

Perspectives in HISTORY

ALPHA BETA PHI
CHAPTER
PHI ALPHA THETA

**JOURNAL OF THE ALPHA BETA PHI
CHAPTER OF PHI ALPHA THETA**

**Perspectives
in
HISTORY**

EDITOR

Roger C. Adams

ASSISTANT EDITORS

Wylie D. Jones

Debra Beckett Weigold

ADVISOR

James A. Ramage

Perspectives in History is a semi-annual publication of the Alpha Beta Phi Chapter of Phi Alpha Theta. Manuscripts are welcome from students and faculty.

Send all articles, essays and book reviews to:

Northern Kentucky University
History/Geography Department
Highland Heights, KY 41076
copyright 1989

CONTENTS

Perspectives in History

Vol. V No. 1, Fall, 1989

FOREWORD

1 *Roger C. Adams*

LETTER FROM THE PRESIDENT

3 *Debra Beckett Weigold*

ARTICLES

5 The Red River Campaign: How the
 Battle that Wasn't Secured the
 Canadian Northwest
 W. Michael Ryan

19 Women and Divorce in the 1920s
 Andrea Ramage

31 Ohio River Transportation: A Look
 at the Past and Glimpse of the Future
 Roger C. Adams

39 African-American Contributions
 in Medicine
 Jeffrey B. Shelton

43 W.E.B. DuBois and the Founding
 of the NAACP
 David C. Pritchard

49 OFFICERS

51 MEMBERS

FOREWORD

I am deeply honored to be editor of Alpha Beta Phi Chapter's *Perspectives in History*, especially as this is the fifth anniversary volume of the journal. The quality of the scholarship in these articles is quite apparent through each author's enthusiasm for their respective topics.

We were saddened by the loss of Jeffery A. Smith, who was inducted into the chapter in April of 1989. An annual memorial award for the best student article published in the journal has been established in his name. Lisa A. Stamm's article, "The German-American Population of Northern Kentucky during World War I: The Victimization of an Ethnic Group and Its Culture" has been selected as the first recipient of this prestigious award from Volume 4, Number 2.

Speaking for the chapter as well as myself, I cannot thank Dr. James Ramage enough for his untiring devotion toward all facets of the chapter. Thanks also to Ms. Shirley Raleigh, History and Geography's Academic Department Assistant, Miss Ivy Washington and Mr. Keith Johnson for their help in making this publication possible.

Best wishes for a successful year,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Roger C. Adams". The ink is dark and the signature is fluid, with a large, stylized 'R' and 'A'.

Roger C. Adams
Editor

LETTER FROM THE PRESIDENT

I have always received much enjoyment from the study of history. Some pleasures are enough in themselves, and our lives would be poorer without them. Being asked to serve as President of Alpha Beta Phi Chapter of Phi Alpha Theta is an honor I will not soon forget.

This has been an especially full year for Phi Alpha Theta members. A few of our activities took us on road trips. Members attended the 55th annual meeting of the Southern Historical Association in Lexington, on November 9, 1989. In January 1990 members ventured to the home of member Rebecca Schroer to hear a lecture by Dr. Edward Otten on Japanese swordmaking. Thank you again for a most informative evening. In April members attended the Regional meeting of Phi Alpha Theta at Centre college in Danville, Kentucky. Member and current editor of *Perspectives in History* Roger Adams presented his paper entitled "Panic on the Ohio: The Defense of Cincinnati, Covington, and Newport, September 1862."

In the chapter we were all saddened to hear of the death of member Jeffery A. Smith. We wish to thank Dr. Michael Washington for the suggestion to set up a memorial award in Jeffery's name. The Jeffery A. Smith Award will be presented annually for the most outstanding student article submitted to the chapter journal by an undergraduate student. The booksale was a huge success due to the contributions and hard work of many people. Our annual Initiation and Banquet was held on April 10th. This year's speaker was Susan Lyons Hughes who presented her lecture entitled "Corsets, Hoops, and Snoods: 19th Century Women's Clothing." It was an intellectually stimulating event as well as an enjoyable social experience.

Finally, there are those to whom our chapter is most grateful and without whose help none of our accomplishments would be possible. I wish to thank Ms. Shirley Raleigh for her assistance in tasks too numerous to mention in such a short space. And I know I speak for all members when expressing gratitude to our faculty advisor Dr. James Ramage for the assistance he has provided us. He is the example of excellence and high standards our chapter strives for.

In all, it has been a great year for Alpha Beta Phi. I wish next year's officers even more success.

Sincerely yours,

Debra Beckett Weigold
President, Alpha Beta Phi Chapter

The Red River Campaign: How The Battle That Wasn't Secured The Canadian Northwest

by

W. Michael Ryan

Large issues are sometimes decided by small forces. Such was the case with the Red River campaign of 1870 in Canada; a campaign which proved to be the last British military expedition on the North American continent. While the eyes of the world were riveted on the titanic clashes occurring along the French border during the summer of 1870, a comparatively tiny military force under the command of Colonel Garnet Wolseley slowly moved 1,200 miles across uninhabited, inhospitable wilderness toward Ft. Garry on the Red River in Manitoba. Despite its monumental significance, the Franco-Prussian War of 1870-1871 ultimately proved a mere prelude to a far more horrible struggle less than fifty years later; the successful Red River campaign, conversely, sealed the destinies of a vast province, a race of people, and the territorial boundaries of North America. Seldom in history have such momentous results flowed from such little application of force, such small expenditure in treasure, and so little loss of human life.

The Red River expedition is normally neglected by both British and American historians, primarily because its bloodless nature captured no penny press headlines and its dearth of violent combat renders it dull to popular military historians who prefer to relate a more sanguinary tale. Attempting to rescue it from obscurity therefore requires an intense effort to peer behind mere newspaper headlines and secondary accounts focused on human carnage. Only by viewing it in appropriate historical context can the dramatic impact of the Red River campaign be perceived.

The backdrop to these decisive events was formed by the tumultuous and tortuous relationship among Great Britain, Canada, and the United States during the decade of the 1860s¹. The British North America Act of 1867 created the semi-autonomous Dominion of Canada within the British Empire. This half-way step toward national unification and sovereignty was itself undertaken partly as a result of fear of American expansionism.² As early as July 1864, William E. Gladstone, who became Prime Minister of Britain in 1868, had recognized that the conclusion of the American Civil War would mark the arrival of "a very great crisis; by far the greatest in the history of British North America. It is of necessity one in which England is seriously involved."³

Despite our current simplistic view that these three countries could never seriously consider hostilities with one another, that phenomenon is less than a century old. In fact, all rhetoric and propaganda concerning the "undefended border" notwithstanding, Canada, the United States, and Britain retained war plans for North America until the very eve of World War Two.⁴ During the 1860s the

Dr. W. Michael Ryan is Associate Professor of History at Northern Kentucky University and a member of Phi Alpha Theta. From 1985 to 1989 he was Chairperson, Department of History and Geography.

possibilities of war were all too real. The *Trent* Affair had led to the dispatch of 18,000 British regular troops to North America⁵ and by the mid-1860s the Fenian Brotherhood was constantly hatching plots to invade Canada with Civil War veterans and hold her hostage in return for the independence of dear old Ireland. Despite these provocations, Gladstone's Liberal ministry in power after 1868 decided to withdraw all British regulars from Quebec and Ontario for reasons of economy, peace, and anti-colonialism.

It is therefore understandable that in the immediate post-Civil War era a wary and only half unified Canada viewed with justifiable suspicion the ardently expansionistic intentions of a burgeoning United States of America. By the mid-1860s, not only had the Union forged one of the world's most formidable military machines, but a victorious and euphoric United States government cast covetous eyes on its potentially vulnerable northern neighbor. With memories of American invasions during the War of 1812 still fresh, with Fenian incursions a reality, and with fear that the mother country Britain might not defend her borders, it was only natural that Canadian leaders trembled at bombastic proclamations such as Secretary of State William Seward's boast before a Boston audience in 1867: "I know that Nature designs that this whole continent, not merely these thirty-six states, shall be, sooner or later, within the magic circle of the American Union."⁶ Manifest Destiny was becoming megalomania.

Further complicating this scenario were the thorny issues of the United State's *Alabama* claims case against Britain, territorial disputes over areas like San Juan island near Vancouver, and the seemingly intractable fisheries disputes. While negotiations dragged on during the first years of the Grant administration, numerous American politicians seriously proposed that all could be resolved if only Canada were ceded to the United States! Even Hamilton Fish, Grant's Secretary of State, dangled this annexationist proposition at every opportunity. After all we had recently outflanked our northern neighbor by purchasing Alaska, so why not conclude all territorial disputes in North America by simply swallowing Canada? So ran the logic of those favoring expansionism.⁷

The catalyst for resolving this potentially explosive international situation was provided by a native rebellion in Winnipeg, Manitoba which began in 1869. The Hudson's Bay Company, which had controlled this vast and vague territory known as Prince Rupert's Land under a charter granted by Charles II in the 17th century, had recently been prodded into selling this domain—larger than all of Europe—to the Dominion of Canada for 300,000 pounds. This transfer evoked fear in the inhabitants of the sparsely populated province, especially in the *metis*. The *metis* were a mixed blood ethnic group with Indian and French lineage who had constituted a majority of the population in Manitoba for generations.⁸ Primarily a nomadic and pastoral people, the *metis* were renowned as fierce frontier fighters and bitter rivals of the Sioux Indians in the annual buffalo hunt. These mixed blood people were indeed a race apart. Neither wholly Indian nor completely European, they had developed a unique way of life which encouraged them to think of themselves as an entirely separate group or even, in their own parlance, the "New Nation."⁹ Roman Catholic and French-speaking, the *metis* naturally feared the

consequences to their freedom and very way of life if Manitoba were absorbed and inundated by vast numbers of Anglo-Protestant, sedentary settlers from Ontario province. Frustrated by the failure of Ottawa to provide guarantees of their status and culture, in the Autumn of 1869 the *metis* rebelled in Winnipeg and seized the major military installation in the area known as Ft. Garry, located at the confluence of the Red and Assiniboine Rivers. Because of its commanding location, its stout walls, its heavy cannon and military stores, whoever controlled Ft. Garry controlled the entire Red River settlement. With this outpost as headquarters and supported by about 400 armed men, the *metis* declared a provisional government in November 1869, which became known as the Republic of the Northwest.

The leader of this rebellion was the brilliant and charismatic Louis Riel. Twenty-five years old in 1869, he had been educated in Montreal and therefore became a natural leader among his fellow *metis*. Photographs and the descriptions of observers reveal an impressive man, nearly six feet tall, with penetrating dark eyes glowing from a face dramatically framed by a luxuriant black beard. Broad shouldered and extremely articulate, he had the physical presence and personality which so often and seemingly naturally command leadership. Prone to bouts of melancholy and renowned for stubborn personal pride, Riel was nevertheless destined to lead his beloved people during this fateful period. He shared with them a mystical devotion to Catholicism and the unfettered life of the plains.¹⁰

For much of the next year Riel walked a tightrope between outright treason and accommodation. Although the Union Jack initially flew over Ft. Garry as a symbol of loyalty to Queen Victoria, a new rebel standard composed of a fleur-de-lis and a shamrock on a white background also flapped in the cold breeze during the winter of 1869-1870. This combination of French and Irish symbolism was particularly worrisome to Canadian authorities because Riel's chief advisor was William O'Donoghue, a reputed Fenian who was not averse to either the use of violence or incorporation into the United States. Equally bothersome to Riel and frightening to Canadian patriots were the machinations of the so-called "American Party" in Winnipeg who urged him to join the United States. Encouraged by this chaotic situation Washington even dispatched James Wickes Taylor¹¹ as a secret agent to foster annexation. Canadian and imperial authorities, even the pacific Gladstone, were forced to take this threat seriously since Winnipeg was separated from Ottawa by the Laurentian shield and was located only 60 miles from the American border and 100 miles from a railroad which led directly to St. Paul. Geography and economic links therefore seemed to portend inevitable American annexation unless the rebellion were crushed.

Highly placed American politicians from the upper Northwest were particularly vociferous in demanding that the State Department actively abet the Riel rebellion with money, arms, and possibly troops as a prelude to annexation. Senator Ramsey of Minnesota offered the following resolution on the floor of the Senate on 1 February 1870:

That the Committee on Foreign Relations be instructed to consider the expediency of recommending to the President of the United States that this Govern-

ment shall tender its mediation between the Dominion of Canada and the people of the Red River district for the adjustment of existing difficulties and the establishment of responsible government in the territory included in the charter of the Hudson Bay Company.¹²

Even more pretentiously, in April Michigan's Zachariah Chandler rose to resolve that negotiations be commenced immediately for the annexation of "that district of the country to the United States as a Territory or as a State."¹³ Sentiments were clear and growing more ambitious by the month. The British Foreign and Colonial Offices shared a mutual concern and horror when their ambassador to the United States forwarded a printed copy of another resolution introduced into the House of Representatives which requested that the president open negotiations for the admission of all Canadian provinces into the Union.¹⁴

Throughout the ten months of his leadership Riel, despite a reputation as a man of mercurial temperament, usually pursued a moderate course in a futile attempt to unite English and French, Protestant and Catholic, English-speaking mixed bloods and French-speaking *metis* in support of his government. While the wily Canadian Prime Minister Sir John MacDonald and his associates labored to construct a political solution which would placate the rebels, Riel sincerely hoped for a compromise which would guarantee *metis* rights in a new province of Manitoba. Although he harbored no dislike of Americans, he was striving merely to postpone incorporation into the dominion until firm assurances were received from Ottawa concerning the rights of the natives. Unfortunately the fissures within the Red River settlement itself created chaos and restiveness. Several armed encounters between English and *metis* settlers forced Riel to imprison members of the truculent "Canada First" party led by Dr. John Schultz,¹⁵ which in turn led to daring escape attempts from Ft. Garry and finally to Riel's greatest and ultimately fatal blunder: in March, 1870 he acquiesced in the execution of one Thomas Scott, a Presbyterian who had arrived in Canada nine years earlier from the bigoted religious cauldron of Ulster and who vigorously opposed the Riel rebellion. Following a series of incidents in which the prisoner Scott had verbally abused and threatened his guards, Riel convened an *ad hoc* tribunal which summarily sentenced Scott to death by a vote of 3 to 2. This sentence was gruesomely carried out the next noon by a *metis* firing squad which botched the job so badly that a wounded and writhing Scott was administered the *coup de grace* at point blank range with a revolver.

