youth. Hephaestion apparently supported every action and measure Alexander took and never questioned his leadership. They paralleled each other so well that Alexander referred to his friend as another Alexander. Conversely, Stone fabricates most of their conversations and reveals a relationship that he claims at its very core is romantic. His revelation that Alexander wept upon the dead body is certainly consistent with the history books. They were best of friends. Perhaps Alexander was so lonely at his pinnacle of power that only Hephaestion could provide the needed friendship and trustworthiness.⁶ This would explain the depth of grief experienced by Alexander upon his friend's death. However, no extant works support Stone's claim that Hephaestion was brokenhearted by Alexander's marriage to Roxane, or that he was generally jealous. Both men had multiple wives and children. They were, quite simply, best of friends.

Historical inaccuracies and loose interpretations aside, Stone largely succeeded on a technical level. He contracted the world-famous Vangelis to construct a very moving, romantic soundtrack whose personality fits the film's various mood swings. Each scene, from the opening scene to Alexander taming Bucephalas and from the Battle of Gaugamela to Alexander's death, is illuminated by Vangelis' soft, timely touch. The slow-motion shots, notably those of Alexander and Bucephalas charging the elephant during the Battle of the Hydaspes, contribute much to the picture's drama. The opening and closing colors and textures create quite a romantic essence for the film that, for those who enjoy romantic epics, does not want for lack of romance. The characters' clothing and weapons seem to be consistent with the location, era and respective cultures. Furthermore, Ptolemy's (Anthony Hopkins) narration is an ingenious segue between various periods in Alexander's life, without which the audience would be lost. Finally, the all-star cast does not disappoint

in terms of performance. Colin Ferrell accurately plays the role an Alexander who is fueled by the promise of conquest, who is at times on the verge of becoming unhinged and whom does some force always drive whether it is tangible victory or an intangible hint of mere possibility. Anthony Hopkins becomes an icon of the aged ruler and military veteran looking romantically back over time. His voice, tears and gestures reveal one of the means by which the myth of Alexander has been perpetuated throughout the centuries. Val Kilmer, Angelina Jolie, Jared Leto and the rest serve their respective purposes.

In short, Oliver Stone's Alexander is a romanticized recounting of the life of Alexander the Great. It is a mix of fact and fiction adorned in the sentimental fragrance of idealism and well wishing. Romance and myth collide with reality and the audience is no closer to understanding the great Macedonian. Nevertheless, for all liberties Stone takes with history, he creates a work the true romantic can enjoy. It is the tale of a romantic, created perhaps by a romantic, for the romantic.

ENDNOTES

1. Also known as 'pseudo-Callisthenes' and originating in Egypt, the Alexander Romance is a largely fictionalized account of Alexander's life.
2. Ptolemy was one of Alexander's lifelong friends and bodyguards. He eventually became the founder of the Ptolemaic Pharaohs of Egypt and confiscated Alexander's body en route from Babylon to Greece.
3. The Greek city-states decimated themselves in the fifth century BCE's Peloponnesian War. When Philip II (Alexander's father) of Macedon rose to prominence, he eliminated democracy in Greece and controlled the city-states through the League of Corinth. Following his father's example, Alexander harbored no designs on democratic reign. His was to be a monarchy at best.
4. Diodorus of Sicily, *Library of History*, Translated by C. Bradford Welles (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1963), 155.
5. Guy MacLean Rogers, *Alexander: The Ambiguity of Greatness* (New York: Random House, 2004), 243.
6. Paul Cartledge, *Alexander the Great: A New Life* (Woodstock: The Overlook Press, 2004), 229.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Cartledge, Paul. *Alexander the Great: A New Life*. Woodstock: The Overlook Press, 2004.
- Diodorus of Sicily. *Library of History*. Translated by C. Bradford Welles. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1963.
- Rogers, Guy MacLean. *Alexander: The Ambiguity of Greatness*. New York: Random House, 2004.

