- Matthew Vasilev
- Jonathan McDaniel
- Raphaël Dallaire Ferland
- Matthieu Caron
- Annie MacKay
- Josh Mentanko
- Gregory Kerr
- Vanessa Fernando
- Rebecca Rodin
- Arielle Shiller

HISTORICAL DISCOURSES

McGill Undergraduate Journal of History
Volume XXVI, Winter 2012

Historical Discourses

The McGill Undergraduate Journal of History

Vol. XXVI
2011-2012

McGill University
Montreal, Quebec, Canada

Cover Art: Aquil Virani

Aquil Virani is a U3 Humanistics Major (Liberal Arts) who spends most of his time doing artwork instead of studying. Given any excuse to bring out the paintbrushes, he'll take it. His portfolio is online at aquilvirani.tumblr.com.

Historical Discourses accepts history papers written by McGill undergraduates. Submissions in either English or French are welcome and may be sent to:

Discours historiques accepte les dissertations d'histoire écrites par les étudiants de premier cycle de l'Université McGill en anglais ou en français. Nous recevons les dissertations à l'addresse suivante:

History Department Office (Room 625)
Stephen Leacock Building
855 Sherbrooke Street West
Montreal, Quebec, Canada
H3A 2T7

Historical Discourses Editors 2011-2012

Contents

Foreword

While you are reading these lines, you are holding in your hands the latest issue of *Historical Discourses*, McGill's Undergraduate Journal of History. In the following pages, you will find articles which the editorial team considered the most representative of student intellectual life in the history department. I am sure that the team had to make some difficult decisions, and I am sorry that not all submissions could be published. Each of you who submitted a contribution spent countless hours in the library to find material for your project. Although the result is definitely rewarding, long hours of research in the library can be difficult, and sometimes tedious. As I am sure most of you have found, these bouts of boredom were often relieved by funny, awkward, or other interesting random moments: couples smooching in the stacks, mice running through the microfilm room, or a fellow student yelling on the phone with his mother near your cubicle. Once you graduate and extend your research beyond McGill, however, you will find dull moments are few. In the twenty years since my undergraduate years, I experienced my share of memorable research experiences which I want to share with you here.

My dissertation project led me to Moscow in 2002 to conduct research in the Russian foreign ministry archive. The ministry is housed in a Stalinesque skyscraper at the western edge of downtown, adorned with a massive, carved hammer-and-sickle emblem on its stone facade. The archive itself stood at the back of Stalin's architectural monster, in the basement of a dilapidated 19th century building. Every day, I approached the skyscraper from the subway station and walked around it on its northern side to get to the archive. One day, I decided to break the routine and walk on the southern side. As I followed the concrete wall surrounding the ministry compound, I reached an open gate that provided me with a

glimpse of the ministry's parking lot. My eyes caught sight of a beige Volga, the famous Soviet-built car for mid-ranking government officials. Only after some time did I realize that its trunk was slightly open and a human hand was sticking out. As a law-abiding Swiss citizen, I immediately thought about reporting this suspicious circumstance to the police. But then I remembered that I was in Putin's Russia; my survival instincts kicked in, and I started to sweat. I turned around, increased the pace of my steps rapidly, and disappeared into the next subway station. As usual, in Russia, you follow the principle: "Don't ask, don't tell." I still wonder how many skeletons might be in the basement of the Russian Foreign Ministry.

After this experience, I decided to spend time in a somewhat safer place, Eastern Central Europe. I knew that the Hungarian archives were open for research, and so I set out to spend some time in a 19th century palace on Castle Hill in Budapest. With the summer break just in view, the archive's staff was less than enthusiastic about fetching the documents I requested, claiming that no Russian-language documents (I don't read Hungarian) had ever been found in the archive. I knew that this was false, as the Soviet Union had provided its Communist satellites during the Cold War with mountains of reports on foreign and domestic issues. Consequently, I ended up in the office of the director of the institute that had written the letter of introduction to the archive on my behalf. Much to my surprise, he did not look like the dignified head of a research center, but more like a character from the cast of the 'Pirates of the Caribbean'—tanned and dressed with a Hawaiian shirt, complete with a big golden earring. He must have accidentally misplaced the black eye patch, or so I thought for a moment. I quickly explained my problem, and he decided to call the head of the archive immediately. After 45 minutes of conversation, he announced that the head of the archive had just made a Maoist-style self-criticism. The next day I was at the archive before the doors opened, and when I sat down to work, thousands of pages of documents in Russian appeared before my eyes. Voilà! Alas, just as I was savoring victory, the ventilator of my computer went up in smoke. After briefly assessing the

documents and ordering photocopies, I sat in a cab to the Toshiba office in Budapest. Once there, I was informed that my laptop was likely to ascend to computer heaven. That evening, I desperately tried to coax my dissertation research out of that piece of junk. Unfortunately, it was a hot summer night which did not make this task easier, as the unventilated laptop overheated quickly. I did not only suffer from the sweltering heat and the antics of my derelict laptop, but also from the raucous symphony of an amorous couple occupying the room to next door.

After I arrived at McGill in 2003, I decided to undertake some more research on my project. One trip led me to Rome where I worked in the archives of the Communist Party of Italy. Since I did not have much money, I decided to stay in a Catholic convent — famous for simple fare and an early curfew. The room was small, had a hard bed, an old closet, and a small table. Hanging above the table, a miniature metal crucifix was overseeing everything that went on in my little room. Below, right under the eyes of Jesus, was my ever growing mountain of literature on Italian communism. I feared that the Lord would punish me one night by sending a bolt from heaven towards that table to burn all of these books on the Anti-Christ, but he must have considered me, a Zwinglian agnostic, not worthy of so much attention. Luckily, the people described in these books did not decide to rise in revolution against Jesus looking down on them. With hindsight, I still feel lucky that this Cold War did not turn into a hot one on my watch.

Finally, I also made it into one of the many archives in China. I only had two weeks scheduled for research, but I managed to identify and see all documents worth examination within four hours. When I tried to order photocopies, the vice-head of the archive gave me a two-hour speech on how foreigners were only allowed to read documents and forbidden to take notes or make photocopies. Once she had disappeared into her cozy office four floors above, the reading room staff could not care less about what I was doing, as long as I did not intrude on their routine of playing computer games. To circumvent the rules for foreigners, I decided to hire several Chinese students to transcribe the documents on their computers.

I entrusted an older graduate student with copying the most important pieces. To my dismay, he seldom showed up in the archive during the remainder of the two weeks, and when he did, he mostly talked on his cell phone. I was furious, but eventually resigned to leaving China only with a bunch of less important documents. On my last day, the graduate student announced shortly before the archive closed that he had miraculously copied all of the documents. I was puzzled—how had he been able to do all of this work in the last minute? Later that evening, he confessed his "crime": he had removed the documents from the files, carried them out of the archive and past several security guards to have them transcribed by several hastily hired copyists before returning them to the archive. Luckily, he was not discovered in the act; this surely would have meant several years for both of us in a not-so-cozy Chinese prison cell.

Overall, I can attest that finding crime scenes, dodging pirates and security guards, and coming close to a Cold War between God and Italian Communists were all part of my work. Who said being a historian was boring?

Lorenz Lüthi
March 2012

Introduction

After months of preparation, it is with great pleasure that we unveil the twenty-sixth edition of the Historical Discourses, McGill's undergraduate journal of history. Given the academic excellence regularly exhibited by history students, and our journal's perennial mission to showcase the best historical works written in the department, our task as editors was daunting. In order to select ten essays from over one hundred submissions, we chose to adhere to Oscar Wilde's credo, which we believed especially befitting of our journal: "The one duty we owe to history is to rewrite it." Although the journal was lucky to receive an incredible amount of excellent submissions, the ten essays included in this year's edition stood out for their outstanding creativity, analysis of primary sources and overall contribution to the field of history. These papers are a testament to the hard work and dedication of McGill history students and we are proud to be able to showcase them for you.

We could not have put this journal together were it not for the help of a number of key people and organizations. We would like to thank the History Students' Association, the Arts Undergraduate Society and the Student Society of McGill University for their generous financial support. A big thank you also needs to go to our editorial team, our layout, and our artistic staff, without whom we could not have published this year's journal. Finally, we are indebted to all the professors from the history department who continue to help guide and inspire their students to achieve academic excellence.

Jean-Robert Lalancette
Alexandra Wapia
Editors-in-Chief
March 2012

Utopian Dreamers: Edward Bellamy and the Canadian Context

Matthew Vasilev

In 1887 Edward Bellamy, an unlikely newspaper journalist from Chicopee Falls, Massachusetts, penned a literary fantasy titled *Looking Backward: 2000 - 1887*. During its second year of publication demand for the book exploded. More than 200,000 copies were sold by 1890 and sales steadily increased in the following years. In fact, these sales numbers were second only to Beatrice Stowe's *Uncle Tom's Cabin*. Bellamy's story had struck a chord in the nation's conscience: by writing a novel, he founded a movement. Hundreds of Nationalist clubs sprouted across the country to spread his ideas and books. These groups soon sought political for reforms to enlarge state ownership of resources, utilities, and services.

Historians of Canada, perhaps put off by the novel genre, have rarely dignified Looking Backward with more than passing mention despite the fact that Bellamy was widely read and avidly taken up throughout late-Victorian Canada. In fact, the only scholarly article on the topic of Bellamy and Canada focuses on the 1930s and the revival of his ideas during the Great Depression.[1] As this study will show, Bellamy's ideas were present in Canada before the 1930s since they intersected with the labour reform movement, the social gospel, and utopian colonies. Canadians read and used Bellamy in much the same way as the Americans did, so I will begin by surveying that initial American reception.

Part One: The Story of Julian West and the Birth of the American Nationalist Movement

Before 1887, Utopian literature remained a marginal subgenre of

the highly popular romance novels. Within ten years of the publication of *Looking Backward*, more than one hundred utopian works were written in the United States.[2] Bellamy's book, however, was not the cause. Instead, this utopian literary explosion was fuelled by demand for answers, solutions, and ideas on how to overcome the perceived *catastrophe* approaching North American society. Bellamy's book was simply the most successful at tapping into this widespread anxiety. These turbulent two decades witnessed immense technological changes, great economic devastation from international market collapses, and violent conflict between capital and labour. Nineteenth century society was being rapidly transformed by new technologies, lay wounded by international market collapses and was under constant threat of violent clashes between capital and labour. Not only did these industrial strikes displace and dislocate workers and families but also almost everybody was reading about them due to the mass proliferation of newspaper. The leading social riddles of the day like "The Labor Question," "The Women Question," and even "The Servant Girl Question" confronted readers and provoked rigorous debates in the editorial pages of newspapers. Utopian novels addressed these leading questions by transporting readers to new realities where dramatic change, a grand theory, or a significant event had solved the great social problems confronting society. In Bellamy's vision the complete transformation of civilization was easy and above all, peaceful.

Looking Backward tells the tale of a modern Rip Van Winkle. Julian West, a wealthy insomniac whom, with the help of his hypnotist, falls into a deep sleep one night in Boston in 1887. His insomnia is evidently a physiological symptom of the feverish social unrest disturbing the moral conscience of the middle classes of the late nineteenth century. During this "great business crisis," America is crippled by "disturbances of industry" as the "working classes had suddenly and very generally become infected with a profound discontent with their condition, and an idea that it could be greatly bettered if they only knew how to go about it."[3] West's only sanctuary from the social unrest surrounding his suburban home is his soundproof

vault. However, his retreat from the "nervous tension of the public mind," is also a flight from history itself since West sleeps until the year 2000.

West is revived by Dr. Leete who acts as both as host and interpreter of the new society to the protagonist and the nineteenth century reader. The novel proceeds as a long series of discussions between West and Leete on the history and development of the new world order as well as a tour of Boston's new superstructure. In this new social order, society has been reorganized along the lines of Nationalism—state ownership of all forms of production—which has produced tremendous material wealth which was distributed evenly. A host of technological innovations have also freed men and women from the cumbersome labour to which they were once bound. The real miracle of production, however, was achieved by unlocking the boundless potential of human energy through cooperation rather than competition. The linchpin to Bellamy's visionary future is the creation of the Industrial Army, a Prussian-inspired and tightly disciplined workforce regulated by a national corporate bureaucracy. All citizens are conscripted at the age of twenty-one, yet are free to choose their line of work, while employment and education are made birthrights.

The peaceful transformation from industrial capitalism to state socialism was brought about, ironically, "thanks to the corporations themselves." Dr. Leete explains to West that "the absorption of business by ever larger monopolies continued," and widened the gap between the rich and poor. However, the "prodigious increase of efficiency" revealed by these great consolidations of capital could not be ignored.[4] The logical evolution

> was completed by the final consolidation of the entire capital of the nation. [...] The nation, that is to say, organized as the one great business corporation in which all other corporations were absorbed; it became the one capitalist in the place of all other capitalists, the sole employer, the final monopoly in which all previous all previous and lesser monopolies were swallowed up, a monopoly in the profits and economies of which all citizens shared. The epoch of trusts had ended in The Great Trust.[5]

Most importantly, this trajectory was peaceful "without great bloodshed and terrible convulsions." Public opinion welcomed the transformation rather than rejected it. "The once bitter identification with the great corporations changed once their necessity was realized as a link, a transitional phase, in the evolution of the true industrial system."[6]

This sudden awakening of the American public is the closest Bellamy comes to describing how the transformation from 19th century industrial capitalism to utopian Nationalism could be achieved. He hoped his book would help in this great awakening, but soon recognized that more effort would be required. After endorsing the initiative of several Boston theosophists, Bellamy quickly took part in launching a nationwide movement of establishing Nationalist clubs to debate and promote the new way forward. Who were these active supporters and why were they so receptive to Bellamy's ideas?

