12

NORTHERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY

Perspectives in History

VOL. XXVII, 2011–2012

PHI ALPHA THETA
ALPHA BETA PHI CHAPTER

Perspectives in History

Contents

Perspectives in History   Vol. XXVII, 2011-2012

Letter from the President

You are about to read the twenty seventh volume of *Perspectives in History* by Alpha Beta Phi, chapter of Phi Alpha Theta. This is a compilation of the historical research completed by many history students attending colleges and universities in the Commonwealth of Kentucky. I know from personal experience the effort that the authors have put into their pieces is exceptional. We are pushed to strive for excellence by our professors and that is most certainly what you will find in this journal. It is not just the authors of these historical pieces that need to be thanked and recognized. The difficult job of Journal Editor was given to Kevin Leibach, who is responsible for the outstanding journal you are now holding. Without his involvement ,the journal would have not been possible this year. However, he did not work alone; Kevin had the help of our wonderful faculty advisers, Dr. William Landon and Dr. Jonathon Reynolds, who were always more than ready to lend a helping hand or piece of advice. A very special thank you needs to be given to Miss Bonnie May. Without her our organization would not be able to function; she is our strong backbone and is a constant inspiration. Jan Rachford and Lou Stuntz should also be acknowledged with gratitude for the large amount of help that they have given us over the year. Dr. Tenkotte also deserves a special mention, for as head of the History Department his help was instrumental and invaluable. I would also like to thank those who gave their time to help with the editing process, like Aaron Sprinkles and Sharon Labate.

This has been an incredibly busy year for Alpha Beta Phi. We have been involved with numerous charity events such as the Relay for Life where we raised $700.00 to support cancer research, and the Polar Bear Plunge where our team braved the jump into freezing cold water for the Special Olympics. We also walked in the Run like Hell marathon to raise money for Cystic Fibrosis. This year we have also taken part in assisting with the Six@Six Lecture Series, and presenting papers at both regional and national Conferences. As always our group assisted the NKU Vets on Veterans Day and Dr. Andrea Watkins on History Day. Additionally, we held a movie night, a caption contest, two field trips, one to the Renaissance fair and one to the Pompeii exhibit at the Cincinnati Children's Museum. We also had an untold number of bake sales and book sales, which along with generous donations from the faculty, funded our many events. Alpha Beta Phi was also awarded the honor of achieving the Merit Award for the second year in a row; a testament to all the hard work our officers and members put in this year. I would like to give a special thanks to all our officers this year: James Lupo for his fine leadership during the first semester; Caitlin Stylinski Hazelip for stepping up and accepting the position of Vice President during our time of need; Matthew Chalfant, our excellent treasurer and green thumb; Vincent Fraley our historian who documented all of our events over the course of the year; Shane Winslow, our secretary; Kari Becker our wellness officer who went out of her way to help me and guide me; and again our hard working journal editor Kevin Leibach. I would also like to recognize Laura Fitzer and Aarron Sprinkles for all the help given this past year and I wish them well next year in their officer positions.

This journal is a representation of the students of the Commonwealth of Kentucky and of Alpha Beta Phi. It represents hard work, our ongoing endeavor to strive for excellence, and our spirit of community. I hope that you enjoy reading the many pieces of research provided in this year's journal.

Alexandra Barrett
President of Alpha Beta Phi, chapter of Phi Alpha Theta year 2011-2012

Foreword

After a short hiatus, I would like to welcome you to the return of the *Perspectives in History Journal.* The work you are about to read is a collective effort of many talented individuals from across the Commonwealth of Kentucky. I have been humbled by the willingness of these individuals to put together a journal that you are sure to enjoy. This year seven talented writers have presented original works that should both entertain your intellectual curiosity and increase your awareness of the subject matter within. Kyla Fitz-Gerald informs us on what impacted the author Mungo Park to turn out the various works that he did, Abby Quiroa delves into the struggle for women in the Bluegrass State to attain the right to vote, Jamie Booth looks at the changing public opinion on prostitution in the late 18th century in England, Michael Johnson examines the downfall of Margaret Thatcher, Chastity Thomas enlightens us on the true machinations behind Henry VIII's reforms, Arin Arnold researches Early American History to discover who exactly was the "common man", and finally Shane West analyzes the confrontation between the Aztec leaders and Hernando Cortes that resulted in that civilization's downfall. Moreover, this edition contains seven student book reviews.

There are many individuals who deserve more than a measure of thanks for their assorted contributions on this edition of the journal. I would first like to thank Assistant Editor Aaron Sprinkles for all his efforts on the cover for this year's journal. Concurrently, I would thank Assistant Editor Sheryn Labate for her continued efforts in reading and editing this volume. *Perspectives in History* could not exist without the encouragement and support of the faculty at Northern Kentucky University and I would like to acknowledge the oversight and assistance of Dr. Jonathon Reynolds, the faculty advisor for this year's *Perspective in History* journal submission. A great deal of thanks is also given to the Alpha Beta Phi Chapter of Phi Alpha Theta faculty advisor Dr. William Landon at Northern Kentucky University as well as to Assistant Faculty Advisor, Bonnie May whose yearly encouragement and assistance is without equal. A word of thanks is also given to Dr. Paul Tenkotte, Chairperson of the History Department at Northern Kentucky University in 2011-2012 as well as to the entire History Department of Northern Kentucky University for creating an environment where historical research is fostered and encouraged. A word of thanks is reserved to departing President of Northern Kentucky University, Dr. James Votruba for his many years of leadership and service to Northern Kentucky University as well as to the Commonwealth of Kentucky. Finally, I also need to thank JoAnn Fincken, Director of University Printing Services and the entire staff of University Printing for their efforts in creating the quality journal you are now reading.

I am proud to present the 27th volume of *Perspectives in History* to you, the reader. I hope the pages within serves to stimulate your mind and add to your acumen as a continuing student of history.

Kevin J Leibach
Editor

Mungo Park's Life and Works in the Public Eye

Kyla Fitz-Gerald

> Some of them ventured so far as to examine the texture of my clothes; but many of them were still very suspicious; and when by accident I happened to move myself, or look at the children, their mothers would scamper off with them with the greatest precipitation.[1]

Much like the African villagers' fascination with explorer Mungo Park, Europeans who read of his travels and heard of his adventures poked and prodded his life. Park's readers—who were much of the population of Great Britain during the beginning of the nineteenth century—extracted bits of inspiration and enlightening knowledge from his writings. His book, *Travels in the Interior Districts of Africa,* was a breakthrough account of the Niger region of West Africa. It shed light upon the true nature of East Africa society, culture and customs and inspired the British to view the Native African differently. Yet the events of his later life, and more important, his own attitude, contradicted this and unconsciously undid some of the progress made by his travel writings.

Mungo Park was born in 1771, the seventh child of thirteen to a Scottish farmer.[2] He studied medicine at the University of Edinburgh, though he was interested in botany. After his studies he moved to South London where he was introduced to the celebrated naturalist, Sir Joseph Banks.[3] Banks was best known for sailing the Pacific with James Cook, and promoting the natural sciences and exploration.[4] When Banks observed Park's interest in these things he arranged for him to travel as a surgeon on a British East India Company ship headed for Sumatra in 1792. After Park's return 1794 he sought to offer himself for the uses of Bank's newly formed organization, the "Association for Promoting the Discovery of the Interior Parts of Africa," or more commonly known as the "African Association."[5]

The Association's only specific mission was to solve the question of the Niger River in West Africa.[6] Virtually nothing was known of the river; only that it was said to connect the trade city of Timbuktu to the West African coast. The Association's inquiry was to the river's location, termination, and direction of flow. The information they had at their formation was based upon past explorations dating as far back as the sixteenth century.

The Portuguese had been the first to explore the African Coast, and by 1550 they had established strategic posts on both the Atlantic and Indian Ocean. Other Europeans were very quick to follow and, by 1650, England, France, and Holland had established trade with West Africa.[7] The first real account of the exploration of the West African interior was from Paul Imbert, a Frenchmen, who, in 1618, wrote of his journey from Morocco to Timbuktu. In the same year Englishman David Thompson trekked up the Gambia river. Two years later a man named

Richard Jobson succeeded in gathering information about Timbuktu along that same river.[8] Between 1650 and 1750 the trade routes along the Senegal were claimed by the French, while the British claimed the Gambia River route. From 1700 to 1750 many books were written on Africa and by the end of the Seven Years' War there was a growing interest in the unknown regions of the world and the use of a scientific approach to explore them.[9] This was the purpose of the African Association, and they were one of the first organizations to promote this method of discovery.

Before Mungo Park, four others attempted to map the Niger, but of these four only one survived to bring back his account. Simon Lucas started from Tripoli in 1788, heading to Frezan and from there to the Niger. His counterpart, John Ledyard, was directed to go to Cairo, through Nubia and then across the continent.[10] Lucas turned around one hundred miles from Tripoli, but he had obtained information regarding the Saharan trade routes. Ledyard unfortunately did not make it out of Cairo before he died of illness. The Association sent Friedrich Hornemann to attempt the Egypt route in 1789, but he was sidetracked to Tripoli for a time. When he started again for the Niger he died mysteriously between the desert and his destination.[11] The last explorer before Park was the most productive of the four, as he was able to send information back to the Association as he traveled.

This explorer was fifty-year-old Irish Army Major Daniel Houghton who asked the Association to sponsor an exploration using the Gambia as a route to the Niger. He wished to discover Timbuktu and another city, called Houssa, known for its trade.[12] Houghton was the first Association explorer that received the orders to gather information on the rise, course, and mouth of the Niger; they also gave him a very long list of questions that they wanted answered about the surrounding nations and natives. Although he was murdered by African tribes farther inland in 1791, he did discover that the Niger was not part of the Senegal River as had been believed by some.[13] This information was helpful to Mungo Park.

When Park offered his services to the African Association in 1794, he did so because he realized that he "had a passionate desire to examine into the productions of a country so little known; and to become acquainted with the modes of life, and character of the natives."[14] His attitude was that of an anthropologist. The Association's requirements mirrored those given to Major Houghton, but they were interested in the nations and their culture as well. Park's first expedition will be explained in detail as it regards his account later in this paper, but the basic events occurred as follows.

Park departed Portsmouth, England on the 22nd of May 1795, and on July 5th arrived at the River town called Pisania along the Gambia. There he stayed for five months learning the Mandingo language and gathering information of the nations he would be visiting. When he departed from Pisania he was robbed many times, mostly by the kings he encountered. He was captured by the chief Ali in Benown, of the inland tribes and held for three months, but he escaped and continued on to find the Niger. At the riverside city of Silla, he decided to turn back. He dreaded the country farther inland and had no money left to support such travel. On his return he fell ill and a native slave trader, Karfa Tawa, offered him aid and passage back to the coast on his slave caravan. Park returned to Pisania June 10th 1797.[15]

Park only accomplished part of his mission; he discovered where the Niger lay, and which direction it flowed (to the East), but his real success was his book.

What set his book apart was its honest, pity-free, and balanced observations of African life. Simply put, Park took everything in and wrote openmindedly.[16] The aesthetic appeal is described by English historian Nicholas Howe as resembling Daniel Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe,* and he establishes that both narrators' voices are similar. Park succeeded in creating an honest account, without unnecessary embellishment, but with the excitement of a novel.[17] At that time, tales of exotic places like the aforementioned *Crusoe* were growing extremely popular. *Travels in the Interior Districts of Africa* was published in 1799 and the first edition was sold out at 1500 copies within a month. It went into second and third editions quickly, and a fourth edition was printed in 1800.[18] The public was receiving his message, and its popularity proves that it was being accepted.

What were Park's messages? What did he present that would cause the average Englishman to think differently of Africa? When considering accounts of Africa, the slave trade cannot be ignored. Most early accounts came from Englishmen. Of course, as the slave trade became more and more important to European markets and economies the travesty of its methods were easier to overlook.[19] The slave traders' attitudes stemmed from their interaction with the already well established African slave trade; people who sold their own kind into slavery and lived in such a hostile climate. The general image that was received from early accounts was of "depravity and instability."[20]

The majority of the accounts before Mungo Park's *Travels* were negative towards Africa, and in fact, some see Park's story as the turning point in African accounts. School children were exposed to the idea of Africa as a savage continent. *A New and Easy Introduction to the Study of Geography by way of Question and Answer, Principally Designed for the Use of Schools* said that the African people spent their time looking after their camels and fighting lions. A letter from the Fourth Earl of Chesterfield to his son called the Africans "the most ignorant and unpolished people in the world, little better than the lions, tigers, and leopards and other wild beasts, which that country produces in great numbers."[21] This letter was later published and widely read and accepted. James F. Barbot, a trader, called Africa a "wild savage country" with "woods pester'd with robbers" and "ravenous wild beasts."[22] Park's travels and writings could do quite a bit to improve the attitude that the British held towards Africa.[23]

Park knew that the subject of slavery was of high interest in Britain at the time, and this might have influenced some of the focus on his descriptions of the slave trade on the continent and on the ship that he took to the West Indies.[24] In his description and implied opinion of the slave trade, a reader can see how objective Park was as an observer. He was clearly horrified by the method and manner in which slaves were treated, but he was of the belief that the institution was foundational to African society and if stopped would bring upheaval. Though this might have discouraged a few anti-slavery readers, he was not writing to change society. It was the small details, and his attitude towards the African people that was important.[25] It can be said with confidence that *Travels* had a part in ending the slave trade in the British Empire. It should also be noted that one of the leaders of the anti-slavery movement, William Wilberforce, had a membership in the African Association.[26]

The simplest way that Park's observations were so revolutionary is in his description of the culture, industry, and governments. At the beginning of his journey, he encounters the Feloop people who are gloomy and unforgiving, yet he explains why they might be that way and also talks of their loyalty and

gratitude to their benefactors.[27] He describes the Jaloffs as quick tempered and excellent textile manufacturers, completing the entire task from spinning to dyeing.[28] Park was especially interested in the people who spoke the language he had learned from Dr. Laidly in Pisania, the Mandingoes. He explains that while most of the Mandingo states were monarchical, the king could not declare war without conferring with a council of elders. He was excited to find that their justice system resembled that of Great Britain's in their use of lawyers, most of whom actually studied the law as a profession.[29] While he was in Pisania he observed the corn harvest, which was almost exactly like the British in the method used to clear the chaff from the wheat.[30]

Park's real adventure began when he left Pisania in December of 1795; he first encountered benevolent King Fatta of Woolli who offered him safe passage, provisions, a guide through his country, and his own personal prayers for safety. Here Park also discovered that the Foolah malted whiskey exactly as the British did, and he expressed a partiality for the Foolah's version of it.[31] By detailing the African customs and the king's behavior, Park presented them as human beings, and not beastly people who could have no meaningful relationships.[32]

Of course not all the East African kings Park came across were kind. Park encountered men, especially Kings, whom he had to work very hard to please. One king was so pleased with him that he gave Park many provisions. Shortly after this he was robbed, but he did not resist knowing that it could come to a deadly end. Park and his traveling companions decided to go hungry for a day instead of risking being robbed once again, and a kind East African woman took pity on them. In passing she found them hungry and without hesitation gave them some of her ground nuts.[33] After this, Park witnessed the homecoming of a villager after a four year absence, and he showed his love for the Africans in the following passage. "I was fully convinced, that whatever difference there is between the Negro and European in the confirmation of the nose and the colour of the skin, there is none in the genuine sympathies and characteristic feelings of our common nature."[34]

Park was repeatedly robbed throughout his journey. He gained supplies and gifts from kind kings, only to lose them to bandits and greedy kings. This contrast showed how the entire continent and people could not be judged hastily because of a few bad figures. Before entering the country of the inland tribes, Park discovered the fate of Major Houghton, he had been tricked by these tribes into taking the wrong route and died of either starvation or at the hand of the Africans.[35] Because of this and other reports Park dreaded crossing the inland territory, but he crossed the frontier February of 1796. The King Ali heard of him right away and sent a boy to bring him to their camp 'safely.' Even with this boy he was robbed, and then to make a bad day worse he was held against his will in Ali's camp at Benown. It is unclear what the King wanted with Park, but near the end of his captivity—which lasted for three months—he heard of plots to kill or maim him. Park escaped one night, and was once again robbed in the process. In classic Mungo Park form, he excused their behavior, gathering that they treated him cruelly because he was a stranger and a Christian, and he believed that the inland Africans hated the East Africans because of their own 'superior' ability to read and write.[36]

In his escape Park had to go hungry and at one point fainted from it. Once again, he was saved by a kind poor East African woman. Every time Park encountered the type of African to strengthen the European stigmas about Africa, shortly afterwards he was saved or aided by the kind of African that would make

the Europeans rethink their idea of the East African.[37] Another example of this occurred when he once again had no food and no shelter while waiting for King Mansong of Segu to allow him an audience. An East African woman fed him and gave him lodging in her hut.[38] When he reached the city of Silla on the Niger, he decided that the dangers of the inland territory and his lack of provisions were too great to continue and he began his return journey. Kindness was again shown to him when Karfa Tawa, the slave trader, gave the ailing Park passage and care on his slave caravan. He returned to Pisania on June 12th 1797, but the only ship available was a slaver bound for the West Indies. Thus he made the Middle Passage to catch a ship bound for England from the West Indies. His trip on the slave ship gave him insight into the treatment and condition of the slave trade, and these references would later be used in debates protesting the institution. Historian Peter Brent commented that, "It is a wonder that its publication did not bring an abrupt end to European support for slavery."[39]

Upon Park's return the Association received a brief of his trip, and all were pleased with his findings. One can only imagine that because of Park's steadfast nature and persistent mind he was a bit concerned at his failure to make it to Timbuktu and to discover the headwaters of the Niger. He was gratified when the Association expressed their deep pleasure with the information he had gained. The official record of 26th of May, 1798 reported, "Mr. Park has obeyed his instructions as far as was practicable, and executed the purpose of his mission with a degree of industry, perseverance and ability that entitle him to the warmest approbation of this Association."[40] Park published his book and lived in Peebles, Scotland with his new wife and worked as a surgeon. It was clear that at this time he was not happy with his profession. He kept a close eye on the Association's work, which was minimal at the time due to the war with France.[41]

The African Association used the war to justify a request for government funding for another trip to the Gambia and Niger. There had been some activities that suggested that France was trying to expand into the Gambia. Park was asked to lead an expedition of twenty-five or so soldiers. To secure his place as military commander he received a temporary commission as a Captain.[42] The nature and attitude of his second trip was beginning to show in the early stages to be polar opposite from his last venture, and his focus on firepower rather than passive acquiescence would hold on throughout the journey. Historian George Shepperson called it the foreshadowing of an army coming to conquer the African lands.[43] There was more at work than his love for travel influencing his journey. His later actions showed that his motives went far deeper than this. It could also be said that his failure on his first journey heightened his desire to finish what he had been sent to do. Perhaps Park did not feel like he had failed, but as though his work was incomplete and therefore, his life was as well.

Park, with thirty-four soldiers and four carpenters, left Pisania on May 4, 1805. Park wrote in some of the notes that survived that he "desired that the soldiers might have on their pouches and bayonets, and be ready for action at a moment's notice."[44] He was grateful for the soldiers, but he would not take care of them as they trekked through the African wilderness. They started losing men at the very beginning of the trip, some from illness and others from exhaustion.[45] He ignored the inhabitants and used firepower to get them out of many situations. This was out of character for Mungo Park who had held the policy of appeasement, and held foreign cultures in high respect. Another attitude that was different from his first journey could be seen when he began naming features of the land.

In his 1795 trip Park would have instead gone to the Africans to learn their names, and he would have respected the language that had been there millennia before his own. The reason for this may have been the desire to see his goal met, and he did not think he had time to learn anymore about African culture.

When Park finally reached the Niger he had lost three quarters of his men, leaving him with six soldiers and one carpenter to build the boat that would take them the rest of their journey. On September 26, 1805, this small party left Segu to sail down the Niger. Early in October two more men were lost near Silla. Turning back there, at the same town he had ended his travels in 1795, would have been a humiliation. So they continued on. During their time on the river, Park decided to ignore those along the bank and chose to shoot his way out of every slightly intimidating situation. This created many enemies, and many resented the white man using the river as a free travel route when, in fact, it was considered a toll road. The last written entry by Park was of the party, now down to five men, leaving the town of Sansanding.[46]

Remember that on his first trip Park had defied his predecessors and proved to Great Britain that one could survive Africa. This was just as important of an achievement as his book. This makes his death influential to the British mindset. The tale that was most commonly accepted and widely circulated came from an East African named Isaaco who was sent to find out what happened to Park. He came across another of the party, Amadi Fetouma, who had been Park's guide. When the party reached Yauri he set Amadi ashore, as this was where they had agreed he would leave the expedition. The King of Yauri was angered when Park left immediately without paying the toll, and the King put Amadi in prison and sent an army to ambush Park's canoe at Bussa, down river. At the Bussa rapids Park and his men put up a fight, but they ended up abandoning their canoe and drowning in the river.[47]

It was quite predictably, the story of its time. Africans murdering the unsuspecting Mungo Park played along with expectations of British attitudes. Rumors of Park's death reached the West Coast of Africa in 1806, and it took until 1809 for a newspaper to carry the story, but it was one which circulated through many a household in Britain. Thankfully, the idea of the African barbarians murdering Great Britain's beloved explorer did not completely undo his previous breakthrough with his book. His account, now largely unknown, was beloved and read for many years. Mungo Park's tragic death did not overshadow the unique treasure of *Travels in the Interior Districts of Africa* which would have one of the greatest positive influences coming from a traveler's account.

ENDNOTES

1. Mungo Park, *Travels in the Interior Districts of Africa* (New York: Arno Press, 1971), 83.

2. Craig Simon, "Journey to the White Man's Grave," *The Geographical Magazine* 69, no. 12 (Dec., 1997), http://vnweb.hwwilsonweb.com/hww/jumpstart.jhtml?prod=O MNIFT&query=199733503134009+%3Cin%3E+an (accessed April, 2010).

3. Elizabeth A. Bohls and Ian Duncan, eds., *Travel Writing, 1700-1830: An Anthology* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 227.

4. Robin Hallett, The Penetration of Africa: European Exploration in North and West Africa to 1815 (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1965), 228.

5. Ibid., 228.

6. Pratt, "Anti-Conquest II," 70.

7. Hallett, *The Penetration of Africa*, 137.

8. J.N.L. Baker, *A History of Geographical Discovery and Exploration* (New York: Cooper Square Publishers, 1967), 200.

9. Hallett, *The Penetration of Africa,*138.

10. Robin Hallett, ed., *Records of the African Association: 1788-183,* (New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd., 1964), 50.

11. Baker, *A History of Geographical Discovery and Exploration*, 303.

12. Hallett, *Records of the African Association,* 120.

13. Hallett, *The Penetration of Africa*, 219-224.

14. Park, *Travels in the Interior*, 2.

15. Margery Perham, and J. Simmons, *African Discovery: An Anthology of Exploration* (London: Faber and Faber Ltd, 1963), 71.

16. Anthony J. Barker, *The African Link: British Attitudes to the Negro in the Era of the Atlantic*
Slave Trade, 1550-1807 (Totawa, N.J.: Frank Cass, 1978), 190-191.

17. Nicholas Howe, "Looking for a River, or, Travelers in Africa." *Research in African Literatures* 32, no. 3 (Sept., 2001): 229-241, http://140.234.1.9:8080/EPSessi onID=cbb39833806aa2b74986eb59ed69d6e1/EPHost=muse.jhu. edu/EPPath/journals/ research_in_african_literatures/v032/32.3howe.html (accessed April, 2010).

18. Hallett, *The Penetration of Africa,* 243-244.

19. Anthony J. Barker, *The African Link: British Attitudes to the Negro in the Era of the Atlantic*
Slave Trade, 1550-1807 (Totawa, N.J.: Frank Cass, 1978), 10.

20. Barker, *The African Link,* 3.

21. Hallett, *The Penetration of Africa*, 37-38.

22. Ibid.*,* 128.

23. Robert G. Albion trans., *Exploration and Discovery* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1965), 108.

24. Brent, *Black Nile,* 102.

25. George Shepperson, "Mungo Park and the Scottish Contribution to Africa," *African Affairs* 70, no. 280 (July, 1971): 281, http://www.jstor.org/stable/720555 (accessed April, 2010).

26. Pratt, "Anti-Conquest II," 71.

27. Park, *Travels in the Interior,* 15-16.

28. Ibid., 17.

29. Ibid., 18-20.

30. Ibid., 10.

31. Ibid.*,* 36-42.

32. Shepperson, "The Scottish Contribution," 279.

33. Park, *Travels in the Interior,* 70-71.

34. Ibid., 82.

35. Park, *Travels in the Interior,* 103-104.

36. Ibid., 114-164.

37. Barker, *The African Link,* 179-180.

38. Park, *Travels in the Interior,* 195-198.

39. Brent, *Black Nile,* 102.

40. Hallett, *Records of the African Association,* 163.

41. Ibid.*,* 322-323.

42. Ibid.*,* 329-331.

43. Shepperson, "The Scottish Contribution," 279.

44. Brent, *Black Nile,* 136.

45. Ibid., 141.

46. Ibid., 147-156

47. Ibid., 159.

Persuasion, Purity, and Politics: Votes for Bluegrass Women!

Abby Quiroa

During the women's rights movement in the United States, the women of Kentucky had a very different view of suffrage. In 1837, Kentucky had granted limited suffrage to select women to vote in school board elections. This ruling was the first of its kind on record.[1] However, the women in the state had no property rights, could not make a will, and did not legally have guardianship of their children. In 1902, Kentucky state legislators repealed limited suffrage, a move which jump started a state-wide suffrage movement. From 1902 to 1920 Kentucky worked toward a strong suffragist movement, with great female leaders such as Laura Clay and Madeline Breckinridge. Rev. Heber Newton once said on the subject of suffrage that, "Whatever woman can do that, by divine ordination, she ought to do, by human allowance she should be privileged to do, by force of destiny in the long run she will do."[2] The Kentucky women saw it as their destiny to work toward equal rights for all of Kentucky, not just political suffrage. The true hurdle which came about was that of the anti-suffragists. A great debate among the pro and anti-suffragists existed within the borders of Kentucky. These arguments forced the women of Kentucky to put their views of being a southern state to the test. The anti-suffragists arguments centered around biblical issues regarding the subordination of women, female physicality, the change of the nature of female character as a result of independence, racial bias, and state's rights. The Kentucky suffragists formed state-wide organizations, and created strong arguments against the persistent anti-suffragists, narrowing in on women's equal rights, and the removal of male supremacy. With small taste for political power the women of Kentucky had a different ambition than women of other states; they saw political suffrage as the ability to work toward self-protection, gender tolerance, and for female influence on moral purity in all facets of life in Kentucky. Although faced with anti-suffrage objectors, the obstacles of popular science, religious subordination, and levels of education, the suffragists of Kentucky were able to push boundaries to gain some equal rights and eventually help ratify a federal amendment guaranteeing political suffrage for women.

To begin, a brief review on the current literature pertaining to the Kentucky suffrage movement and general information on the movement itself is in order. Each piece reviewed does not directly discuss the argument regarding the pro and anti-suffrage debate within Kentucky, all focus on the general overview of topics, but never in depth on issues regarding Kentucky specifically.

Very little secondary literature exists on the Kentucky suffrage movement. The bulk of the literature is biographical information on the two leading suffragists of Kentucky; Laura Clay, and Madeline Breckinridge. Each work spans each woman's entire involvement in the women's movement. The authors lay out the themes of their work in the different approaches to the individual's life. Paul

Fuller and Clavia Goodman's works on Laura Clay are the leading books on the subject. Both discuss the important impact Laura Clay had on gaining women's suffrage in the commonwealth. Sophonisba Breckinridge and Melba Porter Hay's works on Madeline Breckinridge chronicle her life and achievements. Each work gives a good background to the suffrage movement in Kentucky and the main issues concerning the women of such as women's property rights, fair working wages and women's participation in education legislation. But for general information on the suffrage movement many volumes exist.

For the general information on the women rights movement, *The History of Women's Suffrage* written by Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Susan B. Antony is a good overview of the beginnings of the suffrage movement in each state. Anthony explores each initiative, and political action taken by women in certain regions to be able to present productive information for the creation of the equal rights amendment. For a look at the entire suffrage movement Flexner and Fitzpatrick's work, *Century of Struggle,* and Eleanor Clift's *Founding Sisters and the Nineteenth Amendment* are great insights into the suffrage movement by outlining the main turning points, key leaders, and issues involved in the suffrage movement and the passage of the 19th amendment. Some key issues mentioned in all the texts were ones regarding black female suffrage, the difficulty in recruiting politicians to support suffrage, and overcoming the boundaries which prevented women from progressing in society, such as scientific studies which said women could not handle a life involved in politics. Each work provides insight into the women's rights movement in the Western world, to help put the time period into context

The last bit of literature is focused on, specifically, the south and the anti-suffragists movement. In Elna Green's work, *Southern Strategies,* she focuses on the elements that defined the suffrage movement in the south by outlining different key people, events, and turning points. Within the southern suffrage movement the main issue which continued to linger was that of the race question and whether or not the equal rights movement should include black women. In Jane Camhi's work, *Women against Women*, her main theme is the anti-suffrage movement in the United States, particularly in the south. She outlines major players, and the movement's efforts to stop a federal amendment. With that in mind, Kentucky women had a particularly unique motivation for women's suffrage.