Not only did this execution irreparably divide the inhabitants of Red River, but what rapidly began to be referred to as the "murder" of Scott simultaneously engendered an outpouring of rage by Ontario Orangemen. In the eyes of these Protestant English-speaking Canadians, a half-breed Roman Catholic rebel had now shown his true colors. Indignant cries for punishment of Riel grew deafening. In Toronto a massive demonstration attended by 5,000 angry expansionists, led by the "Canada First" cabal, listened with mounting vindictiveness to speeches like that of Dr. Schult demanding vengeance on Riel and exhorting that it would be:

humiliating to our national honour, and contrary to all British traditions for our Government to receive, or treat with the emissaries of those who have robbed,

imprisoned, and murdered loyal Canadians, whose only fault was zeal for British institutions, whose only crime was devotion to the old flag.¹⁶

He described this as particularly reprehensible since the situation at Ft. Garry could be succinctly described as "that the Fenian flag floated from its flag staff. The rebels hold high revelry within its walls, and Canadians lay in dungeons within it."¹⁷

It was in this incendiary atmosphere that the Canadian government secretly determined that a military expedition would be necessary to assuage the blood lust of the Ontario fanatics, restore order to Red River, and assure that the vast western plains remained a dutiful part of empire. In April they also decided that the commander of this expedition should be Colonel Garnet Wolseley, then serving as Deputy Quartermaster-General of the British Army in Canada. A quintessential Anglo-Irish warrior of the atavistic 19th century variety, Wolseley ultimately became Britain's premier imperial soldier. His unbroken string of victories begat the phrase "All Sir Garnet" — that era's equivalent of the astronaut expression "A-OK" — and he later inspired Gilbert and Sullivan's whimsical "very model of a modern Major-General." In 1870, however, Wolseley was still an humble colonel, stationed in the obscurity of the wilderness of British North America, and hungry to make his mark. The Riel rebellion provided him the opportunity to do so, and even more importantly, to warn the United States that Britain was willing to use force to protect its empire on this continent.¹⁸

Garnet Wolseley had already led an exciting life. Born in 1833 in County Dublin into an Anglo-Irish family, as a child his prospects had been damaged by the death of his father in a nearly penniless financial condition when young Garnet was only seven years old. Because his father had once been an officer, he received a commission in the British Army in 1852 without purchase. By age 26 he was promoted a lieutenant-colonel and by 1870 a colonel through battlefield courage and merit displayed in such diverse theaters as Burma, the Crimea, the Indian Mutiny, and China. The fact that he had achieved this rank by sheer ability and not through purchase rendered him a genuine anomaly in the British Army before Cardwell's famous reforms.

In 1861, Wolseley had been dispatched to Canada at the height of the *Trent* crisis and remained in North America for most of the next decade. These were indeed formative years of his career, a period during which he read voraciously, observed the United States Civil War, and in 1869, composed *Soldier's Pocket Book for Field Service* filled with practical advice for rank and file including such diverse subjects as care and feeding of elephants and the proper ingredients for Irish stew. Such attention to mundane detail not only marked Wolseley as extremely unusual in a British Army still noted for its amateurism, but even attracted the scorn of many of his dilettantish superiors. On the part of subordinate officers, however, Wolseley always exerted a captivating influence. Typical of such devotion is the description of him provided by a British officer who served under Wolseley on this Canadian campaign:

At this time Colonel Wolseley was in the prime of manhood, somewhat under

middle height, of well-knit, well-proportioned figure; handsome, clean-cut features, a broad and lofty forehead over which brown chestnut hair closely curled; exceedingly sharp, penetrating blue eyes, from one of which the bursting of a shell in the trenches at Sebastopol had extinguished sight without in the least lessening the fire that shot through it from what was the best and most brilliant brain I ever met in the British army. He was possessed of a courage equal to his brain power. It could be neither daunted nor subdued. His body had been mauled and smashed many times. In Burmah a Gingall bullet fired within thirty yards of him had torn his thigh into shreds; in the Crimea a shell had smashed his face, and blinded an eye; but no man who rode beside Wolseley in the thirty years of active life in which I afterwards knew him could ever have imagined that either in his grip of a horse or his glance at a man on a battlefield, he had only half the strength and the sight with which he had started in life. I never knew him tired, no matter what might be the fatigue he underwent. I never knew his eye deceived.¹⁹

Wolseley seized this first opportunity for independent command with his typical alacrity and meticulous attention to detail. A master of logistics and organization as well as a vaunted fighter, he was precisely the right man for a task which required triumph over terrain and time more than defeat of a martial foe. Disturbed only that he had not been granted complete civil as well as military authority over the Red River area, he hastily recruited and equipped a force for the arduous adventure of transporting this expedition across 1200 miles of a nearly roadless wilderness which many critics regarded as impassable.

The formidable task facing Wolseley was an extreme although not unusual variety of the conundrums encountered by Britain's imperial commanders in the "Splendid Little Wars" of the last half of Queen Victoria's reign. While countries like Germany and France were forced by geographic reality to devise methods of warfare adaptable to a relatively compact border region, the imperatives of imperial power rendered it necessary for Britain to defend the ramparts of an empire which comprised one-fifth of the land surface of the earth with a miniscule volunteer army of only some 300,000 men. Above all else what Wolseley faced in 1870 was that most consistent and pernicious of British opponents—nature.²⁰

By the standards of continental Europe or the American Civil War, Wolseley's army was a pathetic affair. He had under his command an infantry brigade composed of a regular battalion and two battalions of Canadian militia. The former was composed of the first battalion of the 60th Rifles and numbered 373 officers and men; the latter were the First Ontario Rifles and the Second Quebec Rifles, each comprised of 26 officers and 350 men. This was buttressed by small detachments of Royal Engineers and Royal Field Artillery with four 6-pounder guns, about 1,400 men in all. Wolseley was fortunate, however, to be able to be extremely selective in accepting applications for service on this expedition. Enthusiasm ran high among Canadians and hence the campaign was manned only by picked recruits despite the fact that the terms of service indicated a twelve month commitment, extendable to two years at the discretion of the commander. Wolseley oversaw recruiting with his usual meticulous eye, and accepted only men capable of withstanding the rigors which he knew lay ahead. As the result of his experience in training the Canadian

militia and observing the American Civil War, Wolseley retained an unswerving faith in the value of volunteer soldiers as long as they were properly led and disciplined. His Red River force lived up to these expectations.²¹

Beginning in mid-May 1870, this little army started out from Toronto on its mission. The expedition proceeded in three stages: by rail 94 miles from Toronto to Georgian Bay; then by steamer along Lake Superior to Thunder Bay on its western shore, a voyage of 524 miles; and finally, partly by road but primarily by boat from Thunder Bay to Ft. Garry, a distance of about 600 miles. The last leg was the most perilous.

The sheer physical problems encountered were daunting. Time for the conclusion of the campaign was limited to the melting of the ice on Lake Superior in early May and a return before the frosts of October. Moreover, since no supplies would be available after Thunder Bay, all necessary provisions had to be carried in a form light enough to be transported across water and land. To Wolseley's specifications nearly 200 boats were constructed for the expedition. Each vessel was approximately 30 feet long, having both masts and oars, and could carry four tons. Each boat contained a contingent of 11 or 12 soldiers and 2 or 3 *voyageurs*, those hardy Indians or Canadian woodsmen who were indispensable to the expedition because of their knowledge of the territory and expertise at propelling such vessels along dangerous waterways.

Each boat was designed to be a self-sufficient entity and contained 60 days provision of salt pork, preserved vegetables, flour, biscuits, tea and sugar. But also needed were tools, ammunition, tents, cooking utensils, blankets, even a special mosquito oil personally selected by Wolseley based on his experience in the Canadian forests. Personally forbidden by Wolseley was alcohol, formerly a staple of any British military expedition. He implemented this new and unpopular policy in an attempt to maintain strict discipline under circumstances which rendered it difficult for him to retain close supervision over the troops. Furthermore, he believed it was better for the health of his men in an age still accustomed to more casualties resulting from disease than wounds. In the end he was proven correct, but not without some grumbling by men who expected their customary daily ration of rum.

In addition to these privations, the troops also suffered through the torments of a dull and exhausting daily regimen. Reveille was at 3 a.m. and thereafter only two halts were made: at 8 a.m. one hour for breakfast and at 1 p.m. one hour for dinner. Dining on a cuisine consisting almost solely of salt pork, beans and hardtack, the men spent much of the time navigating treacherous waterways and surmounting the greatest natural difficulties encountered, the backbreaking portages. At these portages around unpassable rapids the boats had to be totally unloaded and all the stores transported on the backs of the men and then the boat itself had to be hauled overland by hand. A barrel of pork alone weighed two hundred pounds, testing the stamina of any man willing to attempt to carry it. There were forty-seven of these portages in all, a number of which were a mile in length. Moreover, all this had to be accomplished in inclement weather conditions characterized by incessant rains, fields of mud, swarms of mosquitoes and flies, and the closer the army came to Ft.

Garry, the growing anticipation of an ambush by a force of wily *metis* who knew the ground on which any confrontation might take place.

Along the route Wolseley was also forced to contend with the constant threat of the intervention of additional human enemies. The Indians were bought off by donations of trinkets and tobacco²² and the expected Fenian attack, as usual, failed to materialize. Far more frustrating was the lack of cooperation and the outright harassment provided by American authorities at every opportunity. Indeed, many Americans ardently hoped this British campaign would prove an ignominious failure in order to facilitate the creation of a power vacuum in the Northwest which could then be filled by American economic and political influence. For example, American authorities even temporarily closed the canal at Sault St. Marie to all Canadian traffic in order to impede the progress of Wolseley's force. Only strong diplomatic pressure and the assistance of an American steamer captain who was willing to lie concerning his cargo for the right price, eventually removed this obstacle.²³

Despite his lack of civil authority in the Red River region, Wolseley was still required to play the diplomat since no real political power existed there except for the Provisional Government. In an attempt to placate the inhabitants and weaken support for the rebellion, on 30 June from Prince Arthur's Landing, Wolseley issued a proclamation entitled *To The Loyal Inhabitants Of Manitoba* in which he assured them that the arrival of his army would mean that "Justice will be impartially administered to all races and all classes. The Loyal Indians or Half-breeds being as dear to our Queen as any others of Her Loyal Subjects," and furthermore asserting that those under his command "enter your Province representing no party, either in Religion or Politics, and will afford equal protection to the lives and property of all races and all creeds."²⁴ His true sentiments belie these sanctimonious motives and the aftermath clearly violated the words of this hypocritical proclamation.

Throughout the course of this campaign Wolseley's letters to his new wife reveal a very different private man than his public facade.²⁵ Although his subsequent accounts emphasized only his certainty of success and the adventurous grandeur of the whole affair, initially he was not so nearly as sanguine as the impervious face he attempted to present to his men. Furthermore, he was afflicted by all the same torments which made him such an archetypical Victorian soldier and husband. He was in fact a "muscular" Christian of the Protestant type who sought adventure as an antidote to bourgeois dullness.²⁶ However, he also simultaneously craved conventional success and respectability back home. A far more sensitive man than his memoirs record, Wolseley constantly complained to his wife concerning her lack of correspondence with him while he was off on this perilous mission and expressed concern that she faced "danger and temptation" at every turn.²⁷ As the expedition drew closer to Ft. Garry he grew more optimistic about making what he called his "triumphal entry into the Red River settlement," but also lamented, "Who on earth will care two straws for us or for news from the Red River when great events are being enacted on the Rhine?"²⁸

While Wolseley worried about his personal fame, his bank balance and the coining of pet nicknames for his wife, Louis Riel struggled with more immediate

and mundane matters. Negotiations with the Canadian government proceeded slowly. Although concessions had been won, on one subject Ottawa failed to budge: the provision of an amnesty for the rebels. In the forlorn hope that such an amnesty might arrive, even in Wolseley's kit, Riel refrained from undertaking any military operations against the advancing army and therefore forfeited the chance to defend his position through an ambush or attempt to disrupt the frail boats of the attackers.

Despite seemingly insurmountable obstacles Wolseley brought his force to its objective in only thirteen weeks and without the loss of a single life. A last natural obstacle deemed unpassable even by the native inhabitants was the Winnipeg River with its swirling rapids. In the face of cautious advice that attempting to navigate these treacherous waters invited disaster, the expedition's lead units nevertheless shot these rapids in August 1870 and Wolseley himself experienced a thrilling descent in a birch bark canoe piloted by his intrepid Iroquois guides.

A professional eyewitness account of the capture of Ft. Garry was provided by then Captain Redvers Buller of the 60th Rifles. In a contemporaneous letter to his sister back home in England, he revealed that the final, long-awaited assault on Ft. Garry was more *opera bouffe* than glorious martial achievement. On the night of August 23rd the British regulars had advanced within eight miles of Winnipeg. Although most troops were still in boats, a small detachment of mounted men were sent ashore on commandeered ponies. A number of the men experienced difficulty remaining in the saddle. Once ashore for the evening the force was treated to a downpour of rain and a miserably uncomfortable night. With no breakfast to fortify it the army moved out the next morning, not in glittering battle array, but instead in "pitiless rain" and "in thick, sticky, slippery black mud we splashed our way."²⁹ Advancing through rustic Winnipeg the troops discovered themselves "enthusiastically greeted by a half naked Indian very drunk."³⁰ The final disappointment was the capture of Ft. Garry itself. Just as the 60th Rifles arrived at the back gate of the fort, Riel and O'Donoghue fled out the front and crossed the Red River to safety. Few spoils of war were discovered in the frontier fort and Wolseley's staff had to console itself by eating the breakfast that had been prepared for Riel just before his escape. Disconsolate that the expected formidable resistance had failed to materialize, most troops undoubtedly echoed Buller's sentiments that "It does so disgust one to have come all this way for the band to play "God Save The Queen."³¹ In such an anti-climax did redoubtable Ft. Garry fall.