Significantly, nowhere in the book does Bellamy use the word 'socialism' in association with this new world order despite its very overt similarities. Instead he described his vision as "Nationalism," a term loosely associated with patriotism and pride rather than subversion and violence. By 1887, Socialism had acquired a violent overtone amongst the middle and upper classes in part due to memories of the bloodshed that resulted from the Paris Commune in 1871, and more recent and much closer to home, the Haymarket Affair which shook the nation in May 1886.[7] At the height of the eight-hour movement a group of anarchists were accused of throwing a bomb into a crowd of policemen who were attempting to break up a demonstration in Chicago. For decades after the Haymarket Affair, socialism was equated with violence in the United States. In order to distance his ideas from these associations Bellamy deliberately dismisses the radicals and socialists as hindrances in the construction of Nationalism. Leete stresses, "the red flag party" almost sabotaged the entire enterprise because its assorted anarchists and communists "were paid by the great monopolies to wave the red flag and talk about burning, sacking, and blowing up, in order, by alarming the timid, to head off any real reforms."[8]

In suggesting a new way forward free from radical change and violent revolution Bellamy was reaching out to the middle classes who anxiously observed the conflict between capital and labour but were not versed in writings of Karl Marx or Lawrence Gronlund, author of *The Cooperative Commonwealth*. He was not the first enlightened thinker to reach out to this broad and highly diverse class of people. Several important movements had preceded Bellamy with similar visions of economic equality and social solidarity. These were advocates of Henry George's Single Tax, industrial workers organized into Local Assemblies of the Knights of Labor, and spiritual reformers who preached the Doctrine of Theosophy. Popular participation in these movements signalled a deeper dissatisfaction with two party politics and the limits of reform. For these activists society's major problems were not the shortcomings of a single political party but deeper symptoms of a corrupt economic system. By challenging the economic foundations of capitalism or questioning the spiritual fabric of modern society, these movements enabled Bellamy's success by awakening a spirit of reform he was able to harness.

One of the earliest social panaceas offered was Henry George's Single Tax. In 1879 Henry George published *Progress and Poverty,* an economic treatise that proposed the abolition of all existing property taxes and tariffs and replacing them with a "single tax" on the unimproved value of the land. The idea was to stimulate industry and development and simultaneously prevent land speculation in previously unsettled areas. The Single Tax movement was remarkable because of its capacity to appeal across culture and class, as well as both urban and rural constituencies.[9] Readers of George had come to a more thorough understanding of the fallacies of orthodox free-market capitalist economics. More importantly, the proposed solution was simple: tax land, not industry. He was, however, rather ambiguous whether this reform would amount to the abolition of the private ownership of land as a legal institution. According to George, private property would be abolished through public ownership not of the land itself but of the land's value. Owners

would thus retain possession but not the proprietorship of the land's value.[10] For some single tax supporters this was understood as practical fiscal policy, for others it was land nationalization in disguise.[11] The single taxers who had already accepted the idea of land nationalization through George easily identified with Bellamy's Nationalist programme. Thanks to George's ambiguity and these different interpretations, the single tax was adopted in various municipalities across North America. His ideas, however, were rarely implemented to their fullest.

Within the urban setting, many proponents of both Bellamy's Nationalism and of George's Single Tax had participated in the early industrial union movement headed by the Holy and Noble Order of the Knights of Labor. Born in Philadelphia in 1869, the Knights of Labor reached its peak membership in 1887 with over 700,000 members across Canada and the United States.[12] The Order comprised of mainly semi-skilled and unskilled members of the "producing classes" from all industries. Their purpose was twofold; it was to organize and to educate workers of the world. Industrial workers were organized along vocational lines into local assemblies where they would raise their collective concerns and share ideas of reform. Through these assemblies, Henry George's writings and other social criticism were recommended to members and stocked in Assembly libraries.[13] However, by the time Bellamy's book was in peak circulation between 1889 and 1890, the Knights of Labor were in swift decline across the United States and Canada.[14] Bellamy's utopian vision of an Industrial Army united by the Brotherhood of Solidarity spoke volumes to their collective and idealist ethos and attracted many Knights and former Knights to his cause throughout the 1890s.

When *Looking Backward* was published in 1888 the first group to respond to Bellamy were theosophists from his own locality, Boston. The Theosophy Society was founded in 1875 in New York City to advance spiritual principles and the search for truth in the occult and eastern religions. They were a very inclusive organization that sought to "form a nucleus of universal brotherhood of humanity without distinction

of race, creed, sex, or caste." Within six months of the publication of *Looking Backward*, two theosophists, Cyrus Willard and Sylvester Baxter, approached Bellamy separately about the prospect of forming a Nationalist Club in Boston.[15] Interestingly, half of the founding officers of the first Nationalist club were theosophists. In *Looking Backward*, they saw the material realization of the harmony and brotherly love that theosophy preached. Bellamy's emphasis on the role of an enlightened elite in lifting men from moral degradation paralleled their own vision.[16] However, this goal of universal brotherhood was the extent of their commonalities. Theosophists were less interested in the practical trappings of a centralized bureaucracy promised by Bellamy's future than the potential his novel to expose the spiritual injustice perpetrated by modern industrial capitalism.

Bellamy's message quickly moved beyond theosophists. Within a year, a host of urban reformers—single tax advocates, socialists, and former Knights of Labor—took up the cause and established Nationalist Clubs across the United States. These clubs worked to spread the literature and ideas of Nationalism. In May 1889, the movement's own newspaper, the *Nationalist,* began publication. By December 1889, over 200,000 copies of *Looking Backward* had sold while 69,000 copies of the *Nationalist* had circulated.[17] 1890 witnessed an active growth of this first phase of education and proselytizing, as the numbers of clubs and associations mushroomed throughout the year. In January, there were 44 clubs in 14 states and the District of Columbia. By May, there were 110 clubs across the United States, in December, the number of clubs climbed to 158 and finally peaked at 165 in February 1891.[18]

The second phase of the movement was marked by the appearance of a second Nationalist periodical, the *New Nation*, in January 1891.[19] This new publication quickly eclipsed the *Nationalist* which was seen as limited in ambition and audience and ceased publication three months later. By moving away from the *Nationalist* towards the *New Nation,* Bellamy was also leaving behind his theosophist supporters who had hoped for a regeneration of society outside of the corrupt and

corrupting world of politics. The *New Nation* advocated precisely that, political participation and organization. Bellamy took on the role of chief editor of the new journal and sought to engage the "thinking classes" of America to join the movement towards government ownership and control of industry. A consistent feature of the publication was a section devoted to debating the benefits of Nationalism with different members of society – the business man, the farmer, the teacher, among many others – and urging them to join the movement.[20] In another section of the journal directed at consolidating support for the movement, Bellamy looked with approval upon any municipal reform that pointed toward Nationalism in what he called "gas and water socialism."[21]

Under this new political orientation, Bellamy closely followed the emerging Peoples' Party, commonly known as the Populists. They differed significantly from a typical political party since they were more of a coalition of reform organizations ranging from farmers' associations, labour organizations, women's groups, than an array of nonconformists including urban radicals, tax and currency reformers, prohibitionists, middle class utopians, spiritual innovators, and miscellaneous iconoclasts.[22] This third party force emerged from the increasingly powerful Farmers' Alliance and its kindred associations which numbered in the millions during the 1880s and 90s.[23] These agrarian populists were seeking to forge a reform coalition with labour and in doing so attracted the attention of many Nationalists. Many populists had already been won over to the Single Tax plan as a practical fiscal scheme to yield immediate benefits. However, Bellamy's vision was a bit startling for some of the farm reformers because of the threat of the disappearance of the private farm enterprise in Bellamy's collectivist future.[24] The Farmers Alliance sought agricultural cooperatives in order to help level economic playing field and were not interested in state-run collectivization.[25] The two groups managed to find common ground in their insistence on government ownership of railroads. Although Nationalists viewed such a move as the first step to complete government ownership of industry, Alliance farmers tended to draw the

line at the railroad.[26] Such tentative agreement was nonetheless enough for the two groups to work together under the banner of the Peoples' Party.

More importantly, many leaders of the state Peoples' Parties were also ardent Nationalists and promoted Bellamy's work in the pages of their official organs. Thanks to this fervent fellowship, Bellamy's work enjoyed tremendous popularity in the Midwest and California.[27] When the Peoples' Party hosted its national convention in Omaha on July 4, 1892, the influence of Bellamy embedded itself into the party's new platform planned for the upcoming federal election.[28] The new party polled more than a million votes in 1892 and this strong show of support for a new way forward buoyed Bellamy's hope in the movement. However, the strength of the party remained in the most rural areas, places where farmers wore the yellow ribbons of the Farmers Alliance and remained ambivalent towards the Nationalist orientation of their leadership. Resentment from the periphery of the Party towards the central leadership increased and sowed the seeds of discontent and division within the Peoples' Party. The last gasp of Populist politics was relieved by the defeat of William Jennings Bryan, the Democratic candidate in the 1896 federal election. The Peoples' Party had decided to endorse Bryan and his reform platform instead of running their own candidate and splitting the vote. Their disappointment transformed into bitter infighting over who was to blame.

The ultimate failure of the Peoples' Party should not diminish the value of the Nationalist Movement or the potency of Bellamy's message. This fantastic tale by a relatively non-prolific writer ignited a far reaching movement that inspired people to join new organizations, demand government reforms, and even support a third political party on a national scale. Bellamy's phenomenal reception must be attributed to the book's pivotal timing and the work performed by his intellectual predecessors. The war between labour and capital had escalated to violent proportions and Bellamy's vision promise a peaceful transition to a materialist utopia. People had already begun to question the economic foundations of American society due to Henry George's

Single Tax theory and Bellamy's ideas went further since they promised solutions to the problem of trusts. Moreover, readers could understand Bellamy through the short comprehendible form of a novel and not a fat economic treatise. On a more fundamental level, Bellamy's message of a universal brotherhood resonated with both the theosophists and the Knights of Labor, who actively promoted his writings to fellow members.

Part Two: Arrival in Canada

To this very day, William Fraser's essay on Canadian reactions to Bellamy's *Looking Backward* is the only work to focus on this subject. Fraser, however, is mainly concerned with the revival of Bellamyite ideas during the Great Depression of the 1930s. His assessment of the novel's journey across the border is nonetheless still relevant. According to Fraser's research, Bellamy's most popular works, *Looking Backward* and *Equality,* were officially reprinted in Canada and he is right to surmise that many cheap editions or excerpts of his work were circulated and published in Canada. As early as June 1889, an edition of the *Home and School Supplement* published an advertisement for Bellamy's book: "A wonderful Book. 200,000 Already Sold in the United States. LOOKING BACKWARD... CHEAP CANADIAN EDITION. paper covers, 470pp... 35 cents!"[29] It was also possible to purchase American copies albeit at a higher cost.[30] In short, Bellamy's work was widely available north of the border, but *how* were his ideas "Nationalism" received?

In the city of Toronto, Bellamy's brand of Nationalism quickly entered the public sphere through an already active group of reformers, or "social regenerators" as one caustic critic put it. An anonymous observer in the *Canadian Magazine* named "Uncle Thomas" described this group as "socialists, anarchists, single taxers, Christian scientists, and candidates for the Legislature, and they talk freely of all problems, from the cutting of bay ice to the passing of a resolution on the destiny of the North American continent."[31] Canada, like the U.S. was full of reformers of all stripes, an eclectic list of annexationists, single taxers, prohibitionists, Christian

socialists, and theosophists whom "Uncle Thomas" simply summed up as "regenerators." As in the American context, the increase of social problems and strife between labour and capital had stirred an anxious middle class of professionals and educated workers into action. This energetic cast of actors formed newspapers and established clubs and associations to debate, and to host lectures on the latest subject of reform. Bellamyite Nationalism soon became a favourite topic of these publications and debates, but as the development of these clubs and societies show, Nationalism was both an energizing and divisive force in the reform movement.