Setting the Stage for Women's Rights

The status of women in Kentucky was defined by the male leaders in the community and in the household. Married women did not have legal guardianship of their children. Any property given to her by her father, or wages she earned went to her husband. Even upon death, anything that may have belonged to a woman went straight to her husband, because she could not compose a will.[3] Under such conditions, it would seem unlikely for Kentucky women in 1837 to receive limited suffrage.

In 1837, Kentucky became the first state to grant widows who had young children the right to vote in school board elections. Kansas was the second state to grant limited suffrage but was not engaged until 1861.[4] In Kentucky, women were able to hold offices such as state librarian, and many women had the opportunity to go to Kentucky State College. In the late 1860's arguments arose regarding the legislation on school suffrage and whether or not it should be

repealed. Kate Trimble de Roode argued that few women knew or understood their rights. Further she asserted that few women had actually taken advantage of the privilege.[5] In 1902 limited school suffrage was repealed because of the lack of awareness that the privilege existed.[6] Paul Fuller claims that because this was the period after Reconstruction the Negro women would have the right to vote in school board elections and that many people in the government were afraid the black population might be too involved in politics, even though it was merely a school board election.[7] Another argument which may have risen for the repeal of limited suffrage is that fact that the women's right movement was beginning to grow in the north with the efforts of Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Susan B. Anthony, and the women of Kentucky may begin to want more than just a vote in school board elections. But, before the actual repeal of limited suffrage, female leaders arose as a result of the women's rights movement as mentioned above. These leaders spoke out saying that women were being cheated of their rights as citizens of the United States, pulling ideals from the Enlightenment movement regarding the natural rights of man, the God given rights of freedom. In an attempt to take action, the women created organizations and clubs to band together to fight the legal injustices which they faced.

Origins of the Suffragists Movement in Kentucky

In *History of Woman Suffrage*, Susan B. Anthony articulated the main principles for the national women's rights movement as "Women are citizens of the United States, entitled to all the rights, privileges and immunities guaranteed to citizens by the national constitution."[8] Because of the lack of knowledge regarding limited suffrage, as mentioned before, women in Kentucky also had no clue of the momentum of the women's rights movement in the northern territories. In 1897, in an attempt to spread awareness for the growing national movement around Kentucky, and create a women's rights organization, a woman by the name of Mary Clay and her sisters travelled to little towns going door to door trying to gain supporters. Mary described the task as being rather difficult, "the ladies' signatures had not come easily; most women required a lengthy discussion of the matter before agreeing to sign...a few held out even after persuasion afraid of displeasing their husbands."[9] Only six people showed up to the first meeting of the Equal Rights Association of Fayette County.[10] Before the Clay sisters there were different kinds of women's clubs focused on certain issues; for example Lexington had a very active women's Christian Temperance organization.[11] The Clay sisters found ample opportunity to persuade these other groups and organizations of the idea that women's rights was a cause worth fighting for. And the time came in 1899 with the murder of Jacob Keller which revealed the immorality of the local government in Lexington. Sophonisba Breckinridge argues that this was the central turning point in the creation of a state-wide organization. All the women's organizations came together to fix the morals of the community. Women needed to participate in government and exercise constructive leadership to achieve their goal of purifying the state. With this in mind, the women of Lexington were ready to fight for women's rights.[12]

Kentucky became the earliest southern state to become a part of the National Woman's Suffrage Association under the leadership of Laura Clay, a Kentuckian who served as the auditor of the national organization. Later, Kentucky was also the earliest southern state to form a state wide organization; the Kentucky Equal

Rights Association or the ERA, which was lead by Laura Clay and Madeline Breckinridge. Paul Fuller argues about Madeline Breckinridge, "Like so many other women of her generation she had come to believe that the enfranchisement of members of her sex would make possible the improvements in education, public health, and child and woman labor."[13] These powerful women did philanthropic work, along with civil service work, to work toward women's rights awareness. Laura clay worked to spread the word, and Madeline Breckinridge helped build schools. But as with any social movement there was opposition.

The Great State Debate over Suffrage

The biggest opposition to the Kentucky suffragists were the anti-suffragists; many of whom were affiliated with the Democratic Party. Henry Watterson, a radical democrat, wrote several editorials for the *Louisville Courier Journal*, Watterson discussed the male view of the suffragists in Kentucky as "a few women of rank and the rest are only wallflowers discontented and childless wives, hysterical high flyers, who fancy they are statesmen and orators, whose object and point is the liberal government."[14] This male view is the basis of the pro-suffrage and anti-suffrage debate in Kentucky. The suffragists wanted any type of federal amendment to gain their political rights to work towards equal rights for all the women in Kentucky. The anti-suffragists argued against an amendment to the constitution, making justifications based on; Christian principles, the physicality of females, the natural character of women, and race. The anti-suffragists main goal was to keep state's rights intact, making the question of suffrage a state issue.

Anti-suffragists found many justifications for their position in the Bible. They relied on passages of the Bible, in particular ones which lay out the inferiority of women. For example during a public demonstration in Tennessee a male anti-suffragists quoted Timothy: "Let a woman learn in quietness with all subjection. But I permit not a woman to teach, nor have dominion over man, but to be in quietness."[15] In contrast, Laura Clay and many other women involved in the women's rights movement believed God had put them on this path to fight for women's rights. Laura Clay wrote in her diary that she wanted women to awaken "to the higher life which God, through the advance of Christian civilization, has opened to them."[16] On a national level Elizabeth Cady Stanton created a women's Bible, where she had removed all gender from the Bible.[17] Biblical arguments arose which often coincided with anti-suffragists arguments that women were not physically able to get involved in political life.

Male and female anti-suffragists also argued that women's biological structure was not conducive to political work. During the 1880's the differences in the male and female anatomies were being intensely studied. A neurophysiologist by the name of Dr. Charles L. Dana claimed that he was an expert in the study of the female anatomy and nervous system. He described different parts of the brain, and claimed that the upper half of the female spinal cord was smaller and the lower was larger because it controlled the pelvis. He states that these structural differences between the sexes, "do not prevent a woman from voting, but they will prevent her from ever becoming a man...woman's efficiency lies in a special field and not that of political initiative or of judicial authority."[18] Jane Camhi discussed the stance of many scientists, similar to Dr. Dana, as one which argued that because women were emotionally, and physically different from men, this

difference called for women to need periods of rest which made them more susceptible to go insane.[19] An anti-suffragist, Molly Elliot Seawell, argued that the challenges faced by men when participating in their civic duty were challenges a woman could never endure:

> A voter must, except in occasional individual instances, be physically able to make his way to the polls, against opposition if necessary; and, second, he must be able to carry out by force the effect of his ballot. Law consists of a series of Thou-shalt-nots, but government does not result until an armed man stands ready to execute the law... the spectacle of one half the electorate unable to execute a single law it has made, or even to deposit its ballots without the assistance of the other half, is a proposition so fantastic that it is difficult to attack it seriously...the trouble would begin with the mere attempt of women to deposit their ballots. A dozen ruffians could prevent a hundred women from depositing a single ballot.[20]

The women of the movement did not waver. The suffragists continued to push for a constitutional amendment despite ridicule justified within the Bible and modern science. The suffragists believed that education in how to become involved in politics would help them when it came to working with men in the governing arena. Albana Carson wrote in an essay on the importance for women to have the proper amount of time devoted to their education and training, "we shall need less seeing of her defects, and frivolities, and more of her intellectual capacity, and her companionship with high and noble minds."[21] Tacked on to the physicality of the women the argument stretched to include the disintegration of the family unit, because of feminine independence and lack of femininity.

In the late 19th century the idea of marriage was one in which when the couple married they would become one man and wife. And if the man made a decision it was a good decision and the women should accept his decision. The anti-suffragist argument was that women would lose their feminine nature. The anti-suffragists believed that:

> If women suffrage was enacted, women would degenerate sexually. This ranged from atrophy of the reproductive organs as a result of disuse to the debasement of motherhood, the supreme symbol of femininity, as singleness became a virtue. If women voted, there would be more who were not wives and mothers.[22]

Women with independence would lose sight of what was important to their role in society, the raising of children. Madeline Breckinridge spoke out against this archaic attitude toward the position of women in the family.[23] Women can both be independent and raise a family; women can bring femininity into politics. An issue that hit home for many southern anti-suffragists was the issue of race, based on a fear that blacks would gain too much power within the government.

Democrats of the south posted slogans around southern towns sporting "support for the Susan B. Anthony amendment means Negro rule."[24] John Baskin addressed the stance of the Democratic Party regarding race in his speech, "the leaders of

the democrat party argued if colored women voted it would be an insult to the intelligence of the white female voters".[25] Madeline Breckinridge along with Carrie Chapman Catt, the national leader of the NAWSA, and many other women believed suffrage holds no bias on gender or race. But one of Kentucky's instrumental players, Laura Clay, switched her position towards the end of the run for suffrage to that of state's rights.

Laura Clay did not slip into southern state's rights because she was concerned with race problems as many authors have suggested. She saw a flaw within the process of amendment ratification. She believed the process to be too long, and at that rate an equal rights amendment would never make it through congress. Laura Clay switched to state's rights because she felt the amendment would hold more significance in Kentucky rather than on the national level. Fuller argued that state's rights became the leading goal for the anti-suffragists.[26]

A core value of the Southern Democratic Party, since before the Civil War, had been the concept of state's rights. The basis for the south becoming a confederation is to uphold this belief. The anti-suffragists were afraid of how the national constitution is interpreted. As Henry St. George Tucker argued in his lectures on state's rights and female suffrage, "to deprive the states of the right of determining suffrage was a violation of the United States Constitution."[27] Other anti-suffragists believed state's rights control over suffrage would also control the racial quota within the government. But as stated earlier Susan B. Anthony's platform for the suffrage movement was for the nation to acknowledge that women are citizens of this country entitled to a constitutional amendment for equal rights.

Equal Rights or Bust

Laura Clay's switch did not discourage other Kentucky women. In Paul Fuller's research on Laura Clay's campaign a common excuse among the Southern anti-suffragists for the rejection of suffrage was, "Being Southerners, it is hard for us to advance out of the old routine."[28] One concern of the Kentucky Suffragists was not deviating away from the southern routine but if only a federal amendment passed it would not change the state constitution and the word male would remain part of the language of the constitution. If the language of the Kentucky constitution remained the same it would continue the positioning of male supremacy. This last issue would make it seem that women are still inferior to men within state conditions; to make it equal for everyone in the state, gender needs to be erased from all state documentation.[29] Madeline Breckinridge also touched on the subject of equality of the genders in her editorials on school suffrage, where she accused the men of Kentucky of believing women were too stupid to participate in school affairs. In her closing statement she challenges the male population, "Do you believe that Kentucky women are inferior, are less competent, less intelligent and less dutiful than women of other states?"[30] The women of the movement saw the presence of certain regulations and terms as evidence of mass inequality in the entire system. Female political rights became an important step to gaining equality for all genders.

For the Kentucky suffragists the movement was less about the politics and more about the women in the community. Women who were dependent on their husbands needed to get the ballot to get their own self-protection. Men like Henry Watterson were afraid that if women gained political freedoms they wouldn't need men, and their perception of men would change entirely.[31] But John Baskin

argued that if women were to participate in politics it would not ruin women's view of men in society, but rather enhance society, because women have a different view of the world and morals.[32] Laura Clay said, "We do not want to imitate men...we are going to be women in politics...when we enter politics, we do it in order to give the State the finest femininity of which we are capable."[33] With the image of female moral purity the women continued trying to persuade men that they deserved the rights they proposed, but it takes more than words to move a mountain.

Throughout the years, the women of the movement put on parades, protests during sessions of congress, and campaigned constantly, even while involved in a World War. In 1915 Emmeline Pankhurst the militant suffrage leader from England, came to Kentucky on a tour with other suffrage leaders, and her presence in the state scared many of the men. In another editorial Henry Watterson discussed the possibility of militancy by the Kentucky suffragists, "as the sectional partition of the slavery question in America ultimately made a fractured war, would this sex partition create the condition for war of the genders, if the women could develop the physical requirements."[34] Kentucky suffragists never resorted to violence to get their point across, but their sheer presence in the political world won them several women's rights issues before the amendment passed, with pure persistence.

By 1912, all the main issues facing women's rights were granted. Women had regained the right to vote in school elections regardless of race (1912).[35] Women had won the right to make a will (1894), property rights (1894), and co-guardianship of her children (1910). And finally women could collect their own wages and the women and children's work conditions had become regulated (1912).[36] Now the women waited for the federal amendment to pass through congress which would guarantee security of their freedoms as citizen's of the nation. The bill was proposed year after year to the Democratic majority congress, and finally with a Republican dominated House of Representatives the Anthony Amendment passed in 1919.

Winning the Vote

With the luck of having a Republican dominated congress the 19th amendment passed. Now the Kentucky suffragists awaited the state's ratification of the amendment. Governor Edwin P. Marrow ratified the 19th amendment in Kentucky, surrounded by the whole of the ERA and League of Woman Voters, on January 8, 1920. The movement had finally won. To capture the historic event a photograph was taken of the ratification.[37] Madeline Breckinridge and members of the ERA attended a jubilee convention in Chicago a month after the ratification in Kentucky, and continued to celebrate their victory with their own parody of My Old Kentucky Home:

The sun shines bright in my old Kentucky home,
'Tis winter, the ladies are gay,
The Corn top's gone, prohibition's in the swing,
The Colonel's in eclipse and the women in the ring.
We'll get all our rights with the help of Uncle Sam,
For the way that they come, we don't give a damn.
Weep no more, my lady, oh weep no more today,

For we'll vote one vote for the old Kentucky home,
The old Kentucky home, far away[38]

The women of Kentucky had an unusual and set of circumstances as citizens of Kentucky. Before 1837 the women of Kentucky had few rights if any regarding property, money, or what happened to her holdings after death.. Kentucky women did not have ownership of their own children. However, in 1837 widows with children were granted limited suffrage to vote in school board elections. This ruling on school suffrage was the first of its kind for women, and the next state to do the same was Kansas thirty years later. When this limited suffrage was repealed in 1902 the women began to fight fiercely for full suffrage. Kentucky suffragists differed from other southern suffragists in that they wanted federal suffrage and focused more on the equal women's rights rather than political freedom. Kentucky suffragists met many obstacles including the anti-suffrage movement with its many religious and scientific sub-arguments. But, through it all the group worked to get the women of Kentucky the rights they deserved as citizens of the United States and as human beings. Madeline Breckinridge sums it up best, "What Kentuckians have done Kentuckians may do. To me the inspiration of the past seems to call to the inspiration of the future."[39]

ENDNOTES

1. Eleanor Flexner and Ellen Fitzpatrick, *Century of Struggle: The Woman's Rights Movement in the United States* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1996), 168.

2. Sophonisba Preston Breckinridge, *Madeline McDowell Breckinridge: A Leader in the New South* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1921), 186.

3. Sophonisba Preston Breckinridge, *Madeline McDowell Breckinridge: A Leader in the New South,* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1921), 199.

4. Flexner and Fitzpatrick, *Century of Struggle*, 168.

5. Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Susan B. Anthony, and Matilda Joslyn Gage, ed. *History of Woman Suffrage,* vol. 3 (Rochester: Source Book Press, 1886), 821.

6. Madeline McDowell Breckinridge, *Reasons for Granting School Suffrage to Kentucky Women* (Lexington: 1910).

7. Paul E. Fuller, *Laura Clay and the Woman's Rights Movement* (Lexington: The University of Kentucky Press, 1992), 89.

8. Stanton, Anthony, and Gage, *History of Woman Suffrage*, i.

9. Fuller, *Laura Clay and the Woman's Rights Movement*, 23.

10. Ibid., 23.

11. Breckinridge, *Madeline McDowell Breckinridge*, 35.

12. Ibid., 34.

13. Fuller, *Laura Clay and the Woman's Rights Movement*, 129.

14. Henry Watterson, *Henry Watterson: Papers, 1856-1965* (Louisville: 1965), From the Filson Historical Society, Special Collections.

15. Elna C. Green, *Southern Strategies: Southern Women and the Women Suffrage Question* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1997), 80.

16. Laura Clay, *Clay Diary, July 26, 1874,* quoted in Fuller, *Laura Clay and the Woman's Rights Movement*, 17.

17. Green, *Southern Strategies*, 81.

18. Jane Jerome Camhi, *Women against Women: American Anti-Suffragism 1880-1920* (Brooklyn: Carlson Publishing Inc., 1994), 19.

19. Ibid., 18.

20. Molly Seawell quoted in Green, *Southern Strategies*, 80.

21. Albana C. Carson, *Albana Carson's Composition for the Examination of 1851, Science Hill Academy* (Shelbyville: 1851), From the Filson Historical Society, Special Collections.

22. Camhi, *Women against Women*, 19.

23. Breckinridge, *Madeline McDowell Breckinridge*, 205.

24. Clavia Goodman, *Bitter Harvest: Laura Clay's Suffrage Work* (Lexington: Bur Press, 1946.), 57.

25. John B. Baskin, *Speech of John B. Baskin, Delivered at Frankfort, KY., October 16, 1920,* In the Scrapbook of John B. Baskin (Louisville: 1949), From the Filson Historical Society, Special Collections.

26. Fuller, *Laura Clay and the Woman's Rights Movement*, 143.

27. Camhi, *Women against Women*, 133.

28. Fuller, *Laura Clay and the Woman's Rights Movement*, 34.

29. Ibid., 150.

30. Breckinridge, *Reasons for Granting.*

31. Fuller, *Laura Clay and the Woman's Rights Movement*, 26-27.

32. Baskin, *Speech of John B. Baskin.*

33. Goodman, *Bitter Harvest*, xvi.

34. Watterson, *Henry Watterson: Papers.*

35. Breckinridge, *Madeline McDowell Breckinridge*, 194.

36. Ibid., 199.

37. Breckinridge, *Madeline McDowell Breckinridge*, 237.

38. Ibid., 1.

A Change in Opinion
Jamie Booth

Societal opinions in London began rapidly changing in the 1750s, especially on the subject of prostitution. While mid-century views of issues such as industrialization and religion continued much in the same vein throughout the eighteenth century and on into the nineteenth, the view of prostitution that crept up during this time proved short-lived, but nevertheless influential. Early in the century, society saw prostitutes as idle and worthless. By the end of the century, popular culture and influential leaders stressed the need for prostitutes to become productive members of society and diverted from the earlier emphasis on their eternal souls. The thirty years between 1758 and 1788 proved to be a unique time for the popular opinion of prostitution.

Many sources from the time clearly illustrate this change in views, most notably those of William Dodd and Jonas Hanway, whose sermons, writings, and letters give voice to the common sentiment of the time. Both rigorously argue that prostitutes must receive protection from not only physical harm, but spiritual harm as well, something that only repentant women could obtain. Based on this belief, the two men, along with other philanthropists, founded the Magdalen Charity House. The men opened the house for the purpose of reclaiming the lost souls of prostitutes and allowing them to regain their rightful place in society. Success followed the founding of the House, and money poured in from every echelon of society.

This change in opinion is also seen in popular media culture of the time. The *Times* began to treat women with a semblance of sympathy, especially in the manner in which they addressed prostitutes. Documents from the Old Bailey underwent the same changes. While these documents illustrate the opinion of the court, not the society as whole, they were read by a majority of London citizens and a change in the court shows a change in societal opinion. Further, a popular narrative arose during the mid-century that portrayed the prostitute as a middle class victim and capitalized on the harlot's guilt and shame. This can easily be seen in many of the popular prints of the day as well in novels and other fictional writings.

From roughly 1758 to 1788, many writings show prostitutes as victims of economic need and trying times, but many held this belief in the early part of the century as well. The change lay with the emergence of a genuine, popular concern for the souls of penitent street-walkers and with the opinion that the common prostitute was unhappy with her lifestyle and willing to repent and reform.

In the early eighteenth century, most of society thought of prostitutes as far from victims. Many thought that women who walked to streets did so by choice and often because of pure laziness. The practices of The Society of the Reformation of Manners best illustrate this early held belief.[1] Tony Henderson provides readers of his book, *Disorderly Women in Eighteenth Century London*, with an excellent

illustration of this opinion when he writes, "the men of the Societies had conceived of 'streetwalking strumpets' as wholly corrupt figures who had voluntarily cast off all sense of shame and female honour."[2] For most, the prostitute herself was abhorred as much as her practices. Prostitutes could not be tolerated, saved, or excused. However, this idea changed beginning in the mid 1750s thanks in large part to influential philanthropists.

Beginning in the mid-century, two prominent philanthropists took the stage to fight for the eternal souls of prostitutes all over London. William Dodd and Jonas Hanway became the saviors of street walkers by using the Bible and its message to speak out about the true motives of prostitution and the heavenly value of even the lowliest whore. These ideas differed greatly from the ones expressed earlier in the century, even though the both early and mid-century views used the Bible as context and support. Hanway and Dodd, however, decided to use a different approach to the Bible than their predecessors. They stressed the book's egalitarian principles and its focus on God's forgiveness from any and all vice for those who petition Him with both faith and works. While abhorring the act itself, these men spread the idea that, forced into their lifestyle, prostitutes deserve as much, if not more, of a chance at life and eternal salvation as anyone in the Metropolis.[3]

These men expressed their ideas of prostitution in their writings. Dodd's writing on this subject includes his sermons, most notably to the Duke of York and the leaders of the Magdalen House in 1761. He also wrote *An Account of the Rise, Progress, and Present State of the Magdalen Charity.* This document includes the rules of those employed in the House, a list of contributors, advice to the women in the House, letters written by the women, and statistics on the progress and success of the charity. Hanway mainly wrote letters on the subject of prostitution. He often addressed his letters to specific people, most of who are now anonymous, but he also wrote to less restricted audiences, such as "friends of repentant prostitutes" and "the ingenious reader."[4] These writings give a clear picture of the opinions of prostitutes that each man held and the popularity of these writings implies that the general public agreed with these men.

These men firmly believed that prostitution itself was a vile and dangerous aspect of the city, filling it with "disease, death, and eternal destruction."[5] Sexually transmitted diseases such as gonorrhea and syphilis, which often proved fatal, became a problem for many men and women in London. Not only diseases, but starvation from lack of income and alcoholism all were associated with the practice of prostitution. Hanway and Dodd, however, saw these as merely secondary concerns within the business of prostitution. They believed the real problem lay in the damnation of the souls of those who engaged in the sinful act. Because so many women in the city participated in prostitution, Dodd, Hanway, and many others believed that the business was turning the city of London into a degenerative society that lacked virtue and morals. However, for Hanway and Dodd, this hatred of the act did not mean that prostitutes, while living in sin, were beyond repentance and reacceptance into society: Christ hates the sin, not the sinner.[6]

Hanway encompasses this view when he writes, "though (prostitutes) are all criminal, they are very far from being all irreclaimable."[7] Hanway and Dodd would agree that the prostitute, while guilty of numerous crimes against man and God, proved worthy of forgiveness and acceptance into society. This stemmed from the belief that Jesus came to earth and died to save every sinner, even those

who seem not worthy of saving. Dodd often referred to prostitutes as "fellow creatures."[8] In doing so, he placed prostitutes in the same category as himself; he argued that God loves whores as much as he loves preachers. This idea, that prostitutes possess the right to salvation, came from their belief that many prostitutes were middle class women forced into prostitution by bad times or bad people.

The writings of both men clearly show the belief that women are often either seduced into prostitution by bawds[9] or pimps or have, for one reason or another, fallen under hard economic times. In Dodd's opinion, there existed a variety of reasons that women turned to prostitution, all of which proved beyond the woman's control. These motives include seduction into the trade, the lack of parental guidance and education, especially religious instruction, and the threat of starvation from lack of income. He also blames "one false step...plunging them into a sea of difficulty: barred up from every avenue of return: and left them a sad prey to inevitable ruin." This "false step" usually stems from the seduction by a male, who impregnates a young woman out of wedlock and then leaves her to fend for herself in the harsh streets of the Metropolis.[10] While Hanway and Dodd expressed a strong belief in seduction as a catalyst for entering into prostitution, lack of education provided another excusable reason that women ended up on the street. Coming from the lower and middle classes of society, many of the street walkers never received any formal education. They also grew up in households where religious education was vague, if there at all. Hanway felt as though this lack in moral and religious education led to a weakening in the women's virtue.[11] Dodd and Hanway obviously felt sympathy for many of the women forced to walk the streets and very much believed in their unhappiness and guilt.[12]

Because of the belief that prostitutes hated their lifestyles and felt shame in their profession, both men advocated turning these women into respectable members of society and, most important, saving their souls from the fires of Hell. Dodd and Hanway both put a real emphasis on the spiritual reformation of the prostitutes. For instance, in "Advice to the Magdalens," Dodd set aside most of his writing for spiritual advice to the repentant prostitutes, leaving only a brief section for the instruction of physical matters.[13] He expressed his concern with spiritual over physical wellbeing when he wrote, "For we would have you reflect, that what relates to your soul is of infinitely greater moment, than what concerns your body only."[14] Letters of reformed prostitutes incorporated into the writings of Dodd also showcase this belief. Every letter contains some mention of the woman's guilt and shame caused by her previous lifestyle as well as an expression of joy in her new found religious convictions.[15]

Omitted in most writings on this topic is the theology that most influenced Hanway and Dodd, which can only be classified as Anglican. Several passages as well as the main themes in their writings show that this is the case. The Methodist movement was going on in London at this time, yet, the themes expressed by the writers, most markedly that of works and faith combined for salvation, is opposite to the Methodist belief that faith only can bring salvation. Also, Dodd clearly states that his views are not Methodist, "be it known that nothing of *Methodism* or *Enthusiasm* hath, or ever will have place, we trust, in this Design."[16] Yet, the religion that influenced these ideas must have been Protestant. Not only does Hanway consistently speak out against the papacy and

Catholic faith,[17] but the rules of the Magdalen Hospital say that chaplain must follow the "principles and duties of the protestant religion."[18] No other protestant religion, excluding Anglicanism, follows the theology of works and faith expressed by the leaders of this institution.

The main goal of Dodd and Hanway's writing is to urge their audience to support them in these ideals and help unfortunate prostitutes in any way they can. They filled their writings and sermons with emotional pleas for the saving of these women's souls. The men and women who heard and read these pleas were obviously prominent in society. Dodd preached a sermon to the Duke of York and to the President, Vice-President, Treasurer, and Governors of the Magdalen House, all of whom were esquires or lords, suggesting that their ideas diffused into society and that many people in London agreed with their ideals and views of prostitution. Successful in other ventures during this time, many in London already followed these men and supported their various philanthropies.[19] The founding, popularity, and success of the Magdalen Charity House not only became a physical manifestation of Hanway and Dodd's writing, but proved a widespread belief in Hanway and Dodd's opinions during the years of 1758 to1788.

The Magdalen Charity House opened its doors on "10 August 1758, when eight unhappy objects were admitted."[20] The eight founders of the House, all of them esquires with Robert Dingley and Hanway acting as the main promoters and activists,[21] based the institution on the belief that women turned to prostitution when in dire need and that a place like the Charity House would serve as their only means of escape from the streets.[22] The House welcomed fallen women who expressed an interest in repenting and quitting their sinful lifestyle. Only the women who showed signs of guilt and shame and a worry for "their own present and eternal happiness" could enter the institution.[23] The programs of the institution experienced a good amount of success in its early years, as recorded in the "Accounts of the Rise, Progress, and Present State of the Magdalen Charity" and proved very popular amongst members of London society.[24]

In Hanway's Letter IV, he lists the purposes of the Magdalen House. These included the turning of prostitutes from their sinful lifestyle to God, providing them with a comfortable "retreat," far from the evils of the city that landed them in their lowly position, and preparing them for the outside world, both economically and socially. The Charity should also provide not only a welcoming place for fallen women, but an influence on the values of the rest of society.[25] The institution and those involved were expected to work with these purposes always in mind, as seen in the rules and regulations of the House.

"The Rules and Regulations of the Magdalen House," set out the expectations of not only the women themselves but the various persons employed by the institution and those in charge. "Advice to the Magdalens," was a pamphlet written for the women who come to the Hospital detailing the goals of the House and guidelines which the "magdalens" lived by. These works, both written by Dodd, showcase the beliefs expressed in his writings and those of Hanway. Those who worked inside the House included the matron, the steward, the messenger, the chaplain, and the physician. The underlying job of these men and women was to create an atmosphere of religious and industrial education and in doing so must take every care to set an excellent example for the women; not only that but they must treat the women with care and attention, as everyone in the

Hospital deserved the same amount of respect.[26] The expectations of the employees illustrate the principals of equality and religious virtue that seemed so important to Hanway and Dodd. The expectations of the women clearly indicate the belief in works with faith and the ability of the fallen woman to turn her life around, which so greatly influenced the building of the House.