Nor was much of the immediate aftermath any more edifying. Soldiers denied strong spirits for three months almost immediately went on a debauched drinking spree and it was only with great difficulty and following the consumption of every available drop of alcohol in the city that Wolseley managed to restore discipline and sobriety. Within one week the regulars were already beginning their long trek eastward, to be replaced as an occupation force by the Canadian volunteers. Wolseley, who had confided to his brother that any time spent in Winnipeg was tantamount to "being buried alive,"³² quickly departed with the last of the regulars in early September. In many ways this merely worsened the situation because without the restraining hand of British armed might a number of serious injustices were inflicted on the native peoples.

On September 13th a tragi-comedic episode with potentially explosive international repercussions occurred in Winnipeg. Elzear Goulet, a *meti* follower of Riel and a member of the tribunal which had sentenced Thomas Scott to death, was discovered in a local saloon by a mob of toughs and Canadian militiamen. Hectored and hounded by his pursuers, Goulet, in a possible state of inebriation, fled the tavern and dived into the river, seeking sanctuary on the far bank. Pummeled by rocks thrown by his antagonists, in mid-stream Goulet sank and drowned. Such crude frontier justice sparked further controversy as the Secretary of State, Hamilton Fish, was informed that Goulet was an American citizen and immediately fired off a letter protesting this outrage of international terrorism to Sir Edward Thornton, British ambassador to the United States.³³ Since the subject of the actual citizenship of *metis*, who wandered at will across the imaginary border line separating the western plains, was always ambiguous, the perpetrators were never brought to trial. It would indeed be ironic if the only fatality suffered during the Red River campaign were actually a citizen of the nation preparing to take utmost advantage of the discord.³⁴

Military and diplomatic absurdities, however, are never synonymous with historical insignificance. What began in confusion in 1869 and ended in farce in 1870 in fact largely determined the destinies of the Canadian Northwest. In 1871 both Manitoba and British Columbia were admitted to the Dominion of Canada, thereby firmly debarring American encroachment on that nation's territorial integrity. It had taken a display of armed force to convince expansionists that Britain and Canada meant business north of the 49th parallel. Canada's westward movement had thereby been assured. All of this had been accomplished in only three months, without the immediate loss of a single life in combat, without a battle, and at the astonishingly low cost of only 100,000 pounds, one-quarter defrayed by the British taxpayer.

Just as significantly, for the native inhabitants of these western plains was the fact that the Red River expedition marked the beginning of the end of their isolation and hence their way of life. Once eastern settlers began to move into Manitoba in large numbers, the *metis* were quickly submerged in an alien culture which had little use or respect for their traditions. Just as Riel and his followers had feared, an influx of outsiders could only doom these tragic people. After 1870 their only choices were to remain in the Red River area and await domination or move farther west in a futile effort to delay the inevitable subjugation by the settled and urban civilization of eastern Canadians.

The fate of the *metis* appears especially poignant because a disturbing, albeit inevitable, element in Wolseley's little army was its undoubted racial arrogance and religious bigotry. Composed almost exclusively of English-speaking Protestants, its men displayed little sympathy for the cultural fears of the *metis*. This attitude extended from the top down and even in later years Wolseley expressed contempt for Riel and his followers as "noisy idlers"³⁵ and when Ft. Garry fell confided to his wife that "I should like to hang him to the highest tree in the place"³⁶ when he spoke of "the murderer Riel."³⁷ Even more forthrightly, Buller bluntly informed his sister back home in England that "I think if they were to hang a few priests up here it would

probably have a good effect.”³⁸ Furthermore, the Ontario militia was infected by an Orange Lodge spirit of vengeance that Riel should be hanged as punishment for the execution of Thomas Scott. Thus the attitudes of the advancing army only proved that the *metis*’ fears were well-founded; nothing which has occurred during the last century has proven the *metis* wrong.

In fact, the respective fates of a few of the major protagonists in this drama of the western plains are indicative of the destinies of their peoples. Dr. John Schultz, later Sir John, went on to enormous wealth, patriotic glory, service in Canada’s Parliament, and ended his political career as lieutenant-governor of Manitoba. Lieutenant William Nassau Kennedy of the Ontario Rifles stayed on in Winnipeg at the conclusion of the expedition and rapidly rose in politics, social status, and the local economy. Like many of the Canadian veterans, all of whom had received potentially lucrative and readily liquid bounty land,³⁹ he knew a good thing when he saw one, and by the mid-1870s not only was mayor of Winnipeg but had also speculated heavily in land and real estate. Until his tragic death in London of smallpox contracted during service as lieutenant-colonel in the Manitoba contingent accompanying Wolseley on his ill-fated attempt to rescue “Chinese” Gordon from Khartoum, Kennedy remained one of the city’s most prosperous and prominent citizens.⁴⁰ For example, Kennedy and scores of eastern settler newcomers profited handsomely as the result of a vast real estate boom engendered in the early 1880s after the Canadian Pacific Railway announced that its main line would pass through Winnipeg. No record exists of any *meti* profiting from such developments.⁴¹ The verdant western plains and abundant natural resources of Canada thus had been opened—but not for its native inhabitants.

Worseley returned to England to a quiet but distinguished reception. Although he lamented that continental cataclysms had overshadowed his wilderness exploits, he had at last captured the attention of those who mattered. He knelt before his sovereign to be admitted as a Knight Commander of the Order of St. Michael and St. George and consequently arose Sir Garnet; Edward Cardwell soon selected him as Assistant Adjutant-General; the elderly and obscurantist Commander-in-Chief of the British Army, the Duke Of Cambridge, even attempted to reassign him to Canada to remove a potential rival. Hence, in essence, the Red River campaign launched Wolseley on the path of independent command and popular acclaim which led him inexorably to the Ashantee War, victory over the feared Zulu in South Africa, Tel-el-Kebir, the sobriquet “Our Only General”, and finally his posting as the last Commander-in Chief of the British Army. He had achieved much for a penurious lad from the Anglo-Irish gentry and died peacefully in his bed in 1913, blessedly unaware that the following year would mark the genesis of an age of protracted and prosaic military horrors which would forever render quaint his romantic adventures across pristine forests, burning sands, lush tropical jungles and the fickle rapids of the Winnipeg River.

Louis Riel suffered a different fate. For the fifteen years after the Red River rebellion he became a hunted and rootless man. Living on the run, largely in a slightly more hospitable United States, he was truly a man without a country. Bereft of popular approval in his native Canada, which had now achieved its coast to coast

destiny, he became an increasingly desperate man. In 1885 the *metis* of the new province of Saskatchewan rose in a rebellion reminiscent of Ft. Garry and summoned their old chief to command. He responded. This last stand of the *meti* people was once again crushed by armed force, this time by an all-Canadian army, and Riel was captured. On 16 November 1885 he mounted the scaffold at Regina and was hanged by the neck until dead.

Endnotes

1. A number of excellent secondary works have appeared dealing with this era. Among the best are: Robin W. Winks, *Canada and the United States: The Civil War Years* (Baltimore, 1960); John B. Brebner, *North Atlantic Triangle: The Interplay of Canada, The United States and Great Britain* (New York, 1970); Kenneth Bourne, *Britain and the Balance of Power in North America, 1815-1908* (London, 1967).
2. See for example, the seminal article by C. P. Stacey, "Fenianism and the Rise of National Feeling in Canada at the Time of Confederation," *Canadian Historical Review*, XI (September, 1931), 238-261.
3. Paul Knaplund, *Gladstone and Britain's Imperial Policy* (London, 1966; First Edition 1927), 235.
4. Richard Preston makes this abundantly clear in *The Defence of the Undefended Border: Planning for War in North America, 1867-1939* (Montreal and London, 1977). On the bizarre but significant phenomenon of Fenianism consult Brian Jenkins, *Fenians and Anglo-American Relations During Reconstruction* (Ithaca and London, 1969).
5. See Kenneth Bourne, "British Preparations for War with the North, 1861-1862," *English Historical Review*, LXXVI (1961), 600-632.
6. As quoted in Brebner, *North Atlantic Triangle*, 165.
7. Helpful explanations of the complex negotiations of this period may be found in the following: Adrian Cook, *The Alabama Claims: American Politics and Anglo-American Relations, 1865-1872* (Ithaca, 1975); William S. McFeely, *Grant: A Biography* (New York, 1981); Allen Nevins, *Hamilton Fish: The Inner History of the Grant Administration* (New York, 1957), Vol. I. The Canadian point of view on the *Alabama* issue and related matters is presented by Goldwin Smith, *The Treaty of Washington, 1871: A Study in Imperial History* (Ithaca, 1941).
8. The first official census in 1871 revealed the following population: French *metis*, 5,720; English-speaking half-breeds, 4,080; white settlers, 1600.
9. An admirable study of this belief system is A. Kienetz, "Metis 'Nationalism' and the Concept of A Metis Land Base in Canada's Prairie Provinces," *Canadian Review of Studies in Nationalism*, XV, 1-2 (1988). The classic account of the two *metis* rebellions is George F. G. Stanley, *The Birth of Western Canada: A History of the Riel Rebellions* (Toronto, 1960) which should be supplemented by R. E. Lamb, *Thunder in the North: Conflict Over the Riel Risings, 1870-1885* (New

York, 1957). An indispensable eyewitness account of the turmoil in Winnipeg was provided by Alexander Begg, *The Creation of Manitoba: Or A History of the Red River Troubles* (Toronto, 1871) which was based on his daily journal entries available in W. L. Morton, *Alexander Begg's Red River Journal and Other Papers Relative to the Red River Resistance of 1869-1870* (Westport, CT, 1969).

10. The definitive biography of this fascinating figure is George F. G. Stanley, *Louis Reil* (Toronto, 1963). The voluminous Riel papers are deposited in the Provincial Archives of Manitoba (hereafter PAM), MG3, D1.

11. Taylor, who had begun to catch the annexationist disease while studying in Cincinnati several decades earlier, persisted in hoping for inclusion of Western Canada until the end of his life in 1893. See Hartwell Bowsfield, ed., *The James Wickes Taylor Correspondence, 1859-1870* (Altona Manitoba, 1968).

12. Alvin C. Gluek, Jr. *Minnesota and the Manifest Destiny of the Canadian Northwest: A Study in Canadian-American Relations* (Toronto, 1965), 276-277. Also helpful on American intentions is D. F. Warner, *The Idea of Continental Union* (Lexington, 1960).

13. Gluek, *Minnesota*, 277.

14. Colonial Office Records (hereafter CO), 42/692, June 21 and July 4, 1870.

15. The best inside account of the aspirations of this faction, which demanded incorporation of the Northwest into the Dominion of Canada, is PAM, MG12, E1, Sir John Schultz Papers, 8481-8498 "Sir John Schultz and the 'Canada First' Party" by Lt-Col George Denison, n.d.

16. Stanley, *Riel*, 138.

17. Ibid.

18. The standard biography of Wolseley remains John H. Lehmann, *All Sir Garnet: A Life of Field-Marshal Lord Wolseley* (London, 1964). Also still valuable is Major-General Sir Fredrick Maurice, *The Life of Lord Wolseley* (London, 1924). Wolseley's own Canadian recollections are included in his two volume autobiography, *The Story of a Soldier's Life* (London, 1903), vol. II, 101-225.

19. Lieutenant-General William F. Butler, *Sir William Butler: An Autobiography* (New York, 1911), 113.

20. For a more complete treatment of this factor in British military history this author might immodestly suggest his essay "The Influence of the Imperial Frontier on British Doctrines of Mechanized Warfare," *Albion*, XV, 2 (Summer, 1983), 123-142.

21. A wealth of primary material concerning all details of the recruiting and organization of this force is available at the National Archives of Canada in Ottawa (hereafter NAC), Department of Militia and Defence, RG9, IIB2, vols. 33-35, Adjutant General's Office, "Red River Force." In addition both British and Canadian officers proved to be prolific story tellers in behalf of this operation. Among the best and most representative of these are: G. L. Huyshe, *The Red River Expedition* (London, 1871) and the diary of Matthew Bell Irvine, NAC, Irvine Family Manuscripts, MF29, E111, vol. I, folder 19. Equally fascinating is the

private account written by then Captain Redvers Buller to his sister, PAM, MG3, B8, "Letter from Captain R. H. Buller to his sister, Miss Henrietta I. Buller, giving an account of the taking of Ft. Garry, 1870," August 24, 1870.

22. PAM, MG12, A1, Adams G. Archibald Papers, #25.

23. Representative concern over American actions can be found in NAC, RG9, IIA3, vol. 2, file #1, 95, 97, 101 and CO 42/692, July 9, 1870.

24. PAM, MG3, A1, 27.

25. The Wolseley papers are on deposit at the public library in Hove, Sussex, England. Microfilm duplicates of all his Canadian correspondence are available at NAC, Wolseley Manuscripts, reel A-813. Brief selections may also be found in Sir George Arthur, *The Letters of Lord and Lady Wolseley, 1870-1911* (London, 1922). Additional letters to other members of his family dated from 1861 to 1878 are available at the NAC, reel A-672.

26. A stimulating interpretation of the allure of warfare in the English-speaking world as the result of revulsion against the insidious mercenary values of a commercial civilization is Michael C. C. Adams, "Tennyson's Crimean War Poetry: A Cross-cultural Approach," *Journal of the History of Ideas*, XL, 3 (July-September, 1979), 405-422.