In June 1887, only two weeks after Henry George's second visit to Toronto, the Anti-Poverty Society (APS) was established.[32] The new association attracted many of the city's radical intellectuals who discussed and publicized their favourite themes and schemes; land and tax reforms, temperance, direct legislation, voluntary initiatives, government loans and salaries for MPs.[33] In addition to their educational and propaganda efforts, the Anti-Poverty Society also lobbied the Ontario legislature for single tax measures and related reforms.[33] In 1890, the APS acknowledged its increasing focus on the single tax and renamed itself the Single Tax Association (STA).[35]

Thanks to the impressive organizational efforts made by the Knights of Labor throughout the 1880s in establishing a labour-reform press corps in Ontario's two industrial centres Hamilton and Toronto, many labour intellectuals were given a venue to express themselves. The writer and humourist Phillips Thompson has emerged from the historiography of this period as the most impressive voice of this group and serves as an excellent representation of the development of early socialist thought during this period.[36] Through his editorial writings for the *Palladium of Labor* and later for the *Labor Advocate*, Thompson was an ardent supporter of the Single Tax in the 1880s. He was not only a major presence in both the Anti-Poverty Society and the Single Tax Association, but in July 1890, Thompson helped establish Canada's first Bellamyite Nationalist Association modelled on its American counterparts.[37]

Thompson played a critical role in a highly collaborative effort made by the Single Tax Association and their Nationalist counterparts to rally against the lease renewal of Frank Smith's Toronto Street Railway Company. In the fall of 1890, they both aroused public interest in the question through newspaper editorials, and they campaigned in the Toronto Trades and Labor Congress to stand in favour of public ownership, and pressured municipal candidates to adopt the question in their December electoral platforms. This in turn became a divisive question in the 1891 mayoralty contest in the following month of January. The incumbent mayor, Clarke, was re-elected but only by a thin margin due to his intransigence towards municipal ownership. The initial campaign successfully forced the mayor's hand to reconsider the lease. After four more months of active campaigning through newspapers, lectures, and public meetings, in May 1891 the City Council caved to public opinion and took ownership of Frank Smith's street railway monopoly.[38]

Initially, the two Toronto groups maintained friendly relations as well as overlapping membership despite differing over the proposed panacea to the ills of industrial capitalism. Upon its inception the Nationalist Association appointed a delegate to represent the organization at the meetings of the Single Tax Association.[39] Although Thompson retained membership in both associations he expressed an increasing sympathy towards the Nationalist cause. In March 1891, Thompson publicly expressed his dissatisfaction with the lack of comprehensive solutions provided by the Single Tax, he described the doctrine as "the Unitarianism of political economy – a halfway house where the investigator may find rest for a breathing spell, but not a permanent abode." Nonetheless he recognized its importance in the reform movement by qualifying that "the Single Tax movement is doing excellent work in breaking ground for Socialism."[40]

In general, the range of topics discussed at the Nationalist Association were as wide as they had previously been in the Anti-Poverty Society: socialism versus trade unionism, the establishment of a public library, electoral reforms, the injustices of indirect taxation, and women's

suffrage.[41] However, they also debated and delivered lectures on the principles of Nationalism, the history of co-operativism, the progress of communal cooperative experiments in the U.S, and the movement in general.[42] By late 1892, the differences between the Nationalist Association and the STAs were openly discussed as irreconcilable; a Mr. A. C. Campbell addressed the Association on the relative positions of the two doctrines, describing them as "radically opposed" and that "the adherents of these movements should recognize this fact, and instead of attempting to smooth over fundamental differences work on the same lines."[43] Their short term goals such as local ownership of utilities and more just forms of taxation may have been mutual, but, in the long run the single taxers and Nationalists were fighting for opposite ends. The single taxers wished to preserve capitalism's individual competition of capitalism but make the rules fairer, whereas Toronto's Nationalists could not accept such a compromise, their vision of complete expansion and delivery of state services was simply too frightening and incongruent with the single taxers.

Theosophy and the Social Gospel of Bellamy

Not only was Phillips Thompson a Knight of Labor, a Patron of Industry, a Single Taxer, and a Bellamyite Nationalist, but he was also drawn into the inner circles of the Toronto Society of Theosophists. He was even present at the inauguration of the first Toronto chapter in 1891. From the Nationalist camp Thompson was not alone in becoming a theosophist. In fact, the president of the Nationalist Association, F.E. Titus as well as fellow member Dr. Emily Howard Stowe were also local theosophists.[44] As already seen in the American example, theosophists and Bellamyites found great convergence in the establishing the "Brotherhood of Man."[45] For Thompson, theosophy helped renew his faith in religion since he had previously been sceptical of organized churches, which in his opinion, had failed to live up to their own principles of social justice.[46] Through theosophy, however, Thompson and other

Bellamyites were able to reconcile social reform and religious liberalism.

In addition to theosophists, a handful of Methodist and Presbyterian ministers in Ontario quickly recognized the power of Bellamy's message and actively promoted his ideas within the church. According to the secularization thesis advanced by labour historians Ramsay Cook and Gene Homel, the role of the church as an effective agent of authority and solidarity was being quickly eroded by the increased mechanized production, urban conglomeration, and rationalized consciousness.[47] Accordingly, radicalism offered these clergymen a way to combat the growing despair towards the church. These energetic young ministers sought to remove the perception that poverty and unemployment were the moral failing of the individual. These emerging Social Gospellers supported reforms movements like the Single Tax and Bellamyite Nationalism because they agreed that brotherly love and true Christianity could not flourish in such a corrupt system.

One of the earliest Canadian reviews of *Looking Backward* appeared in the Presbyterian *Knox College Monthly*. The new book enthralled its reviewer, J.A. Macdonald, who recommended the novel as summer reading to ministers: "we commend it all the more strongly because it may awaken in them an interest, or deepen interest already felt in the great social and economic problems so pressing to-day."[48] More specifically, Macdonald praised Bellamy's ability to answer a multitude of pressing questions: "How the men of the gold age manage without money; how the women live without servant girls to vex them; how the labor problem was solved; and the multitude of other questions connected with social, intellectual, religious, and commercial interests of the people – all are explained and illustrated in this really fascinating book." Macdonald's enthusiasm highlights some of the novelties readers found to be startling and inspiring in Bellamy's elaborate solutions. His system of absolute control of the distribution of goods and services through personal credit cards and the magnificent change brought by the complete evolution of the Great Trust were undoubtedly awe inspiring and gave people

something to envision in a perfect world. The so-called "Servant Girl Question," popularized by Harriet Prescott Spofford's 1881 book of the same name, had become a popular topic among middle class reformers who felt uncomfortable about the practice of keeping one or more servant girls to carry out laborious house-hold work.[49] Thus, Bellamy's solution to the problem – outsourcing the work to large scale kitchens and laundries run by fairly paid workers – generated a remarkable amount of discussion and even inspired several small enterprises in American cities.[50]

Bellamy was not the first secular reformer to win the support of the social gospel movement. In the eighteen-eighties and early nineties, in the same way that George's Single Tax had paved the way for Bellamyite Nationalism among urban reformers, it also offered many young ministers a gateway to Bellamy. Bellamy, like George, was regarded as another important Christian Socialist and was taken up in discussions on creating a Kingdom on Earth. The *Methodist Quarterly* and *Methodist Magazine,* both based in Toronto, actively promoted these debates. In October 1890, the *Quarterly* syndicated an articulate three-part paper titled "What is Christian Socialism," by W.D.P. Bliss, an American Methodist and close friend of the famed author. Bellamy's program of Nationalism appealed to Bliss not only in its call for a moral awakening, but because it emphasized peaceful non-violent change. He accepted Bellamy's logic of Nationalism, and in particular the inevitability of the Great Trust: "every trust formed is a concession to the practicability and the necessity of Socialism. Trusts show how competition inevitably results in combination, and how large interests, stretching across a continent, can be conducted by a single organization. Socialism would be a trust, only a democratic one."[51] Bliss' equation of socialism with Nationalism is characteristic of Christian Socialists who never shied from asserting the benevolence of socialism.

In sum, it is difficult to discern exactly what Bellamy's influence amounted to in the province of Ontario. His ideas successfully brought together a swath of urban reformers, or social "regenerators" who believed they had found a more comprehensive cure for social problems than

the single tax solution of Henry George. As a larger group, they were able to achieve practical success in the fight for municipal ownership of the street railway. The Nationalist Association does not appear to have outlived its predecessor and rival Single Tax Association either, as the newspapers reports trail off in 1894. As a harbinger of what was to come, a new group by the name of the Socialist League appears to have replaced the Nationalists' weekly meeting at Richmond Hall with a similar cast of characters, including the wonderful Mr. Thompson within the same month.[52] If the Single Tax was a passing phase for men like Thompson, then Bellamyite Nationalism in Ontario very well appears to have been a steppingstone to socialism. It should be noted that Thompson and his fellow Nationalists were only the most active crusaders fighting for the golden era of cooperation. They were not, however, the extent of Bellamy's influence on Canadian political culture since thousands of Canadians read his book, listened attentively to his disciples' lectures, and debated the merits of state ownership of resources and services.

Bellamy in British Columbia

The search for Bellamy's reception in British Columbia begins with another theosophical connection. On October 25th 1889, W. J. Colville delivered an address on the merits of *Looking Backward* and its agreement with the fundamentals of theosophy.[53] The next trace of Bellamy advocacy does not show up again until November 1890, with a guest lecture by Joseph Cook on "Law and Labour – Property and Poverty," who entreated its audience with a thorough discussion of the doctrines of Edward Bellamy and Henry George.[54] Other than a few advertisements for *Looking Backward* and these speaking engagements, there is scarce evidence of Bellamy or Nationalism in British Columbia.

Yet in April 1894, the Nationalist Party of B.C. was suddenly established. It appears that British Columbia's reformers skipped the first phase of the movement – education and propaganda – and moved directly

to phase two – political reform. Reflecting the absence of a devoted Bellamy Club, these B.C. Nationalists were interested in the ideas of state ownership but not limited to a strictly Bellamyite program. Their ambitious platform promised sweeping reforms in all spheres of civic life and reflected a multitude of influences. The reforms of a distinctly Bellamyite colour are:

> 9. That the Provincial Government provide immediate relief for the unemployed, by opening up and operating coal and other mines, by clearing and cultivating the Provincial lands, and producing therefrom the necessaries of life now imported. [...] 11. That all railways, waterways, telephone systems be made national property, and that all water, light and trainway services be controlled by municipalities, and that no existing franchise be renewed. 12. That all banks be nationalized, and that the Government issue and control the medium of exchange.

In plank number 8, however, it is possible to see a clear enunciation of the Single Tax: "That the poll tax and personal property tax be abolished, and that all revenue for public purposes be derived by a tax on the land values."[55] In addition, to promoting the Single Tax, their platform also coalesced into a wide range of labour demands, such as abolition of electoral property restrictions, and the introduction of the initiative and referendum. Heading their platform is a loud expression of producer ideology, "we demand for the producers and wage earners the full product of their labor." Overall, The Nationalist Party of B.C. represented a coalition of reform interests that banded together to oppose their orthodox political counterparts at the provincial level.

According to Ross McCormack, an independent political tradition had been firmly established among workers in Vancouver due to the early life of trade unions in the province.[56] However, his analysis of the urban reform movement stops there. Thankfully, subsequent historians have picked up where McCormack left off and have re-examined Vancouver's tradition of "labourism."[57] Such popular demands for greater

working-class participation stretch further back into Vancouver's labour-reform tradition. The first major stand made by labour in Vancouver politics occurred when a middle-class group led by newspaper editor Francis Carter-Cotton, mounted an opposition campaign against David Oppenheimer in the mayoralty race of December 1889.[58] Oppenheimer maintained his seat by a narrow margin, but the opposition was enough to send a signal; he retired two years later.[59] In the same year as the opposition campaign, the Vancouver Trades and Labor Council (VTLC) was established providing a central leadership and ideological structure for the city's unions. In Mark Leier's case study of the VTLC, he dismisses previously held assumption regarding the British ethnic importance in the Council's ideology.[60] Instead, he posits that the development of Canadian populism in the late nineteenth century played the most formative role in shaping their principles. According to Leier, this populism was an extension of the farmer-labor alliance sought by the Patrons of Industry in Ontario. This marriage was based on an expansion of simple producer-ideology that redrew class divisions between producers and non-producers. Both groups agreed that labour produced all wealth.[61]

In Vancouver, the Single Tax helped underpin this relationship. Not only did George's theory vindicate the basic economics of producer-ideology that capital was derived from labour, but also that the context of British Columbia provided an additional stimulus to its reception. In the newly born province, there were boundless tracts of land still to be carved up and as the railway marched west and speculators anticipated another great boom on choice land holdings on the outlying areas of Vancouver and Victoria. The Mayor of Victoria, Robert Beaven, who also held a seat in the provincial legislature as leader of the opposition, sought to win a broad segment of support in the 1890 provincial election by declaring himself a "convert" of the Single Tax.[62] Although highly critical of the Single Tax and Beaven's opposition party, the Victoria based *Daily Colonist* was filled with discussions on the subject. In a brief moment of dialogue, the paper published a letter from "A Workingman" who loudly defended the theory:

> the principles of Henry George have no terrors for me, although I own a city lot and live on it with my family, and I think I would be an out and out single tax man were it not for some consideration for those landowners, whose interest you so ably represent. But for the hardship implied by Single Tax on those, I say, I would be thoroughly in harmony with the Single Tax movement.[63]

The Nationalist Party sought to collect this broad segment of workers and farmers under a wide platform. Together, their demands for electoral and franchise reform, single tax policies, municipal ownership and nationalization gave Vancouver voters an appealing alternative. In the 1894 provincial election, Robert Macpherson, a former carpenter, was elected on the Nationalist ticket. Another founding Party member, Rev. George Maxwell, a British coal miner turned Presbyterian minister, won his contest for the riding of Burrard in the 1896 federal election. Maxwell's victory was not a direct triumph for Nationalism because he won his seat as a joint candidate for the Liberals and Nationalists.[64] Despite the working class background of the Party's leadership, it still drew its support from a largely middle class electorate. According to Vancouver labour historian Robert Macdonald, the decade's severe depression had driven away many of the city's best workers, and therefore stunted the full development of working-class institutions and limited organized labour's role in politics to an essentially secondary one of support for middle-class reformers.[65]

Part Three: Blueprints for a Better Society

The new dawn of brotherly cooperation and economic equality envisioned by Bellamy's bestseller evoked another important effect on readers across North America. Instead of prompting discussion groups, literary clubs, or political parties, many saw in it the blueprint for a better society. America had a longstanding tradition of communitarian colonies: it had encompassed early religious colonies along the Atlantic Seaboard and had found its greatest repute at New Harmony and Brook Farm as well as the Mormon migrations. In the 1890s this tradition

united with the growing trend of American socialism espoused by Gronlund and Bellamy. Combined with the impetus of a severe economic depression, in the early eighteen-nineties many disenchanted workers wanted to establish new communities from scratch.[66] The establishment of these new societies signalled a rejection of the competitive system of industrial capitalism and the hope of regenerating the state from within.