Officers
Alpha Beta Phi Chapter
2005-2006

Bethany M. Richter.....	President
Miranda S. Hamrick	Vice President
Emily Keller	Secretary
James A. Pollitt	Treasurer
Rita R. Thomas	Historian
Eric O. Rummel	Journal Editor
Dr. Jonathan T. Reynolds.....	Faculty Advisor
Dr. William J. Landon	Assistant Faculty Advisor
Bonnie W. May.....	Assistant Faculty Advisor

Charter Student Members

Joy M. Baker
Christopher P. Burns
Ann C. Cahill
David R. Caudill, Jr.
Elaine Conradi
John P. DeMarcus Jr.
Daniel M. Driscoll
Scott K. Fowler

Mark K. Gilvin
Bennie W. Good
Joseph S. Guilyard
Matthew W. Hornsby
Todd P. Huff
Kenneth E. Hughes
Jeffrey Junto
Shonda S. Kinman

Andrew O. Lutes
Douglas K. Meyer Jr.
S. Wayne Moreland
Grace M. Murimi
Dick Wolfe
Rudiger F. Wolfe

Members Initiated April 15, 1986

David P. Anstead
Richard T. Dedman
James R. Eilers
Michael P. Holliday
Betty R. Letscher

Darlene S. Miller
Linda M. Ruh
Joseph T. Shields
Harold A. Stephens
Shelley L. Stephenson

Deborah S. Trego
Edwin L. Vardiman
Shawn T. Young

Members Initiated April 14, 1987

Kristen H. Breen
Laura A. Butcher
Lynn David
Cheryl L. Grinninger

Linda Kay Hon
Judith F. Hutchinson
John Prescott Kappas
Martha Pelfrey

Julie Ann Prewitt
Edna L. Stracener
Verna L. Vardiman

Members Initiated April 12, 1988

Susan M. Burgess
Lori Ann Dinser
Stacey L. Graus
Timothy Craig Grayson
Jeffrey Hampton

Derick Rogers Harper
Christopher Gary Holmes
Virginia Johnson
Sarah Suzanne Kiser
Joyce Borne Kramer

William H. Lowe
Michael K. G. Moore
Jennifer A. Raiche
Debra Beckett Weigold
Nancy Lynn Willoughby

Members Initiated April 11, 1989

Roger Craig Adams
James Lee Breth
Edward R. Fahlbush
Linda Holbrook

Christopher Iannelli
Tracy Ice
Elizabeth W. Johnson
Wylie D. Jones

Mary Elaine Ray
Rebecca Rose Schroer
Jeffery A. Smith

Members Initiated April 10, 1990

Fred Quintin Beagle	Rebecca Leslie Knight	Scott Andrew Schuh
Kyle Wayne Bennett	Mary Alice Mairose	Michael Scott Smith
Susan Claypool	Bryan P. McGovern	Eric Lee Sowers
Daniel Paul Decker	Ernestine Moore	Dorinda Sue Tackett
Gregory S. Duncan	Christina Lee Poston	
Mark A. Good	Preston A. Reed, Jr.	
Richard Timothy Herrmann	Christine Rose Schroth	

Members Initiated April 9, 1991

Patrick Thomas Berry	Rick Jones	Brian Scott Rogers
Nicholas Brake	Michael Shawn Kemper	Sandra Seidman
Shelly Renee Helmer	Todd Michael Novak	Stacey E. Wallace
Toni Hickey	Greg Perkins	Steven David Wilson
Tina Holliday	Larry Prine	
Charles F. Hollis, III	Janine Marie Ramsey	

Members Initiated April 7, 1992

Tonya M. Ahlfeld	Kristi M. Eubanks	David R. Lamb
Lisa Lyn Blank	Lori J. Fair	Mary Emily Melching
Douglas E. Bunch	Aric W. Fiscus	Kenneth Edward Probst
Ty Busch	Christopher Bentley Haley	Ty Robbins
Brian Forrest Clayton	Laurie Anne Haley	Gregory J. Scheper
Thomas M. Connelly	Sean P. Hennessy	Julie Shore
Marvin J. Cox	Brett Matthew Kappas	David Stahl

Members Initiated April 16, 1993

Mark E. Brown	Marian B. Henderson	Heather E. Wallace
Randy P. Caperton	James L. Kimble	Kathryn M. H. Wilson
James L. Gronefeld	Daniel T. Murphy	

Members Initiated April 12, 1994

Kelly Lynn Auton-Fowee	Louis W. Brian Houillion	Shannon J. Roll
Fred Lee Alread	J. Chad Howard	Paula Somori-Arnold
Julie B. Berry	Jill K. Kemme	Kimberly Michaela Vance
Craig Thomas Bohman	Brian A. Lee	Brady Russell Webster
Michael A. Flannery	Alden T. Meyers	Michael D. Welsh
Aimee Marie Fuller	Leslie C. Nomeland	Robert W. Wilcox
Joyce A. Hartig	Thomas Arthur Roose, Jr.	
Hilari M. Gentry	David Austin Rosselot	