Dodd used Dingley's[27] words to explain one of the main purposes of the Magdalen Charity House: to provide "an opportunity to become of pests, useful members of society, as it is not doubted many of them may and will."[28] With this in mind, one of the House's main concerns was teaching marketable skills to the women who came to the Charity for aid. The institution employed them in domestic-style jobs such as weaving, artificial flower and toy making, drawing patterns, creating carpets, "or whatever employment their several abilities and genius (led) to."[29] These jobs or "industries" provided the women with not only something to do, for idleness was thought to lead to evil, but also provided them with a skill which could bring them income in the outside world. The rules of the House stressed the principal of industry, which Dodd believed to be "the genuine fruit of true religion."[30] This illustrates the belief that works must be done, as well as faith, to receive salvation and to change a life of vice into one of virtue. Moreover, education received great attention in Dodd's "Advice to the Magdalens." The education focused mainly on reading, of both the Bible and other literature.[31] While this emphasis proves the concern for the souls of the women, it also shows, in addition with the emphasis on industry, that there existed a strong belief that these women had fallen because they possessed no skills or education with which to procure a job and take care of themselves.

The expectations and rules of the physicians, surgeons, and apothecaries of the Hospital, as laid out by Dodd in "Rules and Regulations of the Magdalen House," illustrate the concern for the physical well being of the women. The doctors were expected to provide expert care and treat the women with an especially "humane and prudent conduct." Also, the rules state that only the doctors themselves were allowed to enter the wards, preventing inexperienced men from caring for the women. The Physician must also make a presentation to the General Committee every week as to the health of those in the House.[32] These regulations establish the founders' belief in the importance of bodily health. Concern for the medical treatment the women received was shown in the fact that only expert doctors and surgeons were allowed to treat the patients. The supervisors and contributors of the House must have cared a great deal about the physical health of each woman since they expected the physicians to present their findings on a weekly basis.

During its early years, the Magdalen Charity House achieved a relatively good amount of success, reflected in the number of prostitutes interested in the institution and the number of those that repented and reformed. In 1761, roughly two years after its founding, Dodd recorded the statistics of the House in his "Accounts of the Rise, Progress, and Present State of the Magdalen Charity." According to these statistics, 281 women entered the House in the first two years. One hundred and five of the women received remained in the House at the time the statistics were recorded. Out of the number that no longer lived at the House, twenty-five repented and received welcome back into their community and sixty-eight were "dismist with credit to services" by the Board of Governors. This refers to the promise that well-behaved and reformed women could receive letters

of recommendation from the heads of the Charity with hopes that they would find a job as a servant or maid upon release. Four women died from complications of illness, ten were released based on insanity and mental problems, and twenty-eight either never returned from hospitals, requested release, or did not function well under such seclusion. The Board of Governors dismissed a total of forty-one women for "irregularities."[33] These statistics say a lot about the institution itself but also give a glimpse into the beliefs of the Governors of the Charity.

While no real record of the number of prostitutes in the Metropolis during this time exists, most speculate that there were about 20,000 to 30,000 streetwalkers in the mid-eighteenth century.[34] Considering this estimation, the number of women who entered the Magdalen House seems incredibly miniscule. However, the fact that any women at all felt enticed to live in the House proves that prostitution was not always chosen and that some women were looking for an escape from their poverty-stricken and sinful lifestyle. The real question in the actual success of the Magdalen Charity House lies in the number of women who received dismissal for "irregularities." Based on the rest of Dodd's writing, mainly his "Advice," "irregularities" were women who did not show an interest in repentance, had horrible tempers or some other vice, did not achieve success in industry, or displayed some kind of unwillingness or inability to reform and become members of society.[35] This group is twice as large as the women who received reconciliation.[36] This shows a paradox between the actions and the words of the leaders of the Charity. While showing a real concern for the eternal souls of the "unfortunate" prostitutes in their writings, they proved unwilling to take the time to reform and educate the women who did not initially take an interest in self-improvement. However, this did not hinder the reputation of the house, nor did it keep the charitable donations from skyrocketing, especially amongst the higher classes of society.

The Magdalen Charity House saw a surge of support from many members of society during not only its first two years, as recorded by Dodd, but up through the end of the century.[37] In "A List of the Governors and Contributors to this Charity," Dodd lists the major supporters and governors of the institution and their contribution to the Charity as of 1761. This list extends eighteen pages, with approximately 720 names. Famous names of very prominent men and women appear on the list including the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Duke of York. Other upper class members of society make up a majority of the contributors with titles of duke, earl, duchess, or baron found multiple times on every page. However, there also exists a large number of men and women of middle and lower class standing who gave significant amounts of money to the institution. The list also denotes "annual governors," "governors for life," and committee members.[38] A large majority of the contributors fall under these titles, almost all of them being from the upper class. The balance of the House in 1761 after all expenses totaled a little over £1055.[39] Mary Peace explains in her article, "The Magdalen Hospital and the Fortunes of Whiggish Sentimentality in Mid-Eighteenth-Century Britain," that the Magdalen Charity House procured "extraordinary popularity...throughout the 1760s and 1770s."[40] She states that the House became the most popular charity of the time, collecting £3114 with its first fundraising drive, compared to the Asylum for the Reception of Orphaned Girls which only collected a little over £1000. Helping with the popularity of the House, Dodd's sermons drew in exceptionally large crowds and larger amounts

of money than any other charity-related sermons of the time.[41]

This popularity suggests that many people in London during the mid-eighteenth century agreed with the view of prostitution under which the Magdalen Charity House was based. Society felt as though repentant prostitutes were worth a great amount of charity and became willing to see them as members of society who should be helped rather than spurned. The popularity of the charity and the sermons of Dodd, which would have expressed the sentiments seen in his writing, explicitly prove this change in society's views. This change also appears in the popular media of the day, especially in prints, popular novels and literature of the time period, and the *Times* and the *Old Bailey.*

Popular print media took on the culture of the prostitutes long before the mid-eighteenth century. However, these prints illustrated the views that most of society held in the early century, that of the prostitute as a seducer of men and a purely sinful woman who became a prostitute by choice, not out of necessity or circumstance. By the 1750s though, the view of prostitution in print began to change. Since prints were seen in many public places and the purpose of popular print media was to reflect the sentiments of the society, this new portrayal of prostitutes, utilized by the majority of mid-century artists, shows a change in the opinions of society as a whole. One of the more significant alterations in the way the artists portrayed the culture of the prostitute was through the image of the bawd. Sophie Carter in her book, *Purchasing Power*, notes that earlier in the century the bawd played the seducer in prints as often as they did in mid-century ones, however, the "later images were particularly distinguished by their lascivious insistence on the helplessness of the young women represented."[42] This "helplessness" often manifested itself in the prints as unhappiness or shame.

William Hogarth's *A Harlot's Progress Plate 1* illustrates this change in society's views. While it was originally drawn in 1732, reprints with a more sympathetic outlook were made and heavily distributed during the mid-century.[44] This indicates that the opinion illustrated in this print remains popular throughout the century. This print, which is the first in a series of a narrative collection, conveys to viewers the ability of the bawd to seduce innocent, unwilling girls into prostitution. In the print, a young woman has just arrived in the city and is immediately attacked by a bawd whose goal is to entice her into a world of vice and sin. Carter writes about the print that "the potential harlot arrives in London penniless and friendless, but it is only through the direct and timely intervention of the bawd that she resorts to prostitution." For people in mid-century London, the bawd provided a primary reason of prostitution and the woman "is not explicitly credited with having made an autonomous decision."[45] This being the case, society could find hope in the plight of the prostitute. It was neither her decision nor intent to walk the streets; therefore she could just as easily be persuaded to convert back to virtue and respectable society.

This change could not only be seen in print, but in popular novels and literature of the day as well. Just as with prints, these writings reflected a sense of the sorrow and unhappiness felt by young women who were forced to turn to prostitution. However the writings established a better sense of the motives of women who turned to prostitution, usually poverty. A perfect example of this kind of fictional narrative occurs in *The Histories of Some of the Penitents in the Magdalen-House as Supposed to be Related by Themselves*, published in 1759. The novel, which includes four stories, tells the fictional tale of Emily Markland,

a young woman who gives birth to an illegitimate child with a man who leaves her, is seduced into a brothel by a bawd in disguise, and, after leaving the brothel, has to turn to prostitution to care for her child and herself.[46] This story produces sympathy in readers for the life of the fallen woman, because it focuses on the belief that many women undergo heart-wrenching trials before turning to prostitution, and only then under trickery or destitution. Also, once forced to work the streets, Emily feels extreme guilt and shame for the life that she leads and immediately jumps at the chance to receive help from the Magdalen House. This willingness to repent and reform formed the base of Dodd and Hanway's writings, as well as the core of the Magdalen House's establishment. The fact that this belief plays the central role in this piece of popular fiction proves once again that these ideas began to spread throughout society, at least during this period. But strongest proof of this diffusion of ideals comes from the *Times* and the *Old Bailey.*

The *Times*, known as *The Daily Universal Register* during its earliest years, provided a hotbed of sentimental articles and correspondence on prostitution in the years between 1785 and 1788. While every article on the subject did not express sympathy for the women involved, many of them did. The November 6, 1786 issue along with the one from January 8, 1787, offers readers a tale of the harsh lives that prostitutes live and their longing for repentance and acceptance into normal society. The opening phrase from the November issue sums up this belief perfectly, "Tho' forc'd to act the harlot's wretched part, virtue ne'er quite forsook my wounded heart." This verse, as well as the story that it introduces, which takes up almost an entire column of the newspaper,[47] offers sound evidence that these beliefs were circulating and accepted in London society, as there did not seem to be any negative feedback or loss of popularity of the newspaper during this time. Almost everyone read the *Times*, and therefore, these ideas were at least being made known to the public, even if not everyone agreed with them.

Another common tactic of expressing sentiment towards street walkers is the use of sympathetic adjectives to describe the women.[48] One of the best examples of this comes from the issue of March 19, 1788. The author of the article argues that brothel keepers deserve the punishment, not "the frail fair ones as necessity force to walk the streets for nightly proul."[49] Many of the articles that expressed these compassionate views were written by members of the society, not journalists of the paper. This supplies even greater evidence that these beliefs were widespread among citizens of London and that many felt passionate about it.

Something strange occurs in the newspaper in the year 1789, however. This year produced a significant drop in the number of articles that provided a sympathetic look at prostitution. In 1790, prostitution barely gets mentioned at all. This phenomenon could be caused by many things, including more important world affairs, like the French Revolution. Yet, it seems that this trend simply follows the common beliefs of the time. The end of the century found society developing a harsher view of prostitutes and, while the change did not occur within the course of a year, a shift did take place starting in the 1790s which may have produced such a dramatic decrease in the number of articles on prostitution.[50]

The *Old Bailey* expresses kindness for these women in a way very similar to the *Times.* In many trials, supposed prostitutes were referred to as "unfortunate"

women and sometimes, their offences were acquitted because of the ill treatment posed on them by men. [51] The trial of Mary Osley for theft on October 22, 1766 provides an excellent example of this. She was accused of stealing clothes from Mary Wilson, who was associated with "a man that gets his livelihood by bringing these unfortunate girls to bawdy-houses." Osley was acquitted by the judge.[52] This trial, and others like it, show an increase in the sympathy of not only the citizens, who were most likely to use sympathetic adjectives in court, but also of judges, who became increasingly likely to acquit or provide lesser punishment for those who were "unfortunate women." As seen in the case of Mary Osley, they also began to side against those who seduced young women into brothels.

While these views expressed by Hanway and Dodd became very popular during the mid-century, by the late 1700s, the opinions on the subject of prostitutes began to shift towards a more realistic view. Peace blames this change on the writings of Adam Smith and Jean-Jacques Rousseau. These men greatly helped in spreading the mercantilist idea that became so popular during the late eighteenth and nineteenth century. Mercantilism, while commonly used in economic terms, stressed the need for productive and useful members of society; members who could work in a factory and contribute to industry. Since prostitutes did nothing to aid society in becoming a strong industrial power, they should be taken off the streets and brought into the factories.[53] Peace points out that the Magdalen Hospital became a place that "was no longer confident either about the innate virtue of its inmates or the possibility of their recuperation for society." Therefore, the charity turned into a workhouse with a sole purpose of teaching these women how to do industrial labor.[54] Society no longer saw hope for reconciliation among former prostitutes. Citizens of London believed that these fallen women would probably not turn to God nor receive forgiveness from their families, but they could and would learn how to do menial labor in factories. People became more worried about getting prostitutes off the street, not to save their souls and the soul of the city, but because they were not being productive citizens of the increasingly industrialized London.

Mary Wollstonecraft, an influential feminist during the late eighteenth-century whose writings and thoughts greatly influenced society,[55] presents ideas that suggest a synthesis of mercantilism and earlier, more romantic views of prostitution amongst society at the end of the eighteenth and on into the nineteenth century. In her most famous writing, *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman,* she shows little real concern for the wellbeing of London's prostitutes. While some pity is shown, the sense of hope for these women that was so common in mid-century writing is missing from Wollstonecraft's 1792 *Vindication.*[56] She believed that a prostitute was "a woman who has lost her honour, imagines that she cannot fall lower, and as for recovering her former station, it is impossible."[57] She sees most prostitutes, while once being "bashful, shamefaced innocents," as women who will never regain their modesty and virtue and most importantly, who themselves have no hope of redemption.[58] She does give exception for those who possess "an uncommon portion of sense and loftiness of spirit." For the majority of women who walk the streets, however, she wrote that "no exertion can wash this stain away."[59] This differs from the writings of Hanway and Dodd who believed that most women were capable of being pulled up from their lowly states by institutions that were focused on saving their souls and teaching them skills with which they could earn money.

These writers did, however, see some of the same causes for the prostitute's "common and legal" profession: lack of education and marketable skills. Wollstonecraft writes that women with no support and income could easily find "business of various kinds..., if they were educated in a more orderly manner."[60] Women who received education were able to make their own money, and therefore avoid prostitution. This belief exactly parallels that of popular opinion in the mid-century. Wollstonecraft saw how prostitution affected the women involved on a more personal level. She put a strong emphasis on the fact that these women had lost their virtue.[61] This clearly correlates with the thoughts of mid-century writers, suggesting that throughout the century there remained the assumption that prostitutes turned completely to vice when they began walking the streets. The difference between the earlier and later opinions lies in the belief that the prostitutes could receive salvation, from both God and society, even after their loss of innocence and virtue.

The mid-eighteenth century saw changes in the way the people of London viewed prostitutes. Instead of seeing these women as beyond repair and unworthy of charity, society saw them as fallen women who needed and deserved help, for their physical and spiritual needs. Not only did these women deserve help, society saw them as capable of returning to society and completely dropping their evil lifestyle. The writings of William Dodd and Jonas Hanway and the establishment of the Magdalen Charity House provide evidence that this change in opinion occurred and the popular media of the time proved the popularity of these views in London society. This shift, which swept in and out of the city in only thirty years, shows that societies are very capable of changing their minds quickly and provides evidence of religious leaders and popular media influencing the members of a society. The most impressive aspect of this change is the rapidity with which the mid-century opinion was able to leave society. This took place in a matter of a few years, which suggests not only the power of the media and writers to persuade, but also the strength that current events, like the French Revolution, and the gaining of industrial power, caused by the Industrial Revolution, have on society's opinions.

ENDNOTES

1. Mary Peace , "The Magdalen Hospital and the Fortunes of Whiggish Sentimentality in Mid-Eighteenth-Century Britain: "Well-Grounded" Exemplarity vs. "Romantic" Exceptionality," *Eighteenth Century: Theory and Interpretation* 48, no.2 (2007): 131

2. Tony Henderson, *Disorderly Women in Eighteenth-Century London* [New York: Pearson Education Inc., 1999], 185.

3. Jonas Hanway, *Letters written occasionally on the customs of foreign nations in regard to harlots: the lawless commerce of the sexes: the repentance of prostitutes: the great humanity and beneficial effects of the Magdalen Charity in London: and the absurd notions of the Methodists: with prayers and meditations on the most interesting circumstances and events of life,* [London: Printed for John Rivington, R. and J. Dodsley, and C. Henderson, 1761], Microfilm; William Dodd, *An Account of the Rise, Progress, and Present State of the Magdalen Charity. To Which are Added The Rev. Mr. Dodd's Sermon, Preached Before the President, Vice Presidents and Governors and His Sermon Preached Before His Royal Highness the Duke of York and the Advice of the Magdalens; with the Hymns, Prayers, Rules, and List of Subscribers,*[Printed by W. Faden for Charity, 1761], Microfilm.

4. Hanway, *Letters;* Dodd, *An Account of the Magdalen Charity.*

5. Dodd, *An Account of the Magdalen Charity,* iv.

6. Hanway, *Letters*; Dodd, *An Account of the Magdalen Charity.*

7. Hanway, *Letters*, 8.

8. Dodd, *An Account of the Magdalen Charity*, viii, 47.

9. Owners of brothels.

10. Dodd, *An Account of the Magdalen Charity*, 48-50.

11. Hanway, *Letters*, 314-5.

12. Dodd, *An Account of the Magdalen Charity*; Hanway, *Letters.*

13. Dodd, *An Account of the Magdalen Charity*, 57-79.

14. Ibid., 63.

15. Ibid., xvii-xxviii.

16. Dodd, *An Account of the Magdalen Charity*, xii; "Design" refers to the plan of the Magdalen Charity House.

17. Hanway, *Letter*, 5-16.

18. Dodd, *An Account of the Magdalen Charity*, 126

19. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography,* s.v. "Dodd, William" and "Hanway, Jonas."

20. Dodd, *An Account of the Magdalen Charity*, v.

21. Ibid., iv.

22. Ibid., 59.

23. Ibid., 75.

24. Dodd, *An Account of the Magdalen Charity.*

25. Hanway, *Letters*, 282.

26. Dodd, *An Account of the Magdalen Charity*, 131-39

27. Robert Dingley was a co-founder of the Magdalen Charity House.

28. Dodd, *An Account of the Magdalen Charity*, iv.

29. Dodd, *An Account of the Magdalen Charity*, 135.

30. Ibid., 61.

31. Ibid., 71.

32. Dodd, *An Account of the Magdalen Charity*, 127.

33. Dodd, *An Account of the Magdalen Charity*, iv.

34. Henderson, *Disorderly Women*, 178.

35. Dodd, *An Account of the Magdalen Charity,* 57-79.

36. Ibid., vi

37. Dodd, *An Account of the Magdalen Charity,* 140-159; Peace, "The Magdalen Hospital."

38. Dodd, *An Account of the Magdalen Charity,* 141.

39. Ibid., 159

40. Peace, "The Magdalen Hospital," pg. 126.

41. Peace, "The Magdalen Hospital," 136-7.

42. Sophie Carter, *Purchasing Power: representing prostitution in eighteenth-century English popular print culture*, [Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing, 2004], 125, Fig. 34.

43. Ibid.,118-128.

44. Carter, *Purchasing Power*, 50.

45. Ibid., 112.

46. Laura J. Rosenthal, ed., *Nightwalkers: Prostitute Narratives of the Eighteenth Century,* [Ontario: Broadview Press, 2008], 153-190.

47. The *Times*, Nov. 6, 1786; The *Times* Jan. 8, 1787.

48. The *Times,* Jan. 15, 1785; The *Times,* Nov. 10, 1785; The *Times,* Aug. 1, 1786; The *Times,* June 2, 1788. These provide prime examples of sympathetic adjectives, most commonly "unhappy."

49. The *Times,* March 19, 1788.

50. This change in views will be looked at later in the paper.

51. *Old Bailey Sessions Proceedings*, trial of Catharine Smith, May 22, 1765; *OBSP,* trial of John Brian and Richard Purser, May 22, 1765; *OBSP,* trial of James Mussin and James Redding, May 14, 1766.

52. *OBSP*, trial of Mary Osley, October 22, 1766.

53. Peace, "The Magdalen House," 141-4.

54. Ibid., 142-3

55. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography,* s.v. "Wollstonecraft, Mary."

56. Mary Wollstonecraft, *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman: with strictures on political and moral subjects,* [Harvard University: T. F. Unwin, 1891], http://books.google.com/books?id=hxwEAAAAYAAJ&vq=prostitution&dq=the+vindication+of+the+rights+of+women&source=gbs_navlinks_s [accessed April 17, 2010].

57. Ibid., 119-20.

58. Ibid., 186-7.

59. Ibid., 119-20.

60. Wollstonecraft, *Vindication*, 222.

61. Ibid., 186-7.

PERSPECTIVES

Brutus on the Backbenches: The Parliamentary Overthrow of Margaret Thatcher

Michael Johnson

Author's Preface

Margaret Thatcher's fall from power was as dramatic as her ascent to one of the most prominent premierships in modern British history. Always the subject of intrigue and controversy, noted historians and political scientists, Jeremy Black, E. H. H. Green, Trevor Lloyd, and E. A. Reitan, in particular, have offered a great deal of insight on her political decline. Their analyses have largely been focused on two major elements; the first was her abrasive style of leadership both with her own ministers as well as her European counterparts; the second was her insistence on the adoption and implementation of the Community Charge, better known as the 'poll tax.' Their work has been utilized to establish the context for what Britain was like during the age of Thatcher.

My approach was to add to these fundamental elements by offering a third and all-encompassing factor: the ultimate death blow to Lady Thatcher's residency at Downing Street was dealt not by disgruntled ministers or opponents of a tax, but rather from those rank-and-file Conservative members of the House of Commons uneasy about their electoral prospects with Thatcher as leader; the *Brutus on the Backbenches* if you will.

Given her polarizing reputation and the ease with which one's own political views could inadvertently make their way into the research, I approached the topic by utilizing the words of those who worked closest with her, taken from memoirs and interviews. It is with this presentation of both primary and secondary sources that I seek to offer a realistic, yet succinct insight into the atmosphere Lady Thatcher created both inside the Cabinet Room and out.

Margaret Thatcher led the United Kingdom as Prime Minister for eleven and a half years, from 1979 to 1990. She was, and continues to be, one of the most divisive characters in modern British political culture. Her removal in 1990 as the leader of the Conservative Party, and thus as Prime Minister, was a shock to some outside of the political arena; but to Westminster insiders, her departure was nearly inevitable. What led to the downfall of Britain's 'Iron Lady?' This paper argues that the fall of Margaret Thatcher was motivated by both the politics of personality, as well as political self-preservation by backbench MPs who faced a tough election with Lady Thatcher as the standard-bearer for the Conservatives. These arguments are not in contrast to the widely-accepted ideas that Thatcher fell due to her no-compromise approach to U.K.-European relations, or her decision to stick to her proverbial guns on the 'Poll Tax', but rather they expand

on them to emphasize the roles that her leadership style, as well as the reaction of backbench MPs to it, played as the primary driving forces of her ouster.[1]

From the beginning of Margaret Thatcher's tenure as leader of the Conservative Party she was a controversial figure. She became Tory leader after challenging Edward Heath in the 1975 Conservative leadership contest. The challenge to Mr. Heath was in itself unorthodox, as Mrs. Thatcher wrote herself in her autobiography:

> In 1975 I was the first candidate for the leadership of the Conservative Party to challenge an existing leader under the rules which had been instituted by Sir Alec Douglas-Home a decade earlier.[2]

Her challenge was motivated by the consistent failures of Mr. Heath to secure Conservative victories in three of four general elections. In 1979 Lady Thatcher led the Tories to victory after campaigning that she and the Conservatives recognized the ongoing crisis with widespread unemployment and economic recession in Britain at the time. She capitalized on the public demand for action in Westminster and was successful in presenting herself as the candidate who had a coherent program to repair a broken Britain.[3] Over the course of her ministry, Lady Thatcher embarked on a wide-ranging reform program that involved local taxation, a successful war with the British trade unions, and the implementation of Euro-skeptical economic policies with the European Community.[4]

Although Lady Thatcher was successful in her leadership bid, and the subsequent general election of 1979, documents released by the Margaret Thatcher Foundation Archives show that the Iron Lady was concerned that she had not used her first year in No. 10 to its full advantage.[5] Indeed the early years of Margaret Thatcher's premiership did not produce the results for which she and her government had hoped. One such difficulty was the government's desire to reduce the level of inflation that had skyrocketed under the Labour government led by James Callaghan. Thatcher's policies of rate caps only led to inflation "peaking at 20% which resulted in a year-long recession and soaring unemployment."[6] Such economic difficulties continued into the second Thatcher government, even though the Prime Minister's economic policies indeed reduced the unemployment level in the United Kingdom by adding tens of thousands of unskilled jobs to the British economy.[7]

On top of the economic stresses the Thatcher government faced early on, there was also the issue of the popularity of the Prime Minister herself, as well as that of the Conservative party, among the British people. However, unlike the economic issues that came and went, the problem of popularity continued, and grew increasingly dire later during Lady Thatcher's time in No. 10. According to statistics cited by Earl A. Reitan in *The Thatcher Revolution*:

> As a political leader, Thatcher took for granted the support of Conservative voters...In a poll taken in 1988; it was found that 39 percent of the population said they were 'Thatcherist'...while 54 percent said they were 'socialist.' Although 70 percent of the people polled saw Britain as Thatcherist, only 40 percent wanted it to be that way. The strong British sense of community prevailed over her individualism.[8]

In her memoirs, *The Downing Street Years*, Lady Thatcher cited the fact that she "had won three general elections and lost none..."[9] While she was successful in all of the general elections she faced as the leader of the Conservative Party, the Tories with Thatcher at the helm never received "more than 44 percent of the vote."[10] Perhaps these Conservative victories can be attributed to two general factors: the first is Thatcher's ability to use her political prowess and national crises to demonstrate her leadership abilities and emerge stronger. Second, her ability to exploit the dysfunction and division that plagued the Labour Party prevented them from offering a true alternative government option to Lady Thatcher.

When Thatcher came to power in 1979, Britain had been in the grips of turbulent strikes by the country's trade unions in what the media deemed 'The Winter of Discontent.' She provided an alternative to the Britain-in-decline sentiment that had taken effect among a large swath of the populace.[11] In the 1983 election, Lady Thatcher was able to capitalize on the resounding British military victory over Argentina in reasserting British rule in the Falkland Islands.[12] Thatcher also used her political skill to gauge the winds and determined that, with the split within the Labour Party and with the fledgling SDP-Liberal Alliance, her Tories would have the upper hand in retaining Downing Street.[13] The 1987 election was very similar to 1983 in the sense that the Labour Party was still incapable of providing a real challenge to the Conservatives. Again, the British people returned the Tories to Downing Street, but "with only 42 percent of the votes."[14]

One issue that was a primary theme throughout Thatcher's premiership was the United Kingdom's relationship with the European Economic Community. One of the central themes of Thatcherism as an ideology was inherent Euro-skepticism, an aversion to a strong, federalist European state. Thatcher herself described her European philosophy as being a "free-enterprise *Europe des patries...*"[15] Some of her most controversial moments came during speeches condemning European demands of Britain, or her government's dissatisfaction with the treatment Britain received at the hands of their European neighbors. In particular, the "Bruges Speech" became the quintessential sound bite for defining Thatcherism. In the speech, delivered in September 1989, Thatcher lashed out at Brussels and reasserted the notion of British sovereignty in the face of what she often referred to as 'European bureaucrats.' The speech, delivered in September 1988, included the following statement:

> We have successfully rolled back the frontiers of the state in Britain only to see them reimposed at the European level, with a European super-state exercising a new dominance from Brussels." The European Community should be a union of sovereign states, France as France, Spain as Spain, Britain as Britain, each with its own customs, traditions, and identities.[16]

The European issue was a primary point of contention within nearly all of the successive cabinets of the three Thatcher governments. Although Margaret Thatcher had led the Conservatives to victory in three consecutive general elections, not all was well within the party. Her governments were constantly changing through cabinet reshuffles, sixteen in all, during her eleven and a half year tenure as Prime

Minister.[17] These reshuffles were just one result of several tumultuous relationships between a domineering Prime Minister and her cabinet ministers. Lady Thatcher demonstrated, early on, her intolerance for Tory ministers whom she regarded as soft on the Thatcherite platform. She split the party into 'wets' and 'dries.' The wets were people whom she saw as "opponents of government economic policy."[18] The 'dries' were those members who supported her government.[19] One of the first casualties of the 'wet-dry division' was Foreign Secretary Francis Pym, who was removed from the Foreign Office in 1983. Still, such reshuffles had not posed any great threat to the stability of Thatcher governments prior to 1987, with one exception. In 1986, Thatcher's Secretary of State for Defense, Michael Heseltine, attributed his resignation to the manner in which Lady Thatcher and her advisers had dealt with the situation that would become known as 'The Westland Affair."[20] It was after that point that a number of high-profile resignations and sackings began to reveal that not all was rosy and well behind the glossy, black door at Downing Street.