A fitting illustration of this moment of rejection can be found on the closing page of Bryan Palmer's study of the Knights of Labor in Hamilton, Ontario. Palmer concludes his book with the story of John McDonough a blacksmith displaced from his trade and who found work in a dairy. Dismayed and disappointed by life in his late-nineteenth century industrial capitalist city, John applied for entrance to the Kaweah Co-operative Commonwealth located in California in 1891. After submitting his $100 membership fee, John and his family moved across the continent. He was later reported to have read Edward Bellamy's *Looking Backward*, implying that it was this text that inspired him to take such a dramatic move. Palmer argues that it is less likely McDonough was moved by Bellamy's utopian vision, than he was repulsed by what he saw looking back thirty-four years of his life in Hamilton.[67] Kaweah was not the most prolific Utopian colony across the border or the most Bellamyite. The name implied a more direct reference to Laurence Gronlund's work than Bellamy's and the historiography of the colony confirms this comparison.[68] Nonetheless, the local press consistently referred to the settlers as 'Bellamists' and perhaps the reason McDonough moved to Kaweah.[69] Regardless, the story of McDonough is important for several reasons; first, it vindicates the utopian-colonist impulse, second, it highlights the existence of American settlements, and third, it indicates the proliferation and accessibility of Bellamy's book.

Bellamy publicly expressed reservations towards cooperative settlements on several occasions. Most notably, the author enunciated this objection in his sequel, *Equality*, "The cause of Nationalism is more advanced by a single step taken by the city, state, or nation to its ideal, and

embodied in the law of the land, than by the complete success of some small colony founded on the nationalist plan."[70] Despite such misgivings the *New Nation* often reported on cooperative endeavours being launched across the states in order to demonstrate the spreading influence of Nationalism.[71]

In November 1897, in Skajit County of Puget Sound, fifteen persons gathered to inaugurate a new cooperative colony to be named, "Equality." According to a later recollection of one pioneer, the colonists had asked Bellamy to name their new settlement and the author suggested the title of his recent book.[72] If this account can be trusted than there is further evidence that the author was not completely apprehensive towards cooperative colonies. For the founders of Equality, the establishment of a new colony was not an abandonment of the Nationalist dream, but a first step toward converting the young liberal state of Washington to socialism.[73] This model cooperative commonwealth would demonstrate the advantages of common production, distribution, and consumptions of goods and enjoy the benefits of a pure democratic government. Once firmly established, it could aid in the establishment of similar colonies.[74]

The bold ambition of the founders of Equality was discussed several hundred kilometres north of the border in the coal-mining town of Cumberland, British Columbia.

> The establishment of a cooperative commonwealth in the neighboring state of Washington, will be watched with interest. The placing of a few thousand men upon the soil, to earn their living will be of itself a good thing. But it is hardly likely that Bellamy's dream will be realized; yet some scheme of co-operation may be practicable. If it shall result in benefiting the laborer will rejoice.[75]

The optimism of the *Cumberland News* was undoubtedly tinged with a good dose of realism since six months later the small mining town newspaper published a full page editorial on the subject of "colonizing schemes." It attributed the "appearance of Mr. Bellamy's "Looking Backward" for giving a "great impetus to this movement and the spasmodic outbreaks of

Bellamyism became so wide extent of country that it seemed at one time to threaten almost an endemic form." The article concludes that "even where the results of co-operative colonies have been the best they have not been sufficiently brilliant to induce a widespread following of their example."[76] Equality was no exception, despite lasting an impressive ten years, the frontier colony fell short of its revolutionary goal of transforming the state of Washington into an entire Cooperative Commonwealth.

The most significant Canadian cooperative settlement was established in June 1895 in Saskatchewan's Qu'Appelle Valley on a site named Hamona by the Harmony Industrial Association (HIA). The HIA was the brainchild of two brothers, Ed and Will Paynter.[77] Together they drafted a comprehensive "prospectus" outlining the floor plan, constitution, and by-laws of their future colony. The Harmony prospectus is more restrained than the Equality Manifesto in its apostatizing drive to convert the country. It begins with a more rejective note, "Feeling that the present competitive social system is one of injustice and fraud and directly opposed to the precepts laid down by "Our Saviour" [...] we do write under the name of the "Harmony Industrial Association" [...] to produce from nature self-sufficient to insure it member against want or the fear of want."[77] As the colony's authoritative historian, Alex Macdonald has shown the influences of Bellamy can be registered in the highly bureaucratic make-up of the colony's governance as well as the provision of medicare.[79]

In his unique study of Will and Ed Paynter, Macdonald uncovers close parallels between the founding document of the HIA and the "Regina Manifesto" which gave birth to the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation (CCF) in July 1933. The Manifesto opens a more secular, albeit very similar denunciation of society, stating "The present order is marked by glaring inequalities of wealth and opportunity, by chaotic waste and instability; and in the age of plenty it condemns the great mass of people to poverty and insecurity.", In terms of governance, the "Regina Manifesto" is much more general than the eight central departments outlined in Hamona's "Prospectus". The provision that "health

services should be made at least as freely available as are educational services today," is a clear echo of both Hamona and *Looking Backward*.

Intellectually, Bellamy's ideas were advanced through the vehicle of the Paynter brothers' cooperative experiment and have thus found a place in the genealogy of the CCF. Materially, this colony also affected policy change in the dominion government. One of the first encounters the colony faced was restrictive measures in the *Dominion Land Act* which required settlers to reside in their own quarters and make certain improvements to them as their settlement duties. In November 1896, Will Paynter wrote to the Minister of the Interior, T. Mayne Daly, requesting that an amendment to the *Land Act* be passed to allow for cooperative farming. The Department did not apparently accept Paynter's argument and the problem was not solved until June 1898.[80] In lobbying the new Minister of Interior, Clifford Sifton, the Paynters had more luck. Upon the Amendment's second reading, Mr. Davin, a member of the opposition decided to cross-examine Sifton's intentions in the Amendment, he asked, "What class of immigrants the amendment provides for?" To which Sifton replied,

> The demand for this legislation has been made by a number of farmers now residing in Manitoba, who desire to move into the Territories and work upon the co-operative plan. The application was made last year, but I left the matter over, and after giving it a good deal of consideration, I think it is possibly worthwhile to try it. It will do no harm, and we will make an attempt to see if it can be worked out in this case.

Davin then proceeded to ask, if the proposed settlers were Galicians? Sifton replied, "No; they are Canadian farmers. It is not intended specifically to apply to new settlers but of course it may do so."[81] The new provision provided not only for the Canadian settlers of Hamona, but also proved to be very helpful for the influx of 7,500 Doukhobors, who, in 1902, built 57 communal villages across western Canada.[82]

In Canada, Bellamy's Utopia seemed to have found its most receptive

home in the Prairie Provinces, particularly in Saskatchewan. The echo of the HIA found in the CCF's "Regina Manifesto" speaks to this theme. But in addition of the Paynter brothers, many founding members of the agrarian socialist party attribute Bellamy as one of their chief sources of inspiration during their youth.[83] They paid tribute to Bellamy's work by distributing pamphlets containing his famous "Parable of the Water Tank" chapter from *Equality*; it was used as an eloquent allegory for the Great Depression.[84]

Another great mover of agrarian socialism in Saskatchewan, E.A. Partridge, a founding father to the Territorial Grain Growers Association, was also indebted to the lessons of Bellamy. In 1925, Partridge published *The War on Poverty* describing his own utopian Cooperative Commonwealth called "Coalsamao" (a name created by the first two letters of each Western province and an 'o' for a small part of Ontario). Coalsamao was imagined as a self-sufficient cooperative comprised of many suburban communities called "camps" consisting of 3,500 to 7,000 inhabitants. The commonwealth was to be governed by a Supreme High Court of Control, which oversees ten administrative departments staffed by "experts" who regulate and ensure economic and social equality in the camps. Education, housing, and basic amenities are all provided by the High Court so long as all citizens (men and women) serve in the "Army of the Good."[85] The highly technical governance by bureaucrats and particularly conscription into a universal army of workers reflect a strong affiliation with Bellamy's framework for utopia. *The War On Poverty* is a unique work because it demonstrates the adaptation of an advanced utopian vision like Bellamy's grafted onto an agrarian prairie context.

Conclusion

If the search for Bellamy's influence in Canada has led to Saskatchewan and the utopian designs that preceded the CCF, what can we discern from the rest of the country's experience with Bellamy's thought? In Ontario his ideas were imbibed with an intense zeal by both secular

and religious reformers who had already been well exposed to the Single Tax solution. Their successful campaign for public ownership of Toronto's street railway vindicated the practicality of Nationalism and gave many Canadians their first taste of municipal socialism. Phillip Thompson's career as a social reformer illustrates that Bellamyite Nationalism holds an important place in the genealogy of early Canadian socialism. In British Columbia, where a Bellamy Club was never established, the formation and immediate success of the Nationalist Party showed that Nationalism could be successfully fused with a wider labour program in bringing together both workers and farmers at the polls. These political manifestations were Bellamy's most documented imprints in Canada; the larger experience of euphoria inspired by his utopian novel cannot be captured historians. The blueprints of Hamona and the dream of Coalsamo, however, are testaments to this euphoric reaction.

A second question that deserves to be answered is, 'how much did the 49th parallel matter in the spread of Bellamy's influence in Canada?' In both countries the preceding work of both the Knights of Labor and the Single Tax were highly influential in creating institutional structures, organizing workers, criticizing the foundations of industrial capitalism, and awakening a class-consciousness. Curiously enough, the heavy presence of theosophists in the first Bellamy Nationalist Clubs in Boston and Ontario presents another interesting correlation. In the United States, Edward Bellamy and the network of Nationalist clubs across the country threw their support for the People's Party in the 1892 general election and helped the federal third party register one million votes. In Canada, Bellamyite Nationalists did not advance their cause as far in electoral politics. While the fledgling Nationalist Party in British Columbia elected two of its executive offers to both the Provincial legislature and Federal Parliament, they did not run candidates, however, either elsewhere in the province or in the country, and thus it can hardly be considered a full-fledged political movement at all. Amidst the many cooperative communities established across late nineteenth century America, the utopian dreams

of the Harmony Industrial Association were hardly unique. Given the renewal of utopian designs and Bellamy's general influence among many founding members of the CCF, Bellamy's legacy on the development of agrarian socialism in Saskatchewan was remarkably special.

In 1922 Stephen Leacock, one of Canada's greatest satirists, reflected on Bellamy's work, "never, I think, has the picture of socialism at work been so ably and so dexterously presented as in a book that begins to be forgotten now, but which some thirty years ago took the continent by storm."[86] Looking back to more than one hundred and twenty years, Bellamy's name is almost forgotten in this continent's collective memory. It is worthwhile to recollect his work not simply for posterity purposes, but also because tracing the fault lines created by the movement he helped inspire can help Canadians colour the pages of our socialist past with greater detail.

Notes

1. W. R. Fraser, "Canadian Reactions," in *Edward Bellamy Abroad: An American Prophet's Influence*, ed. Sylvia Bowman, 137-150. (New York: Twayne Publishers. 1962).

2. Anne Marie Warfield, *Utopia Unlimited: Reassessing American Literary Utopias* (PhD Diss., University of Iowa, 2009), 2.

3. Edward Bellamy, *Looking Backward*: 2000 - 1887, ed. Alex Macdonald (Peterborough: Broadview Press, 2003), 52.

4. Bellamy, *Looking Backward*, 75.

5. Ibid., 76.

6. Ibid., 77.

7. Gerald Grob, *Workers and Utopia: A Study of Ideological Conflict in the American Labor Movement 1885-1900* (Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1969), 37.

8. Bellamy, *Looking Backward*, 192.

9. Charles Postel, *The Populist Vision* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 229.

10. John Pullen, "Henry George's Land Reform: The Distinction between Private Ownership and Private Possession," *American Journal of Economics and Society*, Vol. 60, No. 2, (April 2001): 548.

11. Ibid., 554.

12. Grob, *Workers and Utopia*, 98.

13. Robert E., Weir, "A Fragile Alliance: Henry George and the Knights of Labor," *American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, Vol. 56, No. 4, (October 1997): 423.

14. Gregory Keeley, Brian Palmer, *Dreaming of What Might Be: The Knights of Labor in Ontario, 1880-1900* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), 382.

15. Edward Spann, *Brotherly Tomorrows: Movements for a Cooperative Society in America 1820-1920* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1989), 192.

16. Arthur Lipow, *Authoritarian Socialism in America: Edward Bellamy & the Nationalist Movement* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982), 226.

17. John Hope Franklin, "Edward Bellamy and the Nationalist Movement," *New England Quarterly*, Vol 11., No 4. (Dec. 1938), 754.

18. Ibid.

19. Franklin, "Edward Bellamy," 761.

20. Ibid., 762.

21. Alex Macdonald, "Introduction," *Looking Backward: 2000-1887*, 26.

22. Postel, *Populist Vision*, 13.

23. Ibid., 14.

24. Ibid., 223.

25. John T. McGreevy, "Farmers, Nationalists, and the Origins of California Populism," *Pacific Historical Review*, Vol. 58, No. 4 (November 1989): 479.

26. Ibid., 486.

27. Christine McHugh, "Midwestern populist leadership and Edward Bellamy: 'Looking Backward' into the future," *American Studies*, Vol. 19, No. 2 (Fall 1978): 57-74.

28. Ibid., 63.

29. *Home and School*, June 27, 1889.