27. Wolseley mss., Garnet to Louisa Wolseley, August 15, 1870.

28. Ibid., August 6, 1870.

29. PAM, MG3, B8, R.H. Buller to Miss Buller, 10.

30. Ibid., 11.

31. Ibid., 13.

32. Wolseley mss., Garnet to Richard Wolseley, April 6, 1870.

33. NAC, RG9, IIA3, vol. 2, File #2, 141.

34. Alas, at this point the author has been unable to corroborate this claim of Goulet's citizenship.

35. *Story of a Soldier's Life*, vol. II, 169.

36. Wolseley mss., Garnet to Louisa Wolseley, August 21, 1870.

37. Ibid., August 24, 1870.

38. PAM, MG3, B8, R.H. Buller to Miss Buller, 12.

39. NAC, RG9, IIB2, vol. 33, Red River Force, Bounty Lands.

40. The Kennedy papers are located at PAM, P2126.

41. See the analysis of David G. Burley in "The Keepers of the Gate: The Inequality of Property Ownership During the Winnipeg Real Estate Boom of 1881-82," *Urban History Review*, XVII, 2 (October, 1988), 63-76.

Women and Divorce in the 1920s

by Andrea Ramage

The wedding was perfect. Kathleen and Lester were married at noon with all the right people in attendance. The maid of honor was from her sorority and the best man from his fraternity. The groom was an only child of a wealthy family, and their wedding gift to the couple was a beautiful house. Kathleen had prepared for a domestic life while in school, but she also managed the Young Women's Republican Club that she had founded. This is where the trouble began.

Lester expected dinner to be ready and his wife waiting when he arrived home, but the club meetings often went long and Kathleen would be late starting dinner. She saw no reason why Lester should be angry if she were held up because he had often ruined dinners by coming home late. The problems only continued. He forgot to turn on the heat, pick up groceries, or fix some leaks. When she baked a cake for his mother's birthday and the icing did not turn out right, he said Kathleen did it purposely.

When Lester was out of a job for five months the situation reached a low. He had had three jobs in the four years they had been married. It seemed that he was not as good an engineer as his diploma attested. Finally, his father gave him a job at the bank. All through this Lester demanded that he be respected by his wife. She should cook, sew, and wait patiently for him to come home. Kathleen wanted to go to her club meetings at night, but Lester wanted her at home, even when he went out. She settled for a compromise; she would stay in on the nights he did.

Finally, one night she had to attend a club meeting, but Lester forbade her to go. He said a woman's place was in the home, not at a political meeting. Kathleen openly disobeyed and headed for the door. He grabbed her by the hair and pulled her up the stairs and locked Kathleen in the bedroom. She climbed out the window and down a vine to go to the meeting.

The divorce was based on the grounds of cruelty. Kathleen did not ask for alimony because she had a good salary. She is now state secretary and general manager for a political organization of national power, and may be nominated to campaign for the legislature.¹

This reads like an article from today's paper, but it is a paraphrase of a story in *Good Housekeeping* magazine in 1925. In 1920, American women gained political freedom through the ratification of the 19th Amendment. They received a voice in government that had for so long ruled them. Many 1920s women remained in the labor force after the First World War was over even though their services were no longer needed in the defense industry. This major source of income for women freed them from the ties to father or husband. Even moral standards could not escape change in the early part of the decade. The young were dancing to jazz music, driving fast, and drinking alcohol. Young women were living life to what they considered the fullest. They would no longer be treated as second class citizens. The changes contributed to the rising status of women and helped create a feeling of

Andrea Ramage is a Senior at the University of Kentucky majoring in History and Social Studies, and she is a member of Tau Chapter of Phi Alpha Theta.

independence among most women. Although these developments may not have actually caused divorce, the new trends in society could very well have contributed to its increase in the early twenties.

The 1890 United States Census recorded 33,461 divorces; by 1922 the number had climbed to 148,815. This amounts to 148 divorces per 100,000 married in 1890 and 330 per 100,000 in 1922.² Obviously a rapid increase had occurred. Among the 47 states and the District of Columbia, Nevada had the highest rate of divorce: one for every 1.54 marriages. The lowest rate, excluding South Carolina which had no divorce laws, was the District of Columbia, with one divorce for every 91.34 marriages.³ In 1922, Kentucky had the twenty-second most divorces per marriages out of the 47 states and District of Columbia, recording one divorce for every 7.77 marriages. These differences were due in part to the fact that the United States has never had uniform divorce laws.

Most of the American colonies followed the British precedent which considered marriage a moral obligation for life. South Carolina did not grant a divorce until 1868. Many of the special dissolutions granted by the legislatures were separations which did not provide freedom to marry again. The colony of Connecticut, on the other hand, was an exception. Its legislature enacted a divorce act in 1667 that treated marriage as a civil contract which could be broken if the terms were not met. To obtain a divorce, the individual petitioned the superior court or, under certain circumstances, the legislature. The grounds for divorce were adultery, fraudulent contract, willful desertion for three years, or absent and presumed dead for seven years. In most cases the divorce implied the right to marry again.⁴

State legislatures gradually added grounds upon which a divorce could be obtained. Adultery, cruelty, impotence, desertion, conviction of crime, habitual drunkenness, nonsupport, insanity, and others were grounds in many of the states.⁵ Nevada provided conviction of a felony or infamous crime as grounds; whereas, grounds in the District of Columbia were solely adultery.⁶ In Kentucky a divorce could be granted on the basis of impotency, separation for five consecutive years, abandonment for one year, living in adultery, conviction of a felony, concealment of a loathsome disease existing at marriage, joining a religious group that forbade marriage, force or fraud at the time of marriage, drunkenness, cruel and inhuman treatment, or a concealed pregnancy at the time of marriage.⁷

Advances in communication and travel opened up different states and countries to those seeking divorce. In many foreign countries divorce was easier and less publicized. The wealthy often went outside the United States to break the bonds of marriage. In 1922, Frank J. Gould sued for and was granted a divorce in Paris. His wife, Edith, challenged this by suing for divorce in New York, where the courts upheld the decision of the Parisian court. This resulted in a flood of Americans seeking divorces in Paris. Approximately one hundred cases were heard in 1922, and at least that many in 1923. By the end of the twenties and the beginning of early thirties, Parisian divorces were harder to obtain and individuals started to look elsewhere.⁸

In the early twenties divorce was still seen as a disgrace, and many churches

were very much against it. The Protestant Churches allowed divorce for adultery and desertion. Adultery was the only acceptable reason for a divorce in the Reformed, Congregational, and Presbyterian Churches.⁹ The Roman Catholic Church forbade divorce for any reason. The Anglican Church defined divorce two ways: (1) *a mensa et toro* — a separation from bed and board; (2) *a vinculo* — a complete dissolving of the marriage bond allowing the parties to remarry. The first, a separation, was allowed by the church but the second was strictly forbidden.¹⁰

These views did not change significantly throughout the twenties. The Methodist Episcopal Church in 1928 permitted its ministers to remarry people who had been divorced on the grounds of desertion, where previously only those divorced for adultery were accepted. Two years later the United Lutheran Church adopted more strict requirements for membership that excluded persons divorced for cruelty.¹¹

Much of secular society reacted in the same way. Felix Adler, Professor of Political and Social Ethics at Columbia University, compared the bond between a husband and wife to that of a father and son. If a son causes trouble the father must bear it, and a husband and wife must also bear any trouble that faces them. Adler said that the only difference is that we are born into one, and choose to enter the other. "The decision is irrevocable. . . . One can no more disown a spouse than he can disown a child."¹²

Christians looked to the Scriptures to find answers concerning divorce. They pointed out that Christ clearly stated that divorce was made because of man's weakness, and that if a divorce were to be granted, on the grounds of adultery only, no remarriages were to take place by either the guilty or innocent party.

But from the beginning of the creation God made them male and female. For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and cleave to his wife; And they twain shall be one flesh. What therefore God hath joined together, let no man put asunder.¹³

Jesus stated this strong position in Matthew 19:1-9, Mark 10:2-12, and Luke 16:18. The church took its stance from this teaching.

The Catholic church held that divorce did not teach self control after marriage but encouraged selfishness and dishonesty. Allowing divorce for many different reasons leads to rash marriages, where the commitment aspect is forgotten. This in turn leads to the undermining of society.¹⁴

In Reverend Walker Gwynne's book, *Divorce in America Under State and Church* (1925), divorce was called the greatest problem facing America in the twenties. He compared it to slavery because of the conflict between states' rights and the national welfare. Divorce, like slavery, is a question of morals and religion, bringing out conflict among people with selfish interests. Reverend Gwynne stated that the nation would begin to crumble unless uniform divorce laws were set up by the federal government. He gave the old example that if states were allowed to make their own values for money that economic chaos would ensue. The same thing would happen to America morally if the states continued to enact separate laws on marriage and divorce.¹⁵

Gwynne summarized the consequences of divorce as: (1) the shame of the family; (2) children who do not have both parents, and perhaps have several fathers and mothers; (3) suicide rate among children went up due to an unhappy home environment; and (4) a flippant view of marriage evident in comics, theater, and fiction.¹⁶

Throughout the twenties the Roman Catholic Church held to its belief that divorce was wrong and tried to discourage it by passing moral, legal, and religious sanctions. Pope Pius XI in 1930 again reaffirmed the church's position on divorce:

It is clear that marriage even in the state of nature, and certainly long before it was raised to the dignity of a sacrament, was divinely instituted in such a way that it should carry with it a perpetual and indissoluble bond which cannot therefore be dissolved by any civil law. Therefore although the sacramental element may be absent from a marriage, there must remain, and indeed there does remain, that perpetual bond which by divine right is so bound up with matrimony from its first institution that it is not subject to any civil power.¹⁷

By 1924 and 1925 public opinion had changed on divorce. It was being considered by some as a mark of distinction, and it was stated that there was "hardly an influential family in most states whose women have not deemed it wise to divorce their husbands."¹⁸ Many married expecting to be divorced and remarried many times over. The realm once open only to actresses was now open for all women.¹⁹ British philosopher Bertrand Russell, writing in 1924, called the traditional ideal of indissoluble marriage a "musty Muloch."²⁰ It resulted, he declared, "in appalling misery for the wives of drunkards, sadists, and brutes of all kinds," and affected children more adversely than divorce.²¹ In his opinion, society placed too much emphasis on the so-called "wickedness" of divorce. The businessman who was faithful in marriage, yet bullied his employees, was worse than the generous employer who fell in love with his stenographer.²² "There is no evidence," he concluded, "that existing marriage laws, particularly where they are very strict, serve any social purpose."²³

Throughout the 1920s changes in divorce laws were few and of little consequence. From 1922 to 1928 approximately half of the states made a change in their divorce laws, but they were generally of technical matters. In fourteen states, sixteen changes were made of some significance from 1922-1928. Six of these changes put greater restraints on divorce and the other ten loosened the laws. The results, reported by Alfred Cahen in *Statistical Analysis of American Divorce*, had negligible impact upon divorce rates in those states. In ten of the states the rate of divorce remained the same or showed a very small change. In one state the rate increased due to the relaxation of laws, and in three the opposite effect prevailed. In only two states did the statistics show a positive reaction to changes in the laws.²⁴

In Colorado, for example, a law was passed in 1925 that required divorcees to wait six months before remarrying. As a result the divorce rate increased over the next few years, but the increase was not unusually high. Similarly, Illinois showed an increase in divorce in 1923 after it dissolved the law requiring a one year waiting

period before remarriage.²⁵

The laws on divorce in the United States did not change significantly in the 1920s, but the charge of adultery was less frequent and charges of cruelty were more common. By 1929 cruelty replaced abandonment as the number one cause, accounting for forty-one percent of the divorce cases in the nation.²⁶ Cruelty had become the catch-all, encompassing cause. Lawyers and judges found themselves dealing with accusations of immoral behavior with the charge that it constituted cruelty. Therefore, the Court of Appeals in Kentucky, in several cases that set precedents, indicated limits on the definition of cruelty. In *Davis v. Davis* the court held that Sarah Davis was entitled to a divorce with alimony from her husband, William Davis, because when he allowed his two daughters from a previous marriage to practice fornication in the home, its result was cruel and inhumane treatment of Sarah.²⁷

On the other hand, the Kentucky Court of Appeals ruled that a husband's groundless charge of unchastity against his wife was cruelty and grounds for divorce.²⁸ In *Sallee v. Sallee* (1926), the court decided that Anna T. Sallee's testimony did not prove her husband guilty of cruelty. She accused him of such actions as once slicing the bread and apportioning it to each member of the family in insufficient amounts. He also allegedly neglected to repair a leaky roof on the family house. "The marital relation is a sacred one," the judges proclaimed, "and is the chief corner stone of civilized society. It should not be wrecked or destroyed upon trivial causes or scant testimony, and, before courts should assume the responsibility of dissolving the bonds, the proof of the grounds relied on should be reasonably clear and convincing. Human nature should be taken into consideration and due allowance made for its weaknesses."²⁹

Today it is generally accepted that women can file for divorce. This trend began in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. And by 1930, seventy-one percent of all divorces in the country were awarded to women.³⁰ However, what changes in society occurred to allow women so much freedom or desire to be free from the bonds of marriage?

The changing morality of the young in the early twenties played a role in rising divorce rates. Many blamed jazz music, movies, joy riding, and modern dance for the loose morals of the young. These new morals created a new woman — the flapper. She challenged the double standard in society by raising the length of her skirts, publicly smoking cigarettes, using harsh language, openly drinking alcohol, and participating in petting parties.

A cartoon and poem that was circulated throughout college newspapers and ended up in *Literary Digest* depicted a flapper as a girl with very short hair, large dangling earrings, heavy makeup, a cigarette in her mouth, and wearing a strapless gown. The poem read:

Who was this wild and winsome coot
That made poor Adam pull the boot

And taste of that forbidden fruit?

A Flapper.