Perhaps the most divisive issues in the Thatcherite era of U.K.-Europe relations came in 1989 with the question of British membership in the Exchange Rate Mechanism (ERM). The ERM was a system implemented by the European Community (EC) that attempted to tie national currencies to one another in order to keep the exchange rates from fluctuating dramatically across the EC. The motivation for the U.K. to sign on as a member state of the ERM was the spike in inflation and hopes that tying the Pound Sterling to the resilient Mark of West Germany would help stabilize the British currency market.[21] One of the key figures promoting British participation in the ERM was Chancellor of the Exchequer, Nigel Lawson. The debate over ERM membership led to a chilling of relations between the Prime Minister and her Chancellor. This chilling was exacerbated by Thatcher's insistence on taking economic advice not from her Chancellor or Treasury minister, but rather from her personal economic adviser, Sir Alan Walters.[22] It was this use of her personal advisers input over that of her own ministers that became a central issue within Thatcher cabinets, and thus her relations with her colleagues in government.

The ERM issue came to a head when both Chancellor Lawson and Foreign Secretary Geoffrey Howe met with Lady Thatcher early on the morning of Sunday, June 25, 1989 to discuss her upcoming visit to Madrid to meet with her European counterparts. Accounts of the meeting vary from source to source, but it is generally accepted that both Lawson and Howe confronted Thatcher on the ERM issue and wanted to see her lay the foundation for eventual British membership in the ERM. Apparently, if Thatcher refused to include a statement of British support in her remarks, Lawson and Howe pledged to submit their resignations.[23] According to her memoirs, Lady Thatcher viewed the meeting as "the ambush before Madrid."[24] From the accounts given by both Mrs. Thatcher and Mr. Howe in their respective memoirs, one senses tension and collegial frigidity developing:

> Geoffrey and Nigel came in to see me at 8.15 on Sunday morning, as arranged. They were shown into my study and sat down facing me on the other side of the fireplace. That had clearly worked out precisely what they were going to say.[25]

Thatcher went on to describe the nature of the discussion, which was, primarily, an explanation of the framework Lawson and Howe had constructed to provide for British entry into the ERM. Lawson and Howe presented Thatcher with a plan to temporarily halt the progress of the three-phase plan outlined in the Delors Report, issued by European Commission Jacques Delors, which outlined the process for increased European integration with hopes of the implementation of a central European currency. She describes the end of the conversation as follows:

> They [Lawson and Howe] said that if I did this I would stop the whole Delors process from going to Stages 2 and 3. And if I did not agree to their terms and their formulation they would both resign.[26]

In his memoirs, *Conflict of Loyalty*, Geoffrey Howe recollects the way in which his earlier requests for meetings with Lady Thatcher were received:

> For on the following day I telephoned her, in all innocence (but in her view 'imprudently'), to suggest a meeting between the three of us [Howe, Lawson, and Thatcher] to find...a way of settling the 'semi-public dispute' that was now threatening real damage. I was astonished by the ferocity of her reaction. 'No, I shall certainly not see the two of you together about this,' she said. Her own account is even more graphic – and revealing – than my own recollection...[27]

Mr. Howe continued to quote Thatcher's recollection of the conversation as provided in her memoirs:

> I told him [that is me] three times—since he did not seem to take it in and persisted in his attempt to contrive a meeting at which he and Nigel could get their way – that the best thing he could do now was to keep quiet. We were not going into the ERM at present and that was that.[28]

It is generally accepted that losing her Chancellor and her Foreign Secretary at once would have spelled disaster for Thatcher's government. It also seems that Mrs. Thatcher decided not to take such a political risk in calling their bluffs and "in June 1989, she announced her support for Lawson's policies."[29] This episode demonstrated how Lady Thatcher performed under pressure from some of her more powerful and influential colleagues. Geoffrey Howe and Nigel Lawson took the huge risk of bucking the Prime Minister and they would both, in time, pay the price for such transgressions. As Michael Portillo later titled a documentary about the Thatcher downfall, the lady was indeed not for spurning.[30]

The loser in the Madrid debacle was Geoffrey Howe. While the Prime Minister had adopted the framework for entry into the ERM, the damage done to the relationship between Thatcher and her Foreign Secretary was irreparable. Howe learned of his loss from one of his closest advisers Peter Cropper.[31] According to Mr. Howe's accounts, he learned of his impending sack via a note written by Mr. Cropper, who informed him that such word was spreading around various newspaper offices.[32] According to the recollections of both Thatcher and Howe,

the meeting when the dismissal finally came was professional and mannerly.[33] The relatively unknown John Major was installed as Howe's replacement in the Foreign Office. As for Howe, he was made Leader of the House of Commons and Deputy Prime Minister after he had refused to accept a posting at the Home Office. Thatcher herself admitted that the position of Deputy Prime Minister was a title-only job: "This is a title with no constitutional significance...In practical terms it just meant that Geoffrey sat on my immediate left at Cabinet meetings – a position he may well have come to regret."[34]

The tension between Lady Thatcher and her ministers grew more pronounced as time went on. Cabinet meetings were interrupted with quick, but heated, disputes between Thatcher and some of her ministers.[35] Tensions were also high within the respective government offices. John Major recalled the reaction to Geoffrey Howe's sacking as Foreign Secretary upon his arrival at his new post: "The Foreign Office was shellshocked at losing Geoffrey after more than five years."[36] In his new post as Leader of the House of Commons, Howe was less than thrilled, saying "My last fifteen months in government were to be the least satisfying."[37] Reaction to Thatcher's sacking of Howe was obvious according to John Major's memory. He wrote of Howe's return to the Commons:

> When he first appeared in the Commons in his new role as Leader of the House he received a tumultuous reaction. It went on and on, and was clearly *for* Geoffrey and *against* Margaret. It was a warning that should have been noticed.[38]

Relations between Thatcher and her Chancellor Nigel Lawson were also on the fritz. Having seen how No. 10 reacted to the Madrid 'ambush' by pushing Geoffrey Howe out of the Foreign Office, Lawson had the realization that his position within the Thatcher government could be subject to similar treatment.

Both Lawson and Thatcher clashed again over the issue of the 'Community Charge' or what was more popularly called the Poll Tax. The poll tax was a flat rate tax applied to all adults in order to raise revenue to fund local government services. The county councils throughout the United Kingdom determined the tax rates.[39] The decision to implement the poll tax was reached by the Prime Minister and her 'kitchen cabinet' of ministers and advisers. Lawson, as Chancellor, spoke against the policy but his protests fell upon deaf ears. According to Geoffrey Howe, he and Lawson engaged in a brief correspondence regarding the poll tax. Howe quoted Lawson as saying "Money spent on making the Community Charge 'slightly less appalling,' he said [Lawson], was not only 'bad value for money objectively'...it was also 'money spent to save her own face.'"[40] According to Howe, Lawson went on to say "I do not regard that as a worthy cause."[41] It appears that Mr. Howe's assessment of Lawson's frustration about the adoption of the poll tax regardless of the opinion of cabinet members was correct given that Lawson submitted his resignation as Chancellor on October 26, 1989. Foreign Secretary John Major was announced as Mr. Lawson's replacement as Chancellor.

Having pushed her Foreign Secretary out, and with the resignation of her Chancellor, Lady Thatcher continued with her domestic program, which included the poll tax. But the unease about the plan did not go with Lawson. Backbench Tories were speaking out against the plan. One such MP was James Pawsey who

sat on the Conservative 1922 committee, which represents backbench Tory MPs. In a statement to the *Times* he said: "With the plan as currently structured, the cost of the charge would be measured in lost Conservative seats."[42]

The charge had been given a test run in 1989 in Scotland where it was met with great levels of hostility and disapproval.[43] The charge was extremely divisive amongst Tory MPs and at the 1989 Tory leadership conference Sir Anthony Meyer embarked on a hopeless bid to challenge Lady Thatcher for the leadership of the Conservative Party. Though expecting to be unsuccessful, Sir Anthony was able to win the votes of thirty-three of his parliamentary colleagues.[44]

The poll tax faced a lukewarm reception upon its introduction in the House of Commons. Sir Rhodes Boyson, the chairman of the Conservative 1922 Committee, told the *London Times*:

> Without concessions, there is no way I could vote for the government on Thursday. The present arrangement could put at total risk not only the May council elections, but the general election when it comes.[45]

But Thatcher was sure that the Community Charge was right for Britain. What's more, it appears she refused to acknowledge some backbench opposition as a potential threat to her government. There was a great deal of heated debate across all benches and after the final vote, thirty-one Tory MPs had voted against the government.[46] When the poll tax was put into effect in England and Wales, public opinion toward the new charge was incredibly hostile. Demonstrations against the charge took place around Britain. The most troubling of these was a demonstration that was held in Trafalgar Square, London that drew nearly 200,000 protesters. The demonstration subsequently exploded into a full-scale riot.[47] It was the public's reaction to the poll tax that shook the nerve of Conservative MPs in Westminster and began to make them question what the Prime Minister was doing with her government.

In early 1990, a perfect storm seemed to be coming together that ensured a difficult year for the Thatcher government. With widespread public dissatisfaction with the poll tax, many MPs were beginning to think twice about the strength of the Thatcherite mandate in Westminster. Furthermore, Tories felt the first casualty of the poll tax nearly immediately. Just two days after the introduction of the poll tax, they were handed a resounding defeat in the Mid Staffordshire by-election "on a swing of 22 percent against them."[48] This was the first shot across the bow for the Conservatives and MPs were not willing to ignore it; they seemed to take their frustration out on the government by blaming the Prime Minister.[49] Accompanying the dismal aftermath of the poll tax, a series of resignations came from some of the more high profile and experienced members of Thatcher's government. Secretary of State for Employment Norman Fowler and Secretary of State for Wales Peter Walker, "both long-serving ministers, resigned in early 1990."[50]

Adding to an already complicated domestic situation, the issue of Europe once again interjected itself into the goings-on of the Thatcher government. During the meeting of the European Council that was held in Rome in October 1990, plans were announced that would set the stage for the implementation of a single European currency.[51] Thatcher reacted in her trademark manner, with harsh words for the prospect of further European centralization. Her remarks included a direct

attack on Jacques Delors, President of the European Commission; "...he [Mr. Delors] wanted the European Parliament to be the democratic body of the Community...the Commission to be the executive...and the Council of Ministers to be the Senate. No! No! No!"[52]

With those remarks in the Commons, the Thatcher government effectively slammed on the brakes for any further European cooperation. It was also that speech, and the subsequent headlines, that influenced Geoffrey Howe's decision on his future in the Thatcher government. As quoted in Howe's autobiography, some of the headlines read as follows: "*Sun* says Sir Geoffrey Howe has lost the support of his Cabinet colleagues...*Mail* says Sir Geoffrey may have to go for the sake of unity."[53] On November 1, 1990, Mr. Howe submitted his letter of resignation to the Prime Minister. Howe provided a stirring description of the meeting between himself and Thatcher. He wrote, "She was obviously shaken by the event, now that it had actually come."[54] Assuming that Sir Geoffrey is fair in his description of her demeanor, we are better able to understand what the mood must have been like in that Downing Street office: "Margaret's manner had been courteous, shocked, and practical. We parted in curiously formal fashion – with a handshake. It was, I think, the first time we'd ever shaken hands."[55] Margaret Thatcher's account of the event was much less detailed in her memoirs. She devoted just one sentence to the matter which ended with her description of the resignation as a "relief...as if a great burden had been lifted..."[56]

Howe was out of the government and had his opportunity to render his judgment on Mrs. Thatcher and her style in his own speech to the Commons to explain his resignation. In his speech, he gave a damning evaluation of the Prime Minister's approach to the European Community. He used pointed statements that attacked the very foundation of Thatcher's approach to European relations. One of the most critical statements was as follows:

> The tragedy is – and it is for me personally, for my party, for our whole people and for my Right Hon. friend herself, a very real tragedy – that the Prime Minister's perceived attitude towards Europe is running increasingly serious risks for the future of our nation. It risks minimizing our influence and maximizing our chances of being once again shut out....the effects will be incalculable and very hard to ever correct.[57]

The effects of Howe's resignation marked the death knell for the Thatcher government. As reported in the *New York Times*, the Conservatives lost two by-elections to Labour the week following the resignation.[58] The clock was ticking for Thatcher and the final blow was delivered when Michael Heseltine, who offers in his memoirs that after receiving numerous statements of support from his parliamentary colleagues, announced that he would challenge Thatcher for the leadership of the Conservative Party.[59] One of his primary issues was his promise to do away with the poll tax that had caused so many Tory MPs to fear for the security of their seats.[60] Heseltine had a great deal of substance on which to mount his challenge. Results in local elections throughout Britain in 1990 had demonstrated widespread disdain for the Conservative policies under Margaret Thatcher, with Tories only attracting a 30 percent approval rating in the polls.[61] The Conservatives had been dealt a massive blow in the Eastbourne by-election in mid October 1990, where the Liberal Democrats captured a seat largely

considered to be a safe Tory constituency.[62]

In a style that exuded confidence, Margaret Thatcher and her campaign manager Peter Morrison (who also served as her Parliamentary Private Secretary, a ministerial liaison with the House of Commons), insisted that she would win the leadership contest and would carry the Conservative Party on to a fourth election victory. But her colleagues did not share Thatcher's sense of confidence. Perhaps that confidence had influenced those managing her campaign. Michael Portillo recalled in his documentary *The Lady's Not for Spurning*, "Indeed with four hundred electors more or less, members of parliament, I had the impression in the end that she hadn't spoken to a single one of them."[63] John Major wrote in his memoirs, "Even before the first ballot, many in the party were preparing to walk away from a prime minister they admired because they felt she might lose the next election."[64] In the eyes of her party, Margaret Thatcher, the champion of the Conservative movement in Britain, had become a liability.

Lady Thatcher left for Paris to attend a European security summit, believing that there was nothing to fear back in Westminster.[65] By all accounts, Peter Morrison ran quite a lax campaign on behalf of Lady Thatcher, and it showed in the result of the first ballot. The Prime Minister had received 204 votes to Michael Heseltine's 152. There were sixteen abstentions.[66] While she had defeated Heseltine on the first ballot, she had failed to gain a majority plus fifteen percent as mandated by Conservative Party rules. A second ballot was called to determine an outright winner. At first, there seemed to be some confusion as to how the second round would play out, but Thatcher stepped out of the embassy in Paris and announced that she would remain in the contest.[67] But it was not to be. Her colleagues realized that the fatal blow had been struck when the sitting Prime Minister failed to win on the first ballot. This lackluster result would show a fractured party and Conservatives would pay in the next election. Solemnly, they confronted their leader.

In Michael Portillo's documentary, several of Thatcher's ministers and closest advisers recounted the difficulty with which they met with her to explain the reality of the situation. In the program, Norman Lamont described meeting with Lady Thatcher as:

> One of the most awful moments in my life, and I said to her that if she wanted to continue, I would support her and that no one outside this room would know what I had told her. But that my personal view was that she would be defeated in the next round by Michael Heseltine.[68]

One by one, Thatcher's ministers and advisers met with her and told her of the dire situation she faced. Lady Thatcher herself recalled a very emotional setting in meetings with her ministers, "I was sick at heart."[69] At the end of the string of meetings with members of her cabinet, she had made up her mind. She had to withdraw from the contest. Once back at No. 10, she and her team began working on the resignation speech. This too was an emotional scene. "Every now and again I found I had to wipe away a tear as the enormity of what had happened crowded in," she wrote.[70] The next day she announced her resignation to members of her cabinet. Then came the obligatory audience with the Queen, and finally came her final statement to the Commons. With the conclusion of the constitutional business, Lady Thatcher turned her attention to the task of electing John Major

the next leader of the Conservative Party, although he faced an emboldened Heseltine as well as a new challenger, Foreign Secretary Douglas Hurd, who entered his name in the second round. Mr. Major did indeed win the contest after Michael Heseltine and Douglas Hurd withdrew t in his favor. The end of an era had occurred in Britain. The age of Thatcher drew to a close.

In the immediate aftermath of the contest, it was Michael Heseltine who bore the brunt of public opinion as the man who brought down the Iron Lady. The *Washington Post* published article just days after Thatcher's resignation as Prime Minister entitled "Et Tu, Heseltine?; Unpopularity Was a Grievous Fault, and Thatcher Hath Answered for It," a reference to the Shakespearean line from *Julius Caesar* "Et tu Brute?"[71] While the article places a majority of the blame with Mr. Heseltine, historians have largely pointed to Geoffrey Howe as the real instigator. Nearly all of the references used for this paper list Mr. Howe as a primary factor in the fall of Margaret Thatcher. While it cannot be disputed that he indeed played a central role, given the impact his resignation had on the stability of the Thatcher government, one cannot overlook the underlying issues that plagued the Thatcher years. As previously stated, backbench MPs became restless and worrisome when Lady Thatcher chose to promote policies unpopular with the British people. Those same MPs reacted to the culture they saw develop between the Prime Minister and the members of her cabinet. It was her domineering personality that drove wedges within her government. Even her successor, whom she personally chose, had concerns about her style, "I was uneasy; uneasy at Margaret's increasingly autocratic approach."[72] The style that defined her as the Iron Lady ultimately proved to be her downfall. Her style alienated her ministers, members of parliament, and after eleven and a half years, it alienated the British people. Her largely presidential approach to parliamentary leadership developed into an inability to work well with others. Whether they be European heads of state, or her own Foreign Secretary, it appears that her stubborn nature led to poisonous relationships and that poison eventually led to her demise.

ENDNOTES

1. Rodney Brazier, "The Downfall of Margaret Thatcher," *The Modern Law Review* 54 (1991): 471, http://www.jstor.org/stable/1096439.

2. Margaret Thatcher, *The Downing Street Years* (New York: HarperCollins, 1993), 829.

3. Earl A. Reitan, *The Thatcher Revolution: Margaret Thatcher, John Major, Tony Blair, and the*

4. *Transformation of Modern Britain, 1979-2001* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2003), 27.

5. Earl A. Reitan, *Tory Radicalism: Margaret Thatcher, John Major, and the Transformation of Modern Britain 1979-1997* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 1997), 63-78.

6. Brian Wheeler, "Thatcher Archives: 1980 Fears Over 'Wasted Year,'" BBC, March 18, 2011, accessed March 18, 2011, http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-politics-12785959.

7. Jeremy Black, Britain Since the Seventies: Politics and Society in the Consumer Age (London: Reaktion Books, Ltd., 2004), 138.

8. Reitan, *The Thatcher Revolution,* 76.

9. Thatcher, *Downing Street Years*, 829.

10. Reitan, *Tory Radicalism*, 79.

11. Reitan, *Tory Radicalism,* 31.

12. Ibid., 48-51.

13. Ibid., 51-53.

14. Retian, *Thatcher Revolution*, 72.

15. Thatcher, *Downing Street Years*, 536.

16. Margaret Thatcher's speech to the College of Europe, September 20, 1988, quoted in Earl A. Reitan, *Tory Radicalism*, 84-85.

17. Indridi H. Indridason and Christopher Kam, "Cabinet Reshuffles and Ministerial Drift," *British Journal of Political Science* 38 (2008): 642, doi:10.1017/ S0007123408000318.

18. See footnote in Thatcher, *Downing Street Years,* 51.

19. Thatcher, *Downing Street Years*, 51.

20. Michael Heseltine, *Life in the Jungle: My Autobiography*, (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 2000), 293-313.

21. Retian, *Thatcher Revolution*, 86.

22. Ibid.

23. Reitan, *Thatcher Revolution,* 86.

24. Thatcher, *Downing Street Years*, 709.

25. Ibid., 712.

26. Ibid.

27. Geoffrey Howe, *Conflict of Loyalty* (London: Macmillan, 1994), 576.

28. Ibid.

29. Reitan, *Thatcher Revolution*, 87.

30. *Portillo on Thatcher: The Lady's Not for Spurning,* BBC program, presented by Michael Portillo (2009; London, U.K.: BBC Four). In this BBC program, former Conservative MP Michael Portillo interviewed several key players in the Thatcher governments and the Conservative Party during the Thatcher era.

31. Howe, *Conflict of Loyalty*, 584.

32. Ibid., 585.

33. Ibid., 586; Thatcher, *Downing Street Years*, 757.

34. Thatcher, *Downing Street Years*, 757.

335. Quick rows were reported in the autobiographies of both Geoffrey Howe, *Conflict of Loyalty*, 626; John Major, *The Autobiography*, 134.

36. John Major, *John Major: The Autobiography* (London: HarperCollins, 1999), 114.

37. Howe, *Conflict of Loyalty*, 601.

38. Major, *The Autobiography*, 115.

39. Barry K. Winetrobe, "A Tax by Any Other Name: The Poll Tax and the Community Charge," *Parliamentary Affairs* 45(1992): 420-427, http://jstor.org.

40. Howe, *Conflict of Loyalty*, 603.

41. Ibid.

42. Nicholas Wood and Robin Oakley, "Conservative Rebel Call for Poll Tax Concessions," *The Times*, January 11, 1990."

43. Reitan, *Thatcher Revolution*, 87.

44. Black, *Britain Since the Seventies,* 138.

45. Wood and Oakley, "Conservative Rebels," *The Times*.

46. Reitan, *Tory Radicalism*, 92. This vote should have been particularly disturbing given the nature of the British Parliament. With strong allegiance to political parties in key votes, such a large number of members breaking ranks with the government should have served as the first signal of threat from the backbenches.

47. Black, *Britain Since the Seventies,* 138.

48. Ibid.

49. Major, *The Autobiography*, 173.

50. Black, *Britain Since the Seventies*, 139.

51. Ibid.

52. Margaret Thatcher, (statement to the House of Commons, London, United Kingdom, October 30, 1990).

53. Headlines as quoted by Geoffrey Howe in *Conflict of Loyalty*, 645. Here Sir Geoffrey speaks to the dead-end situation he faced as a member of a government essentially opposed to his vision for U.K.-E.U. relations.

54. Howe, *Conflict of Loyalty*, 648.

55. Ibid.

56. Thatcher, *Downing Street Years*, 722.

56. Geoffrey Howe, (speech to the House of Commons, London, United Kingdom, November 13, 1990.)

57. "Labour Party Wins 2 Elections A Week After Tory Aide Quits," *New York Times*, November 10, 1990.

59 59. Heseltine, *Life in the Jungle*, 362.

60. Ibid., 363.

61. Reitan, *Thatcher Revolution*, 91.

62. Ibid.

63. *Portillo on Thatcher: The Lady's Not for Spurning*, BBC, 2009. Particular attention should be paid to such a statement, given that it emanated from the man whom Thatcher hand-picked to succeed her as Conservative leader and thus Prime Minister.

64. Major, *The Autobiography*, 185.

65. Ibid., 180.

66. Reitan, *Thatcher Revolution*, 94.

67. Major, *The Autobiography*, 186.

68. *Portillo on Thatcher*, BBC.

69. Thatcher, *Downing Street Years*, 855.

70. Ibid., 856.

71. Most likely used as a metaphor comparing Thatcher to Caesar. In the original Shakespearean text, the line reads: "The noble Brutus Hath told you Caesar was ambitious: If it were so, it was a grievous fault, And grievously hath Caesar answer'd it."Matt Ridley, "Et Tu, Heseltine?; Unpopularity Was a Grievous Fault, and Thatcher Hath Answered for It," *Washington Post*, November 25, 1990, sec. C.

72. Major, *The Autobiography*, 169.

Henry VIII's English Reformation: Supreme Egotist?
Chastity Thomas

The English Reformation of King Henry VIII radically altered the course of English history, and subsequently the rest of the western world. In order to understand what occurred during the Reformation, it is important to analyze what Henry's rationale was in the first place. Despite years of a seemingly happy marriage, Henry sought annulment from Catherine of Aragon because he feared it would produce no male issue. The Church of Rome was consulted on what came to be known as the "King's Great Matter," but Pope Clement VII continually refused to grant an annulment. After many years of waiting Henry took matters into his own hands and repudiated the authority of the Church over his kingdom. The so-called "divorce" appeared to be the main cause for the Reformation, but it revealed something even deeper and darker about Henry's character. His aspirations for further power and wealth were at the expense of others' suffering and death.

Henry styled himself as the supreme head of both church and state, therefore allowing himself to divorce Catherine and marry the one he so amorously pursued, Anne Boleyn. Thus, Henry cast off the yoke of the Roman Catholic Church, against which England had long struggled. Now, without the control of the papacy looming over his head, Henry was left free and unencumbered to do whatever he wished within his own kingdom. Egotism became Henry's primary motivation for the English Reformation. He, selfishly, realized that supremacy of both church and state entitled him to even more money and power. Constantly, Henry looked for his own gain in situations, and for that reason became "a tyrant, a murderer, a thief, a treacherous and faithless husband, a cruel father and a vindictive friend."[1] England's breach from Rome was indeed revolutionary, yet it was extremely opportunistic.

To understand the man Henry grew to become, one must first examine his beginnings. Henry was born to King Henry VII and Elizabeth of York on June 28, 1491 in Greenwich Palace. Little did his parents or anyone know that this small child was "fated to change the entire religious outlook of a whole nation."[2] Henry, born the second son, was not raised or groomed to be the future king as was his elder brother Arthur. Instead, his parents decided he should receive an education befitting a future churchman. Henry VII hoped that one day his son could achieve the Archbishopric of Canterbury.[3]

In the context of this historical period, the Tudor throne had only recently become secured. In 1485 Henry VII, a Lancastrian, defeated Richard III, a Yorkist, for the kingship of England. Finally, after several years of disarray the country found peace as Henry consolidated his new power. Henry married Elizabeth of York in order to unite the once-dissenting Houses of Lancaster and York. Renowned for his miserly ways, Henry's avarice grew to great extremes. Henry "kept strict

account of every penny spent in the royal household. Power! Money! Jewels! These were his gods, and the example of their royal father was not lost upon his children."[4]

Plans were made that Arthur should marry Catherine of Aragon, daughter of Ferdinand and Isabella of Spain. Due to Spain's increasing power on the European Continent, Henry VII believed an alliance with Spain was the best possible option. Arthur and Catherine married on November 5, 1501, but this proved short-lived as Arthur passed away just a few months later.

Even with Arthur's death, King Henry VII did not want Catherine to return to Spain. Henry wanted to keep both the dowry and the alliance with Spain, and therefore decided that his son Henry should marry Catherine. In 1509, just a few months before the wedding, King Henry VII passed away. On his deathbed, Henry encouraged his son to proceed with the marriage, and negotiations for Catherine to wed Henry VIII were contracted. Pope Julius II granted a dispensation for Henry to marry his brother's former wife on the basis that Catherine's relationship with Arthur was never consummated. There is a distant possibility that Arthur's illness may have caused sexual impotence. The document allowing Henry and Catherine to marry states that "The Papal dispensation is required, because the said Princess Katharine [English spelled it with a "K"] had on a former occasion contracted a marriage with the late Prince Arthur, brother of the present Prince of Wales, whereby she became related to Henry, Prince of Wales, in the first degree of affinity."[5]

Upon the death of his father, Henry VIII ascended to the throne. Henry VII's avarice left an abundance of money in the royal coffers, but this only sufficed for so long. Renowned for his spending, Henry quickly depleted the coffers through his gambling and lavish tastes in clothing, food, and jewelry. This love of money, learned from the example of his father, most certainly increased Henry's selfish desires to confiscate as many goods as he could throughout his reign. As the reader will see, Henry confiscated lands from those who fell out of his favor, including former friends and even the monasteries of the Catholic Church.

Henry emerged as a sixteenth century new national monarch, which also included the dynasties of France, Spain, and the Holy Roman Empire.[6] The new national monarchs provided foundations for the modern European states. European nationalism grew, and people defined themselves as a specific people with a specific language. With the growth of both the Renaissance and Protestant Reformation, this time period became a hot-bed of new ideas and practices. Understanding this period is pivotal to placing Henry into the context of his time in European society.

That said, the emergence of the Renaissance divided the timeline of that which is "ancient" (Middle Ages and everything before it) and "modern" (Renaissance and everything after it).[7] Renaissance means "re-birth," and that is exactly what it was. It originated in Italy, and brought with it the first purely secular attitude.[8] This attitude originated mainly as a result of the Black Death, which greatly altered society by killing half of Europe's population. Many people began to question the Church. Their faith was tested because they did not understand why God would allow something so awful to happen. People came to appreciate the life of here and now much more, as they realized they were not promised tomorrow.

The Renaissance owed much of its development to the funds and the leadership of the Medicis, a wealthy merchant family in Florence, Italy. Many new and

improved ideas and techniques in art, science, education, and philosophy emerged from the Renaissance. Humanism was one of these new philosophies, which began to spread through the ideas of men such as Desiderus Erasmus. Humanism held an affinity for the natural world, distaste for scholastic thought, and an interest in the Greek and Roman classics. Literacy spread and the vernacular appeared as people began reading and writing in their own languages. The humanist educational movement thus substituted the medieval curriculum for a curriculum centered on the Greek and Roman classics. Overall, society began to view the future more optimistically.

The Protestant Reformation that Martin Luther initiated created a new type of society, different from that of the Middle Ages. The Roman Catholic Church was shaken to its core by the Reformation, as it had never previously been so openly challenged. People no longer looked to the Church as the final authority; instead more people questioned the Church and its practices. Political and social unhappiness, thought to be the responsibility of the Church, emerged. People wanted to manage their own religious affairs just like they would any other aspect of their life with a relief of authoritarian rule. They believed the church was too "old-fashioned" with its hierarchical structures, and very little commonality existed between the people and the church. The Renaissance issued a change in society to which the church itself was unwilling or unable to meet.