30. *Literary News* (Victoria B.C. est. 1888), Vol. 9, No. 3 (March 1888): 95.

31. *The Canadian Magazine*, Vol 1. No. 1. (March 1893).

32. Gregory Keeley, Toronto Workers Respond to Industrial Capitalism: 1867-1892 (Toronto: Unversity of Toronto Press, 1980), 277.

33. Gene Howard Homel, "Fading Beams of the Nineteenth Century: Radicalism and Early Socialism in Canada," *Labour/ Le Travail*, Vol. 5 (Spring, 1980): 9.

34. Keeley, *Toronto Workers Respond*, 278.

35. Ibid., 279.

36. For more on Phillips Thompson see, Ian McKay, *Reasoning Otherwise: Leftists and the People's Enlightenment in Canada 1890-1920* (Toronto: Between the Lines, 2008), 90-96, Ramsay Cook, *The Regenerators: Social Criticsm in Late Victorian English Canada* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1985), Keeley and Palmer, *Dreaming of What Might Be*, 301-305, and Christina Burr, *Spreading the Light: Work and Labour Reform in Late-Nineteenth Century Toronto* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1999), 84-85.

37. *Toronto Daily Mail*, July 18, 1890, 8.

38. Gregory Keeley, *Toronto Workers Respond to Industrial Capitalism 1867-1892* (University of Toronto Press, 1980), 281-283.

39. Ibid.

40. Frank W. Watt, "The National Policy, the Workingman, and Proletarian Ideas in Victorian Canada," *Canadian Historical Review*, Vol. 40, No.1 (1959): 23.

41. See *Toronto Daily Mail*, April 8, 1892, 8, May 6, 1892, 8, December 16, 1892, 8, February 3, 1883, 8, and June 9, 1883, 8.

42. See *Toronto Daily Mail*, April 7, 1893, 8, May 27, 1892, 8, May 27, 1892, 8, and June 24, 1892, 8.

43. *Toronto Daily Mail*, December 2, 1892, 8.

44. Homel, "Fading Beams of the Nineteenth Century," 20.

45. Cook, *The Regenerators*, 168.

46. Ibid., 163, 166.

47. See, Homel, "Fading Beams of the Nineteenth Century," and Cook, *The Regenerators*.

48. J.A. Macdonald, "Looking Backward," *Knox College Monthly*, Vol.10, No. 1 (August 1889): 211.

49. Harriet Prescott Spofford, *The Servant Girl Question* (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin and Co., 1881), 16-21.

50. One such co-operative kitchen opened in New Haven, Conneticut, see *Cumberland News*, April 3, 1900, 1. In Decatus , Illinois a co-operative boarding house was opened in 1891, s*ee Manitoba Free Press*, September 1, 1891, 7.

51. W.D.P. Bliss, "What is Christian Socialism," *Methodist Quarterly*, Vol 2, No. 4 (October 1890), 479.

52. *Toronto Daily Mail*, February 2, 1894, 8.

53. *Victoria Daily Colonist*, October 25, 1889, 1.

54. *Victoria Daily Colonist*, November 1, 1890, 3.

55. "Ashamed Of Their Principles," *Victoria Daily Colonist*, May 13, 1894, 4.

56. A. Ross McCormack, *Reformers, Rebels, and Revolutionaries: The Western Canadian Radical Movement 1899-1919* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1991), 18.

57. Robert Macdonald, "Working Class Vancouver, 1886-1914: Urbanism and Class in British Columbia" in *Vancouver Past: Essays in Social History*, ed. Robert Macdonald, Jean Barman (Vancouver: UBC Press, 1986), 33-69, and Mark Leier, "Ethnicity and Urbanism in Vancouver's Trade Unionism" in *Canadian Historical Review*, Vol. 74, No. 4 (1993), 510-534.

58. Robert Macdonald, "Working Class Vancouver", 59.

59. Peter Liddell, Patrica E. Roy, "David Oppenheimer", *Dictionary of Canadian Biography Online*, 1891-1900 (Volume XII), accessed December 11, 2011, http://biographi.ca/009004-119.01-e.php?&id_nbr=6346.

60. Leier, "Ethnicity and Urbanism," 510-522.

61. Ibid., 523.

62. "A Convert," *Victoria Daily Colonist*, June 1, 1889, 4.

63. "An Anxious Enquirer," *Victoria Daily Colonist*, July 4, 1890, 3.

64. "Dominion Politics on the Mainland, a Municipal Revolution Promised in Vancouver City," *Daily Colonist*, November 3, 1895, 1.

65. Robert Macdonald, "Working Class Vancouver," 60.

66. Charles P. LeWarne, "Equality Colony: The Plan to Socialize Washington," *Pacific Northwest Quarterly*, Vo. 59, No. 3 (July, 1968): 137.

67. Bryan D. Palmer, *A Culture in Conflict: Skilled Workers and Industrial Capitalism in Hamilton, Ontario, 1860-1914* (Montreal: McGill-Queens University Press, 1979), 246.

68. Carey Jones, "The Kaweah Experiment in Co-operation," in *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, Vol. 6, No. 1, (October 1891): 53, and Robert V. Hine, *California's Utopian Colonies* (Los Angeles: Huntington Library Publications, 1953), 81.

69. Ruth R. Lewis, "Kaweah: An Experiment in Cooperative Colonization," *Pacific Historical Review*, Vol. 17, No. 4 (November 1948): 436.

70. Bellamy quoted in Fitzhugh Brudage, *A Socialist Utopia in the New South: The Ruskin Colonies in Tennessee and Georgia 1894-1901* (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1996), 31.

71. Alex Macdonald, "Introduction," *Looking Backward: 2000-1887*, 26.

72. Charles P. LeWarne, *Utopias on Puget Sound* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1975), 253.

73. Ibid., 55.

74. Ibid., 56.

75. *Cumberland News*, July 6, 1897, 2.

76. "Colonizing Schemes," *Cumberland News*, Jan. 31, 1898, 3.

77. Alex Macdonald, *Practical Utopians: The Writings and Lives of Will and Ed Paynter* (Regina: University of Regina Press, 2004), 11.

78. *Prospectus of the Harmony Industrial Association (Co-operative System)*, (Birtle, Man.: Birtle Printing Co., 1895), 4.

79. Alex Macdonald, *Cloud-Capped Towers: The Utopian Theme in Saskatchewan History and Culture* (Regina: University of Regina Press, 2007).

80. Macdonald, *Practical Utopians*, 17.

81. *House of Commons Debates*, May 23, 1898, 5937-5938.

82. John W. Friesen, Virgina L. Friesen, *The Palgrave Companion to North American Utopias* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004), 98.

83. Fraser, "Canadian Reactions," 145.

84. Ibid.,138.

85. Carl Berger, "A Canadian Utopia: The Cooperative Commonwealth of Edward Partridge," in *Visions 2020*, ed. Stephen Clarkson (Edmonton: M.G. Hurtig Ltd., 1970), 259-261.

86. Stephen Leacock, *The Unsolved Riddle of Social Justice* (London: John Lane The Bodley Head Ltd, 1922), 93.

Works Cited

Secondary Sources

Allen, Richard. *The View from Murney Tower: Salem Bland, the Late Victorian Controversies, and the Search for a New Christianity*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2008.

Beaumont, Matthew. *Utopia Ltd. Ideologies of Social Dreaming in England, 1870-1900.* Brill: Brill Academic Publishers, 2005.

Berger, Carl. "A Canadian Utopia: The Cooperative Commonwealth of Edward Partridge." In *Visions 2020*, Edited by Stephen Clarkson, 257 - 262. Edmonton: M.G. Hurtig Ltd., 1970.

Burr, Christina. *Spreading the Light: Work and Labour Reform in Late-Nineteenth Century Toronto*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1999.

Fitzhugh Brudage, *A Socialist Utopia in the New South: The Ruskin Colonies in Tennessee and Georgia 1894-1901*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1996.

Franklin, John Hope. "Edward Bellamy and the Nationalist Movement." *New England Quarterly*, Vol 11., No 4. (Dec. 1938): 739 - 772.

Fraser, W. R. "Canadian Reactions." In *Edward Bellamy Abroad: An American Prophet's Influence*. Edited by Sylvia Bowman, 137 - 150. New York: Twayne Publishers, 1962.

Friesen, John W. and Virgina L. Friesen. *The Palgrave Companion to North American Utopias*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.

Grob, Gerald. *Workers and Utopia: A Study of Ideological Conflict in the American Labor Movement, 1885-1900*. Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1969.

Hine, Robert V. *California's Utopian Colonies*. Los Angeles: Huntington Library Publications, 1953.

Homel, Gene Howard. "Fading Beams of the Nineteenth Century: Radicalism and Early Socialism in Canada." *Labour/ Le Travail*, Vol. 5 (1980): 7 - 32.

Keeley, Gregory. *Toronto Workers Respond to Industrial Capitalism 1867-1892*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1980.

Keeley, Gregory and Brian Palmer. *Dreaming of What Might Be: The Knights of Labor in Ontario, 1880-1900*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.

Leacock, Stephen. *The Unsolved Riddle of Social Justice*. London: John Lane The Bodley Head Ltd., 1922.

Leier, Mark. "Ethnicity and Urbanism in Vancouver's Trade Unionism." *Canadian Historical Review,* Vol. 74, No. 4 (1993): 510 - 534.

LeWarne, Charles P. "Equality Colony: The Plan to Socialize Washington." *Pacific Northwest Quarterly,* Vol. 59, No. 3 (July, 1968): 137 - 146.

LeWarne, Charles P. *Utopias on Puget Sound, 1885-1915*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1975.

Lewis, Ruth R. "Kaweah: An Experiment in Cooperative Colonization." *Pacific Historical Review*, Vol.17, No. 4 (November 1948): 429 - 441.

Lipow, Arthur. *Authoritarian Socialism in America: Edward Bellamy & the Nationalist Movement*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982.

Macdonald, Alex. *Practical Utopians: The Lives and Writings of Ed and Will Payneter, Saskatchewan Cooperative Pioneers*. Regina: University of Regina, 2004.

Macdonald, Alex. *Cloud-Capped Towers: The Utopian Theme in Saskatchewan History and Culture*. Regina: University of Regina Press, 2007.

Macdonald, Robert. "Working Class Vancouver, 1886-1914: Urbanism and Class in British Columbia." In *Vancouver Past: Essays in Social History*. Edited by Robert Macdonald and Jean Barman, 33 - 69. Vancouver: UBC Press, 1986.

McCormack, A. Ross. *Reformers, Rebels, and Revolutionaries: The Western Canadian Radical Movement 1899-1919*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1991.

McGreevy, John T. "Farmers, Nationalists, and the Origins of California Populism." *Pacific Historical Review*, Vol. 58, No. 4 (November 1989): 471-495.

McKay, Ian. *Reasoning Otherwise: Leftists and the People's Enlightenment in Canada, 1890-1920*. Toronto: Between the Lines, 2008.

Palmer, Bryan D. *A Culture in Conflict: Skilled Workers and Industrial Capitalism in Hamilton, Ontario, 1860-1914*. Montreal: McGill-Queens University Press, 1979.

Postel, Charles. *The Populist Vision*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Pullen, John. "Henry George's Land Reform: The Distinction between Private Ownership and Private Possession." *American Journal of Economics and Society*, Vol. 60, No. 2 (April 2001): 547-556.

Sadler, Elizabeth. "One Book's Influence: Bellamy's 'Looking Backward.'" *New England Quarterly*, Vol. 17, No. 4 (Dec. 1944): 530 - 555.

Thomas, John L. *Alternative America: Henry George, Edward Bellamy, Henry Demarest Lloyd and the Adversary Tradition*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press, 1983.

Spann, Edward K. *Brotherly Tomorrows: Movements for a Cooperative Society in America, 1820-1920*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1989.

Watt, Frank W. "The National Policy, the Workingman, and Proletarian Ideas in Victorian Canada." *Canadian Historical Review*, Vol. 40, No. 1 (1959): 1-26.

Weir, Robert E., "A Fragile Alliance: Henry George and the Knights of Labor." *American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, Vol. 56, No. 4 (October 1997): 421-439.

Primary Sources

Bellamy, Edward. *Looking Backward: 2000 - 1887*. Edited by Alex Macdonald. Peterborough: Broadview Press, 2003.

House of Commons Debates, May 23, 1898.

Prospectus of the Harmony Industrial Association (Co-operative System). Birtle, MB.: Birtle Printing Co., 1895..

Newspapers and Periodicals

The Canadian Magazine, Vol 1. No. 1. (March 1893).

Cumberland News, July 6, 1897.

"Colonizing Schemes," *Cumberland News*, Jan. 31, 1898.

Home and School, June 27, 1889.

J.A. Macdonald, "Looking Backward," *Knox College Monthly*, Vol.10, No. 1 (August 1889): 209-212.

Literary News, Vol. 9, No. 3, March 1888.

Toronto Daily Mail, April 8, 1892.

Toronto Daily Mail, May 6, 1892.

Toronto Daily Mail, May 27, 1892.

Toronto Daily Mail, June 24, 1892.

Toronto Daily Mail, December 2, 1892.

Toronto Daily Mail, December 16, 1892.

Toronto Daily Mail, February 3, 1883.

Toronto Daily Mail, April 7, 1893.

Toronto Daily Mail, June 9, 1883.

"A Convert." *Victoria Daily Colonist*, June 1, 1889.

"An Anxious Enquirer." *Victoria Daily Colonist,* July 4, 1890.

"Ashamed Of Their Principles." *Victoria Daily Colonist*, May 13, 1894.