This Cleopatra maiden fair
For whom great Caesar tore his hair,
Who was this vamp so debonair?

A Flapper.

Who was this biddy called Salome
That robbed John Baptist of his dome,
The one that made mere man leave home?

A Flapper.

Who is it now that flashes by
With scanty clothes and dropping eye,
For whom some sap would gladly die?

A Flapper.

Who strokes the profs upon their nobs,
And on their shoulders gently sobs
While some swell mark from them she robs?

A Flapper.

Who it is spends their hard-earned kale
Who makes this plant a woeful tale
Who is more deadly than the male?

A Flapper.³¹

The *Literary Digest* claimed that the attempt at setting a single standard resulted in "indecent exposure in dress, disregard of the common conventionalities of society, a familiarity in relationships of young men and young women, cigaret smoking by both men and women, Sunday desecration, epidemics of murder and lawlessness, the increasing number of inmates in industrial and reform schools, and in women's rescue homes, and a large number of hasty and tragic marriages and divorces."³² The freedom of the young resulted in an impatience to stay and work things out in a marriage relationship. Women were no longer catering to men and allowing their own wants and personalities to be stifled. They were demanding "to live the forbidden experiences directly and draw conclusions on this basis."³³

Not only did morals change, but economic conditions did as well. World War I opened new opportunities to women in the work place. Benjamin P. Chass best stated it: "The war proved that the hand that rocked the cradle could rock the world."³⁴ The Fifteenth Census of the United States pointed out two important facts that stand out in the forty-year period from 1890 to 1930 — there was a significant increase in the number of women gainfully employed, and there was an increase in the proportion of married women in the female work force.³⁵

In 1890 the number of women gainfully employed was 3,712,122 (18.9 percent of the total population). This number increased slightly by 1900 with 4,997,415 (20.6 percent) employed. By 1930 a huge increase had occurred with 10,632,227

women employed (24.8 percent). The number of married women in the labor force increased from 13.9 percent in 1890 to 28.9 percent by 1930.³⁶ The figures on divorced women gainfully employed were combined with those women workers who were widowed. In 1910 only 15.0 percent of the women workers were widowed and divorced, and by 1930 the percentage rose to 17.2. In 1920 the number of divorced and widowed was combined with the single and unknown category.³⁷

The jobs that the 1920s women held were generally in domestic service. Other areas where significant numbers of women worked were clerical, factory, and professional service jobs. Among widowed and divorced women domestic service jobs were most often held, making up 27.7 percent of all jobs held by this group. Within this occupational grouping 44.6 percent were housekeepers. The number of divorced or widowed in clerical jobs was only 6.3 percent compared to 75.4 percent of single women.³⁸

The traditional view of this increase maintained that the new jobs that women held gave them an economic freedom once thought impossible. William Lechtenburg wrote: "By 1930 more than ten million women held jobs. Nothing did more to emancipate them."³⁹ The industrial revolution made housework easier and left women with more free time. Many turned to the factory or local department store to find work to fill their hours. Other women were forced to follow the job they once had at home into a factory or starve.⁴⁰ The traditionalists feel that a weekly paycheck gave a woman financial freedom and knowledge that she could provide for herself or her children. Marriage was no longer the only way to economic security. This, mixed with the social changes, gave woman a reason to hold off marriage or to escape a marriage of despair.

Revisionist historians do not place as much importance upon the rise of women in the work place. Leslie Woodcock Tentler concluded that "women inhabited a distinct and separate labor market, one characterized by low pay, low skill, low security, and low mobility."⁴¹ Such low wage jobs did not allow women to have any economic freedom. These independent women often lived in the dangerous, lower-income sections of town, ate poorly, had little or no health care, and few chances at recreation. Society itself isolated the working woman. A respectable woman lived at home, either as a daughter or a wife. Studies have found that many of those women on their own were orphans or immigrants who came to the United States without their parents. Churches had few social functions for single women, and fun parks, dance halls, and other entertainment outlets were expensive or impersonal. A single life was also risky and lonely. Although a degree of personal autonomy was given up in a family, it gave economic and emotional support and a status the single woman could not afford.⁴²

The increasing education of women also contributed to the possibility of divorce. Women were not always taught to be the obedient slave to a husband. The woman of the twenties might often be as well-educated as her husband. She was intelligent enough to be on her own and make her own decisions. This is evident in the rising number of female high school graduates and college degrees conferred upon women in the 1920s. Female high school graduates rose from 188,000 in 1920

to 367,000 in 1930. At the higher education level the number of bachelor degrees given to women increased significantly. In 1920 the total was 16,642, rising to 35,045 by 1926, and in 1930 alone 48,869 degrees were given. This rise is also seen in the master's and doctorate programs. The total of master's degrees rose from 1,294 in 1920, and 3,533 in 1926, to 6,044 in 1930. The number of women obtaining doctorates, or the equivalent, was only 93 in 1920 and 193 in 1926. By 1930 women were conferred 353.⁴³ The increase in women's education did not necessarily lead more women to the divorce courts, but it enabled women to feel more independent. She could think for herself, and combined with new moral standards and economic freedom this gave her a new kind of self-confidence.

On August 26, 1920, the Nineteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution was ratified. The Amendment states "the right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any state on account of sex."⁴⁴ Women were now a part of the voting public and their voices were to be heard. Although few women exercised their right to vote during the four years after the Amendment their votes were still felt. *Current History Magazine* reported in 1924 that in issues pertaining to morality women voted most often. Results of the 1920 presidential election in Illinois showed that of the total votes obtained by the Prohibition Party, 56.4 percent were by women.⁴⁵

Women's votes on moral issues were felt, and many began to support and propose new bills and amendments. The January 1921 issue of the *Ladies' Home Journal* ran an article supporting the proposal of a twentieth amendment to the Constitution. This amendment would give Congress the power to establish uniform marriage and divorce laws. The article stated that such an amendment was needed because of the problems created by a spouse getting a divorce outside the state where the couple lived. The courts within the family's home state often would not recognize the divorce; therefore, remarriages would be seen as bigamy and any children from these marriages as illegitimate. It also says that many times women are those who suffer from the differing divorce laws.⁴⁶

The number of women in elected offices was few in the early twenties. One woman had been elected to Congress, and out of approximately five thousand members to be elected to state legislatures, only sixty-three were women.⁴⁷ Although few held governmental offices, women were becoming more involved in party organizations. The Tammany Hall of New York City had a woman co-leader for every man in each district, and the Republican and Democratic national committees were made up of equal numbers of men and women. Throughout the West, where women had had the vote longer, women were an active and integral part of party politics. The Democratic State Central Committee of Arizona had forty-one places, six of which were held by women, but of the four Vice Chairmen, three were women.⁴⁸

Many men regretted the decision giving women the vote. *Literary Digest* quoted one man who said, "Having been heartily opposed to the extension of suffrage to women, I am perhaps over inclined to hold this responsible for the immodest and immoral behavior which is characterizing the present era. It seems

to be necessary for women to imitate the vices of man in order to prove actual equality with him."⁴⁹ Another said that the political and economic freedom gained was not yet used properly, therefore women "are apt to claim the virtues and ape the vices of men."⁵⁰ Much of male society agreed.

This assertion and recognition of political power and influence gave women a new status in society. The use of power increased the feeling of independence and self-confidence among women. The fear of being alone and unable to take care of herself was no longer an excuse for not escaping an unhappy marriage.

Among historians, the causes of the increase in divorce are open to interpretation. In a doctoral dissertation at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Mary Somerville Jones analyzed changing divorce laws throughout United States history. She concluded that the rapid increase in divorce rates in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries was due to urbanization and greater employment opportunity for women resulting from the industrial revolution. In urban areas anonymity was possible. Traditional relationships and customs were weaker; and the divorced woman was less likely to be socially ostracized than in small towns or rural regions.⁵¹

Attorney and University of Southern California School of Law Professor Riane Tenenhaus Eisler wrote that all industrialized western nations have experienced skyrocketing divorce rates. She attributed the trend to the breakdown of religious restraints, greater mobility, rising expectations of fulfillment and happiness, higher standard of living, and yet-to-be-understood ecological changes evolving in urban society.⁵²

Clearly divorce was considered the new social menace in society. The rate continued to climb each year despite warnings that it would only bring the downfall of the state or the wrath of God. The changes in the political, economic, and social status of women made divorce easier and more accessible. The freedoms obtained forever changed the woman's attitude toward marriage and divorce. Financial dependency no longer forced women into or kept women in marriages. The change in politics allowed women a voice in government and a hand in the decisions that would affect her. The social opportunities afforded a flapper were unthinkable to married women. The single life was as appealing as married life. Women and men would no longer stay and suffer through disappointing marriages. Happiness was the goal and if that meant divorce, then away to the courts they went.

Endnotes

1. Mabel Potter Daggett, "What the Judges Told Us About Divorce," *Good Housekeeping* (April, 1925), 29, 156.
2. Benjamin P. Chass, "The Alarming Increase in Divorce," *Current History Magazine* (August, 1925), 789.
3. George L. Koehn, "Is Divorce a Social Menace?" *Current History Magazine* (May 1922), 296.
4. Linda K. Kerber, and Jane De Hart-Mathews, *Women's America: Refocusing the Past* (2d ed; New York, 1987), 469.
5. Helen I. Clarke, *Social Legislation* (2d ed; Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1957), 122-128.
6. Chass, "Divorce," 790.
7. John D. Carroll, ed., *Kentucky Statutes*, 2 vols. (Louisville, 1915), vol. 1, 1115-1117.
8. Nelson Manfred Blake, *The Road to Reno: A History of Divorce in the United States* (Westport, 1962), 160.
9. Alfred Cahen, *Statistical Analysis of American Divorce* (2d. ed; New York, 1968), 55.
10. Paul B. Bull, *Marriage and Divorce* (New York, 1924), 15.
11. Cahen, *Statistical Analysis*, 56.
12. Walker Gwynne, *Divorce in America Under State and Church* (New York, 1925), 102-103.
13. Mark 10:6-9, *Holy Bible*, King James Version.
14. Gwynne, *Divorce*, 55, 90, 98-99.
15. *Ibid.*, 22.
16. *Ibid.*, 53-54.
17. Lynne Carol Halem, *Divorce Reform* (New York, 1980), 156.
18. O. H. P. Belmont, "Women as Dictators," *Ladies Home Journal* (Sept., 1922), 7.
19. *Ibid.*, 7.
20. Freda Kirchway, ed., *Our Changing Morality: A Symposium* (New York, 1924), 10.
21. *Ibid.*, 16.
22. *Ibid.*, 13-14.
23. *Ibid.*, 16.
24. Cahen, *Statistical Analysis*, 88, 91.
25. *Ibid.*, 89, 90.
26. Mary Sommerville Jones, "An Historical Geography of Changing Divorce Law in the United States," doctoral dissertation, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1978, in Harold Hyman and Stuart Bruchey, eds., "A Garland Series of Outstanding Dissertations" (New York, 1987), 90-91.
27. *Davis v. Davis, Kentucky Decisions*, 4 S.W. 822.

28. "Recent Important Decisions," *Michigan Law Review* (May, 1930), 937;
Morgan v. Morgan, Kentucky Decisions, 21 S.W. 2d 653.
29. *Sallee v. Sallee, Kentucky Decisions*, 280 S.W. 932.
30. Cahen, *Statistical Analysis*, 60.
31. "The Case Against the Younger Generation," *Literary Digest* (June, 17
1922), 58.
32. *Ibid.*, 56.
33. Kirchway, *Changing Morality*, 247.
34. Chass, "Divorce," 792.
35. U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Fifteenth Census of the United States: 1930.
Population*, 272.
36. *Ibid.*
37. *Ibid.*
38. *Ibid.*, 272, 280.
39. William E. Leuchtenburg, *The Perils of Prosperity, 1914-1932* (Chicago,
1954), 160.
40. "The Case Against the Younger Generation," 60.
41. Leslie Woodcock Tentler, *Wage-Earning Women: Industrial Work and
Family Life in the United States, 1900-1930* (New York, 1979), 14.
42. *Ibid.*, 116-117, 134-135.
43. United States Census Bureau, *The Statistical History of the United States:
From Colonial Times to the Present* (New York, 1976), 385-386.
44. *Dictionary of American History*, 7 vols. (New York, 1976), vol. 2, 206.
45. Stuart A. Rice and Malcolm M. Willey, "American Women's Use of the
Vote," *Current History Magazine* (July, 1924), 645.
46. E. Jean Nelson Penfield, "The Twentieth Amendment," *Ladies' Home
Journal* (January, 1921), 30.
47. Charles Edward Russell, "Is Woman-Suffrage a Failure?," *Century Maga-
zine* (March, 1924), 725-726.
48. Rice, and Willey, "Use of the Vote," 645-646.
49. "The Case Against the Younger Generation," 60.
50. *Ibid.*
51. Jones, "Historical Geography," 206.
52. Raine Tennenhaus Eisler, *Dissolution: No-Fault Divorce, Marriage, and
the Future of Women* (New York, 1977), 13-14.

Ohio River Transportation: A Look at the Past And a Glimpse of the Future

By Roger C. Adams

The Miami Indians called it *O'hiopeckhanne*. The French called it *La Belle Riviere*. The British anglicized the Indian name and today we know it as the Ohio River. It is estimated that over 25 million people in parts of fourteen states live in the 203,900 square miles of the Ohio River Basin.¹ The United States Army Corps of Engineers estimates the annual discharge of the 981 miles of the river from Pittsburgh to Cairo at 1,468,800 cubic feet of water per second per year. Although it is still a vital link in the Mississippi Inland Waterway System, the Ohio River was even more significant in earlier times when the nation depended and thrived on river transportation. The Ohio River has undergone three distinct phases in its recorded history: a brief frontier era, the steamboat epoch, and the modern period.