The new ideas and practices of the Renaissance and the Protestant Reformation certainly had an impact on Henry. He received a humanist education, which included some tutoring from Erasmus whenever he visited court.[9] Henry's ability to speak "good French, Latin, and Spanish" reflected this education.[10] The English Reformation would never have taken place, had the Reformation on the Continent not preceded it. Even though Henry held no inclination to change his own religion, he did see the benefit of challenging the Pope for his supremacy. Beatrice Saunders, author of *Henry the Eighth*, stated that Henry "unconsciously used this new 'movement' as one of his tools. The Reformation of the Church of England did not seriously interest him, but who could prevent him from repudiating the Pope's authority and then compelling an English Archbishop to pronounce the much-desired divorce?"[11] Like any great politician, Henry spotted a societal trend (Reformation) and utilized it for his own specific and effective purpose.

Oddly enough, Henry fervently supported the Pope in the beginning of his reign. In 1521, with the assistance of his advisers, including Thomas More, Henry wrote *Assertio Septem Sacramentorum,* or *Defense of the Seven Sacraments*.[12] This challenged the growing influence of Martin Luther's ideas, and in return the Pope named Henry *Fidei Defensor*, or "Defender of the Faith."[13] In an excerpt from the document Henry rages against Luther by stating the following:

> [Luther] is ashamed of nothing, fears none, and thinks himself under no law. Who contemns [sic] the ancient Doctors of the church, and derides the new ones in the highest degree; loads with reproaches the Chief Bishop of the church. Finally, he so undervalues customs, doctrine, manners, laws, decrees and faith of the church (yea, the whole church itself) that he almost denies there is any such thing as a church, except perhaps such a one as himself makes up of two or three heretics, of whom himself is chief.[14]

Diarmaid MacCulloch, author of the article "Putting the English Reformation on the Map: The Prothero Lecture," suggested that England experienced its own unique Protestant Reformation, as Henry put his spin on religion.[15] Even when Henry broke away from Rome he continued to repudiate Lutheranism of any sort, as evidenced by his execution of those he considered "heretics." In fact, the Church of England or Anglican Church appeared to still be the same as the Catholic Church, except with Henry as the head rather than the Pope.[16]

As a young man, Henry enjoyed attending to his own amusements, while he virtually left someone else to attend to matters of state. In the first years of Henry's reign Thomas Wolsey filled this position, but "as the King learned his job, there would be less and less of a place for the Cardinal."[17] Wolsey was an ambitious, self-serving man who worked in the court of Henry VII, but he rose to even greater heights under Henry VIII. As the son of a butcher, Wolsey was driven to make a better life for himself. He received an excellent education from Oxford University, as documented by his gentleman usher, George Cavendish. Cavendish wrote, "Trewthe it ys/ Cardynall wolsey sometime Archebisshope/ of York/ was an honest poore mans Sonne borne in Ipsewiche. . .And beyng but a chold was very Apte to learnyng/ by mens wherof his parentes or his good ffrendes and maysters conveyed hyme to the vnyuersitie of Oxford."[18] Wolsey understood that the highest power could be achieved by entering into church service, and his goal was to one day become pope. In 1515 Wolsey earned the prestigious titles of both Cardinal and the Lord Chancellor of England. The position of Lord Chancellorship enabled Wolsey to become Henry's right hand man.

As a mentor, Wolsey's influence molded and shaped the future character of Henry. It could be argued that it was Wolsey's partial responsibility that Henry became such a "monster." Wolsey showed Henry how to wield great power, and he taught him that there was a benefit to arresting and executing people in high places. For example Henry, upon Wolsey's encouragement, gave orders to arrest and execute the Duke of Buckingham. The duke was one of the last of the Plantagenets who presented a legitimate claim to the throne. He was also "one of the wealthiest subjects in England—a very important consideration to Wolsey and Henry."[19] Henry confiscated all of Buckingham's estates and titles while leaving his son "with the title of Baron Stafford, a worthless handle, as the boy was utterly impoverished."[20] This simply meant more money for Henry's pockets. This same trend of confiscating titles and estates is also seen with the downfall of many other people who became, in one way or another, a hindrance to Henry and his schemes.

In 1520 Wolsey organized the Field of the Cloth of Gold. This event became another example of Henry's selfish mentality, as he was subject to frequent temper tantrums. Henry and Francis I of France met at the Field of the Cloth of Gold, in an area near Calais for two weeks in June. The event of Calais emerged as a celebration of great egos in royal society. Much pomp and circumstance followed events such as tournaments and feasts, as both Henry and Francis tried to outdo one another. Henry's immaturity clearly showed through when he raged against Francis for beating him at a wrestling match.

Accompanied by this same self-serving attitude, Henry first made objections to his marriage to Catherine public in 1527, although he may have been in love with Anne Boleyn as early as 1526.[21] At first, no one knew whether or not to take Henry's infatuation seriously, for he previously entertained many mistresses.

The affair with Elizabeth Blount and the birth of their illegitimate son, Henry Fitzroy, is a prime example. Henry questioned whether it had been Biblically sound to take Catherine as his wife since she was previously married to his brother. Henry proposed this was the reason they had not produced a male heir. He utilized scripture from Leviticus 20:21 to support this claim, which stated, "If a man marries his brother's wife, it is an act of impurity; he has dishonored his brother. They will die childless."[22] Yet, the subsequent book of Deuteronomy (25:5) stated, "If brothers are living together and one of them dies without a son, his widow must not marry outside the family. Her husband's brother shall take her and marry her and fulfill the duty of a brother-in-law to her."[23] Clearly, Henry picked and chose only one of these Biblical verses for his own means.

Initially, in the "Great Matter," Henry strove for an annulment from the Pope. He did not want to acknowledge Catharine as his lawful wife because to do so would be to acknowledge his own misgivings in the matter. This would have been considered a life "lived in sin." Therefore, Henry did everything in his power to keep it a secret from Catherine. He did not want these requests to reach the queen or her advisers. If they discovered Henry's campaign her nephew, Charles V of the Holy Roman Empire, would be immediately notified. Pope Clement VII's relationship with Charles remained a major source of anxiety and also a main factor in delaying the divorce process. Clement, who had been held hostage by Charles V during the sack of Rome, did not want to upset him. However, Clement did not want to anger Henry either. Therefore, he prolonged the divorce and made it as difficult as he possibly could. According to Geoffrey de C. Parmiter, author of *The King's Great Matter*:

> The pope was anxious to satisfy Henry but he was afraid of the emperor; he did not refuse absolutely to send a legate but, as reported by Casale, put forward a number of difficulties: among the cardinals acceptable to Casale, de Cesis was a hostage at Naples, Caesarinus held a Spanish bishopric. Aracoeli had the gout, and even Compeggio, most suitable of all, could not leave Rome.[24]

Eventually, Cardinal Lorenzo Compeggio did leave Rome, and he arrived in England as the papal legate for Clement. The purpose of a legate was to decide the matter on behalf of the Pope. The divorce trial took place in England because Henry knew that if it was ever held in Rome, the Pope would most certainly rule in Catherine's favor. As the trial carried on, Henry became increasingly frustrated with Wolsey's lack of success in obtaining the divorce. Wolsey had many enemies in court, including the Boleyn family, the Duke of Norfolk, and the Duke of Suffolk. These people watched and waited for Wolsey to fall from the King's graces. Also, Wolsey's reputation did nothing to help him, and his behavior clearly revealed the abuses within the Church. Wolsey, under oath to live a life of celibacy, kept a mistress who had given birth to his illegitimate children. To many, he was nothing but a selfish, ambitious, upstart who held too much power over the king. Indeed, some even believed it was he who ruled the country! In a document written by the Venetian ambassador Giustiniari, he exclaimed "This Cardinal is the person who rules both the King and the entire kingdom."[25]

Wolsey's fall came swiftly. While at Cawood Castle he was arrested by the Earl of Northumberland, "the very man whom he had dismissed from Court some

years ago because he was in love with Anne."[26] Accused of high treason, he was forced to hand over the Great Seal and sent to live out his final days at Leicester Abbey. Wolsey was gravely ill and broken-hearted after devoting so many years of his life to the king's service. After his arrest, it did not take long for him to pass away. The date of his death is recorded on Tuesday, November 29, 1530.[27]

As stated earlier, Henry relished taking other's property as his own. With Wolsey's death, all his possessions were confiscated by Henry. Beatrice Saunders stated that, "Henry had gained far more than gold and palaces from unscrupulous but brilliant statesman; Wolsey had taught him his statecraft. . .Wolsey had shown his master not only how to achieve power but how to consolidate it."[28] It appeared that Henry had learned from the best.

Now that there was an empty office for the Lord Chancellorship, Henry asked his long-time friend and advisor, Thomas More, to accept the honors. As a fervent supporter of both Rome and Catherine, More demonstrated reluctance, but did agree. Apparently, More disliked court life years before his appointment as Lord Chancellor. This attitude is displayed in a letter written by More to Bishop Fisher sometime between 1519-1520 after becoming Privy Councillor. In it he stated, "I have to come to the court extremely against my will, as every one knoweth, and as the king himself knows, for in sport he often twits me with it."[29] J.A. Guy, the author of *The Public Career of Sir Thomas More*, believed it was a "limitation on More's freedom to. . .remain Henry's loyal servant at a time when the acid test of loyalty was support for the royal divorce."[30] Overall, Henry respected More's opinion on matters because he was renowned for his wisdom and pious ways. This aspect of his character is noted in a letter from his friend Erasmus to Ulrich von Hutten in 1519. Erasmus stated, "He diligently cultivates true piety, while being remote from all superstitious observance."[31] Henry only hoped to win More over to supporting the divorce.[32]

Eventually, More decided that he could no longer righteously serve the king in his "Great Matter," and he resigned as Lord Chancellor on May 15, 1532, the day after the submission of the clergy.[33] His end followed shortly, after refusing to acknowledge Henry's Supremacy of the Church. He and Bishop Fisher (another person in disagreement with Henry) were imprisoned in the Tower of London around the same time. More continued to refuse, and his date of execution took place on July 6, 1535. Following More's death, Henry once again demonstrated his cruelty. All of More's possessions became the property of the king, and More's family were forced out of their home in Chelsea.[34] News of More's death was brought to Henry while he played backgammon with Anne Boleyn.[35] Henry could not even own up to More's death himself, so he blamed it on Anne by telling her that it was all her fault.[36] As was the custom, the heads of those executed were placed onto pikes for display. Sadly and undoubtedly disturbing, Margaret Roper, More's most beloved daughter, removed his impaled head so that it could be buried.

Two people that became instrumental to the "King's Great Matter," were Thomas Cromwell and Thomas Cranmer. Reformists themselves, these men sought to push Henry's Reformation even further than he himself intended. Cranmer caught Henry's attention as a divinity professor at Jesus College, Cambridge.[37] He proposed the idea that the divorce was a theological issue which should be consulted by the universities. Upon the death of the Archbishop of Canterbury William Warham in 1532, Henry appointed Cranmer to replace him.[38] Thomas

Cromwell's rise to power began after Thomas More resigned as Lord Chancellor. Cromwell, who had worked in Wolsey's service, became Lord Chancellor and Lord Secretary.

Finally after years of waiting, Henry and Anne were married in a secret ceremony on January 25, 1533. It is believed that Anne was already pregnant with Elizabeth at this point. In the First Act of Succession in 1534, Henry's marriage to Catherine was declared "void and annulled."[39] It further stated the following:

> The lawful matrimony had and solemnized between your Highness and your most dear and entirely beloved wife Queen Anne shall be established and taken for undoubtful, true, sincere, and perfect ever hereafter. Also be it enacted by authority aforesaid that all the issue had and procreate, or hereafter to be had and procreate, between your Highness and your said most dearly and entirely beloved wife Queen Anne, shall be your lawful children and be inheritable and inherit, according to the course of inheritance and laws of this realm, the imperial crown.[40]

This act of Succession clearly bastardized his daughter Mary. The line of succession was now to follow Henry and Anne's children. Therefore, Mary was forced to revoke the title of "Princess," and even more cruelly Henry required her to work in the service of Elizabeth's household. This undoubtedly denigrated Mary's status even further by giving her a subservient role to her younger sister.

The fates of both Catharine and Mary were left completely up to Henry. During this time in history, it was not uncommon to treat women as pawns, simply using them or casting them off whenever the need arose. By the time of Henry's marriage to Anne, he had long cast Catherine aside. Henry forced Catharine to live in the cold and damp Kimbolton Castle as a virtual prisoner. Catherine, in ill-health, lived out the rest of "her lonely life in one room on the ground floor of the castle."[41] She was not allowed to see her daughter Mary even when dying. Many of her servants were dismissed, and she was forced to relinquish her title of Queen and instead take the name of "Old Princess Dowager."[42] Henry did not treat her with any compassion whatsoever.

Even at the time of Catherine's death on January 7, 1536, Henry still ignored her. He had long stopped providing Catherine with sufficient funds to manage even a meager lifestyle, "yet she had brought a generous portion to him on her marriage."[43] Abhorrently, Henry did not honor any of Catherine's last wishes, and upon "receiving news of Catharine's death Henry sent his creature, lawyer Rich, to see whether he could not seize all her property without paying her trifling legacies and obligations."[44] Saunders referred to Rich as a "creature" because Henry used him as a "creature" or "puppet" of sorts to carry out his royal bidding. However, in regard to the seizure of Catherine's property Rich advised Henry that this would not be a good idea. Henry was even selfish enough to keep the furs which Catherine bequeathed to Mary because he "was fond of sables for his own adornment. They looked well on his velvet gowns."[45]

In the recently published book *Catherine of Aragon: The Spanish Queen of Henry VIII*, author Giles Tremlett proposes a new theory, that Catherine was not the passive victim everyone has long believed her to be.[46] Instead, she actively

fought against Henry until the end of life. She refused to accept the title of "Princess Dowager" because to do so would be to acknowledge that she and Henry were never married and their child Mary was a bastard. For a long time Mary refused to acknowledge her father's marriage to Anne and his Supreme Head of both church and state. Eventually by 1536, in fear of her life and title, she wrote a letter to her father in 1536 to apologize for the behavior she displayed. She acknowledged her obedience and service to him, and she accepted him as the rightful head of the church and state. Mary stated:

> I do recognize, accept, take, repute and acknowledge the king's highness to be supreme head on earth, under Christ, of the church of England; and do utterly refuse the bishop of Rome's pretended authority, power and jurisdiction within this realm, formerly usurped, according to the laws and statutes made on that behalf, and by all the king's true subjects humbly received, admitted, obeyed, kept and observed.[47]

Anne was soon forced to accept a fate even worse than that of Catherine's. Henry and Anne tried for a few years to have a male child. Unfortunately for her, Elizabeth was the only child born to them, and Anne suffered miscarriages just as Catherine had. This provided evidence that Henry more than likely suffered from some type of sexual impotence or malady, perhaps the sexually transmitted disease of syphilis. Henry grew frustrated with Anne, and he construed a plan to execute her. His heights were set to produce a male heir, whether it was with Anne or not. Her ambiguous rise to power soon resulted in a quick fall from grace. Henry allowed trumped up charges to be produced accusing Anne of adultery with five other men, including her own brother George Boleyn. Anne's execution took place in May 19, 1536. Even until her death on the scaffold, she respectfully spoke only good of the king saying, "gentler nor a more merciful prince was there never."[48] Afterwards, her daughter Elizabeth was demoted to the same bastardized status of her half-sister Mary. Henry wanted more children, specifically a male, and he could have no other child standing in the way of succession until he married again and produced a son.

Mere days after Anne's execution, Henry married Jane Seymour. Together, they gave birth to a much awaited son, named Edward VI. It was a difficult birth, and Jane did not live more than a few days after it. Henry was once again free to marry, and this resulted in three more marriages. Negotiations were made for Henry to marry Anne of Cleves, his fourth wife, but she was soon cast aside because Henry considered her unattractive. Afterwards, Henry married Catherine Howard, Anne Boleyn's cousin. This familial relation may have been more than just coincidence as she came to suffer the same fate as Anne. Catherine and Anne were Henry's only two wives to be executed. After Catherine's death, Henry marred the twice-widowed, well-educated Catherine Parr. Henry still wanted to have another son, in case something happened to the sickly Edward, and he grew increasingly frustrated with Catherine when she did not become pregnant. She barely escaped death herself, and if Henry had lived any longer, her warrant for execution would have been signed. In fact, Henry had set a date for her arrest. On this day Henry and Catherine were outside when Thomas Wriothesley, Henry's Lord Chancellor at the time, arrived to take her to the Tower.[49] Unbeknownst to Wriothesley, Henry had changed his mind, and so, Henry stormed at him and

ordered him to leave.[50] This situation made it evident how quickly Henry could change his mind. Someone could be on his good side one day, then executed for treason the next day. Throughout six marriages, Henry demonstrated a unique mistreatment of each and every one of his wives.

The destruction and confiscation of the monasteries were another example of Henry's campaign for self-gain. He understood that in bringing about the downfall of these holy sites, he was simply adding more money to his diminishing coffers. Thomas Cromwell, as Lord Chancellor and Lord Secretary, mastered the technique of monastic destruction for the benefit of his sovereign. Cromwell owed much to the service of his previous master, Cardinal Wolsey, from whom he learned this particular art from. G. H. Cook, editor of *Letters to Cromwell and Others on the Suppression of Monasteries*, stated "Ten years or more before the dissolution of the smaller monasteries, Thomas Cromwell had been actively employed in promoting a project dear to the heart of Cardinal Wolsey, a project that involved the suppression of a goodly number of religious houses."[51] Cromwell felt strongly about his mission, as he was no supporter of monasticism himself.[52]

In a 1534 royal statute, Henry ordered the submission of the clergy. Henry said that the "clergy is always, hath been, and ought to be assembled only by the King's writ, but also submitting themselves to the King's Majesty hath promised in *verbo Sacerdotii.*"[53] Therefore, the clergy answered only to the King, not the Pope, and they could do nothing without his approval.

Visitation of the monasteries began in July 1535, which allowed for Cromwell and his men including doctors and lawyers, both clerical and lay, to take inventory of the monastic goods.[54] The names of the main men involved in this were Thomas Legh, John London, Richard Layton, and John Rice.[55] After inventory was taken, all items were confiscated; then the monastic men and women (nuns, monks, friars, etc.) were cast out into the streets by accusation of false charges. These poor people were left with nowhere to go and no money upon which to live. Another incredible loss was that of important historic documents. According to Beatrice Saunders, "The greatest loss to posterity was the valuable libraries, which contained practically all the wealth of medieval literature; many hundreds of beautiful books and manuscripts were wantonly destroyed or dispersed."[56]

The dissolution of the monasteries included suppression of both "lesser" and "greater" religious houses. By the end, around 800 or more places, including cathedrals, parish churches, collegiate churches, convents, hospitals, and monasteries, were all taken over by the crown.[57] The First Act for the Dissolution of the Monasteries of 1536 states that there was "manifest sin, vicious, carnal and abominable living…daily used and committed" in the monasteries.[58] Therefore Henry took it upon himself that "all their rights, profits, jurisdictions, and commodities [of the monasteries be given] unto the King's Majesty and to his heirs and assigns for ever, to do and use therewith his or their own wills to the pleasure of Almighty God, and to the honour and profit of this realm."[59]

In order to accomplish these confiscations, Henry knew that the authority of the Pope first needed diminishment. On June 9, 1535 the *Enforcing Statutes Abolishing Papal Authority in England* was passed. As one of the most definitive acts of defiance against the papacy, it firmly established England as a country with "a law unto themselves."[60] The process of Reformation was well on its way. The act stated that any books, prayers, etc., where the Bishop of Rome is named are "utterly to be abolished, eradicated, and erased out, and his name and memory

to be nevermore (except to his contumely and reproach) remembered, but perpetually suppressed and obscured."[61]

Soon enough Thomas Cromwell too fell from Henry's graces. In 1540 Thomas Howard, the Third Duke of Norfolk, and Stephen Gardiner, the Bishop of Winchester, convinced the king of Cromwell's treasonous activity and heresy.[62] Confiscation of his goods followed his arrest. Cromwell, like Wolsey, entertained several enemies because of the power he held with the king. Also like Wolsey, Cromwell came from humble beginnings, but instead of a butcher for a father he had a blacksmith for a father. The Spanish ambassador to England, Eustace Chapuys, spoke of Cromwell's origins in a letter to Nicholas de Granvelle in 1535. In the letter he stated, "As you desire me to give you a detailed account of Secretary Cromwell and his origin, I will tell you that he is the son of a poor blacksmith."[63] Then after the king took Cromwell into his service, Charpoys in the same letter stated, "Since then he has been constantly rising in power, so much so that he has now more influence with his master [Henry] than the Cardinal [Wolsey] ever had."[64] At a time when status meant everything, people viewed someone with such lowly beginnings with distain, especially someone who should rise to such a prestigious position. During his incarceration in the Tower, Cromwell wrote letters to Henry without receiving any response in return. Cromwell faced his execution on July 28, 1540; he simply became another number in Henry's growing list of casualties.

Another example of Henry's lust for power is revealed in the dissolution of Canterbury in 1538, one of England's wealthiest cathedrals. Henry needed a reason to plunder the riches of Canterbury so he willingly placed St. Thomas Becket, who died nearly four hundred years previously, on trial.[65] Becket, cited to appear in court to answer charges of usurping the position of sainthood, could not possibly be expected to do so.[66] Even more ridiculously, the prosecution chose the counsel for the defense.[67] The sentence was carried out; Becket's bones were burnt, his name was erased from service books, and a great jewel given by Louis XII to the shrine was set into a ring for Henry's use.[68] All of the treasures were confiscated for the royal coffers.[69] When news reached the Continent many people, especially the Pope, Emperor Charles and the King of France were livid. Henry committed such unreasonable acts that there were even rumors of England's invasion.[70] This example reveals just how far Henry was willing to stoop to achieve his means.

Henry's "reformed" religion caused many troubles for England.[71] Some wholeheartedly welcomed the change while others of the old faith, Catholicism, despised them. These troubles caused many riots and rebellions, including the famous Pilgrimage of Grace. Fighting between the Protestants and Catholics continued to plague not only England, but the rest of the European Continent for centuries to come.

Henry's health suffered for many years because of the sore on his leg and the likely diagnosis of syphilis. If syphilis was the case, it answers many questions about Henry's insane and maniacal behavior, although it does not excuse it. Henry did not have a clear conscience upon his deathbed. He suffered from terrible nightmares, in which he feared the torments of hell.[72] His date of death is recorded as January 28, 1547 in Westminster Palace. He asked for masses to be said for the deliverance of his soul, yet he abolished this practice of chantries for others during his lifetime.[73] Catherine of Aragon wanted masses said for her

soul, but Henry denied her this as one of her final wishes. This final act reveals the ultimate extent of Henry's selfishness as he cared for no one else's soul but his own.[74]

Henry's life reveals one example after another of his selfishness. It is estimated that around 72,000 people were brought to their deaths by his command during his reign.[75] He used anything within reach to achieve his own means. Arguably, Henry was willing to risk eternal damnation of his soul (Papal excommunication), the torture of wives, friends, and subjects, and the bastardization of his own children. Henry initiated the English Reformation by breaking from Rome for his own reasons; he may not be admired for his actions, but he did create something revolutionary. The English Reformation, though not truly reformed under Henry, pivotally changed the course of English history and subsequently the rest of the western world. The Reformation continued on and became more cemented through Henry's line of successors, especially his daughter Elizabeth. Even today, the Church of England remains the state church with the monarchy as supreme head.

ENDNOTES

1. Beatrice Saunders, *Henry the Eighth* (London: Alvin Redman, 1963), 10.

2. Ibid., 11.

3. Ibid., 13.

4. Ibid., 15.

5. Negotiations for the marriage of Prince Henry and Catherine of Aragon (1503) in *English Historical Documents 1485-1558*, Volume V, ed. David C. Douglas (New York: Oxford University Press, 1967), 697.

6. J.J. Palmer, Joel Colton, and Lloyd Kramer, *The History of the Modern World*, 10th ed. (Boston: McGraw-Hill, 2007), 73-74.

7. Ibid., 56.

8. Ibid., 58.

9. Saunders, *Henry the Eighth*, 16.

10. Dispatch of Giustiniani, the Venetian Ambassador, Description of Henry VIII, in *Every One A Witness: The Tudor Age*, ed. A.F. Scott (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1975), 1.

11. Saunders, *Henry the Eighth*, 114.

12. Hester W. Chapman, *The Challenge of Anne Boleyn* (New York: Coward, McCann & Geoghegan, Inc., 1974), 50.

13. Chapman, *The Challenge of Anne Boleyn*, 50.

14. Henry VIII, King of England, Excerpt from "The Defense of the Seven Sacraments," in *English History in the Making.* Vol I, ed. William L. Sachse (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1967), 182-183 as found on http://www.luminarium.org/renlit/defense.htm (accessed October 3, 2011).

15. Diarmaid MacCulloch, "Putting the English Reformation on the Map: The Prothero Lecture." *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 15 (2005), 76, accessed October 16, 2011, http://www.jstor.org/stable/3679363 (accessed October 16, 2011).

16. Peter Marshall: cf. A. Ryrie, "The Strange Death of Lutheran England," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* [hereafter J. Eccl. H.], 53 (2002), 64-92, at 67 referenced by MacCulloch in "Putting the English Reformation on the Map," 78.

17. Charles W. Ferguson, *Naked to Mine Enemies: The Life of Cardinal Wolsey,* Volume Two (New York: Time Incorporated, 1958), 5.

18. George Cavendish, *The Life and Death of Cardinal Wolsey*, ed. Richard S.

Sylvester (London: Oxford University Press, 1959), 4.

19. Saunders, *Henry the Eighth*, 69.

20. Ibid.

21. G.W. Bernard, *The King's Reformation: Henry VIII and the Remaking of the English Church* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005), 4, 9.

22. Leviticus 20:21 NIV.

23. Deuteronomy 25:5 NIV.

24. Geoffrey de C. Parmiter, The *King's Great Matter: A Study of Anglo-Papal Relations, 1527-1534* (New York: Barnes & Noble, Inc., 1967), 40.

25. Dispatch of Giustiniani, *Every One a Witness: The Tudor Age*, 210.

26. Saunders, *Henry the Eighth*, 105.

27. Ferguson, *Naked to Mine Enemies*, 298.

28. Saunders, *Henry the Eighth*, 107-108.

29. Sir Thomas More's Letter to Bishop Fisher from Agnes M. Stewart, *The Life and Letters of Sir Thomas More* (London: Burns & Oates, 1876), 29, as found on http://www.luminarium.org/renlit/morefisher1519.htm (accessed October 3, 2011).

30. J.A. Guy, *The Public Career of Sir Thomas More* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1980), 99.

31. Letter from Erasmus to Ulrich von Hutten, Epistles of Erasmus, in *Every One a Witness: The Tudor Age*, 206.

32. Guy, *The Public Career of Sir Thomas More*, 101.

33. Theodore Maynard, *Humanist as Hero: The Life of Sir Thomas More* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1947), 186.

34. Saunders, *Henry the Eighth*, 147.

35. Ibid.

36. Ibid.

37. Parmiter, *The King's Great Matter*, 215.

38. 3asper Ridley, *Thomas Cranmer* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962), 50.

39. Henry VIII's First Succession Act (1534) from 25. Henry VIII cap. 22: Stat. Realm iii. 471-474, quoted in Mortimer Levine, *Tudor Dynastic Problems 1460-1571* (London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1973), 152.

40. Ibid.

41. John E. Paul, *Catherine of Aragon and Her Friends* (New York: Fordham University Press, 1966), 200.

42. Ibid., 201.

43. Saunders, *Henry the Eighth*, 153.

44. Ibid., 153-154.

45. Ibid., 154.

46. Giles Tremlett, *Catherine of Aragon: The Spanish Queen of Henry VIII* (New York: Walker & Company, 2010), 5.

47. 1536, Letter of Princess Mary to King Henry VIII, http://englishhistory.net/tudor/primary1.html (accessed October 30, 2011).

48. 1536, Anne's Execution Speech, http://englishhistory.net/tudor/prianne2.html (accessed October 30, 2011).

49. Saunders, *Henry the Eighth*, 236.

50. Ibid.

51. G. H. Cook, *Letters to Cromwell and Others on the Suppression of the Monasteries* (London: John Baker Publishers Ltd.), 13.

52. A.G Dickens, *Thomas Cromwell and the English Reformation* (London: The English Universities Press Ltd.,1959),125.

53. An Act for the Submission of the Clergy to the King's Majesty. St. 25 Hen. VIII, c. 19, 1534 (Stat. Realm, III, 460), *English Historical Documents*, 741.

54. Dickens, *Thomas Cromwell and the English Reformation*, 127-128.

55. Philip Hughes, *The Reformation in England: Part I "The King's Proceedings,"*

3rd ed. (London: Hollis and Carter, 1954), 283.