"Dominion Politics on the Mainland." *Victoria Daily Colonist*, November 3, 1895.

"What is he?": Electioneering and the Emergence of Political Party Allegiance in Canada West and Ontario, 1857-1872

Jonathan McDaniel

On his way from Britain to Upper Canada in 1817, Robert Gourlay penned thirty-one questions to pose to the landholders of the colony that would form the backbone of his study for the Imperial government.[1] The work he produced by 1821, his *Statistical Account of Upper Canada*, was largely a reference work detailing population sizes, occupations, wages and other figures. While Gourlay was by no means Canada's Toqueville, his *Account* does have its moments of deeper insight into the society that he surveyed. In one such moment of astuteness, he observed that "the people are not agitated by parties, as they are in the United States." Canadians, he wrote, were "distinguished rather by their occupations, than by their political connexions."[2]

Given the political upheavals and reorganizations of the next half-century, this primordial state was not to last long. From the rebellions of the 1830s to Confederation itself, Canadians were not merely *agitated* by parties, but consumed by them. So when, and how, did Canadians become partisan as we know the term today? How did personal client-patron relationships and overlapping local social networks give way to parties as objects of political allegiance in their own right, with which electors identified? It is not my aim to trace the development of formal party structures or the party consistency of parliamentary voting, though these will be important to the discussion. Instead, this paper will examine how formal parties emerged as acceptable objects of political allegiance, which were openly discussed within public discourse and an electoral

setting during the period between the 1857 election for the Parliament of the United Province of Canada and the second Dominion election of 1872. Certainly, patronage and the importance of local social networks did not disappear entirely by 1872. However, there is a notable and visible trend in public discourse, as seen in the newspapers of Canada West (Ontario), moving from the promotion of the ideal, non-partisan, "independent" parliamentarian beholden to no "faction" and capable of making his own judgments regarding issues of public importance, towards an open, unabashed association with and loyalty to political parties. I will examine how this view of parties as legitimate political operators changed over the period in question and how different labels were assigned to candidates over time. I will also explore how Confederation altered the perception of the role and efficacy of parties in government.

It is worth tracing the emergence of embryonic political parties in Upper Canada out of the tumultuous political environment of the 1840s. With the union cemented in 1841, questions about the direction of the new constitutional order emerged as central. Party designations were not particularly important markers used in the electoral arena. Instead, they were markers of place along a continuum of constitutional thought with the "Tory" label applying to those who believed the council should be chosen exclusively from a "loyal" party and the "Reform" label applying to those who subscribed to the constitutional principle that the party grouping that gained the most seats at the polls ought to form the executive.[3] Jeffrey McNairn traces this development in his discussion of the growth of deliberative democratic norms and print culture in nineteenth century Canada. McNairn argues that prior to the Union, the parties demarcated a divide concerning not only the Constitution as a formal template for political organization, but also the role of public opinion in governance. Though debating societies, social clubs, and newsrooms had emerged and political debate had been embraced by a larger segment of the population than ever in Upper Canada by the 1830s, there was no consensus regarding the degree to which the government of the day ought to adhere

to the public's dictates.[4] "Although conscious of these developments [in the growth of public debate], conservatives had yet to integrate public opinion into their constitutional outlook."[5] Whether the executive should be dependent upon the support of the elected assembly, and thus the "people," was not a decided matter. There were not two political parties in agreement about the role of public opinion, debating matters of policy on a level constitutional playing field, so to speak. There was no agreement between the two groups that public opinion ought to be consulted in the formation of policy and more or less heeded. Rather, the very role and purpose of public opinion in governance was being debated between them. For that reason, they were not the parties that would come to be by the 1860s.

Parties as groups created for the purpose of fielding candidates and presenting a unified policy program to the electorate were not yet conceived. From the deeper constitutional debate of the 1830s emerged another discussion concerning the union and the achievement of responsible government. The matter of the role of public opinion was no longer as deeply challenged, as the significance of electoral politics within the system of responsible government was much greater than in the system which preceded it. However, in the 1840s, the parties were divided over another constitutional matter. It was not a matter of policy but rather the functioning of the new political system itself. Should ministers be individually responsible to the legislature or responsible as a group or "Ministry?" The latter, it was argued by conservatives, required strict parties to command consistent majorities in the House of Commons. This was tantamount to the subversion of the idea of mixed monarchy itself. It was argued that, if the Ministry was collectively responsible to a permanent majority in the House, the democratic element was to dominate the "aristocratic" and the "monarchical" branches embodied by the Ministry and Governor.[6] Reformers retorted that a collectively responsible Ministry was no more a subversion of the constitutional principle of "mixed monarchy" than an overly strong executive. Thus, the debate was still fundamentally constitutional as opposed to policy-based.

In addition, the debate not only deepened disparities between parties, but also divided party groupings internally, leading to the distinction between hard-line Tories, moderate Conservatives, moderate Reformers and Grits.[7]

By the mid-1840s, a constitutional consensus began to emerge regarding the collective responsibility of the administration, paving the way for the slow emergence of political parties, not as markers of constitutional preference but of political and policy stance. "The Council," complained Governor General Metcalfe in 1844, "are now spoken of by themselves and others generally as 'the Ministers,' 'the Administration,' 'the Cabinet,' 'the Government,' and so forth. Their pretensions are according to this new nomenclature. They…expect that the policy of the governor shall be subservient to their views and *party purposes*."[8]

Once this constitutional consensus was reached, parties began to be conceived in terms of electoral and legislative coalitions, and were built as such. However permanent, strictly voting parties were still not seen as acceptable in the Assembly. "Temporary coalitions," for the passage of a bill or the achievement of a reform, fit within constitutional thought of the 1840s and early 1850s, but parliamentary majorities were often seen as "expendable, even dangerous" if they persisted beyond the achievement of the objective for which they were formed.[9] Such was the difference, as Thomas Hockins has argued, between the "flexible Parliamentarism" of the period from 1848-1864, in which temporary shifting coalitions in the Assembly were the norm, and the "structured Parliamentarism" of parties after this period.[10] As McNairn argues, the debate turned once again to the state of the public sphere and discourse. This time, it occurred on an even constitutional playing field and under a consensus of the role of public opinion; the Ministry was responsible to the Assembly, and members of the Assembly of all affiliations more or less agreed that elected representatives had at least some duty to respect public opinion. The "conservative" opinion expressed by Egerton Ryerson, the famous Methodist educator and enemy of the "Brownite" Reformers, was that parties hindered free public discourse: "party spirit...has neither eyes, nor

ears, nor principles, nor reason." The general "reform" position proposed that opposition was necessary for fostering public debate; only parties could sustain true opposition, as they could hold men to their principles where self-interest may otherwise sway them.[11] The debate reached a new level by entering the electoral realm in the election of 1851, when Reform associations in Waterloo, Halton, Oxford, and Perth demanded that their candidates sign a "party creed" which, if broken, would result in the expulsion of the Member from the party or lead to his recall from office. Radical Reformers stated that it was a way for Members to more closely reflect public opinion through their legislative duties. Others, including John Sandfield Macdonald, he moderate Reformer Premier of the United Province of Canada and later the first Premier of Ontario, denounced it as a perversion of the independent judgment of representatives.[12] J.S. Macdonald's *Montreal Pilot* railed against "the absurdity of pledges which preclude the possibility of accommodation, and thus defeat the end of Legislation itself."[13] The concept was roundly rejected in 1851, but we can see the roots of the debate over the role of parties in public deliberation as it unfolded between 1857 and 1872. It is in the context of this debate that parties emerged as acceptable and even desirable in public electoral discourse, and it is this emergence that will be explored.

Tory patronage was central to forming the conservative coalition in the 1850s. The party was not yet an official organization that existed or functioned outside of the networks of its patrons, but nevertheless it was increasingly "effective in building, maintaining and disciplining a conservative coalition for electoral purposes."[14] Patronage allowed for a link to form between the members of the cabinet and their client interests in the various constituencies throughout Canada West. It was exclusion from these networks of patronage that drove the coalescence of the Reform party into a more coherent political grouping.[15] But despite the roots of the parties having taken hold in the 1850s, neither was monolithic by the early 1860s; they were rather "broad constellation[s] of more or less independent local interests."[16] Labels

were loose and allegiances hardly steadfast. As reformer assembly Member and later Premier of Ontario, Oliver Mowat, wrote to a friend who questioned his own change in party preference in the 1850s: "Do not be carried away by names, my dear fellow…one party has sometimes had most virtue on its side, the other party has had it at other times."[17]

So how did attitudes toward parties change from being primarily networks of patronage to becoming more organized political institutions after Confederation? How was the changing reality of party politics reflected in public discourse within an electoral setting? In the discourse surrounding the 1857 election, the ideal of the "independent Member" was held in high esteem, touted as something for legislators to aim for. The legislature was meant to function as a "debating chamber somewhat like a Greek *agora*."[18] Many members were so-called "loose fish," voting as they saw best for their constituents, patrons, or province at large. "Although parties, factions, and alignments existed, although members of the Assembly were not all independents, the groupings were by no means entirely predictable either in terms of cohesion or voting habits."[19] To vote with one party with rigid consistency was quite often condemned as "partyism," a blind and unreflective followership.[20] As such, it was castigated in an electoral setting. During the campaign of 1857, the *Perth Courier* lambasted one James Shaw, the candidate for South Lanark, for his "partyism" in the prior session. "Mr. Shaw states that he was elected as a Conservative, and 'uniformly voted with the party' through thick and thin, right or wrong." The editorialist further rumbled: "if that party had voted that the moon was made of green cheese, Mr. Shaw would have done the same."[21] Not only did the editorial draw into question Shaw's declaration of his party allegiance, but it treated his voting history as a declaration of rigid party loyalty rather than a show consistent principles.

As they attempted to project an image of the ideal "independent man," columns about candidates fitfully attempting to put out fires and quell rumours about their party allegiance abounded in the 1857 race. The *Globe* derided the candidate for East Middlesex for his attempt, bluntly

claiming that "Mr. Talbot is undoubtedly a ministerialist, and he has injured himself much by denying it."[22] John Beverly Robinson of Toronto assuaged the electorate's worries by stating: "I am no nominee of the Government[…] I go into Parliament as an independent man…and not to support any government right or wrong."[23] Were these claims genuine, and were the newspapers in which they were recorded independent themselves? Without analyzing parliamentary votes, we cannot be certain of the former. The latter can be answered simply with "no." The *Globe* and the *Perth Courier* were undoubtedly Reform in sympathy while the *Ottawa Citizen* and the *St. Thomas Weekly Dispatch* were supportive of John A. Macdonald and, more precisely later on, the Conservative party. From P.G. Cornell's analysis of Assembly votes, we can tell that the purportedly "independent" Robinson was one of the most steadfast Conservatives in the House.[24] Newspaper editorialists were often sympathetic to one side or the other, therefore claims of independent motivations by Members were not always honest. This does not mean, however, that attitudes towards parties did not change or that parties and allegiances to them did not become more acceptable throughout this period. The fact that the *Citizen* generally supported Macdonald's Conservatives did not detract from the fact that their pleadings for independence of judgment could be seen as appealing to an electorate that held this quality in high esteem. Nor did it mean that ties to a party did not stand something significantly different in 1872 than it did in 1857 in terms of organization and public opinion. Even though editorial and candidate ties to loosely cohesive patronage and social-network-based party groups existed in 1857, parties as permanent, organized institutions were not yet accepted by the electorate. This came later, as shown by the change in public discourse.

Indeed, there was a reluctance to use party labels at all, even when accusing one's opponent of his partyist tendencies. This was indicative of the lack of strength party labels had in commanding allegiance from voters, and in actually describing the allegiance of candidates or legislators over time. The terms "ministerialist" (or "corruptionist," as

was used when referring to a Macdonald ministry) and "oppositionist," most often stood in for party labels. They untidily indicated a promise to give the ministry of the day the benefit of the doubt, rather than indicating support for a party or its leaders in the Assembly.[25] As shown through public discourse, the rarity of steadfast party labels may also have be an indication of the underlying structure and methods of party building, which was emerging in the 1850s. Many candidates surely did not believe that they were running as the agents of a particular party, but rather according to the advice, and in the interests of, their patrons and ridings. These patrons may have been party leaders or high-profile legislators, but this was not always the case. Whether or not they genuinely believed in their ability to vote freely and independently upon entering the legislature is another question that cannot be determined from public discourse in the newspaper sources. However, what is important to note, for multiple reasons, is that parties of the late 1850s were certainly not the principal objects of political allegiance for voters within the context of elections. They were instead treated with some suspicion in public discourse, as seen in editorials and public statements made by candidates; parties were largely seen to pervert the idea of the "independent Member."

Candidate selection procedures were also indicative of the lack of regard for parties as public institutions with a significant role the electoral process. Nominations were held as public meetings, often at city halls or court houses and presided over by municipal sheriffs and other municipal officials who acted as Returning Officers. At these meetings, electors of all political stripes nominated and voted for all candidates from the constituency at once. It was not seen as the role of parties to choose their candidates and to present them to the electorate as their "official" choices. One such meeting held in Aylmer nominated both a Reformer and a Grit as candidates for East Elgin. The former, George Southwick, took his time on the hustings to praise John A. Macdonald and his "Coalition Ministry," referring to himself both as a Reform candidate and a "government candidate."[26] He also used an advertisement

column to detail how he had worked closely with Conservative George MacBeth, of the neighbouring riding of West Elgin, on a number of initiatives in the previous parliamentary session.[27] Before the close of the meeting, committees of both Reformers and Conservatives were formed to return to canvass the various municipalities of the riding.