Members Initiated April 11, 1995

Donald C. Adkisson
Monica L. Faust
Sean A. Fields
Randal S. Fuson
Jason E. Hall

Michael Hersey
Sherry W. Kingston
Christina M. MacFarlane
Andrew J. Michalack
Rachel A. Routt

Steven M. Watkins
Brian Winstel
Bradley E. Winterod
Roberta A. Zeter

Members Initiated April 9, 1996

Brandon E. Biddle
Dale N. Duncan, Jr.
Gary W. Graff
Robert L. Haubner II
William M. Hipple
Sarah E. Holland

Deborah L. Jones
Francois Le Roy
Bonnie W. May
Scott A. Merriman
Lauren K. Norris
Cliff J. Ravenscraft

Allison Schmidt
Diane Talbert
Jason S. Taylor
Elisaveta Todorova
Lisa A. Young

Members Initiated April 8, 1997

Megan R. Adams
Dawn R. Brennan
Patrick A. Carpenter
Brad A. Dansberry
Terry L. Fernbach
Mary A. Glass
Roy S. Gross

Walter C. Heringer
Kraig S. Hoover
William J. Landon
Carrie D. Mayer
John D. Nichols
Andrea M. Reckers
Christopher M. Scherff

Jennifer L. Schmidt
Walter L. Schneider
Joshua L. Searcy
Gabrielle H. Snyder
Andrew G. Wilson

Members Initiated April 9, 1998

Erik J. Arwood
Clara M. Gerner
Stephanie Hagerty
Andre L. Maitre

Thomas J. May
Patricia A. Morwood
Jodi L. Otto
Rick L. Trump

Andrew K. Von Bargaen
Karen L. Watkins
Aaron M. Weaver

Members Initiated April 13, 1999

Lisa V. Barrett
Wendy J. Bradley
Emily C. Bromwell
Dean H. Celenza
Mark E. Garbett, Jr.
Jennifer L. Gerding

Jann K. Irwin
Anthony R. Koester
Daniel H. La Botz
Terry A. Leap II
Mary Beth Patterson
Joshua P. Perkins

Daniel E. Pickett
Brian K. Puddy
Ann L. Reckers
Sara P. Scheyer
Dawn R. Ward

Members Initiated April 11, 2000

William B. Addison
Rick Brueggemann
Jeremiah J. Cummings
Suzanne K. De Luca
William R. Eckerle
Theresa D. Geisen
John A. Hodge

Michael D. Howton
Sara Meuser
Rachel E. Noll
Nichole R. Puckett
Karen S. Ramsey
Thomas L. Ramstetter
Jonathan T. Reynolds

Gregory J. Schweitzer
Misty A. Spinner
Ryan N. Springer
John R. Stoll
Catherine D. Trunnell
Rhonda K. Vrabel
Anna M. Webb

Members Initiated April 10, 2001

Joseph A. Alig
Deborah M. Bogel
Antonio Browning
Mark D. Covey
Lyman D. Dehner
Robert K. Detmering
Carmen S. Elliott

Brooke A. Gillette
Stephen A. Goldsworth
Tara N. Higgins
Charlie T. Lester
Robert A. Long
Brian K. Powell
Leigh Ann Ripley

Dominic E. Ruschman
Arden L. Steffen
Christopher P. Teeter
Ami M. Van De Ryt
Danielle S. Vizgirda

Members Initiated April 9, 2002

Richard L. Carr Jr.
Rebecca B. Carter
Kevin C. Bricking
Brandon N. Brown
Elizabeth A. Sauer Bugge
Tammy L. Dorgan
Karen M. Engel
James M. Faulhaber
Sakiko Haruna
Eric R. Jackson

Kristy K. Kim
Nathan J. Kohler
Jonathan W. LaVelle
Deanna Litchard
Kevin Matthews
Erin M. McDermott
Luke T. McGlasson
Breanne L. Menkhaus
Debra Meyers
Jim J. Nobbe

Brian E. Noel
Robert S. Owens
Angela A. Riesenberg
Laura A. Roach
Anne L. Shaw
Louise A. Stuntz
Kristopher A. Teters
Cindy K. Vorwerck
Jerry L. Waddell