The frontier era began when the French explorer Robert Cavellier, Sieur de La Salle, discovered the Ohio River in 1670. However, some modern historians argue that he never saw the river. It is now believed that the first person to explore the river was Celeron de Bienville in 1749. The Marquis de la Glassoniere (commander of all New France and Louisiana) sent Pere Bonnacamp, a cartographer and Jesuit priest, with de Bienville to chart the expedition.² His map is the oldest known existing map of the Ohio River. A few years later the French ceded New France, which included the Ohio River, following the French and Indian War. The British quickly sent a young officer named George Washington down the Ohio in 1770, from Fort Pitt to survey their new acquisition. Washington's party made detailed accounts of their journey including the Falls of the Ohio. Fort Nelson, now Louisville, was later established there to guard river travelers. As a break in bulk point, the Falls hampered everyone traveling down the Ohio until a canal was completed around them in 1830. Interestingly, almost exactly half-way between Fort Pitt and Fort Nelson, the United States government built Fort Washington in 1789 to protect the settlers at Losantiville, which was established on December 28, 1778, and situated on a broad terrace north of the river. As Fort Pitt became Pittsburgh and Fort Nelson became Louisville, Losantiville (L for [for Licking] as [mouth] anti [opposite]) became Cincinnati. Arthur St. Clair, governor of the Northwest Territory, landed at Losantiville in 1790, and reportedly exclaimed, "What an awful name, dammit, call it Cincinnati!" (after the Society of Cincinnati).³ Regardless of names, it is important to remember that Fort Washington was established to protect the hundreds of settlers moving down-river in their batteaux, pirogues, barges, flatboats, and keelboats. Of these vessels, flatboats and keelboats were the most commonly used and most adaptable.

Losantiville was founded when the original settlers beached their flatboats near present day Yeatman's Cove. The flatboat or barge was perhaps the most versatile

Roger C. Adams is a Senior history major at Northern Kentucky University. He is Vice President of Alpha Beta Phi Chapter and Editor of Perspectives in History.

craft ever to float on water. A flatboat was nothing more than a raft with a house on it. Historian A. B. Hulbert described flatboats as "anything from a creaking raft with a little barn in the rear," adding, "...not one craft in a thousand that went down the Ohio ever came back again."⁴ Their sole purpose was to float down river with the current. Once they reached their destination, they were often broken up, sold as lumber, and used to build houses. The first schoolhouse in Cincinnati was actually made out of a flatboat.⁵

Flatboats averaged 10-25 feet wide, 30-50 feet long, and were guided by a rudder often accompanied by oars. Flatboat designs were as diversified as the goods and men that transported them. For example, average barges in 1811 transported miscellaneous pork for \$2 per barrel, navy pork for \$11 per barrel, prime pork for \$10 per barrel, flour for \$4.50 per barrel, dry fruits for \$3 per barrel, whiskey for 37 1/2 ¢ per barrel (imagine that!), and lard for 6 ¢ per pound.⁶ These items were the most commonly transported goods in 1811, though on any given day, on any given flatboat, any given product could be found. One enterprising flatboatman discovered that he could buy "cherry bounce" and "boiled cider" for \$3 per barrel and walk home to Brownsville, Pennsylvania, with the profits.⁷ Although versatile, flatboats had one drawback—they could not travel up-river. In Cincinnati and Louisville a strong desire developed, as commerce expanded, to export goods upstream. Flatboats stubbornly remained on the Ohio until 1817, mostly carrying coal, iron, and dry goods for Kentucky from Pittsburgh.⁸

The yearning of businessmen to ship their goods to any point on the river led to the development of the keelboat. The firm of Tarascon, Berthoud, and Company of Pittsburgh first introduced keelboats on the Ohio in 1792.⁹ Keelboats were streamlined, sturdy, and capable of transporting greater tonnage (40-50 tons) than flatboats: averaging 7-10 feet wide, 45-50 feet long, and propelled upstream by sails, oars, or poles in shallow water. Jacob Meyers, "influenced by a love of philanthropy and desire of being serviceable to the public," established the first regular keelboat packets between Cincinnati and Pittsburgh in November, 1793.¹⁰ His early line consisted of two keelboats with sails leaving Cincinnati two weeks apart and making a round trip once a month. Revenues were so great that Meyers was able to expand his fleet to four boats departing once a week in 1794. During this time the variety of goods did not change, although Cincinnati and Louisville were already becoming meatpacking centers. Only the amount and speed of goods shipped increased. Oddly, Cincinnati did not begin building keelboats until 1805. The earliest recorded company was Noland and Richardson, who in 1807, boasted "no danger need be apprehended from the enemy [Indians] as every person on board will be under cover made proof against rifle or musket balls, and convenient port holes for firing out of."¹¹ Keelboats shared the same fate as flatboats. They disappeared from the river between 1825-1830. Hulbert best summarized flatboats and keelboats: "There were as many styles and designs of these vessels as human ingenuity and human exigency could call forth."¹²

The frontier era on the Ohio River owes its brevity to the steamboat. Robert Fulton demonstrated the first successful steamboat, the *Clermont*, in 1807. "Fulton's

Folly" (as the *Clermont* was often known) steamed up the Hudson River from New York City to Albany in thirty-two hours, proving that steam power was reliable. Fulton, Daniel D. Tompkins, Robert R. Livingston, DeWitt Clinton, and Nicholas J. Roosevelt formed the Ohio Steamboat Navigation Company in December, 1810.¹³ Skeptical Cincinnatians exclaimed, "When we see one of the contraptions out there on the river we'll believe it! When horses grow six legs then only will we be convinced that a boat can be pushed through the waters by other than man power."¹⁴ Zadoc Cramer, the editor of *The Navigator*, a riverman's paper, was less doubtful:

It will be a novel sight, and as pleasing as novel, to see a huge boat working her way up the windings of the Ohio, without the appearance of sail, oar, pole, or any manual labour about her—moving within the secrets of her own wonderful mechanism [sic] and propelled by power undiscoverable. This plan [the Ohio Steamboat Navigation Company's] if it succeeds, must open up to view flattering prospects to an immense country, an interior of not less than 2,000 miles of as fine a soil and climate as the world can produce, and to a people worthy of all the advantages that nature and art can give them....¹⁵

Cincinnatians and six-legged horses soon got their first glimpse of a steamboat. The *New Orleans* (sometimes seen as the *Orleans*) arrived from Pittsburgh in October, 1811.¹⁶ It was 183 feet long, traveled at 8 miles per hour, and could carry 300 tons of cargo.¹⁷ But the draft of the *New Orleans* was too deep for the shallow Ohio River, and it was sent to deeper water at Natchez, Mississippi. The steamer *Washington* successfully navigated the Ohio in 1816, drawing less water than the *Orleans*, setting the pattern for future steamboats on western rivers.

However, in terms of transportation, it is futile to try to present the entire steamboat era in a few paragraphs. Most important are the three phases transportation and commerce underwent during this period: the antebellum years (1811-1860), the war years (1861-1865), and the post-war/modern years (1866-1940s).

It became clear in the steamboat's infancy that Cincinnati would become the center of commerce on the Ohio River. One traveler noted in 1828, "...the city of Cincinnati is the Wonder [sic] of the west for soil situation & commerce perhaps surpassed by none any where."¹⁸ Between 1816 and 1825, sixty steamboats were built in Cincinnati. In 1826, 48 steamers were built in Cincinnati and three years later in 1829, 81 steamboats were built. These ships imported goods such as lead, peltry and skins from Missouri, cotton, tobacco, saltpeter and marble from Kentucky and Tennessee, bar, rolled and cast iron, stones, coal, salt, glassware, pine timber and plank from Pennsylvania and Virginia. Steamers exported goods such as flour, pork, lard, cheese, soap, walnut and cherry boards, cabinet furniture, and corn meal.¹⁹ Almost anything and everything could be found at the Cincinnati wharfs. As early as 1825, 360 packets arrived in Cincinnati and that number steadily increased in the years prior to the Civil War. The wonderful thing about steamboats was that they "brought 'to the very doors' of the people of the smallest towns, 'a little Paris, a section of Broadway, or a slice of Philadelphia.'"²⁰ These figures and goods

may seem insignificant to us now, but consider the total shipping tonnage of the Ohio/Mississippi system in 1834 and 1842:

1834²¹

Great Lakes	15,652 tons
Atlantic Seaboard (New York, Philadelphia, & Boston)	76,064 tons
British Empire	82,696 tons
Ohio & Mississippi Rivers	126,378 tons

1842²²

Great Lakes	17,652 tons
New York City	32,260 tons
Ohio River (only 120 boats)	26,788 tons

The Ohio/Mississippi figures are especially astonishing when compared to the entire British Empire!

The wharfs teemed with constant activity. One old-timer described the scene at Cincinnati as “the nerve center of a thriving metropolis. Frame this picture of the scenes of restless, human life that ebbed and flowed unceasingly on departure and arrival days, with a veritable field of freight of all kinds, and you may, perhaps, have some conception of what that landing looked like” and the steamers as, “Picturesque? Gosh all hemlock,...[they were] embroidered with it. Colorful? Oh me, oh my,...[they were] stocked with pigments of all shades.”²³ Aside from shoals, sand bars, reefs, snags, and ledges, the river still was not free of hazards. Steamboats often ended in violent explosions and fires with extreme loss of lives (excluding Civil War river battles). The earliest explosion occurred on April 25, 1838, at Cincinnati when all four boilers of the *Moselle* exploded. It was estimated that 230 people were killed, but only 80 bodies were recovered. Nevertheless, this antebellum period abruptly ended with the start of the Civil War in 1861.

The Civil War nearly brought commerce to a halt on the Ohio River. Steamboat commerce was the economic boom in Pittsburgh, Cincinnati, and Louisville in the three decades prior to the war. Naturally, businessmen in these cities feared that the Confederacy might gain and keep control of the Mississippi River, thus cutting off the Ohio. Not only would trade be restricted by the Federal government during the war, but if the Rebels gained independence—what would happen to river commerce? Businessmen feared high Confederate tariffs and hoped for a quick Union victory. As the war progressed, river commerce adapted. Pittsburgh, Cincinnati, and Louisville specialized in military goods: weapons, soap, candles, pork, clothing, etc. Shipbuilding adapted as well. Pre-war docks began building

ironclads, tinclads, mortar boats, gunboats, and transports. Many aging steamers were "converted" during the war for military purposes. Ending in 1865, the Civil War made a brief, but extensive impact on the people, commerce, and transportation of the Ohio River.

The postwar years from 1866 to the 1940s were characterized by many changes that led to the decline of steamboats. During Reconstruction, cities along the Ohio profited from southern misfortune. Building materials, machinery, food, and textiles were desperately needed in most of the ex-Confederate states. Steamboatmen literally raced the railroads to get supplies to the South. Steamers fought hard to win, but railroads had two main advantages over steam packets. First, the new Bessemer process for producing steel made it economical for the railroads to mass-produce steel rails instead of iron rails. And second, railroads were able to transport goods year-round; whereas, the Ohio was limited to shipping seasons. But steamers got some relief during the Panic of 1873 as one of the fundamental causes for the panic was the overexpansion of railroads. Economic cuts in railroads during the depression following the panic led to strikes in eastern railroad companies. The strikes interrupted railroad traffic throughout the country and riots flared up in many cities; including Pittsburgh where mobs looted and pillaged railway properties.²⁴ This seesaw competition between steamboats and railroads lasted for many years, while steamboats gradually faded into the background.

The modern period is characterized by two facets: the assimilation of steamers and the rise of diesel powered boats. The first pronounced decline of steamers began in 1893 (only 48 steamers were built, repaired or rebuilt).²⁵ The actual year that steamers ceased to prosper is indeterminate. One newspaper reporter wrote in 1911 about steamers: "Never before has Ohio River tonnage been so worthless."²⁶ Additionally, an ice gorge crushed many of the old, idle, and empty steamers seven years later in 1918. It was becoming apparent that the railroads had "won the war." The advance of diesel power in the 1940s added to the defeat. After that, the old steamers were either converted to diesel power, destroyed, converted to floating museums, or kept as luxury cruise ships. In the early 1940s one old-timer lamented that "the Public landing..[is] anything else but one of the great open spaces of the Queen City of the West."²⁷

To compensate for declining transportation on the river, the United States Army Corps of Engineers began a series of improvements. In 1929, the corps completed a massive series of 50 locks and dams that would provide channels at least nine feet deep along the entire length of the river. It was a dream come true for rivermen. The new system accommodated more cargo in its first year than the Panama Canal. By the 1940s, though, diesel-engined boats began to replace the remaining antiquated steamers, joining their predecessors as anachronistic anomalies. Diesel power became the supreme ruler of the river. In 1954, the Army Corps of Engineers improved the aging '29 locks, replacing them with nineteen high lift locks, some over 1,200 feet high. This new system could accommodate a seventeen-barge load and shorten the trip from Pittsburgh to Cairo to less than seven days. The three most commonly used towboats on the river today have these basic features:

<u>length</u>	<u>width</u>	<u>draft</u>	<u>horsepower</u>
117 feet	30 feet	7.6 feet	1,000-2,000
142 feet	34 feet	8.0 feet	2,000-4,000
160 feet	40 feet	8.6 feet	4,000-6,000

Towboats of 6,000 horsepower and greater can push tows carrying 40,000 to 50,000 tons of cargo.²⁸ Commerce has changed dramatically since diesel powered tows were invented. One tow captain gave this impression of this new commerce:

The river's big business,...[we've] got to keep the boats running all the time. But my goodness, the fun we used to have on the river! Why the boats would get into town, and both watches would go up the hill. Well, you only had one thing in mind to do—get drunk and then have a big fight. Everybody.²⁹

The river is now a corporation. Imports and exports from seven states total over 221 million tons of goods per year. Main commodities now include petroleum, crude oil, coal, aggregates, grains, chemical, ores and minerals, iron, and steel.³⁰ Barges that move these commodities have several advantages over trains and trucks. First, standard barges average 192 feet in length, 35 feet in width, and can carry over 1,480 tons of cargo. And second, one barge can transport the same amount of cargo as 15 jumbo railroad hoppers or 50 trucks. A 15 barge tow only 1/4 miles long is equal in length to a train 2 1/4 miles long moving the same amount of cargo, while a truck convoy would be over 34 1/2 miles long. These advantages have now given river commerce an edge over railroads and trucks which initially added to the decline of river commerce.