That is not to suggest that gatherings of partisan supporters did not have a say in the selection of candidates. For instance, the *Globe* recorded the occurrence of a "convention of Reformers" held in Brockville to select their favoured candidate, and they expressed concern at the deferral of the date of the convention to choose a Reform candidate in South Waterloo.[28] The week prior to the East Elgin meeting mentioned above, the Conservatives of that riding met to select a candidate in St. Thomas. However, before the conclusion of the meeting, their preferred candidate rejected the nomination and the electors present pledged to give their support to the Conservative-Reform ministry.[29] Thus, while these meetings were called to allow party supporters to express their approval of a given candidate, they were not the official means by which candidates were selected. As the Conservative St. Thomas meeting shows, these gatherings did not always result in the selection of preferred nominees. As the pledge that closed the meeting and the subsequent collaboration between Reformers and Conservatives at the Aylmer meeting demonstrate, electors could be flexible regarding their party allegiances if, at the end of the day, it meant supporting a reasonably "ministerialist" candidate.

This lack of confidence in, and strict allegiance to, parties meant that other organizations, both religious and social, were quite often presented as parallel political bodies, and were as important as party ties in determining one's vote. As McNairn argues, these voluntary associations were integral to the growth of public political debate and, over time, were adapted to "overtly political ends." They were not, however, strictly tied to parties; " '[p]arty', like faction, remained a label for one's opponents among these associations."[30] Churches, religious groups, social clubs and other organizations not only functioned as useful

existing networks for parties to tap into, but the members of these groups also had enough convergent interests to be considered electoral coalitions, which were as strong as parties.[31] The *Globe*'s description of the field in the riding of Grenville put it as such: "[Reform candidate] Mr. Patrick is to be opposed by Mr. A. Keefer, conservative, and Mr. Peter Moran, Roman Catholic."[32] Not only were there more candidates than parties in Grenville, but the *Globe* did not even make mention of Mr. Moran's party affiliation, if he had one at all. Whether he had one or not, the same conclusion can be drawn about the strength of parties in determining political allegiance: if he supported either major party, he would have been running against an opponent of the same party. If he did not, and was simply the "Roman Catholic" candidate, this suggests that at least some Catholic voters considered faith before party at the ballot box.

In similar fashion, the *Perth Courier* predicted that Colonel Playfair, candidate for the riding of South Lanark, would garner the votes of most Conservatives and Orangemen, as well as "Protestant Reformers."[33] Not only did his support cross party lines, but it also qualified within at least one party by religious affiliation. Likewise, both his faith and his Orange ties were seemingly well known and important enough to electors to inform their vote choices. After decrying that "divisions of parties" only served to cloud legislators' ideas of the public good, Toronto candidate Mr. Boulton announced to the assembled crowd that he was the "representative of the Protestant community."[34] Like Mr. Moran in Grenville, Mr. Boulton was also running against a Conservative, J.G. Bowes, and a Reformer, George Brown. Thus it is clear that parties had not moved ahead of numerous other social and religious organizations to form the main object of political allegiance in the electoral context. These other ties were strong forces in determining with whom electors placed their votes, and they were openly presented within public discourse as legitimate alternate associations.

The pre-confederation elections of the 1860s, however, saw the emergence of more partisan discourse, and a more emphatic and frequent use of the concept of the party as an acceptable and even desirable object

of political allegiance. A product largely of the 1859 "Great Reform Convention," this open partisanship was centred on the emergence of the more organized and more centralized Grits, or "Brownite," Reformers. The 1859 gathering was the largest political convention ever held in Canada up until that time. It served to both split Reform ranks and create a political party under George Brown, which was far more disciplined, united and partisan than the still rather loose coalitions of John A. Macdonald's Conservatives or John Sandfield Macdonald's residual "Baldwinite" Reformers. The moderate or "Baldwinite" Reformers largely stayed away from the convention, and it was an opportunity for Brown to effectively stage-manage the affair in a way that presented a remarkably unanimous political front.[35] Looking at the impetus for holding the convention, the implications for contemporary ideas about party are important. The frequent changes in ministry, including shifting parliamentary groupings and the perceived deadlock that ensued as well as the failure of the Brown-Dorion administration, all led Brown to conclude that greater party cohesion, in both policy and legislative votes, was necessary. He believed that the convention was a way to forge some degree of unanimity in that direction.[36] The logical electoral corollary was to appeal to voters on a more coherent, and naturally more partisan level, making the argument that it was the only way to enact meaningful change within the Union. Thus in the elections of 1861 and 1862, party loyalty lost its stigma somewhat in public discourse on the Brownite side, and while the ideal of the "independent man" was maintained as much as possible on the Conservative-Reform side, it was often forced to respond in kind to the greater partisanship of its opponents to demonstrate an effective contrast.

The 1861 contest in East Elgin strikingly demonstrated the break between the two groupings that resulted from the Convention. After the nomination of Mr. McCausland, an editorial in the *St. Thomas Weekly Dispatch* congratulated "the moderate Reformers and liberal Conservatives of East Elgin" for nominating a man so "opposed to extremes."[37] The purpose of his nomination, as stated by the chairman

of his nomination meeting, was to run someone "in opposition to the Clear Grit faction."[38] He hailed McCausland as "an independent man… who was not tied down to support any party," yet McCausland referred to himself as a "moderate Reformer," and later, at Mapleton, as an "independent reformer."[39] An editorial from the following week praised him as a "true Reformer, a liberal in the strictest sense of the term."[40] Thus, the Conservative-Reformer side carefully attempted to walk the line between the ideal of the "independent man" and advocating support for one party, in order for non-Brownite Reformers to distinguish themselves from the "political faction which [appeared] to be assuming shape and motion under the leadership of …George Brown."[41] The East Elgin contest of 1863 showed a similar dynamic. The *Dispatch* described the difference between the two candidates in the county tellingly:

> The differences between the candidates was well worthy of remark – the one promising modestly but earnestly to do all he could for the good of the country, and not to vote as a blind party man – the other flippantly praising his own consistency (!)… [one speaking] temperately of all parties, but well defining to which he belonged,- the other insulting the Governor, by boasting that he sided with the 'Reform party,'…[42]

The ideal of the "independent man" was still alive and well by 1863, but there was an increasing inability to maintain it to the same degree as had previously been done in public discourse. "Consistency," in the sense of faithfulness to one party, was derided. However, one Mr. Eccles of East Elgin nevertheless felt compelled to "[define] to which [party] he belonged," something that was in many cases entirely avoided on the hustings and in the pages of the newspapers in 1857.

Even in the pages of the *Ottawa Citizen*, where the ideal of the "independent man" was strong for far longer than many other papers in Canada West, we see a marked shift as the 1860s progressed. As the 1861 contest approached, an editorial exhorted voters that "[w]hatever party the

candidate may belong to who solicits your suffrages…[l]et your first and indispensable requirement be *respectability of character*."[43] Much like in the 1857 contests, candidates' published letters to electors focused on their past parliamentary performance, their promises for the betterment of their own counties, and promises to eschew partyism.[44] Daniel McLachlin expressed to the voters of Renfrew that he hoped "being thoroughly an Ottawa man will be considered to be of more value than the avowal of a preference for any party."[45] Party titles were not entirely absent from the coverage of the election, but the familiar terms "ministerialist" and "oppositionist" were overwhelmingly used. Even in reference to the Grits, the exclusive preference was for more diffuse labels like "the most Radical [sic] of the Oppositionists."[46] Even in its analysis of the outcome of the election, the *Citizen* expressed a deep doubt about the solidarity of parties and their ability to remain cohesive groupings in the face of the election results. With the changes that occurred at the polls, "there must be more or less of party reorganization" it opined, claiming that "it remains to be seen whether, in the absence of their late chief [George Brown], the same degree of cohesion will be preserved" in the Opposition ranks.[47] The article concluded that "it is vain to speculate upon the position which men and parties will assume in the House," since "men are obliged to deal with the questions of their own day and generation." As for which party any of the "new men" elected would support, it claimed nobody could know for certain.[48] This lack of confidence in the stability of parties over time shows that not only did they not form the main object of political allegiance for many, but that parties themselves were still rather fluid in organization and composition.

Local concerns, from the completion of the Parliament buildings to the construction of roads, dominated coverage of the 1863 contest, as well as the pages of the *Citizen*. Nonetheless, attitudes toward parties did show signs of change. Dawson and Wright, candidates for Ottawa, both attempted to portray the independent ideal, with the former promising to "hold [himself] aloof from party strife," and the latter claiming "emphatically to be an independent member."[49] However McLachlin,

who had hoped that his being "thoroughly an Ottawa man" was sufficient in 1861, announced to reading electors of the *Citizen*'s pages: "I come before you as a Liberal Conservative."[50] A column praising McLachlin stated that he was "a Conservative of the best and only genuine school."[51] Alongside these claims, McLachlin also promised not to support government blindly, but it was clear that he now felt a greater need to mark himself apart from his opponents by suggesting his party leaning. Even the editorialists of the *Citizen* felt a more pressing need to defend their party identity, if only in negative terms. After being accused by the *British Whig* of letting their "really excellent, and once Conservative Journal" become "one of the Scotch Grits' Organs," they devoted the entirety of their editorial space on 31 July to debunking this claim.[52]

The newspapers aligned with Brown's new wing of Reformers or "Grits," were adamantly more partisan in their discourse during the pre-Confederation elections of the 1860s, a reflection of their relatively more organized and unified party. The language of betrayal, oddity, and lack of principle that was used to describe straying from one's party is striking, even given that these "Brownite" journals were relatively more party-focused in 1857 than their "ministerial" counterparts. The *Courier* denounced a Mr. Morris as a "political hermaphrodite," guilty of tricking men of different political persuasions into supporting him.[53] Mr. Allan, a "seemingly earnest Reformer," had nominated Morris as such, and Mr. Code, a Conservative, seconded the motion. Rather than painting him as an "independent man" for attracting a wide breadth of voters, the writer chided him for his apparent deviousness. Conversely, a supporter of Morris' attempted to salvage the old ideal by telling the meeting that Morris' "votes were given honestly and independently" of any party.[54] Yet the *Courier* appeared to be through with the old ideal of nonpartisanship, bellowing in an article titled "Choose Between Them!":

> Between these two parties there can be no half way - whoever is not for them is against them, because at such a time as the

> present, nothing but unity amongst Reformers can keep out the old Corruptionists. To hesitate now, is to be lost; - to put in doubtful or independent men - call them which you will - is to desert and weaken the hands of those who are bravely wrestling with the giant evils that have brought the country to the verge of ruin. We therefore call upon every man to whom right Government and Canada is dear - every man who calls himself by the honoured name or Reformer, to use his best endeavours to put in a member about whom there can be no doubt - who has no latent leaning to the Corruptionists- who has no Tory connections to provide for - who does with the good cause heart and soul, and leave Mr. Morris until he can make up his mind to choose between hyperion and a satyre.[55]

A similar trend unfolded in the *Globe*, although less zealous than the *Courier*. The *Globe* walked a more careful line, reserving the ideal of independence for some, and demanding party loyalty from others. For instance, it defended Oliver Mowat's shift in party allegiance over the years, and praised his inter-party support, going on to ask readers how they could prefer a member of the "corruptionist Coalition" of Macdonald over "the independent man who has no evil connections and no hindrances to acting as he thinks best for the good of the country?"[56] However, it also claimed that the Reformers of South Wentworth were obliged to "do their duty" as "true Liberal[s]" in returning their Reform candidate.[57] Although asymmetrical between the two party groupings, partisanship not only became more acceptable in the 1860s, but parties were increasingly being seen as objects of political allegiance and as organizations that voters could support in their own right. Though the "Brownite" Reformers were more explicitly and positively partisan in public discourse, Conservatives and old "Baldwinite" Reformers were choosing to define themselves more openly along party lines, in order to distinguish themselves and perhaps to attract votes from a more party-minded electorate.

The election of 1867 was anomalous in many ways, but not least in

the way that the rhetoric of party was used and opinions toward party were held. John A. Macdonald and many Conservative candidates very consciously denounced partyism, stating that, with the new project of consolidating Confederation before them, Canadians should not let a rift of party animosity distract them from their task. Whether or not Macdonald truly believed this we cannot know. Yet the effort to undercut party allegiance in an attempt to garner support from all who encouraged the Union, which in Ontario was the overwhelming majority, was apparent everywhere.[58] The "Brownite" Reformer reaction to the "no-party dodge" in favour of the principle of party majoritarianism was also conspicuous. The *Dispatch* recorded one of Macdonald's speeches in London, where he stated emphatically that he and the other Fathers of Confederation had "laid aside [their] party difference and united for a great purpose, thinking not of party, but of our country." He informed the crowd that it was the duty of all Canadians to support his government in the completion of the project of Confederation until the government erred in its actions. To accept "Mr. Brown's challenge to form a partizan [sic] government" would lead only to struggle, leaving the Dominion "unfinished and incomplete."[59] The chairman overseeing the demonstration agreed, announcing that he was neither a Conservative nor a Reformer but a "Unionist and a Confederationist."[60]

Yet there is a notable difference between this discourse and the prior encouragement of "independent men." While the *Dispatch* argued that the first election of the new Dominion was ideal for choosing only the ablest men to return to Parliament, there was a consistent acknowledgement in all the newspapers of two great groupings, unified and organized, between which voters had to choose. Macdonald's Conservatives and moderate Reformers tried to portray themselves as "Unionists" rather than by old party labels. Nonetheless, papers like the *Dispatch* contrasted "the present Coalition" with "the political partisans of the Globe school;" the "Clear Grit factionists" made up of "the scheming nominees of packed Conventions."[61] Even while denouncing

Grit partisanship, Macdonald's supporters nonetheless acknowledged that a binary choice had to be made. Even the *Citizen*, standard-bearer of the independent ideal, praised the candidate for Ottawa as "a firm and consistent supporter of the Government," even while denouncing George Brown's "own school of Reformers" for "recklessly [pledging] themselves to vote with [Brown], through thick and thin."[62] Gone from the *Citizen* and the other papers was the narrow concentration on local issues and the lists of constituency-specific projects forming the bulk of candidates' platforms. The *Citizen* expressed a belief that "Union Candidates" were to represent issues of "national importance." Even in his résumé of election promises, the candidate for Ottawa stressed that the Ottawa canal was "a work of real NATIONAL IMPORTANCE," which would "develop the resources of the whole Dominion."[63] The *Globe* portrayed the Reformers as the truly national choice; not prey for the "factiousness" of patronage but concerned for the "prosperity of all sections of the New Dominion – from Vancouver to Newfoundland."[64] Thus it seemed that where a view of the Assembly as a debating chamber of constituency-minded independent Members did not necessitate strong or unified parties in an electoral context, a new federal Dominion, with nation-wide tasks ahead of it, was thought to require strong, unified groupings in Parliament to present broad, uniform programs of policy. This was reflected in electoral contests.