   56. Saunders, *Henry the Eighth*, 141.

   57. Hughes, *The Reformation in England*, 283.

   58. First Act for the Dissolution of the Monasteries, 1536, St. 27 Hen. VIII, c. (Stat. Realm, III, 575), *English Historical Documents*, 771.

   59. Ibid., 772.

   60. Norah Lofts, *Anne Boleyn* (New York: Coward, McCann & Geoghegan, Inc., 1979), 90.

   61. Enforcing Statutes Abolishing Papal Authority in England, (1535) in *Tudor Royal Proclamations*, Volume I, ed. Paul Hughes and James Larkin (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1964), 231.

   62. Dickens, *Thomas Cromwell and the English Reformation*, 169.

   63. 1535, Letter from Eustace Chapuys to the Imperial Ambassador, Nicholas de Granvelle, in *Every One a Witness: The Tudor Age*, 206.

   64. Ibid., 207.

   65. Saunders, *Henry the Eighth*, 186.

   66. Ibid.

   67. Ibid.

   68. Ibid., 187.

   69. Ibid.

   70. Ibid.

   71. Ibid., 241.

   72. Ibid., 244.

   73. Ibid., 245.

   74. Ibid., 245-246.

   75. Ibid., 247.

The Rise of the Common Man: Jeffersonian and Jacksonian Influences on the Prosperity of the Common Man by 1840

Arin Arnold

When the Founding Fathers of the United States set out to write the new governmental documents for the recently founded country, there were several issues that they had to confront. One of the most important of these issues was the question of who qualified for civil rights under the United States government. Resolved not to mimic Great Britain's aristocratic and monarchical ways, the United States government desired to give civil rights to the common man.

This idea of "common man" has gradually transformed over time and new political advancements have granted more rights and changed who the common man is. When the Founding Fathers decided to give him rights, the common man was a white, non-elite man. He had to own property but need not be particularly wealthy. Although advocating for the common man's rights, the government did not necessarily fairly spread the civility to those who desired it, nor even granted to the common man the same rights as they granted themselves.

The political advancements that granted the common man more rights occurred significantly between the drafting of the United States Constitution in 1787 and the election of 1840, known as the Log Cabin Campaign. The Log Cabin campaign is a great example of the prosperity the common man came to know during the first half-century of the nation's existence. The question of how the common man came into prosperity is important. This paper aims to display the progress of the common man from the drafting of the U.S. Constitution to the election of 1840.

Two influential presidents are the most important influences regarding the common man gaining civil rights. These presidents' ideas were so widely accepted that their political agendas became political parties. The first is Thomas Jefferson. Jefferson sought to spread the rights of the common man through expanding the lands in which the common man lived, forming the American economy around the common man, and by restricting the federal government's rights. The second is Andrew Jackson. Jackson furthered the rights of the common man by destroying the federal monopoly of money, attempting to abolish the Electoral College and expanding suffrage to more men in the United States. Without their political parties, Jefferson and Jackson would not have been able to sufficiently aid the common man's progress. Jeffersonian Democrats and Jacksonian Democrats were pivotal in the politics of their time and supported their parties' namesakes devotedly. Jeffersonian democracy and Jacksonian democracy maintained the same tactics and agendas that Jefferson and Jackson had themselves. In modern times, both are examples of different forms of American democracy.

Jeffersonian democracy and Jacksonian democracy have long been compared by historians. The two political philosophies have been proclaimed as completely

different- with different theories, principles and agendas which classify two completely different political eras. While the diversity between these separate interpretations of American democracy should not be ignored, neither should the extensive evidence of their similarities. Separately, each had an effect on American democracy, yet the impact of the two types of democracy together is much greater. The best way to demonstrate the practices of both Jeffersonian and Jacksonian democracy is to examine them in their prime years. Jeffersonian democracy began with the election of Thomas Jefferson in 1800 and lasted into the 1820s. Jacksonian democracy grew in popularity with the election of President Andrew Jackson and lasted through 1854. Because these two philosophies were named after Jefferson and Jackson, it is only appropriate to speak of the men and their agendas which their followers, Jeffersonian democrats and Jacksonian democrats respectively, supported. The political aspects of each philosophy revolve around popular sovereignty. Both philosophies aspired to give the people power, whether it was through rights against the government or patronage. Through popular sovereignty both political philosophies sought to expand voting rights as well. Male suffrage was an on-going battle in the United States through Jackson's presidency until it was finally widely accepted in 1840. The two political eras under the two men experienced economic prosperity as well. An agrarian economy under Jefferson and opposition to the National Bank under Jackson sought to give all United States citizens an opportunity to prosper. While the two philosophies had different ways of running the government, their agendas were similar. The two political philosophies were the most important in the progress of the common man. This is evident through their objectives of popular sovereignty, expanded suffrage, and economic prosperity. Both Jeffersonian and Jacksonian democrats aimed for an equal political field for men, white men specifically. Thus, Jeffersonian democracy and Jacksonian democracy were the most important political philosophies in the evolution of the common man's prosperity.

Jeffersonian democracy's beliefs and agenda were important in leading to the common man's prosperity. Jeffersonian democracy cannot be properly examined without studying its namesake Thomas Jefferson. Jefferson was a complex man, a man full of contradictions yet undoubtedly a genius. There was never a time when Jefferson was not buried in his thoughts, and after the American Revolution, much of his thinking and theorizing had to do with government and politics. Throughout his political career Jefferson made many contradictions in his beliefs, his belief in a "rule-by-the-people" never faltered. During the time when Jefferson lived in Europe as the minister to France, the Constitution of the United States was drafted. Even with Jefferson's absence, he was very much involved in the U.S. politics of the day. Through correspondence with colleagues like James Madison, Jefferson was able to remain in the know about what was being added in the Constitution and what was being left out. Jefferson did not hesitate to form and give his opinions as well. Always an advocate for a Bill of Rights that would give American citizens rights against the government, Jefferson expressed his discontent in a letter to Madison: "A Bill of Rights is what the people are entitled to against every government on earth, general or particular; and what no government should refuse, or rest on inference."[2] Jefferson focused on protecting the American people from the government. Jefferson believed that certain rights needed be granted, these being freedom of religion, freedom of the press, and freedom of speech. With these rights the people would be protected from the

government. "To Jefferson the crucial problem in government was one of safeguarding the liberties of the people from potential tyrannies."[3] With the freedom of speech and of press, the American people would be able to not only protect themselves against the government but also resist it. Drawing from Lockean inspiration, an inspiration that to Jefferson proved to be life-long, Jefferson believed that it was the duty of the citizens to resist corruption in the government. This interpretation of popular sovereignty was radical for the late 18th century but proved to be a worthwhile fight for Jefferson. Along with his beliefs on restriction of government rights, Jefferson also aspired for a restriction on the size and power of the government. Following Anti-Federalist beliefs, Jefferson and his new Jeffersonian democracy wanted a government where the people and the states had more power than the federal government.[4] The United States was already on its way to being more democratic without having a monarchial power, but Jefferson and his political followers wanted to ensure that the federal government would not become too big. To expand this idea, Jeffersonians relied on the non city-dwelling citizens, the citizens many elites considered from the back-country. While some elite members of society did not believe that these common men had a place in politics, Jeffersonians disagreed. These were the men who helped elect Jefferson in 1800 and who reaped the benefits of supporting the Jeffersonians.

Besides trying to include men outside of the cities in New England in the government, Jeffersonians took up an issue with the Alien and Sedition Acts. These acts were passed under the Federalist administration of John Adams. Adams belonged to the Federalist Party. The Federalist Party was in direct opposition to Jeffersonians who are sometimes referenced as Anti-Federalists. These two parties were in opposition on numerous political issues; the interpretation of the Constitution, for example. The Jeffersonians also disapproved of the Alien and Sedition Acts.[5] Claiming to be concerned for the safety of citizens and the government from foreigners and seditious acts, the laws passed by the Federalists in 1798 were greatly opposed by the Jeffersonians. The political party viewed the Alien and Sedition Acts as a direct attempt to silence the Jeffersonians about the upcoming election of 1800 and the issues they discussed. Jeffersonians considered these acts unconstitutional and accused them of stripping the rights of the people away and giving them to the higher powers. Jefferson and his followers also saw these acts as dangerous and as "an experiment on the American mind, to see how far it will bear an avowed violation of the constitution."[6] Jeffersonians believed these laws to be contemptible and so Jefferson secretly authored the Kentucky Resolutions.[7] Withdrawing himself from the federal government briefly, Jefferson formulated a document resolving states' rights and their ability to check and balance the federal government. In his Kentucky Resolutions, Jefferson stated "Where powers are assumed which have not been delegated, a nullification of the act is the rightful remedy: that every State has a natural right in cases not within the compact... to nullify of their own authority all assumptions of powers by others within their own limits."[8] Jefferson was trying to convey that the people and the states needed to demand more power from the federal government; the states and the citizens had a duty to keep the central government from becoming too big and powerful and that they had the right to disregard any laws that they believed to be unconstitutional. "That this commonwealth does, under the most deliberate reconsideration, declare that the

said Alien and Sedition Laws are, in their opinion, palpable violations of the said Constitution."[9] The battle with the Alien and Sedition Acts is a prime example of Jeffersonians supporting popular sovereignty. Jeffersonians believed that the people had a duty to fulfill against their national government to keep them from growing too large. Out of this battle, the people and governments of Kentucky and Virginia, two "backcountry" states, became nationally recognized and were given power through their confrontation with the Federalists and the federal government over the constitutionality of the Alien and Sedition Acts. "That although this commonwealth, as a party to the Federal compact, will bow to the laws of the Union, yet, it does, at the same time declare that it will not now, or ever hereafter, cease to oppose in a constitutional manner, every attempt at what quarter so ever offered, to violate that compact."[10] The Kentucky Resolutions (and the Virginia Resolutions under Madison which fulfilled the same purpose of those in Kentucky) empowered the small state governments of the new, backcountry areas of the Union. In short, Jeffersonians began to empower the common man of the day.

Just as Jeffersonian democracy cannot be discussed without Thomas Jefferson, Jacksonian democracy would be nothing without Andrew Jackson. In many ways Jackson is an antithesis to Jefferson. He was the first United States president to be born in a log cabin, he was a soldier and believed in resorting to fighting and dueling to solve problems, and was not necessarily an intellectual. Jackson was intelligent and well-read but not as much as Jefferson. Jackson formed his own beliefs on the government of the United States, an opinion much different than Jefferson's. Though their paths to promote popular sovereignty differed, Jacksonians did want the people to be more involved in the government and that is where Jacksonian popular sovereignty comes to have importance. While his motives may have been driven from his experience with the Electoral College in his unsuccessful run for president in 1824, Jackson wanted the voting process in the United States to be ratified. Jackson's attempt to destroy the Electoral College displays his attempt to give rise to the common man. The election of 1824, what Jacksonians refer to as the Corrupt Bargain[11], outraged Jacksonians throughout the Union. Jackson's tough and hot-tempered reputation led many politicians to believe him unfit for the presidency. "No one liked Jackson for president except the voting public."[12] The voting public was the key for Jackson. Winning 41.3% of the popular vote in the election of 1824 and receiving 99 Electoral College votes, Jackson did not understand how he still did not become president. In Jacksonian opinion, it was contemptible that John Quincy Adams became the president that year. Through the Corrupt Bargain ordeal, Jacksonians grew in number. Jackson accumulated many supporters, especially in the South, and they became uneasy about the voting process as well. "Public opinion throughout the country was shifting in favor of having the electors chosen by the voters."[13] When Jackson finally became president in 1828, it was due greatly to the support of the growing Jacksonian party and the widespread knowledge of the unfair Corrupt Bargain and the voting system in the United States. When Jackson became president, he took measures to change the system, attempting to do away with the Electoral College and adopt a direct voting system. "[Jackson] defined himself as a defender of the people against special interests and advocated-unsuccessfully- a constitutional amendment to abolish the Electoral College and choose the president by direct popular vote."[14] Jackson and his followers attributed corruption

to the elites, declaring the elites' obsession with power as the driving main reason that the United States was not popularly sovereign. Popular sovereignty could be granted to the people, in Jacksonian opinion, through a direct election instead of utilizing the Electoral College and legislators to make election decisions. While Jackson's motives were most likely personally induced, it is still evident that Jacksonians wanted a more direct democracy which in turn would have meant more popular sovereignty.

In addition to Jacksonian desire for direct democracy, Jackson and his supporters also wanted common people to be more involved in the government. One way that Jackson involved common men in the government was through patronage. By rewarding those who supported him, Jackson formed himself an advisory staff that history would deem the "Kitchen Cabinet". Patronage helped Jackson in two ways: first, patronage would make more people supportive of Jackson in case he was victorious. Politicians did not want to lose their positions because they did not support Jackson, so in turn, some of Adams' cabinet members supported Jackson in promise of keeping their cabinet position. Second, the patronage system rewarded those who supported Jackson and subsequently involved common men in politics. Before Jackson, American politics were strictly limited to and dominated by the upper class.[15] The position of the president, in particular, was limited to elitists, intellectuals and Founding Fathers. Hence, presidents preceding Jackson were nothing like him. They did not know the struggles of common men in America. Even Jefferson did not understand the appeal of Jackson as president. Jefferson stated "[Jackson] is one of the most unfit men I know of for such a place".[16] Seemingly, common men had no place in government, especially federal government, prior to Jackson. In Jackson's first inaugural address, he called for a reform in the government and a cleaning of federal offices.[17] Thus, Jackson would "reward his friends and punish his enemies."[18] Jackson not only rid the government of republican influences, he also made sure to add more positions for his friends and loyal supporters. Jacksonians had made it to the White House and a government ruled by the people became a reality. In defense of his actions, Jackson wrote "In a country where offices are created solely for the benefit of the people, no one man has any more intrinsic right to official station than another."[19] It just so happens that the men whom Jackson chose did not come from the same class as previous government officials. "Those whom the Jackson administration appointed to office did not differ in their economic class from previous appointees, though they were more often self-made men or born into provincial rather than cosmopolitan elites."[20] Jacksonians saw no need for high education or accomplishments to become a government official, just the support of the Jacksonian party. "Qualifications and experience were just excuses invoked to justify the perpetuation of privilege."[21] Jacksonians used patronage, eventually known as the Spoils System, as a way of benefiting themselves and the people. Jacksonians believed that the government should be in the hands of the people and that all white men should have the same opportunities, especially the same chances to become involved in the government.

One issue certainly more Jacksonian than Jeffersonian is *almost* universal male suffrage.[22] While Jefferson did not necessarily ignore the issue of suffrage, it was not a main topic during his presidency or even his era. Commencing in 1802, states began to rule whether they would allow universal male suffrage or not. Maryland began this trend, granting all white males the right to vote if they

met a residency requirement. Throughout the early 19th century, almost universal male suffrage became ordinary.[23] During the Jeffersonian era, however, suffrage was not extended to all white males and instead was limited to the rich, the educated, and the powerful. Jefferson did not directly address suffrage as an issue, only discussing one requirement he believed was a necessity to be a voter; education. In a letter to British philosopher Richard Price, Jefferson stated "Whenever the people are well-informed, they can be trusted with their own government."[24] Since Jefferson does not address suffrage, it can be inferred that it was not as great of an issue to the Jeffersonian era as it was to the Jacksonian era. By the 1820s, many states had granted white men the right to vote, yet this is when the federal government intervened. At this point, the federal government was still run by aristocratic who did not want the common man to have the same rights as they enjoyed. Under Jacksonian influence, white male suffrage was a reality and most states had no property requirements for voters. With this shift to a more democratic voting system, [25] voter turnout increased. Under Jacksonian influence, voter participation expediently increased. Voter participation increased from about 25% in the election of 1824 to 56.3% in 1828. "Statistics seem to show that Jacksonian party organizations were able to arouse high levels of enthusiasm among voters and to bring them to the polls in much higher proportions than was typical in the early nineteenth century."[26] Through the expansion of male suffrage to common men, some who were not even property owners, Jacksonians were able to empower these men through their involvement in politics. Even though in most states in 1824 the opportunity to vote was common, there was a low voter turnout. Jacksonian campaigning transformed the voting process and gave rise to the common man through the process of involving him in politics and the government.

One of the most important aspects the Jeffersonian policy had on the rise of the common man was its economic policies. Following Jefferson's beliefs, Jeffersonians were agrarians, and believed that agriculture was the most important element of the economy. Jefferson himself said "Those who labour in the earth are the chosen people of God, if ever he had a chosen people, whose breasts he has made his peculiar deposit for substantial and genuine virtue."[27] A multitude of historians, like A. Whitney Griswold for example, have stated that Jefferson and his supporters were the epitomes of agrarian democracy. Jefferson put his economic beliefs totally in agrarian society and in the trust of farmers. "No one believed so implicitly as [Jefferson] in a casual connection between the occupation of farming and political system of democracy."[28] Perhaps the most important feature of Jeffersonian support of agrarian society is that it supported the common man. "[Jefferson] had espoused the cause of the common man. At that time, the common man was a farmer. Ninety per cent of all Americans, common or uncommon, were farmers. To champion the people, therefore, was to champion agriculture."[29] Jefferson viewed the farmers as the most important and most valuable citizens. Jeffersonians were determined to empower the common man through this economic theory. They believed that the farmer, who was an example of the common man, deserved recognition for his impact on society.

The idea of expansion and the Louisiana Purchase sparked from Jeffersonian support of common farmers. The Louisiana Purchase was a controversial decision and was not actually supported by many Jeffersonians due to their strict interpretations of the Constitution. Because the Constitution does not say anything

about purchasing land, Jeffersonians were uneasy about Jefferson's decision to carry out the purchase. Once they realized the possibilities of prosperity that would come from this new land, they reluctantly gave their support. One of the greatest impacts the purchase had was giving the United States more land to cultivate and more room for, not only, the population to grow, but also an agrarian economy to boom. Jefferson considered drafting an amendment to the Constitution that would give him the right to purchase land, but he realized the necessity of speed during the deal with France. "In the end, [Jefferson] rationalized the purchase by saying it was in the interest of the people."[30] Jeffersonians concluded that this early take on Manifest Destiny was a good thing for all Americans. It gave rise to common men by allowing them to spread out and to have a chance to own property anywhere in the United States. This allowed the common man to have a better opportunity for success, whether he was a farmer or an industrialist. These two ideas of an agrarian economy and of expansion were two political advancements which gave way for the prosperity of the common man.

With the great success of farmers, the Jacksonian era enjoyed a booming economy. Agriculture was of the utmost importance during the Jacksonian era because everything relied on successful cultivation and bountiful harvests. Transportation was a vital part of the economy as well, as historian Daniel Walker Howe argues in his book, *What Hath God Wrought,* chronicling the extreme changes America endured from 1815 to 1848. Howe posits that advancements in transportation were the most important facet of the progress of the United States.[31] It is impossible to discuss the importance of transportation without discussing farming. Without farming and crops that needed to be transported, transportation would not have been so wide spread or important. "Agriculture earned twice as much wealth as any other activity, with transportation in second place only because of the movement of agricultural products within the nation."[32] Jacksonians also supported industry, however, unlike Jeffersonians who wanted a strictly agrarian society, Jacksonians understood the necessity of industry in the U.S. While Jeffersonians wanted to keep industry in Europe, Jacksonians recognized the benefits of having industry at home. Not only did industry create more jobs, for common men, but it also reduced the import/export taxes for the United States, which made it easier to be a successful citizen.

The Jacksonian era is said to be one example of laissez-faire economics. "Generalization would characterize the relationship between government and the economy during the [Jacksonian] era as flexible, governed by no strict doctrines."[33] Laissez-faire is one way to describe Jacksonian economics, but the economic policy of Jackson cannot be discussed without addressing the Bank War.[34] Jackson's contest of the National Bank was a political advancement in support of the prosperity of the common man. In his combat with the second Bank of the United States, Jackson argued that Bank was unconstitutional in its private and public affairs. "To the Bank's influence Jacksonians traced constitutional impiety, consolidated national power, aristocratic privilege, and plutocratic corruption."[35] Jacksonians' attack on the Bank was arbitrary; prior to Jackson's refusal to sign off on the bank's charter, there had been no known disputes between Jackson and the bank. In fact, the Bank's president, Nicholas Biddle, even voted for Jackson in 1828.[36] Yet Jackson, a man coming from very little, distrusted the wealthy business owners and detested paper money. Jackson's disapproval of the Bank of the United States led to Jacksonian outcry against the bank as well. The most

prominent issue of the Jacksonian era had been born. Jacksonians accused the Bank of several things, particularly being unconstitutional and taking advantage of citizens. In his attempt to destroy the Bank, Jackson vetoed the Bank's re-charter. Jackson claimed that he could understand why many people thought that a United States Bank was convenient, especially for the government, but that this was one of its main problems. Jackson believed that the Bank took power away from the people and did not approve of the control that the Bank of the United States had over the money of the country. Therefore, Jackson, against the desires of the Supreme Court, vetoed the Bank bill. "I sincerely regret that in the act before me I can perceive none of those modifications of the bank charter which are necessary, in my opinion, to make it compatible with justice, with sound policy, or with the Constitution of our country."[37]

Having the ability to do multiple monetary transactions- giving loans, utilizing paper currency and having it always available in gold and silver- made the Bank more powerful than Jackson liked it to be. For these reasons, Jackson began the Bank War. Jackson, without a huge cast of support at first, decided to veto the proposal of a new charter, even though it could possibly be detrimental to his reelection. "The president did not want his showdown with the Bank to come in an election year; but it would have been uncharacteristic for Jackson to back away entirely from a position held long and deeply."[38] Jackson decided to put up a fight, but he knew he could not do it alone. At first, it was a tough task because many people did not have a specific opinion on the Bank. "Although some people felt strongly about it, the public as a whole was not sharply divided into pro- and anti-Bank factions during the 1820s and early '30s... Most Americans were probably ambivalent or complacent in their attitude toward the Bank."[39] Soon enough, Jacksonians supported their leader. Common men were Jacksonians and they felt strongly about the issue of the Bank. The farmers had long hated banks and distrusted their loans and their paper money. This time, however, it was not only the farming common men who were behind Jackson. Business men supported Jackson as well. Basically, wage earners were distrusting of paper currency and supported Jackson's desire to do away with the Bank. The Jacksonian Bank War against what they referred to as "the Monster" would be successful and Jackson effectively extracted federal money out of the Bank of the United States and dispersed it in a multitude of small banks throughout the country. This made the small bank owner more successful and gave the small banks chances to survive. An argument cannot be won without touching on the reality of what level of power Jeffersonian democracy and Jacksonian democracy wanted to grant to the common man. While both Jefferson and Jackson claimed to be of the common men, neither truly was. Jefferson was born into wealth, and when he married, he acquired more land and more wealth. Jackson knew more of the scruples of a working life, yet he rose to success and built a grand mansion, the Hermitage. Both Jeffersonian and Jacksonian principles empowered common men through their economic and political foundations, yet neither group truly wanted them highly involved in politics. Jeffersonians sought out to educate and inform these men so they would be enlightened enough to participate in the government. Jackson on the other hand really did want the common man's participation in politics and government, but he was not as much an advocate for states' rights and the rights of individuals as he was about his own presidential power. While, Jackson was the head of a democratic era named for him, his

rulings and actions were borderline tyrannical and abusive to presidential powers. Jeffersonian and Jacksonian democracy wanted uncommon men to rule the common men. Yet these two men began political factions based on their political philosophies that forever transformed American democracy.

In conclusion, the political advancements enacted by Jeffersonian and Jacksonian democracy had the greatest influence on the common man's prosperity and civil equality by the year 1840. The combination of Jeffersonian and Jacksonian principles set the common man up for success in 1840. Economically, Jeffersonians' agrarian society and expansion were important in Jackson's economic plan. Jackson expanded on Jefferson's ideas and utilized the technology of his time to further encourage the common man through industry. In addition, Jacksonians' attack of the Bank of the United States made way for a money system to be localized and "common man-friendly." Farmers and most common men did not trust banks or paper currency, so the destruction of the Bank was a victorious gain for the economic standing of the common man. Politically, the combination of Jeffersonian and Jacksonian principles is pivotal in the prosperity of the common man. The main Jeffersonian advancement was the fight for the Bill of Rights. Because Jefferson's Kentucky Resolution sought to take the power from the government and give it to the people, it is an important advancement towards the success of the common man. Jacksonians' main advancement was the attempt to do away with the Electoral College. Even though the attempts were unsuccessful, the effort was a political advancement. It was the first time that the voting system of the United States was in question and there was a fight to give more voting rights to the people instead of elected officials. This along with the fight for a Bill of Rights and defense of said Bill of Rights were advancements. The powerful were trying to give more power to the people, or the common man. The high voter turnout in 1840 when all white men- rich, poor, property owning or not, farmers, industrialists, etc- had the right to vote. This is due greatly to the success the common man had found. The political advancements of Jeffersonian democracy and Jacksonian democracy are the most important influences in the success of the common man by 1840.

ENDNOTES

1. Patronage in Jackson's case was the Spoils System. The Spoils System is where a victorious political party reimburses its supporters by supplying government jobs as a reward. Jackson is the first president noted to have used a patronage system like this.

2. Dethloff, Henry C. 1971. *Thomas Jefferson and American democracy.* Problems in American civilization (Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath), 14.

3. Lerner, Max, and Robert Schmuhl. 1996. *Thomas Jefferson: America's philosopher-king* (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers), 31.

4. Sheldon, Garrett Ward. 1991. *The political philosophy of Thomas Jefferson.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

5. The Alien and Sedition acts are a series of four bills passed in 1798. They were a primarily Federalist set of laws and were designed to protect American citizens and the American government from foreign powers. Also, these laws were meant to protect the government from libelous accusations. They were signed into law under a Federalist Congress and Federalist president John Adams as America prepared for war with France. These acts increased the residency requirement for American citizenship from five to fourteen years, authorized the president to imprison or

deport aliens considered "dangerous to the peace and safety of the United States" and restricted speech critical of the government. Jefferson was very much opposed to these laws as were many Anti-Federalists.

6. Cunningham, Noble E. 1987. *In pursuit of reason: the life of Thomas Jefferson.* Southern biography series (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press), 216.

7. The Kentucky Resolutions was a political document secretly written by Thomas Jefferson. James Madison secretly authored the Virginia Resolutions. These documents were in response to the Alien and Sedition Acts. Both of these resolves went to the Kentucky and Virginia legislatures where they were put into law that neither state would abide by the orders under the Alien and Sedition Acts. The Kentucky and Virginia Resolutions argue in favor of states' rights over the power of the central government and state that the states have a responsibility to keep the central government from becoming too powerful.

8. Cunningham, *In pursuit of reason*, 216.

9. The Kentucky Resolutions, February 22, 1799. In *Major problems in American Constitutional history,* ed. Kermit L. Hall and Timothy S. Huebner, 90. Boston: Wadsworth Cengage Center.

10. Ibid.

11. The Corrupt Bargain was a Jacksonian assumption that some kind of deal was made with president-elect John Quincy Adams and Speaker of the House Henry Clay. Jackson won both the popular vote and the Electoral College, yet failed to receive the majority in either category. According to Constitutional law, the decision then must be decided by the House of Representatives. It is speculated that Clay persuaded the House to elect Adams over Jackson. Clay became the Secretary of State during Adams' administration which is why Jackson believed a "corrupt bargain" to have taken place.

12. Howe, Daniel Walker. 2007. *What hath God wrought: the transformation of America, 1815-1848.* (New York: Oxford University Press), 205.

13. Ibid., 207.

14. Ibid., 330.

15. Prior to the election of Jackson, all six preceding presidents were of wealthy background. Four of the first six presidents were from Virginia and known as being a part of the Virginia Dynasty. The other two, John Adams and his son John Quincy Adams were both successful lawyers from Massachusetts. Thomas Jefferson and John Adams both signed the Declaration of Independence and George Washington and James Madison signed the Constitution. Prior to Jackson, the position of president was filled by solely elites, upper class men who had always been involved in politics.

16. Howe, *What hath God wrought*, 205.

17. Ibid., 331.

18. Ibid.

19. Ibid., 334.

20. Ibid.

21. Ibid.

22. Almost universal male suffrage refers to the male suffrage of all white males. At this time, it was not a question whether suffrage would be extended to anyone else, especially not males of different races, like African Americans or American Indians.

23. Watson, Harry L., and Eric Foner. 1990. *Liberty and power: the politics of Jacksonian Americ*a (New York: Hill and Wang), 50

24. Jefferson, Thomas. *Thomas Jefferson to Richard Price, January 8, 1989.* Letter. From Library of Congress*, The Thomas Jefferson Papers,* http://www.loc.gov/exhibits/jefferson/jeffrep.html (accessed October 15, 2010).

25. Although this was more of a democratic form of voting system, it was still not a direct democracy. In many states, the men who were allowed to vote would

vote for the state legislatures who would in turn vote for bigger elections, like the presidential election.