Members Initiated April 15, 2003

Rebecca L. Campbell
Elizabeth K. Comer
Annette Fournier
Jonathan A. Gabis
Tiffany R. Hammonds
Kelly M. Linkugel
Carrie A. Masters

Colin M. McClure
Boyd T. Miller
Donald A. Miller
William A. Montague
S. Paul O'Hara
John E. Osterhage
Jamie C. Petrunia

Christina A. Reis
Ashley K. Sanders
Eileen C. Slattery
Mark L. Speed
Nicholas D. Summe
Stephen J. Tully

Members Initiated April 16, 2004

Lisa A. Barber
Aaron A. Biddle
Nathan L. Brooks
Kelly J. Carnahan
Kenneth J. Crawford
Jennifer D. Davis
Vanessa de los Reyes
David C. Ellis
Kristen N. Fibbe
Heather M. Flannery
Sabrina A. Gagliardi
David R. Glier

Nancy E. Gohs
Miranda S. Hamrick
Elizabeth J. Kamradt
Mary L. Keeton
Emily Keller
Justin L. McClure
Julie A. McKinney
Donnita K. Miller
Adam J. Moler
Jeffrey A. Perkins
James A. Pollitt
Brian L. Sergent

Robert B. Snow
Rachel M. Steinhauser
Dustin W. Stewart
David E. Stigall
Rita R. Thomas
Susan M. Walter
Amanda L. Watton
David L. Webster, Jr.
Amber W. Weiss
Michael L. Williams

Members Initiated April 5, 2005

Lance Angle
Alvin Bartlett III
Tony Cox
Anna Dean
Jeffrey Foster
Megan Fricke
Lindsay Graham
Glenn Guill

James Henley
Robert Jenkins
Lori McEntee
Dawn McMillan
Kim Medley
Jonathan Moore
Darin Richart
Bethany Richter

Eric Rummel
Jason Smith
Mary Swart
Daniel Tombragel
Zachary Wells
Eric Widmeyer
Ralph Worley III

Members Initiated April 4, 2006

Sarah E. Berkley
Brandi N. Boston
Joshua P. Byers
Amanda H. Campbell
John A. Dipuccio
Eric A. Gorlewski
Allen W. Faulhaber
Eydie M. Turvey-Franklin
Carrie L. Grady
Kyle E. Holbrook

Joseph R. Johns
Kara M. A. Knorr
Megan M. Lake
Jonathan M. McCormack
Thomas F. McGill
William S. Matthews, Jr.
Jonathan M. Miller
Diana L. Mondragon
James Y. Moore
Sean J. Pace

Jennifer L. Sandlin
Erin M. Spaulding
Jonathan E. Stone
Ashley L. Talbott
Timothy L. Trenkamp
Scott D. Reed
Baird R. Ullrey
Stephanie N. Vines

Faculty

Leon E. Boothe
Lawrence R. Borne
Tripta Desai
Eric R. Jackson
Francois Le Roy

William J. Landon
Debra Meyers
James A. Ramage
Jonathan T. Reynolds
W. Michael Ryan

Robert C. Vitz
Michael H. Washington
Robert W. Wilcox
Jeffrey C. Williams

Perspectives

Perspectives

is pleased to draw attention to these other fine historical periodicals published in the Northern Kentucky Region.

Heritage

A publication of Northern Kentucky African American Heritage Task Force (NKAHATF) *Heritage* publishes articles, book reviews, and editorials on the history, impact, and legacy of African Americans in the thirteen counties of northern Kentucky. To have your work considered for this publication, submit an abstract (of no more than fifty words – e-mail or “regular” mail) to: Dr. Eric R. Jackson, Northern Kentucky University, Department of History and Geography; Nunn Drive; Highland Heights, KY 41099.

Northern Kentucky Heritage Magazine

The *Northern Kentucky Heritage Magazine* publishes articles, book reviews, and editors on the preservation, research, and dissemination of the history of Northern Kentucky, especially the counties of Boone and Kenton. To have your work considered for this publication, submit an abstract to Karl J. Lietzenmayer, Editor, *Northern Kentucky Heritage Magazine*; The Kenton County Historical Society; PO Box 641; Covington, KY 41012 or via e-mail at nkyheritage.kchs@juno.com.

2005-20

X