Since the Ohio River's "discovery" by LaSalle in 1669, its three periods of transportation have been interesting and varied: from simple flatboats and keel-boats to gilded and highly ornate steamboats to grimy, diesel "workhorses." But what will river transportation be like in the future? New superconductors may provide a more practical way of moving goods and people, once again threatening river commerce. Until then, we can still watch the barges or see an occasional steamboat with its calliope and puffs of smoke billowing from tall stacks and dream about the past.

Endnotes

1. Priit J. Vesilind, "The Ohio River With a Job to Do," *National Geographic* (February, 1977), 245.
2. Archer B. Hulbert, *The Ohio River, A Course of Empire* (New York & London, 1906), 18.
3. Vesilind, 257.
4. Hulbert, *Ohio River*, 139-140.
5. *Ibid.*, 273.
6. Frank Y. Grayson, *Thrills of the Historic Ohio River* (Cincinnati, 1929), 12.

7. Hulbert, *Ohio River*, 237.
8. Grayson, 23.
9. Archer B. Hulbert, *Waterways of Westward Expansion: The Ohio River and Its Tributaries*, vol. 9 (Cleveland, 1903), 107-108.
10. Hulbert, *Ohio River*, 230.
11. Ophia Smith, "Cincinnati. From Keelboat to Steamboat, *Historical and Philosophical Society of Ohio Bulletin*. XV (1957), 262. Smith indicates that Noland and Richardson might be Nelson and Richardson.
12. Hulbert, *Ohio River*, 139.
13. *Ibid.*, 330
14. Grayson, 19.
15. Hulbert, *Ohio River*, 330-331.
16. Walter Havinghurst, *River to the West: Three Centuries of the Ohio* (New York, 1970), 156.
17. Hulbert, *Ohio River*, 331.
18. John C. Cozine, *The Day-book Account of John C. Cozine: a journey from Harrodsburg, Kentucky, to New York, and return. September 10th through November 27th, 1828 (with illustrations)*. (Lexington, 1976), 42, (November 22, 1828). This is a rare hand printed edition of 100 published by the University of Kentucky. It provides an excellent first-hand account of travel in the early nineteenth century frontier. The original journal is in the collections of the University of Kentucky.
19. Smith, 272-273.
20. *Ibid.*, 289.
21. Grayson, 23.
22. Hulbert, *Ohio River*, 337.
23. Grayson, 56.
24. Havinghurst, 258.
25. Grayson, 61.
26. Havinghurst, 257.
27. Grayson, 55.
28. United States Army Corps of Engineers, *Ohio River Navigation System Part II: 1987 Supplement* (Cincinnati, 1987), 53. Often overlooked, these government documents provide a wealth of information on nearly every aspect of the Ohio River, from transportation to wildlife to pollution to sediment deposition rates.
29. Vesilind, 253.
30. Corps of Engineers, *1987 Supplement*, 56.
31. Corps of Engineers, *Ohio River Navigation System: 1986 Report* (Cincinnati, 1986), 56.

African-American Contributions in Medicine

by Jeffrey B. Shelton

Western medicine can historically trace its roots over twenty-three hundred years to ancient Greece. Yet, not all practices have their foundations in Western cultures. And in American medical history doctors such as Walter Reed, the Mayo brothers, George Papanicolaou, Jonas Salk, and others have made many innovations in their respective fields. However, these doctors are not alone. Though largely ignored, minorities have had significant innovations as well. Blacks, indeed, made many valuable contributions to the field of medicine.

The ancient Egyptians were writing textbooks as early as 5,000 years ago.¹ Perhaps the most remarkable of their medical achievements was that of surgery. Like many other peoples of Africa, the Egyptians practiced the art of trephination. This operation, the forerunner of neurosurgery, involves boring a hole through the skull to the outer covering of the brain. This was done to remove bone fragments from an injury or to relieve epilepsy or chronic headaches. Skulls have been found from ancient graves with definite signs of healing, indicating the patients did indeed survive for many years.

Some ancient papyri documents indicate other remarkable knowledge. Separate guilds of specialists in Egypt who treated bone fracture and dislocations are mentioned.² Described are treatments for collar bone fractures and dislocated jaws and shoulders. Long bone fractures were immobilized with tight splints and nasal fractures were treated by the insertion of stiff nasal packings into the nostrils, a method still used today.³ Other accomplishments of the Egyptians include a vast knowledge of pathology, anatomy, physiology, diagnostic methods, obstetrics, and gynecological problems including inducing abortions and quite possibly the first pregnancy test.⁴ This glimpse of Egyptian medicine shows that it was the best and most advanced of ancient civilizations. Indeed, medicine as we know it began in Egypt not Greece. The most important Greek god of healing Asclepius, was identified with the legendary Egyptian physician Imhotep, while Hippocratic therapeutics had direct antecedents in Egypt.

The study of other African systems of medicine is more difficult due to the lack of written records. Most of our knowledge of other systems comes from the testimony of European missionaries. This knowledge, nevertheless, proves that other areas of Africa acquired a startling level of medical science.

All traditional African cultures had a magico-spiritual conception of disease. This aspect of medicine has been down-played by many; however, modern medicine must concede that as much as 60 percent of illness has a psychic base from which the "placebo effect" of modern pharmaco-medicine arises.⁵ Also in African medicine, all children's diseases, obstetrics, and everyday complaints are handled

Jeffrey B. Shelton graduated from Northern Kentucky University in 1989 with a major in biology. He is now enrolled in the College of Medicine at the University of Kentucky.

by women. Surgery, bone setting, special diagnostic and therapeutic problems are handled by men.

In the area of surgery, evidence indicates that some African surgeons attained a level of skill comparable to that of 20th century surgery in the West. Among the warlike peoples, the physician was expert in treating traumatic injuries. This included disinfecting the wound with plant juices, cauterizing the blood vessels to stop bleeding, suturing the wound with fiber, and bandaging it with a fiber mat that was tightly wrapped. In East Africa, Masai surgeons were known to treat pleurisy and pneumonitis by collapsing the lung by drilling holes into the chest. One of the most remarkable examples of African surgery was that of the Caesarean section. This was documented by a missionary doctor in 1879. The Caesarean operation was years away even in the most advanced hospitals in Europe at the time.⁶ Medicine in Africa achieved a high level of skill well before the "advanced" Europeans.

Traditional African cultures have contributed an abundance of herb and plant knowledge valuable to medicine. The Zulus, for example, are reputed to know the medicinal uses of some 700 plants.⁷ Ouabain, capsicum, digitalis, physostigmine, kola, kaolin, and calabar beans are just some of the substances from African medical knowledge that have made their way into Western pharmacology. Some of the remedies of the traditional African doctor have been against intestinal parasites, vomiting, skin ulcers, rashes, convulsions, tumors, venereal disease, bronchitis, conjunctivitis, and urethral stricture, among others.⁸ The complete list of effective drugs and remedies in African culture is far too extensive to elucidate.

The Negro people brought from Africa "materia medica," which was not much different from the "kitchen physick" flourishing in colonial America. They emphasized the control of disease through charms and conjuration while believing that demons caused many illnesses. Thus, incantations and the "healing touch" were used to exorcise "evil spirits." The "materia medica" was the product of centuries of practical usage. This knowledge of mineral, plant, and herb concoctions resulted in "root-doctrine." This occupied a prominent place in the therapy used on many southern plantations.⁹

One practice known as "buying the smallpox," was a method of inoculation against smallpox using serum from patients having the infection in a mild form. The Reverend Cotton Mather, who introduced this practice in Boston in the early eighteenth century, learned it from a negro slave. Likewise, another negro named Caesar, was given his freedom from his discovery of a remedy to cure rattlesnake bites in 1751. So beneficial was this remedy, that it was reprinted in *The South Carolina Gazette* and *The Massachusetts Magazine* in 1792 for the general public.¹⁰ One fact should be noted about the black "physicks" of the slave era. Whites, for the most part, feared being poisoned by the blacks. This resulted in the limited practice of black medicine.

During Reconstruction, two medical schools, Howard and Meharry were established for the training of negro doctors. Howard was opened in Washington, D.C. in 1868 to negro and white students. In 1871-72, students came from thirteen states (mostly northern), six foreign countries, and the West Indies. To help financially needy students, tuition fees were low, being half of what most medical

colleges were charging. The first faculty of Howard consisted of four white professors: Dr. Silas Loomis, dean; Dr. Joseph Johnson, Dr. Robert Reyburn, Dr. Lafayette Loomis, and one negro, Dr. Alexander Augusta.¹¹

Unlike the medical school of Howard University, Meharry Medical College was established solely for the education of negro doctors. Chartered in 1866 in Nashville, Tennessee, as part of Central Tennessee College, it was supported and funded by the Freedmen's Aid Society. In 1875, money furnished by the five Meharry brothers was used to expand the university. Another motivating spirit behind the new school was George W. Hubbard. For forty-five years he administered Meharry, building it up until it became the Mecca for large numbers of southern negroes interested in medicine.

By the turn of the century, four negroes were noted for their contributions in the field of medicine: Dr. Daniel Hall Williams, Dr. George Cleveland Hall, Dr. Austin Maurice Curtis, and Dr. Nathan Francis Mossell. All of these doctors had one common interest: hospitals for the care of negro patients and the professional improvement of negro doctors and nurses.

Daniel Hale Williams, founder of Provident Hospital in Chicago, was one of the first pioneers of open heart surgery. In July, 1893, a negro expressman named James Cornish was stabbed in the chest following a bar brawl. Dr. Williams entered the thoracic cavity and explored the heart. He then decided that the heart was fine but the pericardial sac surrounding the heart needed suturing. The operation was successful and the patient lived for another twenty years. Williams was one of the best-known physicians of his day. In 1936 the *Dictionary of American Biography* lauded him as "the most gifted surgeon and the most notable medical man that the colored race had produced."¹²

George Cleveland Hall, was also a leading Chicago surgeon and diagnostician. Beginning his association with Provident Hospital in 1894, he served in one capacity or another from 1894 to 1930. He held the staff together and organized the hospital's first postgraduate courses. Hall was also a fighter for negro rights. He brought the National Urban League to Chicago. He was active in the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and was among the founders of the Association for the Study of Negro Life and History.

Austin Maurice Curtis was a protege of Williams at Provident, where in 1891, he was offered an internship. His practice and reputation grew steadily. In 1896, he became the first negro appointed to a non-segregated hospital, namely, Cook County Hospital in Chicago. In 1898, he was named surgeon-in-chief at Freedman's Hospital in Washington, D.C. A daring, but not reckless, surgeon, he soon established a national reputation for emphasizing the need for correct diagnosis. Curtis ended his career as professor of surgery at Howard University from 1928 to 1938.

Nathan Francis Mossell was associated with Frederick Douglass Memorial Hospital in Philadelphia. He helped establish the hospital in 1895. The hospital became successful and continued to grow. By 1912, it had seen 3,500 in-patients and 40,000 out-patients.¹³ Mossell was also active in the fight for racial equality. He joined others in driving the anti-negro play "The Clansman" out of Philadelphia.

He also protested against the showing of "Birth of a Nation" an adaptation of "The Clansman." He organized a Thaddeus Stevens Memorial Association and lived to the age of ninety.

Another great contribution was made by Dr. Charles R. Drew. He was born in Washington, D.C. in 1904, and worked his way through McGill Medical College as a basketball referee. Two years after his graduation he joined the faculty of Howard Medical School. By working in conjunction with Columbia University, Drew discovered how to lengthen the life of stored blood for transfusions, thus earning the degree of Doctor of Science. His research was responsible for saving thousands of lives during World War II. One point should be noted concerning Drew. He was angered by the common practice of segregating the blood for negro and white donors. He was quite vocal about this and maintained his position, as did all competent scientists, that all human blood is the same and has no relation to an individual's color.

In conclusion, blacks have greatly contributed to the enhancement of modern medicine; from "materia medica" of ancient Africa to the meticulous research of a devoted few. Every contribution has been essential to the broad evolution of medical science.

Endnotes

1. Ivan Van Sertima, *Blacks in Science: Ancient and Modern* (New Brunswick, 1983), 140.
2. Ibid., 143.
3. Ibid.
4. Ibid., 147
5. Ibid., 140.
6. Ibid., 151
7. George W. Harley, *Native African Medicine* (London, 1970), 68.
8. David Landy, *Culture, Disease, and Healing* (New York, 1977), 77.
9. Herbert M. Morais, *Afro-American Life and History* (Pennsylvania, 1978), 11.
10. Ibid., 207.
11. Ibid., 41.
12. Ibid., 77; Allen Johnson and Dumas Malone, eds., *Dictionary of American Biography* (22 vols., New York, 1928-1944), X, 253
13. Ibid., 81.

W.E.B. DuBois and the Founding of the NAACP

by

David C. Pritchard

Five years after President Lincoln issued the Emancipation Proclamation, William Edward Burghardt DuBois was born on February 23, 1868. During his lifetime he witnessed changes in the attitudes and values of people in the United States and the world. He became the first black to graduate from Harvard with a doctorate and proved to be an outstanding intellectual. Through his personality and powerful intellect, he became the leader of a race and a founding father of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP).