26. Watson, *Liberty and power*, 233.

27. Jefferson, Thomas. 1964. *Notes on the State of Virginia* (New York: Harper & Row), 164-164.

28. Dethloff, *Thomas Jefferson and American democracy*, 39.

29. Ibid., 43.

30. Lerner, *Thomas Jefferson*, 73.

31. Howe, *What hath God wrought*, 7.

32. Pessen, Edward. 1969. *Jacksonian America; society, personality, and politics.* The Dorsey series in American history (Homewood, Ill: Dorsey Press), 94

33. Pessen, *Jacksonian America*, 95.

34. The Bank War was the attempt to destroy the Second United States Bank by President Andrew Jackson. The BUS had a great influence over the economy of the United States but Jackson viewed the bank as a monopoly. Jackson decided to veto a renewal in the Bank's charter in 1832 commencing heated arguments over the Bank. Jackson found enough support and was able to destroy the BUS and withdrew all federal money from its reserve.

35. Meyers, Marvin. 1957. *The Jacksonian persuasion; politics and belief.* (Stanford: Stanford University Press), 11

36. Howe, *What hath God wrought*, 378.

37. President Andrew Jackson defies the Supreme Court and vetoes the Bank bill, 1832. In *Major Problems in American Constitutional History*, ed. Kermit L. Hall and Timothy S. Huebner, 136-137. Boston: Wadsworth Cengage Center.

38. Howe, *What hath God wrought*, 378.

39. Ibid., 377.

PERSPECTIVES

The Cost of Empire; How the Aztec political and economic system facilitated Spanish Conquest
Shane Winslow

In 1519, crusaders with visions of conquest and fortune came ashore in Mesoamerica. Led by Hernan Cortes, these were the Spanish conquistadors; soldiers sent by Charles V on a mission to find riches and establish new colonies in the Americas. To achieve their goals, they would battle and defeat the Aztec Empire. Yet how could a force of 500[1] Spaniards conquer a population of 700,000[2] Aztec in Tenochtitlan? This paper will argue that the Spanish victory was not so much a triumph of arms as it was a crime of opportunity.

There have been many theories regarding what caused the empire to collapse. Sara Cohen, of *How the Aztecs Appraised Montezuma*, blames the fall on Emperor Montezuma's poor leadership. She claims that Montezuma, thought to have been an extremely superstitious man, caused the collapse due to his misperception about the identity of Hernan Cortes. Montezuma believed that Cortes was a representative of their sacred lord Quetzalcoatl. Coincidentally, Cortes had arrived precisely at the time that their religious manuscripts predicted Quetzalcoatl would return. This circumstance allowed Cortes to approach the capital and led to its subsequent defeat.[3] Douglas A. Daniel, in *Tactical Factors in the Spanish Conquest of the Aztecs*, argues that tactical advantages led the Spanish to victory. Daniel cites that the Spaniards' horses, native allies, and differing conceptualizations of warfare, resulted in the conquistadors' triumph.[4]

This essay does not seek to discredit these views, but rather to include an additional element to academia's understanding of the Aztec defeat. The Aztec had a mighty empire prior to the Spanish invasion; however, their sovereignty was jeopardized by economic and socio-political vulnerabilities.

In the Beginning—The First Mexica Presence

The Mexica founded Tenochtitlan, capital of the Aztec Empire, by dividing the region into four separate provinces. The temple of Huitzilopochtli united the divided settlements geographically, and paid homage to their mighty war-god. *Calpultin*, or family groups, controlled specific neighborhoods within each province. This land was divided so it could be utilized by each group. Each province's administration was shared by two representatives from the respective region. One delegate controlled the province's internal affairs, whereas the second functioned as the spokesperson between his domain and the central government. During the beginning of Tenochtitlan, the elite lineages in each province possessed the most power, while the central government, located and functioning through the temple of Huitzilopochtli, acted as a linchpin to unite the decentralized kingdom.[5]

Land conflicts and scarcity in wild fauna forced the Mexica to split their population only thirteen years after founding Tenochtitlan. The migrant Mexica relocated to the northern island of Tlatelolco and began calling themselves the

Mexica-Tlatelolca. They lived separated from the Mexica-Tenochca—who remained in Tenochtitlan.[6]

This shortage of resources played a large factor in their economy. Only those with means could acquire needed natural resources. The land of Tenochtitlan was agriculturally limited because of its location. Tenochtitlan was located on an island with restricted terrain and little area for agriculture. Although the Mexica adopted intensive farming techniques that could support some of the population[7], the geography led the Mexica to expand into Tlatelolco.

Soon after the split, the Mexica established a more powerful central government. The peculiarity about this institution is that *foreign* dignitaries (leaders from stronger local ethnic groups) were given positions of authority. There are multiple motives for this action. Jonathan Rounds explains that a neutral central government was likely created to mediate between the various provinces because of their inability to work together. Rounds cites the Codex Ramirez, stating that, "… [Mexica] migration record [shows] constant bickering among the calpulli, and one account in the foundation of Tenochtitlan."[8] Therefore, foreign nobility may have been appointed leadership positions because of their neutrality amongst Calpulli. Moreover, David Carrasco believes that the Mexica needed to ally themselves with the current ruling classes of the area in order to be legitimized as a group.[9]

It's known that foreign dignitaries were instated to the Mexica thrones.[10] These men ruled as legitimate leaders of the Mexica and served as a bridge to connect the society with the dominant powers in the area. Due to this, Tenochtitlan became a tributary of the Tepanec Empire (one of the strongest local ethnic states) because of their political strategies.

It's estimated that the Tenochtitlan began to challenge the Tepanec Empire during the early 1400's.[11] They gained superiority over the Tepanecs when Tenochtitlan, Texcoco, and Tlacopan, launched a joint campaign against the Tepanecs. The alliance succeeded and the Aztec Empire was born from their treaty. The Aztec soon became the most powerful empire in Mesoamerica, and grew into the largest native empire to rule in Mexico.[12]

Aztec Imperial Growth–The Not So Golden Age

Ironically, the roots of the Aztec defeat by the Spanish began with the centralization of their government. With the Tepanecs gone, the Aztec could now amplify their power without interference. They created a massive domain by uniting the kingdoms. The realm was formed by assimilating Tenochtitlan, Texcoco, and Tlacopan. These areas merged into an enormous super-state or 'Triple Alliance'"[13] and each was led by a ruling *tlaotani,* or emperor. One important reform that affected the Triple Alliance's economy was the consolidation of political power towards the emperor. Autonomy was reduced in each province by a shift of control towards the central government.

This shift was supported by bribery. When the Tepanecs fell, an unimaginable amount of wealth was syphoned directly to the *tlaotani.* Emperors' could exploit the provincial leaders by distributing imperial riches and land as they decreed.[14] If the leaders pleased the *tlaotani,* they would be rewarded for their actions. Those loyal to the emperor profited immensely. This system succeeded at discreetly syphoning power from the jurisdictions without directly dictating imperial declarations.

In order to maintain their dominance, ensure a constant source of capital, and continue their method of exploitation, the *tlaotani* used a number of tactics. The

Triple Alliance threatened neighboring territories with conquest unless they provided continuous tribute. The ultimate motive for this action seems to be an increase in status wealth. Each area that was drawn into the empires' tribute network had specific items that the area was expected to produce. As archaeologist Mary Hodge, explains, "...the array of goods in the Codex Mendoza and other tribute lists implies regional specialties... [for example,] Otumba [has] strong evidence of several craft specialization[s]... for clay-mold figurines, ceramic censors, obsidian ear spools, obsidian blades, and other lapidary items."[15] As the number of tribute areas increased, more specialization could be enforced to yield the most optimal products. The Alliance was very successful in their conquests and wars stretched beyond the Basin of Mexico.

By the 1500s, archaeologists estimate that the empire received tribute from 38 regions. Yet the strength of the Aztec seems hard to establish precisely. The Aztec did not invest in roads, administrative buildings, or walls.[16] Hodge suggests that the strategy of the Aztec were not to control a broad expanse of land, but instead focus on specific areas where they could extract wealth.

Within the core zone, there were eco-political practices that were integrated within Tenochtitlan.[17] This was to maintain a uniform government within the Basin area. Regions outside of the core zone were considered *strategic* provinces. These were significant geographical sectors that served to defend trade routes, entrepots, and strategic centers. In addition, these zones were expected to give gifts to the capitol.[18]

The Alliance's economic and political practices were influential within the empire. While their methods created significant revenue, it also created tensions that would be exploited by the Spanish. One consequence that resulted from these tactics was the vulnerability of strategic and tributary provinces and threatened the empires' internal security.

Settlements located outside of the Basin of Mexico, which were segregated from the Aztec by distance, played an important role for the conquistadors. These areas maintained most of their autonomy, yet chafed under Aztec dominance. Therefore, when the Spaniards arrived in Mesoamerica, their welcome was conditional to the response of local settlements. This is how Hernan Cortes was able to proceed inland, largely unopposed, after landing at Veracruz.

The first chiefdom that Cortes encountered on his expedition inland was the Cempoalla. After careful deliberation, they allowed Cortes to move into the interior and assisted him with his route into Mexico. As Fray Bernardino de Sahugan, a Spanish priest who was responsible for recording much of Aztec history, describes, "...a man of Cempoalla called a *tlacochcalcatl*... interpreted for them, established the road for them, eliminated [wrong] roads for them, [and] was their guide along the way."[19] The Cempoalla assisted Cortes by guiding him to the land of Tenochtitlan. This may have happened because the area was unconsolidated. If the Aztec had more closely administered this land, the Spaniards may not have had this advantage. This critical information could have been more easily guarded. The lack of firm administration indicates the geographical consequences created by the Aztec economy.

The growing inequality of the community was another issue. With the introduction of more status items, and the value they held in society, citizens recognized their own social status. This marked the beginning of a distinct class division within the empire. Soon the Alliance would be distinguished by a visible system of prosperity.

Some provincial leaders evolved into the emerging noble class with the riches they had been gifted by their emperor via bribery. In order to mark the class distinction between groups, Montezuma I declared that certain physical distinction be enforced by law. Duran writes, "The first four insignia [were] designed unique to the tlaotani and set the death penalty for any nobleman or commoner who entered the palace wearing footgear. Cotton clothing was reserved for the nobility and the commoners were restricted to maguey-fiber mantles that must not fall below the knee."[20] These divisions, based on dress, solidified the difference between classes, and added a new element of 'otherness' to class distinctions.

Citizens were also placed into defined categories. At the top of the hierarchy was the *tlaotani*, followed by the loyal nobles, the province leaders that still exercised individual control of their district, commoners who were responsible for maintaining basic labors (agriculture, trade, or merchant), and finally slaves who lacked basic rights and acted as human sacrifice if they failed to uphold their duties. Although some of these classes existed before stratification occurred, their distinction became more apparent through the widened standards of living. The lower classes suffered, while the imperial elites were treated with superb care. After some archaeological scrutiny, Hodge argues that the general standard of living decreased under Aztec rule when compared to similar demographics.[21] Within the areas that continued local provincial rule, even the resident elite could not escape degenerated conditions.

> Excavations at two sites in Morelos provide functional data to compare pre-imperial conditions to those when under the [Aztec] Empire. These excavations, directed by Michael Smith, revealed that after this regions incorporation into the Aztec empire, the overall standard of living decreased. Additionally, elite and commoner houses became more homogenous, suggesting depression of elite income. [Data] suggests a general decrease in the standard of living after conquest by the Aztec empire, seemingly due to taxation by provincial and imperial powers.[22]

This argument is based on a summation of archaeological evidence found at multiple sites in Morelos. It illustrates that any individual who did not work for the *tloatani* suffered under Aztec rule. This degradation occurred in part because of the quantity of resources that areas were required to provide, at times being expected to contribute more resources than could be spared.

Distinctions can also be seen in the patterns of sustenance between the commoner and the elite. The nobility had a much larger range of food than commoners. The nobles, those who gained wealth through the emperor, enjoyed a diet of wild foul, poultry, and game, whereas the commoner, "...skimmed a floating substance from the surface [of a lake] which was called *tecuitlatl*, 'stone dung'; it was something like cheese, and they squeezed it into cakes... the floating substance [was] algae possibly fostered by pollution from the dense population."[23] While this is an extreme case, mostly reserved for the poorer ranks, it serves to spotlight the differences in class. It seems probable that citizens of the Aztec Empire, who were not of the lavish elite, were discontent with their treatment. These economic conditions likely assisted the conquistadors in their campaign. The Spaniards may have been embraced, with reservation, as a deliverance from oppression. One woman who rose from lowly circumstances by joining the Spanish was Dona Marina.

Dona Marina is an important figure in Latin American history, whose actions

may have been influenced by her poor social status. When discussing Marina, one cannot help but recognize the complex historical position she occupies. Marina's fame originated from acting as a native interpreter and courtesan to Hernan Cortes during the conquest, and there are varied perceptions of who she was. Some Latin Americans refer to her as 'La Malinche', meaning 'the traitor'. They claim that she betrayed the Aztec Empire and helped foreign invaders 'steal their land'. However, her social status, prior to Spanish arrival, should not be overlooked.[24] Marina was born a Coatzacualco princess and sold as a slave to the Tabascans by her mother. Tabasco was a province controlled, and exploited, by the Aztec Empire. One can only theorize the living conditions that slavery under the empire entailed. Marina could speak Mayan and Nauhtl.[25] Nuahtl was the Aztec language, and this greatly benefited the Spanish when they needed to express complicated concepts to the Nuahtl-speaking populations. She also advised the Spaniards on cultural customs and was an incredibly bright woman whose guile was legendary. As Antonio de Solis wrote, "she had a rare liveliness of spirit... and natural gifts that accorded the quality of her birth,"[26] illustrating that Marina's unique character was not dampened by her subjection. Regardless of her servitude, she surpassed her impoverished status by attaining a position of power at Cortes' side.

Some might question why she betrayed 'her people'. It seems logical that Marina would resent an empire that helped enslave her. The arrival of the Spaniards presented an opportunity to rid herself of slavery and possibly acquire wealth. Marina was doubtlessly one of the most important mediators for the Spaniards. The abilities of Cortes combined with the charisma and skills of Marina provided an important advantage to 'La Conquista' (the conquest).

Reinforcing the socio-economic conditions, Michael Harner's, *The Ecological Basis for Aztec Sacrifice* suggests that the reason for human sacrifice in Aztec culture resulted from a shortage of flora and fauna. Harner writes, "As population pressure increased in the Valley of Mexico, wild game supplies became decreasingly available to provide protein for the diet... [and] large scale cannibalism, disguised as sacrifice, was the natural consequence of this situation."[27] With continued increase in population pressure, and fortification from particular religious rite—as was recorded by the Spanish, human sacrifice became incorporated into their dietary habits.

Although this theory has not been well received among most Latin American scholars, Harner's work does present some valuable information. In Aztec society, it seems that these sacrificial victims were viewed as *status items,* though it's unlikely that they were used as a staple to reinforce their deficient subsistence patterns. These 'items' were obtained from enemy warriors that were captured in battle and considered property of the warrior that made the capture. With the importance of human sacrifice in their religion, they were also partially owned by the priests, and the *tlaotani.*

Though Harner's study is a fascinating interpretation on Aztec culture and ecology, the significance of his piece within this essay is the political influence in *how* the Aztec acquired their subjects for sacrifice. They employed non-consolidation tactics that seemed curious to European perspectives of the time period. As William Prescott writes, "This Aztec failure to consolidate in the Old World fashion even puzzled Cortes, who asked Montezuma for an explanation of why he allowed the Tlaxcalans, a constant and bitter enemy of the Aztec, to remain independent. Reportedly, Montezuma replied that it was in order for his

people to obtain sacrifices."[28] They allowed certain ethnic states to remain independent in order to conduct war and obtain enemy warriors for sacrifice. As Jacques Soustelle wrote, "The sovereigns of Mexico, Texcoco, and Tlacopan, and the lords of Tlaxcala, Uexotzinco, and Cholula mutually agreed that, there being no war, they would arrange combats, so that the captives might be sacrificed to the gods."[29]

Sacrificial offerings to the gods were a necessary religious right and extremely important in Aztec theology. The Aztec people were invested in the beliefs of the temporality of human life. As George Valliant states, "The process of worship entailed offering presents, uttering prayers and performing symbolic acts to induce the divine's powers to operate for public benefit… vast powers hovered close, ready to destroy the whole tribe if it ceased its vigilant watch on nature."[30]

This practice benefited the Spanish when they approached Tlaxcala. Similar, to some of Cempoalans' freedoms, the Tlaxcalan people were able and willing to help the Spanish, however were completely sovereign for the aforementioned reasons. This left them free to openly support Cortes' approach to the capital without the repercussions of disloyalty. The Tlaxcalan's provided the largest amount of support and were crucial to the Spanish campaign.

First Contact – The Spanish Invasion

The Spaniards benefited from the weaknesses created by the economic and political instability of the Aztec Empire. During Cortes' campaign, he began by stopping at the northern tip of the Yucutan peninsula, where he found a shipwrecked Geronimo Aguilar. Aguilar had been stranded during a previous expedition by Spain and had learned the local Mayan language during his extended stay.[31] Geronimo Aguilar rejoined with Cortes and traveled to the province of Tabasco. When Cortes arrived at Tabasco, the Tabascans attacked. Defeated, the Tabascan leaders offered twenty slaves, including the aforementioned Dona Marina. Originally Marina could not speak Spanish; however, Cortes had luck because both Marina and Aguilar could speak Mayan. Due to this, Aguilar could help bridge the communication gap and teach Marina to speak Spanish. As a result, Marina was able to speak Spanish within a matter of weeks and was an effective addition to the party. During her time with the Cortes she saved him at least once, worked as a cultural and linguistic liaison, and behaved as Cortes' personal courtesan. One could also argue that she acted as the brains of their operation, because of the influence she held among communities. As is written in a biography of Marina, "Communication meant psychological warfare, as each Indian community tried to decide whether it benefited more by challenging Cortes' advance or by aiding that advance in the hope of throwing off the hated yoke of the Aztecs… Marina rose above the role of interpreter, to that of confidante and fellow strategist."[32] With Marina, Cortes could bridge the communication barrier with the ethnic groups, persuade surrounding groups to join his growing army and, if necessary, engage in psychological warfare to gain an advantage. The most publicized account of Spanish psychological warfare is Montezuma's perception of Cortes acting for or as Quetzalcoatl.

As stated previously, Sara Cohen claims that Montezuma believed Cortes was a representative of Quetzalcoatl. Marina played no small role in this misdirection due to her knowledge of local ideology. Montezuma may have accepted Cortes as this representative because of the fear/respect that the Aztec possessed for their gods and because Quetzalcoatl practiced transubstantiation. Therefore, it

was not ignorant for Montezuma to assume Quetzalcoatl had returned. As the prophecy claimed,

> Quetzalcoatl, the great king would return and take over the ruler ship that he had lost centuries before. Remember that... the human representative of god, Quetzalcoatl, left his kingdom in disgrace and went to the eastern shore, where... he sailed away on a raft of serpents to the east, whence some predicted that he would return one day.[33]

The Aztec may have also believed that Cortes was from Quetzalcoatl because their religion allowed for these superimpositions. Additionally, "Quetzalcoatl, the "Feathered Serpent"... seems to have been widely venerated under different guises..."[34] Thus, the belief that he would return in the guise of Cortes is not inconceivable. Important persons could attain the title of Quetzalcoatl. "Quetzalcoatl [in title] was given to the rulers but also... to the chief priests who exemplified the learning of the time"[35] Therefore, it's not incredible that the Aztec viewed Cortes, who possessed technology never before seen by the natives, as something supernatural or perhaps one who exemplified the "learning of the time".

They were a devout people whose religion pervaded almost every aspect of life. The Aztec gods controlled every aspect of human existence and to tamper with that control would be self-damning. Marina likely knew that the Aztec understood what actions would please their gods and encourage the gods to work in their favor. She had the ability to mislead them.

Cortes and Marina used brain and brawn to invade the Aztec region. They gathered support from tribes, employed their skills of persuasion, and took advantage of tribal animosity to build an army that could challenge the city of Tenochtitlan. Those who remained loyal to the empire were crushed.

As the Spaniards proceeded, they were able to gain access to the interior of Mesoamerica because of the Cempoallan's decision to welcome and assist the foreigners with their expedition. As Cortes wrote in his correspondence to Charles V in Spain,

> "...they were subjects of Mutezuma and... had been subdued by force not long previously. When they heard through me of Your Highness and of Your very great Royal power, they said they wished to become vassals of Your Majesty and my allies, and asked me to protect them from that great lord [Montezuma] who held them by tyranny and by force, and took their children to sacrifice to his idols."[36]

Cortes continued his correspondence by explaining that he incorporated some of the elite Cempoallan chiefs into his party to assist him with overthrowing the Aztec.

The sentiment expressed by the Cempoallan in Cortes' letter was not uncommon. Many tribes were unhappy with the Aztec. The Cempoallans had only recently been incorporated into the Aztec tributary network. Located on the eastern coast of Mesoamerica, they were far from the Basin of Mexico. This means that they were a *strategic* and/or *tributary* inclusion of the empire, and mostly autonomous because of the Aztec system. It also means that they were likely distressed with the treatment they received under the Aztec empire, politically and economically. These factors aided the Spaniards because there was nothing to prevent Cempoallan support. Whether Cortes is biased about why the Cempoallans joined cannot be proven. Perhaps his story is accurate and the Cempoallans viewed the Spaniards

as saviors from subjugation, or perhaps they were intimidated by the Spaniards power. It's likely that a combination of elements led to their decision. Whatever their motivation, the Spanish could not have taken advantage without the ability to safely travel to Tenochtitlan. In order to assist, the Cempoalan's guided the Spanish through Aztec territory. This is when they met the Tlaxcala.

The Tlaxcala were one of the largest autonomous chiefdom groups located near the Basin of Mexico. Some claim that they retained their autonomy by warding off multiple campaigns by the Aztec, though it seems more likely that the Tlaxcalans ensured their autonomy through the aforementioned 'treaty' they had *with* the Aztec.

Upon the arrival of the Spanish, the Tlaxcala were understandably wary, and a small force tested their skill against the Spaniards steel, only to be defeated. The leaders of the area assembled to decide their next action, and chose to ally with the Spanish. According to Tlaxcalan muralist Desiderio Xochitiotzin, in the PBS documentary series, *The Conquistadores: Episode 1, The Fall of the Aztecs*, "...the elder... knew the future of his people was at stake, [and] he believed that this alliance would ensure that his people would not disappear from the map, would not disappear from history."[37] The leaders understood that this next decision was crucial because it could have ultimately led the Tlaxcalans to annihilation if chosen poorly. Indeed, the Tlaxcalan support of Cortes may have helped protect the community from conquest and subjugation.

Tlaxcala's role was pivotal during the remainder of the Spaniard's campaign. The warriors of Tlaxcala joined the Spanish to destroy the Aztec. Over 6,000 soldiers[38] joined the Spanish. It transformed the Spanish from a small group of raiders to an army capable of crushing their opponents. With their new allies, the Spaniards continued their march to the capital. As they proceeded, support continued to gather from other areas that were displeased with Aztec rule. Soon, Hernan Cortes would be graciously welcomed to the capital by Montezuma, who was uncertain if he was their returning lord's representative. Cortes would soon imprison Montezuma inside his own palace and only months later Montezuma would be killed at the hands of his own people. The siege of Tenochtitlan would then begin.[39]

Conclusion

Interestingly, it seems that the Aztec may have recognized some of the injustices they forced others to endure. The Florentine codex tells the story that Montezuma had sent many magicians and enchanters to try and cast "bad magic" against the Spaniards to "stray them from their path". However, they were allegedly drawn away from their mission when they encountered a drunken man along the way. The codex reveals these events,

> They just came up to a drunken man in the road... He ranted at them saying, "What are you still doing here? What more do you want? What more is [Montezuma] trying to do? Did he come to his senses yesterday? Has he just now become a great coward? He has done wrong, he has <abandoned> the people, he has destroyed people, and he has mocked people and deceived them... What is the use of your coming here? Mexico will never exist again; it [is gone] forever. Go on with you; it is no longer there. Do turn around and look at what is happening in Mexico, what is going on." Then they looked back, they quickly looked back, and saw all the temples, the calpulli [buildings], the calmecacs, and all the houses in Mexico burning.[40]

The drunken man may signify the various provinces resentment about their subjugation by the empire. The visions seen by the Aztec shamans could be interpreted as their guilt, as it says; they saw '...all the houses in Mexico burning', as a result of their own actions. This vision infers that the shamans saw the future collapse of their capital for the sins they had committed. Potentially, they saw how their own actions had led them to destruction at the hands of the peoples they fought to enslave. These suggestions are only posed as interpretations of the passage and it's most likely that these 'realizations of guilt' were probably spurred as hindsight because of Spanish presence.

The Triple Alliance was the most powerful empire that Mexico had ever seen. The empire stretched for miles outside the Basin of Mexico, from the eastern Gulf to the western mountains of Sierra Madre Oriental and the Pacific coast. The relative strength and size of the empire was comparable to many of the early civilizations in Latin America. Like these great civilizations, it shares a similar fate. The Aztec fell through a convergence of environmental and cultural factors that affected their economic and political practices; all combined to bring the empire to its knees. The Aztec seemed to have pulled too many outliers together within the area, weakened its external security, and created resentment among the populations they forced into servitude. The Spanish used the empires infamy to turn the tables against the Aztec and exploited the empires' social conditions to their advantage. Some of the events that transpired occurred through luck and good timing; it was a complex convergence of factors that facilitated a successful conquest for a tiny Spanish force and led to the eventual creation of New Spain.

ENDNOTES

1. Hernan Cortes, *Hernan Cortes: Letters from Mexico*, (New York, New York: Grossman Publishers, 1971): 50.

2. Eduardo Noguera, "Sitios de Ocupacion de la periferia de Tenochtitlan," *Anales de Antropologia UNAM*, XI (1974)

3. Sara Cohen, "How the Aztecs Appraised Montezuma," *History Teacher*, 5, no. 1 (1972): 21-30.

4. Douglas Daniel, "Tactical Factors in the Spanish Conquest of the Aztecs," *Anthropological Quarterly*, 65, no. 4 (1992): 187-194.

5. J. Rounds "Lineage, Class, and Power in the Aztec State." *American Ethnologist.* 6. no. 1 (1979): 73-86.

6. Ibid., 74-75.

7. Reference *chinampas*.

8. Rounds, "Lineage, Class, and Power in the Aztec State.", 73-86. Juan de Tovar, *Códice Ramírez, "Relación del origen de los indios que habitan esta Nueva España según sus historias*, (México: Editorial Leyenda, 1944), 39-40.

9. David Carrasco, *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Mesoamerican Cultures: The Civilizations of Mexico and Central America*, (New York, New York: Oxford University Press, Inc., 2001), 69.

10. Ibid., 69.

11. Carlos Santamarina Novillo, *El sistema de dominacion azteca. El Imperio Tepaneca*, (Madrid, ES: Fundacion Universitaria Espanola, 2006).

12. Carrasco, *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Mesoamerican Cultures,* 70-71.

13. Ibid., 69.

14. Rounds, "Lineage, Class, and Power in the Aztec State," 77.

15. Mary G. Hodge, "Archaeological Views of Aztec Culture," *Journal of Archaeological Research*, 6, no. 1 (1998): 195-238.

16. M.E. Smith, and F.F. Berdan, "Archaeology and the Aztec Empire," *World Archaeology*, 2, no. 3 (1992): 353-367.

17. R.E. Blanton, "The Basin of Mexico market system and the growth of empire," *Aztec Imperial Strategies* (1996): 47-84. M.G. Hodge, "Political Organization of the Central Provinces," *Aztec Imperial Strategies* (1996): 17-45.

18. F. F. Berdan , "The Tributary Provinces," *Aztec Imperial Strategies*(1996): 115-135. Smith and Berdan, "Archaeology and the Aztec Empire, "353-367.

19. Arthur J. O. Anderson, and Charles E. Dibble, *Florentine Codex: General History of the Things of New Spain: Book 12-The Conquest of Mexico*, (Salt Lake City, Utah: The School of American Research and The University of Utah, 1975): 27.

20. Diego Duran, *The Aztecs: The History of the Indies of New Spain*, (London, England: Cassell & Company Ltd., 1964). 214-217.

21. Hodge, "Archaeological Views of Aztec Culture," 195-238.

22. T.J. Price, and M.E. Smith, "Archaeological Research at Aztec-Period Rural Sites in Morelos, Mexico, Vol. 1. Excavations and Architecture," Monographs in Latin American Archaeology, 1, no. 4 (1992): 267-292. M.E. Smith , "Archaeological Research at Postclassic Period Sites in Morelos, Mexico, Volume I. Excavations and Architecture, "Monographs in Latin American Archaeology, 1, no. 4 (1992). M.E. Smith, "Hernan Cortes on the size of Aztec cities: Comment on Dobyns, *"Latin American Population History Bulletin*, 25 (1994): 25-27.M.E. Smith, and C. Heath-Smith, "Rural economy in Late Postclassic Morelos: An archaeological study," *Economies and Polities in the Aztec Realm*, 6 (1994): 349-376.

23. Michael Harner, "The Ecological Basis for Human Sacrifice," *American Ethnologist*, 4, no. 1 (1977): 117-135

24. Jerome R. Adams, "Dona Marina (La Malinche) c. 1505-1530 (Mexico) Mother of Conquest," *Liberators and Patriots of Latin America: Biographies of 23 Leaders from Dona Marina (1505-1530) to Bishop Romero (1917-1980)* (1991): 1-12.