His father died while DuBois was a baby, so he lived with his mother in Great Barrington, Massachusetts, during his early life. DuBois later recalled that there were approximately twenty-five, but certainly not more than fifty blacks in the town's population of five thousand, and that his family was one of the oldest families in that area.¹ According to Rayford Logan, the color line was pretty faint in Great Barrington. Young Will found his childhood somewhat better than many other southern black children. The white community seemed to find room for him in its social life, and years later he would recall not much experience of segregation or color discrimination.² DuBois was successful in high school, usually surpassing the white students in his academic endeavors. He noted that he was only moderately good at baseball and football, but usually was the leader when it came to running, exploring, story-telling, and other intellectual competitions.³

DuBois was later troubled about going to college. He wanted to go to Harvard because he felt it was the oldest and greatest institution of higher learning in the land. So naturally, he felt this was the one he should attend. However, he had some difficult "bridges" to cross in order to realize that goal. The first obstacle was to get by the entrance examinations, since his high school, being so small was not adequately preparing its students for Harvard's standards. The second question involved financial considerations — he could not afford it. The people of Great Barrington saw potential in William, so with help from them, he was able to attend Fisk University in Tennessee which was an all black school.⁴

Between 1885 and 1894, DuBois received his education at Fisk University, Harvard College, and the University of Berlin. While at Fisk, he received a different education. Besides academics, he learned what race discrimination was and how very threatening it was for blacks. DuBois wrote:

"I saw discrimination in ways of which I had never dreamed; the separation of passengers on the railways of the South was just beginning; the race separation in living quarters throughout the cities and towns was manifest; the

public disdain and even insult in race contact on the street continually took my breath; I came in contact for the first time with a sort of violence that I had never realized in New England; I remember going down and looking wide-eyed at the door of a public building, filled with buck-shot, where the editor of the leading daily paper had been publicly murdered the day before. I was astonished to find many of my fellow students carrying fire-arms and to hear their stories of adventure."

At Fisk, he became editor of the *Fisk Herald* and also developed a "belligerent attitude" toward the color barrier.⁵

DuBois graduated in three years from Fisk and was accepted at Harvard. He was awarded three hundred dollars in a scholarship called the Price Greenland Aid.⁶ From there, he applied to study in Europe and was accepted at the University of Berlin. There he gained time to think about the negroes' status and his own relation to it. When DuBois was twenty-five, he made a very powerful diary entry in which he vowed to become a leader of the black race. In this particular entry, his career decisions included devoting his life's work to teaching and research.

As a college teacher he would dispel negro ignorance by training other missionaries who could carry the gospel back to their communities; at the same time, his research would convert white America to a just appraisal of the negro. His research would serve a third purpose as well: it would fill a genuine personal need. Among white intellectuals he had always found acceptance. As their peer he would continue to find it. In the negro world he would be a liberator. Here was a career, a mission, which would consume many lifetimes.⁷

At first DuBois wanted to have blacks in America form their own society within the country. Biographer Elliot M. Rudwick pointed out that DuBois wanted to see black social services, unions, and industrial enterprises under the direction of black leaders. Rudwick noted that his ideas were impractical for a "marginal and uneducated" group. DuBois' faith in college-trained negroes was often misplaced, since many blacks viewed education as a symbol of individual status and exploitation, and not as a tool for race advancement.⁸

Around the turn of the century, his political objectives partially switched from the thoughts of negro nationalism and moved toward the theme of negro civil rights. DuBois was involved in a split movement; one to develop the race as a separate cultural group, and the other to integrate its members in the United States as "full" citizens.⁹

Booker T. Washington was the founder of the Tuskegee Institute in which industrial education for blacks was stressed. With Washington believing that industrial education was the best type of education for blacks, he made the statement that "agriculture would be the race's basic industry for a long time." Washington differed from DuBois with thoughts that he would much rather see a "young colored man graduate from college, go out and start a truck garden, a dairy farm, or conduct a cotton plantation, and thus become a first hand producer of wealth, rather than a parasite living upon the wealth originally produced by others, seeking uncertain and unsatisfactory livelihood in temporary and questionable positions." Rudwick noted

that Washington dedicated himself and his university to training negroes for vocational activities. Washington believed that white southerners, with their long history of racism, would only support negro education if they were convinced a docile and efficient labor supply would result. Washington found whites were supportive when blacks were not protesting against injustice and they were "emphasizing harmony within the framework of the caste system."¹⁰

Both DuBois and Washington were great leaders. However, they had different philosophies as to how to educate and help their race to advance. Rudwick noted that both men respected each other, although their personalities were too different to build a friendship. Their two major differences were over education and suffrage. DuBois' thoughts were centered around the negro college, which had a cultured brain trust urging the race forward. On the other hand, Washington emphasized industrial education and repudiated abstract knowledge. The supporters of Washington pushed very hard for universal industrial education, so many voting whites approved of funding for industrial schools rather than negro colleges. Many politically important whites supported the industrial schools where it could do some good rather than being wasted on "useless" abstract subjects. The other difference was the right to vote: Washington wanted blacks to be prepared for the vote and DuBois demanded immediate suffrage.¹¹

Monroe Trotter was a co-editor with George Forbes of the *Guardian* in Boston. This publication opposed the programs of Booker T. Washington and "demanded full and immediate equality for the Negro."¹² Trotter wrote many criticisms of Washington's policies. He felt that Washington was taking the negro race back a few steps by making it a docile and passive labor force. Trotter challenged educated negroes to either endorse Washington or the "Radicals" (meaning the generic term for negroes who were anti-Washington). Trotter also sought the brilliant scholar DuBois to help in his campaign against Washington. This was, however, not an evil plot to turn DuBois on Washington, for DuBois was becoming disenchanted with the Tuskegeean's ways and platforms. DuBois was changing his philosophies and slowly beginning to disagree more and more with Washington and agreeing with the ideas of Trotter.¹³

In 1902 and 1903, DuBois published an essay and then a book *The Souls of Black Folk* in which he more directly attacked the philosophies of education of Washington. With these publications, he came to be on the "other side of the fence" from Washington.¹⁴ Although DuBois was on the other side, he was still willing to try to work with him and so he attended a conference in New York at Carnegie Hall. The two men were too influential to work against one another, but this was the end result. At the conference, DuBois noted that Washington contradicted himself on certain points. Washington agreed that the vote for blacks was very important, by the "Committee of Twelve," appointed at the conference ignored the ballot question a few months later.¹⁵

With Washington now reaching the height of his popularity in both the black and white communities, DuBois decided to step in another direction. With Trotter's persuasion, he moved away from Washington's policies and gravitated toward a new tactic of propaganda called the Niagara Movement.¹⁶

In 1905, DuBois and a group of young men decided to organize a campaign that would secure full citizenship for all blacks. They felt that the day of temporizing was over; a fight was on, and these men were going to fight to a finish. Under the leadership of DuBois, the group met at Niagara Falls, Canada, in June of 1905, and drew up a platform for aggressive action.¹⁷ DuBois then told the world about the movement when he delivered a number of speeches in 1905, explaining the Movement and its goals and purposes.¹⁸

DuBois explained that the Niagara Movement was an organization of fifty-four men who resided in eighteen states. The organization was comprised of ministers, lawyers, editors, businessmen, and teachers. He also described how the bureaucratic organization was arranged simply so that the states could each receive information from their representatives at the Niagara Meetings. The Movement has several goals including freedom of speech and criticism, an unfettered and unsubsidized press, manhood suffrage, the abolition of all caste distinctions based simply on race and color, and other basic human rights that had been denied to blacks but which the majority of the population had enjoyed.¹⁹

The Movement met annually at different locations and with the papers and conclusions it published, began to receive national attention. Then in 1907, a race-oriented riot broke out in Springfield, Illinois, which shocked the sensibilities of many whites throughout the nation. After observing the scene William English Walling, a distinguished writer, wrote an article entitled "Race War in the North," which appeared in the *Independent*. He called for blacks to be treated equally both socially and politically, or the race war which had raged in the South for years would breakout in the north.²⁰

Mary White Ovington, a concerned New York social worker, read Walling's article and took up the challenge to do something about the race problem. She, along with Walling and Henry Moskowitz, decided to call a meeting on Lincoln's Birthday in 1909. William Lloyd Garrison's grandson Oswald Garrison Villard wrote the call for "all believers in democracy to join in a national conference for the discussion of present evils, the voicing of protests, and the renewal of the struggle for civil and political liberty."²¹

The members of the Niagara Movement were invited. Most of them accepted. The gathering consisted of people from many distinguished professions including educators, professors, publicists, bishops, judges, and social workers. Many important individuals participated in the conference including Jane Addams, William Dean Howells, Ida B. Wells, John Dewey, John Milholland, DuBois, and Villard. They organized the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People for the purpose to fight all forms of forced segregation, work for the complete enfranchisement of the Negro, and call for the enforcement of the Fourteenth and the Fifteenth Amendments. DuBois, the only negro officer, was placed as director of publicity and research.²²

Some of the public felt that with DuBois on the staff, the NAACP would be radical group based upon the Niagara Movement and its "radical" ideals. It is noted that many white philanthropists and even some blacks felt that the move was unwise, but success proved them wrong.²³

The NAACP took many cases to the Supreme Court and won more and more rights for blacks to have equal citizenship. And with the successful beginning, it grew to other areas of the nation. This organization would not have been possible without a handfull of men who stood up for their unalienable rights.²⁴

The Declaration of Independence states that all men are created equal. This is what men like DuBois and later Martin Luther King, Jr. fought for in the United States. King seems to have based some of his fight on the groundwork set forth by DuBois. Had DuBois not "had a dream" and pushed for equality of the black race, then quite possibly the country might still be in the dark abyss of legal segregation.

Endnotes

1. W. E. B. DuBois, *Dusk of Dawn: An Essay Toward and Autobiography of a Race Concept* (New Brunswick, 1984), 10.
2. Rayford W. Logan, *W. E. B. DuBois: A Profile* (New York, 1971), 3.
3. W. E. B. DuBois, *The Autobiography of W. E. B. DuBois: A Soliloquy on Viewing My Life From the Last Decade of Its First Century* (1971), 95.
4. DuBois, *Dusk of Dawn*, 20-21.
5. *Ibid.*, 25,30,31-32.
6. *Ibid.*, 32.
7. Quoted in Logan, *DuBois: A Profile*, 30,34-35.
8. Rudwick, Elliot M., *W. E. B. DuBois: Propagandist of the Negro Protest* (Philadelphia, 1968), 32-38.
9. *Ibid.*, 53.
10. *Ibid.*, 59-62.
11. *Ibid.*, 63,64.
12. John Hope Franklin and Alfred A. Moss, Jr., *From Slavery to Freedom: A History of Negro Americans* (6th ed.; New York, 1988), 264.
13. Rudwick, *DuBois: Propagandist*, 65-67.
14. *Ibid.*, 66-67.
15. *Ibid.*, 77-87.
16. *Ibid.*, 87-93.
17. Franklin and Moss, *From Slavery*, 286.
18. W. E. B. DuBois, *W. E. B. DuBois Speaks: Speeches and Addresses 1890-1919* (New York, 1970), 144.
19. *Ibid.*, 144-5, 146.
20. Franklin and Moss, *From Slavery*, 286.
21. *Ibid.*, 287-8.
22. *Ibid.*, 288.
23. *Ibid.*
24. *Ibid.*

***Officers
of
Alpha Beta Phi
Chapter
1988-1989***

Debra Beckett Weigold

President

Roger C. Adams

Vice-President

Mary Elaine Ray

Secretary/Treasurer

Timothy Craig Grayson

Historian

James A. Ramage

Faculty Advisor

Charter Student Members

Joy M. Baker	Christopher P. Burns
Ann C. Cahill	David R. Caudill, Jr.
John P. DeMarcus Jr.	Daniel M. Driscoll
Scott K. Fowler	Mark K. Gilvin
Bennie W. Good	Joseph S. Guilyard
Matthew W. Hornsby	Todd P. Huff
Kenneth E. Hughes	Jeffrey Junto
Shonda S. Kinman	Andrew O. Lutes
Douglas K. Meyer, Jr.	S. Wayne Moreland
Grace M. Murimi	Elaine M. Richardson
Dick Wolfe	Rudiger F. Wolfe

Members Initiated April 15, 1986

David P. Anstead	Joseph T. Shields
Richard T. Dedman	Harold A. Stephens
James R. Eilers	Shelley L. Stephenson
Michael P. Holliday	Deborah S. Trego
Betty R. Letscher	Edwin L. Vardiman
Darlene S. Miller	Shawn T. Young
Linda M. Ruh	

Members Initiated April 14, 1987

Kristen H. Breen	John Prescott Kappas
Laura A. Butcher	Martha Pelfrey
Lynn David	Julie Ann Prewitt
Cheryl L. Grinninger	Edna L. Stracener
Linda Kay Hon	Verna L. Vardiman
Judith F. Hutchison	

Members Initiated
April 12, 1988

Susan M. Burgess	Sarah Suzanne Kiser
Lori Ann Dinser	Joyce Borne Kramer
Stacey L. Graus	William H. Lowe
Timothy Craig Grayson	Michael K.G. Moore
Jeffrey Hampton	Jennifer A. Raiche
Derick Rogers Harper	Debra Beckett Weigold
Christopher Gary Holmes	Nancy Lynn Willoughby
Virginia Johnson	

Members Initiated
April 11, 1989

Roger Craig Adams	Tracy Ice
James Lee Breth	Elizabeth W. Johnson
Edward R. Fahlbush	Wylie D. Jones
Linda Holbrook	Mary Elaine Ray
Christoper Iannelli	Rebecca Rose Schroer
	Jeffrey A. Smith

Members Initiated
April 10, 1990

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

Faculty

Michael C. C. Adams
Lawrence R. Borne
John P. DeMarcus
J. Merle Nickell
W. Michael Ryan
Louis R. Thomas
H. Lew Wallace
Michael H. Washington

Leon E. Boothe
James C. Claypool
Tripta Desai
James A. Ramage
W. Frank Steely
Robert C. Vitz
Richard E. Ward
Jeffrey C. Williams

This publication was prepared by Northern Kentucky University and printed with state funds (KRS 57.375). Northern Kentucky University is an Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Institution. 10N033