25. Adams, "Dona Marina", 1-12

26. Ibid., 3.

27. Harner, "The Ecological Basis for Human Sacrifice," 119.

28. William H. Prescott, *History of the Conquest of Mexico and History of the Conquest of Peru*, (New York, New York: Modern Library, 1936), 50.

29. Jacques Soustelle, *Daily Life of the Aztecs on the Eve of the Spanish Conquest*, (Harmondsworth, Middlesex, England: Penguin, 1964), 114.

30. George C. Valliant, *Aztecs of Mexico: Origin, Rise, and fall of the Aztec Nation*, (New York, NY: Doubleday, Doran & Company, Inc., 1941), 169-170.

31. Hugh Thomas, *Conquest*, (New York, NY: Simon & Schuster Paperbacks, 1993).

32. Adams, "Dona Marina," 6.

33. David Carrasco, and Scott Sessions, *Daily Life of the Aztecs: Peoples of the Sun and Earth*, (Indianapolis, Indiana: Hackett Publishing Company, 1984).

34. Valliant, *Origin, Rise, and fall of the Aztec Nation*, 176.

35. Ibid., 177.

36. Cortes, *Letters from Mexico*, 50-51.

37. Wood, Michael, "Episode 1: The fall of the Aztecs," *Conquistadors*, Web, http://movies.netflix.com/WiPlayer?movieid=70213156&trkid=3325853&t=Conquistadors.

38. Cortes, *Letters from Mexico*, 72. Josefina Garcia Quintana, and Carlos Martinez Marin, *El Lienzo de Tlaxcala*, (Polanco, Mexico: Carton y Papel de Mexico, 1983).

39. Anderson and Dibble, *Book 12-The Conquest of Mexico,*

40. Ibid., 33-34.

REVIEWS

"What is a Civilization, Anyway?"

Caitlin Stokes-Brown

Review by Caitlin Hazelip

How did some societies amass power with elite ruling minorities, while others considerably more egalitarian were left to be disparaged and ultimately conquered by such dominions? Not only does Stokes-Brown effectively demonstrate the consequences of the civilization concept, despite seemingly well intended past anthropological efforts to categorize urbanized persons as living amongst "an advanced state of human society" (p. 2), but she dismantles its terminology completely, by way of her own societal classifications. Why overthrow the old model? Her catalyst for change is engaging, and lies in that the classification, which originated in 1756 and continues to be used to this day, has only reflected "the West's sense of its own superiority"[1] (.She drives this point home by a look at the model taught within fifth and sixth grade classes [2]. From her examination, it is evident that from the start of a Westernized education, one is conditioned to identify the "differences"[3] (between those who are urbanized, and everyone else in the world, rather than celebrate cultural similarities.

Reflecting once again on the seemingly well-intentioned anthropological logic, Brown further stresses how small scale societies have been continually belittled, even well into the twenty-first century. In her paraphrase of cultural characteristics worthy of this classification, according to prehistoric archaeologist V. Gordon Childe, those persons who fit this mold are those whose sciences must be "exact" and "practical", and whose art and architecture can be described as "monumental"[4]. By presenting these characteristics, Stokes-Brown mirrors their condescending undertones. To the observer, it seems that the exclusionary nature of these qualifications seems to strip recognition from societies who have may have successfully adapted to unfavorable environments, whose art may not tower over a horizon, or who have developed unorthodox ways of coping with life. To the author's credit, she does praise Childe for using "positive"[5]) descriptions, yet denounces his continual use of classifications of "savagery" and "barbarism"[6] throughout his career.

Not only are small scale societies affected by the dated civilization concept, but Stokes-Brown contends that the diverse, large scale urban societies at present are not being correctly identified. Thus, they are opposed to the updated version of this model, by anthropologist Elman Service, which replaces civilization with "bureaucratic state" and "industrial society". It seems that she is most accurate in her breakdown of modern cities and governments, that there are still state level monarchies and state level societies that are too different in their governing powers to be considered under one umbrella of categorization, and that multiple types of societies can form a totally new categorization when globally combined[7].

From her descriptions of these groups in the twenty first century, it would seem illogical for one to argue that the proposed solution, to splinter these categories into three types of communities-agrarian civilizations, industrial nations, and modern global societies[8]) is without benefit. Stokes-Brown has succeeded in giving detailed, distinct descriptions of which groups fall into her particular categories, so one is easily able to see how two nations that share close cultural similarities can be just as stratified categorically. Using Service's model, and a hypothetical example, an observer would not be sure under which category the United States would fall. It is bureaucratic like most government-run societies, and also industrialized. Bureaucratic societies, according to the new categorization, fall under Agrarian Civilizations, have monarchal rule, and have "social stratification"[9], in contrast to Industrial Nations, which have a considerable amount of government intervention in their lives, but without monarchs (p. 3). Using the author's criteria, the United States fits more easily into the Industrial category. The third category, Modern Global Society, might include all employees in a single overseas company, in which people from the United States and several other countries are participating, creating a distinct group with its own culture. Stokes-Brown solidifies her defense when stating what defines a civilization, as "an advanced state of human society, in which a high level of culture, science, industry and government have been reached"[10] with a counter argument of why city structures arose in the first place. Hence, the author puts the notion of the intellectual superiority of some societies to rest in her explanation of how most aspects of state level societies emerged. It's not that some societies lack ingenuity, as Stokes-Brown demonstrates, but instead were the result of chain reactions to ongoing changes occurring around them. One example of this postulation could be climate warming which eventually will lead to larger populations needing to adapt specializations to protect their resources[11]. Taking into account these catalysts, one could surmise that highly structured societies could happen anywhere environmental conditions are favorable for grain production, and that Europe could have just as easily become hunting and gathering if it had instead become grasslands or desert.

This author's work would most obviously be useful amongst historical, anthropological and archaeological circles, as the Modern Global Society category would be applicable towards gathering data, making it easier to categorize the new subcultures that have emerged in trans-national corporations and the Internet, while the remaining categories, including the new Agrarian Civilization and Industrial Nations, could be used to classify and study cultures of both past and present. Most significantly, this new model would have the most profound impact on how children learn to view the non-western world. The author's ant analogy is the most vivid example of how no matter the size of a society; they are no less valuable than the dominant forces above them.

ENDNOTES

1.   Cynthia Stokes-Brown, "What is Civilization Anyway, "*Honolulu, HI: World History Connected,* 6 (October 2009):1.
2.   Ibid., 1.
3.   Ibid.,1.
4.   Ibid.,2.
5.   Ibid.,2.

6. Ibid.,2.
7. Ibid.,3.
8. Ibid.,3.
9. Ibid.,3.
10. Ibid.,2.
11. Ibid.,4.

Modern Chinese Stories
Selected and edited by W.J.F. Jenner
[Oxford Paperbacks, 1970,
Translated by W.J.F Jenner and Gladys Yang]
Review by J Oliver Young

Modern Chinese Stories is a collection of short stories written in China during the 1910's through the 1960's. To describe this period as one of cultural and political upheaval would be as imprecise as to say that the Niagara Falls during the same period experienced a vast Charybdis. China has a lengthy history of failed statehoods and dynasty collapse which weave a tapestry of seemingly endless revolutionary warfare. The period covered in the book is when China begins to experience a cohesive revolution. It is a military and a cultural revolution as well as an industrial revolution. Land and people are taken away. Collective agriculture is being implemented. Communists are being assisted by United States Christians. Millions are fleeing ragtag armies. An old cumbersome bureaucracy is being abandoned. The scent of revolution is in the air, but it smells of gunpowder and brutality.

The editor states his purpose for this collection- "over the years, contemporary Chinese writing has so far failed to make any serious impact in parts of the world formed by very different historical and cultural forces." He further states- "the main aim of this collection are to illustrate life and to enable the reader to see some Chinese views of the world." He also states how his collection is different by presenting a focus on rural and more peasant stories than those of the aristocratic class or those of urban-centric writers. Finally, he concludes by stating- "this selection makes no pretense at representing anything more significant than the editor's tastes. There has been no attempt to include all the well-known names."

The first story by Gao Yuanxun, "Liu Eryuan," is a great introductory story for this collection. It hits all the notes. A brawny young man gets employed by the new system. He and the other workers get mistreated by the administrations of the new order. He rebels and leads the other workers in a bloody revolt. It is a simple story that mythologizes a prominent leader of the Nian rebels. It makes him appear to be a down-to-earth man of the people. This appearance is painted by parts of the story which mention his voracious eating habits and his brutishness. Also included is the passage- "'Kill the misbegotten devils.' shouted the common people, angry too." this connects the hero in every way with the common man.

The second story also is a heroic depiction of another rebel leader told by Guo Tongde. Here, instead of brawn, this leader uses his cleverness. Again it is Nian rebels being celebrated while their enemies the Qing forces chase them. Instead of slaughtering their oppressors, the rebel leader ingeniously employs concealed

hornets and a hidden gunpowder bomb. Both are stories most Western readers can enjoy for their celebration of the rebel and straightforward plots.

The next stories from Lu Xun provide an excellent contrast to the first two stories. In *Kong Yiji*, Xun presents us with a seemingly autobiographical account of a boy who goes to work at a tavern. The story seems straight forward as a depiction of town life for the peasantry. However, the editor in describing it - "shows how decrepit and moribund the traditional Confucian culture was, and does this far more effectively and economically than a long polemical article might have done." It was only after I had read some of the other stories that I began to realize the culturally obscured message of this story. Basically, the Confucian system had failed one of its potential scholars. He had not passed its test and because of that he had no status in his community. He was left to beg and steal. His status was so low that a child of twelve who was too dim witted to properly ration the wine for the workers and was demoted to only warming the wine could openly ridicule the man. Xun continues his commentary on the Confucian order with the short story, *My Old Home*, a delicious take on the proverb- "one can never truly go home again." With masterful strokes the writer depicts how the new and old orders are still separating people who should be friends. How the elevation of one class over another causes all the neighbors to be petty thieves. The author does not know where this will lead and he concludes with this passage-

"As I dozed, a stretch of jade-green seashore spread itself before my eyes, and in the deep blue sky above hung a round, golden moon. Hope could neither be said to exist, I thought, nor not to exist. It was like roads crossing the earth. For the earth, of course, had no roads to begin with; but when many men pass one way, a road is made."

The stories continue painting a picture of the Chinese struggling a national order and identity. The brutality of everyday life is brought home again and again, but nowhere more stoically and desperately than in the story by Rou Shi, "The Slaves' Mother." Nothing good happens to this "hero" of the story. She is a complete victim of the Confucian order and the traditional accepted role of peasant women. Her husband sells her to pay off his debts. She is denied both of her sons by two different husbands. The horror of her situation is graphically conveyed by the scene in which she is too exhausted from childbirth to stop her husband from murdering their newborn daughter by drowning in hot water.

Yet against this bleak backdrop of revolution's blunders and cruelty, other stories provide a real taste for the "Revolution" with a capital "R". Guro Moruo writes a short story called, "Double Performance." It is an account of what happened when the armies of the Northern Expedition had taken the city of Wuchang. Here the author, who writes in the first person, is asked by his superior to address a crowd of communists fresh from their victory. The event is organized at the Y.M.C.A. The organizers were not impressed with an underling being sent instead of the esteemed revolutionary they had hoped to hear. Impression and status is emphasized throughout the writing. The leader of the Y.M.C.A. is insistent on impressing on the Chinese that their victory is a "Christian" victory. He goes on at length to link all of the leaders of the revolution to "Christianity" and says their victory was a victory for Christ. The second in command mentally objects to this, but waits his turn and addresses the crowd saying:

"Because I had realized that we Chinese were in no need of baptism. Ever since the Opium War we had all been Christians from birth, and we spent our whole lives following Christ's teachings. Christ said, for example, that you should love your neighbor and even your enemy. If someone stripped you of your overcoat you should present him with your shirt...Some people have stolen Hong Kong, so we insisted on letting them lease Kowloon. Some others had snatched Vietnam, and we insisted on giving them the Vietnam-Yunnan railway. Others had occupied Korea, and we offered them Manchuria and Mongolia. We Chinese were more Christian than any Christians."

He then took a deliberate shot at his "Christian" revolutionary. He suggested-

"However, I was sorry for him for being stuck in Hankow like Jesus nailed to the cross, unable to use his divine powers. He really should have gone to London, Paris, New York or Tokyo to make those camels shrink till they were thin enough to go through the needle's eye."

Modern Chinese Stories is an excellent collection. For years, I have wondered why the Chinese went along with the Mao Revolution. I wanted to know why they attacked their intellectuals, scientists and artists. These stories help to explain the collapse of the Confucian order. I understand better the entrenched bureaucracy and the revolution necessary to overturn such a long standing tradition. A wonderful and horrific painting of everyday life on the farm and in the revolution is conveyed by this book. The editor is very successful in bringing out the reality of life during this period. I hope others get a chance to read it as well. Still, after reading these stories, I cannot help but remember the lyric to the Beatles song "Revolution"-

But when you want money
for people with minds that hate
All I can tell is brother you have to wait.'

"Interregional Interaction in Southern Africa: Zhizo and Leopard's Kopje Relations in Northern South Africa, Southwestern Zimbabwe, and Eastern Botswana, AD 1000 to 1200"

John A. Calabrese
[*The African Archaeological Review*,
Vol. 17, No. 4 (Dec., 2000), pp. 183-210]
Review by Erich Kirby

The traditional view of the interactions between Zhizo and Leopards' Kopje ceramic using groups between 1000 and 1200 CE in the area of modern day South Africa, Zimbabwe, and Botswana has been one of hostility. It was generally thought that the interactions between the two groups were limited to violence or wife trading or a combination of the two. In his article "Interregional Interaction

in Southern Africa: Zhizo and Leopard's Kopje Relations in Northern South Africa, Southwestern Zimbabwe, and Eastern Botswana, AD 1000 to 1200" John A. Calabrese says that it is time to rethink this view.

Archaeological evidence in the past led many to think that relations between two groups, named for the type of ceramics they used, the Zhizo and Leopard's Kopje, were actively hostile from the eleventh to the thirteenth century. It was thought that Leopard's Kopje users violently displaced their Zhizo counterparts forcing them to move into modern day eastern Botswana. This simple violent replacement of one group by another has been used to explain a number of historical trends such as language or economic change. In this case it is used to explain the appearance of Zhizo ceramics in the Shashi-Limpopo area where once there had only been Leopard's Kopje ceramics. Like other violent displacement theories this one has been challenged. John A. Calabrese says that the situation is much more complicated than once believed.

Calabrese posits that in the Shashi-Limpopo area there was cohabitation between Zhizo and Leopard's Kopje groups at the beginning of the eleventh century and into the late thirteenth century if not later. He admits that he does not have enough information to make a detailed hypothesis of interactions between the two groups but states that "… such interactions were frequent, regular, and not altogether hostile." He suggests that interactions in the greater Sashi-Limpopo and eastern Botswana area may be much more complex, and less hostile, than once thought.

To support his theory of the complex social and political interactions of Zhizo and Leopard's Kopje using groups Calabrese turns to archaeological evidence in the Shashi-Limpopo area. He mainly looks at ceramic evidence from Leokwe Hill in the Northern Province of South Africa. The area is around 80 square kilometers, and is divided into four areas, A through D. Sites A and B are the only ones to be extensively excavated and are, subsequently, the regions on which he focuses his research. A number of objects have been found at those sites including pottery, non-pottery ceramics, metal objects, beads, and ground stone. Nine ceramic samples were taken from the sites for radiocarbon data, two from A and seven from B. The results from A seem to prove the old theory right with Leopard's Kopje ceramics dating from the thirteenth century, but the results from B is surprisingly contradictory. They show that the Zhizo style was also in use into the thirteenth century. This can only mean one thing; Zhizo and Leopard's Kopje using groups lived in the same area of Shashi-Limpopo, but not together, into the thirteenth century. Had the traditional theory been correct then there should be no Zhizo ceramics in the area after the eleventh century.

The evidence casts doubt on the traditional theory of interactions between Zhizo and Leopard's Kopje using groups during the eleventh and twelfth century. Evidence from one dig site is hardly conclusive enough to completely disprove the traditional theory but that is not what Calabarese set out to do when writing this article. He simply wanted to show that there is evidence to the contrary and there needs to be more research done on the subject. He challenges the old theory but does not really put forward a new one. Perhaps someone will read this article and be spurned into action to do just that.

This article provides an interesting discussion regarding the relations of two groups once thought to be hostile to each other. It is interesting how often the first theory to explain historical changes is often a violent one. It was once

Half of a Yellow Sun

Chimamanda Adichie

[New York: Anchor Books, 2007]

Review by Deandra Jackson

The Biafran war was a civil war in Nigeria during the mid-1960s. It was fought by the Igbos of Eastern Nigeria and the Hausa of Northern Nigeria. The Igbos were looked down upon by the Hausa. In the Hausas' eyes the Igbos were taking their jobs in the north; in the Igbos' eyes they were simply making a living, trying to survive. The Hausa started to massacre the Igbos, forcing them to move back east. Colonel Ojukwu brought the Igbos together and seceded from the north in 1967 thus the birth of Biafra. Nigeria didn't want Biafra to be an independent country, especially when it sits on a vast amount of oil. Many lives were lost due to war; the blockade of supplies caused millions to die of starvation, the majority of who were women and children.

The Biafran war is seldom heard of because it was easily overlooked due to the Vietnam War. Lives of soldiers, women and children of Nigeria were lost. As a part of history, knowledge is isolated with those that partake in current events while they are happening. Literature, however, can bring the knowledge worldwide and for generations to come. Through the writings of historians, everyone worldwide can gain knowledge and get a better perspective from all angles as to any aftermath and legacy of those who died or survived this civil war. As a result, a decision can be made based on the principle that "justice must at all times be tempered with mercy."

It wasn't until reading a novel called *Half a Yellow Sun* by Chimamanda Adichie that I had even heard of Biafra. Through her words, she allows her readers to experience Biafra in 1967.

Half a Yellow Sun is a symbol of hope to the people of Biafra. *Half a Yellow Sun* is a novel about the Nigerian/Biafran civil war told through the eyes of three characters diversely separated by social class. The reader is first introduced to a poor house boy named Ugwu. Ugwu becomes a house boy for Odenigbo, a mathematics professor. Odenigbo's mistress (and later wife) Olanna is another main character who is an Igbo women born of wealth and is English educated. Later in the story you find out that Olanna has a non-identical twin sister named Kainene. Kainene forms a relationship with a British white man by the name of Richard. Richard is another important character who is an aspiring writer and is fascinated with Igbo/Biafran art.

I believe that Adichie wanted to open others' eyes onto Africa. When we think of Africa, we tend to focus on the lower class with starving children, poverty and people struggling with HIV/AIDS. All of these things are televised, but at the time, most of the world was more focused on the Vietnam War, thus, overlooking the middle and upper class that, during this time, were forced from their easy, comfortable lives into poverty and starvation. The war brought massive massacres of the Igbo people and due to the blockage of necessities such as clothing and food a lot of innocent women and children starved to death while husbands and brothers were being brutally murdered in the war. I believe a lot of what happened in Nigeria was overlooked because other countries were more focused on the Vietnam War. Adichie wanted to make people aware of the horrific disasters that occurred during

the 60's in Nigeria and *Half a Yellow Sun* does just that.

The war is shown through the eyes of three complete strangers whose lives Adichie creatively intertwines. The story is set during the time when Eastern Nigeria wanted to become an independent nation, but it focuses on how fighting for their independence changed the lives of many people and how their morals were challenged. Class and race play a big part of this story and also shows how love can make everything more complicated.

Adichie organizes her story which begins during the early 60's just before the war. She describes the war and slowly starts to bring Olanna, Richard and Ugwu's lives together. Her story purposely jumps to the late 60's telling each character's life during the middle of the war. Olanna and Odenigbo now are raising a little girl by the name of Baby while Kainene and Richard are taking their relationship to the next level. During this time the characters reference things that had happened in the mid 60's, keeping the reader curious as to what happened in the previous years. Lives are lost and Richard, an aspiring writer, wanting to write about Igbo art, finds himself having difficulty obtaining the information he needs because of his appearance; he is white. Nigerians did not trust white men because they felt that white men just looked down on them and did not understand what they were going through. But later in the story Richard picks up on the Igbo language and starts to refer to himself as a Biafran. With the stress and fear of the war and the secrets lost in the 60's Olanna and Odenigbo are struggling to keep their relationship alive. I believe that Adichie wants the reader to pick up on the fact that Baby calls Odenigbo dad while she calls Olanna momma Ola. Eventually the reader is able to go back in time to the mid 60's where all secrets are revealed. During the beginning of the war, fear and stress weigh heavily on the people of Biafra and relationships were tested. The reader finds out that Odenigbo had an affair with his mother's house girl and wound up fathering her child. He and Olanna had been trying to have a child and eventually decide to raise the little girl and Olanna came up with the idea to have the baby call her momma Ola so as not to get her confused with her birthmother. Olanna eventually hits rock bottom with Odenigbo and on a drunken night, regrettably, sleeps with Richard. This book is full of lust and betrayal, regrets and loses. I like the fact that Adichie delays the fact that Baby wasn't hers because when you find out, it just makes your heart sink because Olanna and Ugwu have a great relationship with Baby and she and Odenigbo tried so hard to have children that you just want Baby to be her biological child.

Chimamanda Adichie has an amazing gift with writing and detail. *Half a Yellow Sun* is like a soap opera that you cannot put down. Before reading this book I had never heard of Biafra or even known that Nigeria had a civil war. This book really opened my eyes to non-western cultures. Adichie writes a book within this book and the title will stick with me forever, "the world was silent when we died". At first I didn't really focus on the words until close to the end of the book when a colonel asks Richard to write to newspapers around the world because they will listen to white man in Biafra before they would to an educated black man; his argument for writing to the newspapers was "the world has to know the truth, because they simply cannot remain silent while we die." The world was silent when they died, and through the eyes of Ugwu, Olanna and Richard they will be remembered.

Supreme Power:
Franklin Roosevelt vs. The Supreme Court

Jeff Shesol

[New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2010]

Review by Gabriel Brown

Jeff Shesol's book, *Supreme Power: Franklin Roosevelt vs. The Supreme Court*, is a work retelling the epic struggle between the 1933-1944 Roosevelt Administration and the United States Supreme Court justices of the same era. The book itself is organized almost like a novel, with chapters compellingly titled and hinting at what's next to come. With over 600+ pages, the work tends to delve into deep detail regarding the events surrounding the feud.

In writing *Supreme Power*, it seems clear that Jeff Shesol wants to draw a parallel with this event to events in the present. The book seriously analyzes the perspective in how the U.S. Supreme Court is viewed by the population. This includes examining the aura of secularism citizens perceived the Court to exude, the growing politicization of the justices, the role of the Supreme Court in regards to the other branches of government, and the power the other two branches could impose on it. In our own time, these issues are just as important. No constitutional provision exists limiting the number of Supreme Court justices, just as no such provision existed in Roosevelt's time. So the legal and ethical questions in regards to "packing the court" still arise to this day.

Perhaps more important, Shesol analyzes the political role of the Supreme Court. Up until Roosevelt's imminent first-term electoral victory, the Court had been viewed almost as a secular priesthood above the political machinations of the two major parties and branches of government. However, with Roosevelt's declaration at a political rally that the U.S. Supreme Court was under Republican control, the sacred status of the Court was called into question which embroiled it in the political fight.

This is applicable to our own time, as we constantly see and hear about political maneuvering regarding the U.S. Supreme Court and whatever administration resides in the White House. Liberals and conservatives jockey for a seat once a justice steps down or dies, and many suspect the Court of ruling on important constitutional issues on the basis of party ideology, rather than unbiased review.

A final issue raised by Shesol is the nature of the U.S. Constitution. Conservative members of the Court during the 1930's, as described by Shesol, viewed the Constitution as immutable and very specific in what it implied. Liberals and progressives, however, viewed the Constitution as a "living" document that could bend to the needs of the citizenry (such as during the debilitating Great Depression). As the core of our system of governance, the nature of the Constitution and the powers it bestows is just as important today as it was during the Roosevelt Administration. Today we face a similar financial crisis in the making, as many believe, and the citizenry is once again looking for leadership from both federal and state governments. How the Supreme Court interprets the wording and design of the Constitution may affect what these aforementioned governments can do in the face of crisis.

Jeff Shesol does an impressive job stating these points in *Supreme Power.* While, obviously, Franklin Roosevelt fails in his bid to control the Supreme Court by packing it with an additional six justices, the president's New Deal initiatives eventually triumph legally, despite previous setbacks. The Constitution proves to be pliant enough to allow such initiatives to thrive, yet specific enough to resist unprecedented and radical changes.

I completely agree with Shesol's goals in writing this book. I believe it is highly important we understand history, and in particular our own history. Few people have a clear understanding of the role of government, let alone the Supreme Court and its relationship to the rest of the government. Shesol's book, however, could rectify this. Clearly and descriptively written in a story-driven model that has one turning the pages in suspense, Shesol's book would surely keep the attention of most.

I, personally, thoroughly enjoyed *Supreme Power.* As a history buff, especially in regards to the 1930's to 1950's, I found the book riveting and easily applicable to our own political and financial situation. I would recommend this book to anyone who has an interest in the way our government functions and who, frankly, enjoys a good political battle once in a while. I highly recommend *Supreme Power* in an academic setting, such as a college, as supplemental reading. Given its novel-like design, I feel most students would find the task of reading and comprehending its contents rather easy and enjoyable.

Aden & the Indian Ocean Trade: 150 Years in the Life of a Medieval Arabian Port
Roxani Eleni Margariti

[Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2007]

Review by Andrew Boehringer

Aden & the Indian Ocean Trade: 150 Years in the Life of a Medieval Arabian Port, is an analysis of the port city of Aden, which is in current day Yemen. This study by Margariti is an overview of a Muslim trade network up to the 7th/13th century, linking Aden to what is current day Africa and the Indian Ocean. Margariti often uses a dual notation for dates, referring to both the date in the Hijri calendar and the Gregorian calendar. This most likely stems from Margariti's desire to "confront terminologies and periodizations that stem from Eurocentric perspectives" as stated in the introduction. Aden was interconnected with what is now considered Africa through religion, trade, and empires such as the Ayyubid Empire, which ruled over much of the Arabian coast and Northeast Africa in the 12th and 13th centuries.

Margariti begins by describing the geography of Aden. Aden was an excellent port city with large natural harbor created by an extinct volcano, as well as many small inlets, all devoid of reefs and shoals. It was also situated on an insular peninsula, which made the city easily defensible from the mainland. In addition, Aden had a steady supply of salt from the mainland nearby, although Margariti states that archeologists have yet to find the exact source. Most settlement on

the peninsula was around the crater itself, which was natural to the surrounding terrain and the trade from the harbor.

Margariti argues that Aden charged customs on imports and exports. Taxes were about the same for both, and despite a Muslim law that stated taxes were to be higher for non-Muslims, taxes did not differ much based on religion. While there was trade with Aden itself, much of the taxes were paid for the right to trade in the Indian Ocean. Examples of exports from Aden were dates, brazilwood, and lac destined for Egypt as well as copper, iron, pepper, textiles, and lead destined for India. When traders imported goods that Aden usually exported, such as pepper and iron, they received a higher import tax than other imported goods. Margariti notes that the higher tax on certain imports was to stifle competition. Conversely, a needed staple food such as wheat was often exempt from taxes when imported to Aden.

Margariti does an excellent job of analyzing the history of the port city of Aden, using extensive primary sources, as well as archeological evidence. Much of Margariti's primary sources come from letters or logs written by traders such as Ibn al-Mujawir and customs officials in the customs house of the city. The city of Aden has been consistently inhabited since its beginnings as a trade center, and this is likely why these documents have been preserved. Margariti uses archeological evidence to outlay the buildings and walls surrounding the city, as well as to prove that people in the port of Aden had a significant diet of fish and dugong.

Margariti does an excellent job of placing Aden in a historical context outside the norm. Rather than viewing Aden as a city in itself, Margariti links Aden to Ethiopia, Egypt, Arabia, and the greater Indian Ocean. Margariti shows the techniques of maritime trade and the various cultures and religions coming through the same port. This book focuses more on the economic aspect of trade, but would be greatly enhanced if it focused on the cultural impact and exchange as well.

Overall *Aden and the Indian Ocean Trade* is an excellent historiography of a natural port city. Margariti does a good job of combining many facts into a readable format, using charts to demonstrate trade goods and taxes when appropriate. Margariti constantly makes one look at the city from non-western eyes both in the facts that are pointed out, and in the context that facts are given.

Officers
Alpha Beta Phi Chapter
2011-2012

James Lupo..................................President Ex-officio

Alexandra Barrett......................President

Caitlin Stylinski Hazelip ....Vice President

Matthew Chalfant......................Treasurer

Vincent Fraley............................Historian

Shane Winslow ....Secretary

Kevin Leibach.............................Journal Editor

Kari Becker ....Wellness Officer

2011-20

XX