"Brownite" Reformer newspapers denounced the "no-party dodge" as, at best, disingenuous and, at worst, an outright lie designed to swindle voters. The *Courier* asked indignantly "where is the Coalition?" before answering that there was no such thing. It was merely "the absorption into a Conservative Government of a few quondam Reformers."[65] In effect, they were acknowledging that parties were a fixture of politics, and to deny this was either to baldly lie or to be deceived. One should place one's allegiance with a party on principle and declare it, not pretend that one had no such allegiance at all by using other labels, they argued. To prove its point, the *Courier* even published an article from the *Ottawa Daily News*, which portrayed Conservative dismay with the "no-party dodge." The

article called for a "Conservative Association for the Province of Ontario," an official party body equivalent to the existing Reform Association that would make party stances clear. "[W]e will at least…not be ashamed to flaunt the Conservative flag in every County of Upper Canada." the *News* proclaimed.[66] Now even grassroots Conservatives seemed to be of the same party opinion as the radical Reformers of 1851 discussed above:

> There is but one remedy that we know of for evil; and that is the establishment of a Conservative Association for the Province of Ontario. The Reformers of Ontario have their Association, and when any dispute takes place in the party the matter is referred to a Convention of the representatives of that party. By that means the leaders are kept in a straight track. They cannot sell their principles for a mess of pottage without receiving immediate expulsion from the party.[67]

The *Globe* was equally blunt in its denial of Macdonald's claim that partisanship had been left behind in order to complete Confederation, bluntly stating that "[t]he people of Ontario have before them the candidates of two parties, the Conservative and the Reform," likening Macdonald-supporting Reformers to the rehabilitated drunkards paraded about by "temperance orators" to show how their ways were truly effective.[68] Thus, in 1867, party allegiance was not only openly accepted and discussed in public discourse, but was encouraged by Brown's Reformers and acknowledged as a reality to be resisted by Conservatives.

During the first years after Confederation, parties grew as organizations in a way which they had not been able to before. Indeed, Confederation created "a much broader context within which party-building could take place." John A. Macdonald was able to use patronage in a less personal, more party-based way in order to build an organization to rival Brown's the already more cohesive Reformers.[69] In Ontario in particular, the party was more homogeneous than ever, as most Reformers had by then returned to the Reform party proper or "been swallowed

up by the Conservatives."[70] This change was reflected by the election discourse during the contest of 1872. With both parties more organized, they were able to portray themselves as national bodies. The attitude in newspaper discussion was that parties were there to formulate and implement policies for the Dominion as a whole. The *Dispatch* denounced the opposition candidates who narrowly "[fought] for each local office," as opposed to John A. Macdonald's "party of Union and Progress" which it said strived for the public good.[71] The *Citizen* echoed the same sentiment, calling into question "the narrow idea that the sole duty of a representative is to secure advantages for his own constituency."[72] The *Globe* contended that parties were essential for popular government and liberty itself, and expressed relief that party spirit had been awakened in 1872 when it had almost been snuffed out in 1867.[73] Parties were not only now accepted as parts of the political system, but were in many cases necessary for its functioning and the achievement of broader national goals and development. Independence of thought and judgment were still portrayed as admirable and necessary qualities for candidates, but parties were seen as playing the role of formulating policies to be carried out in the legislature by blocs of affiliated, unified Members.

This was a crucial break from the pre-Confederation contests. Independence of judgment was still praised, but it was more important for a candidate to declare his allegiance and thus, which plan he supported for the country. The *Globe* editorial of 27 July titled "What is he?" clearly depicted the electoral mood. In response to a letter from a Mr. Dodge expressing his concern that he had been listed as a "Ministerial" candidate when he claimed not to be, the editorial laid out the two things that were required of "candidates for a seat in the Parliament of Canada[:] […] experience and knowledge of the country," as well as "clear and definite views as to the line of action by which their course in Parliament should be regulated."[74] In other words, independent judgment and knowledge were important, but candidates were to "[nail their] colours to the mast as soon as the fight began," like Mr. Dodge's opponent. To promise merely to reflect

upon legislation as it came and make an informed decision was no longer enough – one was to openly support a party program. The *Globe* concluded: "there will be no 'Independents' in the House of Commons next February." Unless he wanted to be "a great Dodge party of one," Mr. Dodge was not going to accomplish very much. [75] The *Courier* rallied to the same cry, complimenting the integrity of "the standard-bearers of the great Reform party" and calling for "honest party government" instead of the guise of non-partisanship.[76] The idea was weaker in the Conservative press, which maintained some elements of the nation-building no-party stance, but partisan ideals were still present. The *Dispatch* praised the Conservatives of England for holding a conference in Essex to codify their principles and platform, and advised: "Let us unite on the same principles."[77] In even the banalities of the electoral fight, the acceptance of party allegiance as a political reality was present; candidates were no longer listed by name and riding alone, but as "Ministerial," "Opposition," "Independent" or by party label. "Deputation[s] of Conservatives" joined "conventions of Reformers" in nominating candidates without the old public meetings and party leaders were consulted by candidates before entering the race.[78]

The role that religion played in this election was notable as well. Religion had certainly not died out as an object of allegiance for electors by 1872, but was qualified in the discourse and was no longer a sole, or even primary, force for political organization. For instance, in Ottawa, one Mr. O'Connor withdrew from the race after expressing distaste at a split in the "Catholic vote" created by the entrance of another Catholic candidate in the race. While there may have been a "Catholic vote" to speak of, O'Connor was not exclusively a "Catholic" candidate as Peter Moran had been in Grenville. O'Connor was also a Conservative supporter of John A. Macdonald. Indeed, "he made it his duty to call upon Sir John Macdonald to see if he came forward whether or not he would get a reasonable support from the Government" for his candidacy – he appealed to Catholics, but as a party-sanctioned candidate. Whether Catholic voters themselves regarded his Catholicism or his Conservative ties as a greater motivator

for supporting him cannot been know for sure, but from this incident it is clear that Mr. O'Connor did not feel it was enough to run as a Catholic without also aligning himself with a party.[79] An editorial from the following day gave its gloss on O'Connor's withdrawal, explaining that religion only became an issue in the race because of the weakness of the "opposition element." They believed that religion was only brought up because there was such a high degree of political agreement at the time between adherents of the two parties: "if public opinion were divided on political questions, we perhaps should not have religious squabbles on our hands."[80]

Thus, by the second general election for the Parliament of Canada, political parties had emerged as objects of political allegiance in their own right, openly discussed, supported and acknowledged. Religion did not die out as something capable of directing electoral support. Nor was patronage removed from electioneering by any means, but was rather used in a more partisan way. Social organizations were not entirely separated from parties. However none of these things had to happen entirely for parties to become more or less unified organizations to which electors felt allegiance or strong affiliation in their own right. Elections were still complex affairs in which many groups played a role. It is made clear through the public discourse how opinions toward parties changed significantly, at least until they were accepted as realities of political life and electoral politics. Although many electors in 1872 would perhaps view our present-day politics as being riddled with rampant "partyism," we can see how the period from 1857 to 1872 set in motion the trajectory toward the more cut-and-dry party politics that our system has inherited, and about which the public political discourse still revolves. In his recent article on the state of Parliament, Andrew Coyne of *Maclean's* lamented: "the only aspect of that vote [on election day] that matters is the party affiliation of the members of Parliament [whom voters] elect." "Isn't it true," he asked his readers, "that MPs are elected almost entirely on the basis of party?"[81]

Notes

1. M. Brooke Taylor, *Promoters, Patriots, and Partisans: Historiography in Nineteenth-Century English Canada* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1989), 123.

2. Robert Gourlay, *Statistical Account of Upper Canada* (Yorkshire: S.R. Publishers, 1966), 116.

3. Gordon Stewart, *The Origins of Canadian Politics* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1986), 34.

4. Jeffrey McNairn, *The Capacity to Judge: public opinion and deliberative democracy in Upper Canada, 1791-1854* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2000), 102, 144.

5. Ibid., 211.

6. Ibid., 243-245.

7. Stewart, *The Origins of Canadian Politics*, 41-42.

8. Ibid., 49.

9. Jeffrey McNairn, *The Capacity to Judge*, 330.

10. Thomas Hockins, "Flexible and Structured Parliamentarism: From 1848 to Contemporary Party Government," in Journal of Canadian Studies, Vol. 14, No. 2 (Summer 1979): 8-9.

11. McNairn, *The Capacity to Judge*, 331.

12. Ibid., 334-337.

13. Quoted in McNairn, *The Capacity to Judge*, 338.

14. S.F. Wise, "Upper Canada and the Conservative Tradition" in *God's Peculiar Peoples: Essays on Political Culture in Nineteenth Century Canada* (Ottawa: Carleton University Press, 1993), 178.

15. Ibid., 179.

16. S.J.R. Noel, *Patrons, Clients, and Brokers* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990), 215.

17. S.F. Wise, "The Ontario Political Culture: A Study in Complexities" in *God's Peculiar Peoples*, 217.

18. Richard Gwyn, John A., *The Man Who Made Us* (Toronto : Random House Canada, 2007), 123.

19. Hockins, "Flexible and Structured Parliamentarism," 9.

20. Gwyn, John A., 123.

21. *The Perth Courier*, December 8, 1857, 2.

22. "East Middlesex," *The Globe*, December 4, 1857, 2.

23. Ibid.

24. P.G. Cornell, "The Alignment of Political Groups in the United Province of Canada, 1854-1864," in *Upper Canadian Politics in the 1850's*, edited by Ramsay Cook, Craig Brown and Carl Berger (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1967), 79.

25. J. Murray Beck, *Pendulum of Power: Canada's Federal Elections* (Scarborough: Prentice-Hall of Canada, 1968), 19.

26. *St. Thomas Weekly Dispatch*, December 17, 1857, 2.

27. Ibid.

28. "Brockville," "South Waterloo," *The Globe*, December 4, 1857, 2.

29. *St. Thomas Weekly Dispatch*, December 17, 1857, 2.

30. McNairn, *The Capacity to Judge*, 102, 107-108.

31. Stewart, *Origins of Canadian Politics*, 56.

32. "Grenville," *The Globe*, December 15, 1857, 2.

33. *The Perth Courier*, December 18, 1857, 2.

34. "City Election. The Nomination.," *The Globe*, December 15, 1857, 2.

35. Noel, *Patrons, Clients, Brokers*, 196-198.

36. G.W. Brown, "The Grit Party and the Great Reform Convention of 1859," in *Upper Canadian Politics in the 1850s*, edited by Ramsay Cook, Craig Brown, and Carl Berger (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1967), 18-22.

37. "East Elgin Election," *St. Thomas Weekly Dispatch*, 6 June 6, 1861, 2.

38. "Election Meeting," Ibid., 2.

39. Ibid.; "Mapleton Meeting," *St. Thomas Weekly Dispatch*, June 13, 1861, 2.

40. "Mr. McCausland's Address," Ibid., 2.

41. "Mr. Macdougall's opinion of George Brown a few years ago," *St. Thomas Weekly Dispatch*, July 4, 1861, 1.

42. "Election Intelligence – East Elgin," *St. Thomas Weekly Dispatch*, June 11, 1863, 2.

43. "The Coming Election," *The Ottawa Citizen*, June 11, 1861, 2.

44. "Election Meeting in South Osgoode," "Ottawa City Election," "To the Independent Electors of the County of Renfrew," *The Ottawa Citizen*, June 21, 1861, 2.; "To the Electors of the County of Russell," Ibid., June 28, 1861, 2.; "To the Free and Independent Electors of the County of Ottawa!," Ibid., July 2, 1861, 3.

45. "To the Independent Electors of the County of Renfrew," *The Ottawa Citizen*, June 21, 1861, 2.

46. "Representation by Population," *The Ottawa Citizen*, June 25, 1861, 2.

47. "Parties in Parliament," *The Ottawa Citizen*, July 23, 1861, 2.
48. Ibid.
49. "To the Free and Independent Electors of the County of Ottawa," "To the Independent Electors of the County of Ottawa," *The Ottawa Citizen*, June 6, 1863, 3.
50. "To the Free and Independent Electors of the County of Carleton," *The Ottawa Citizen*, June 13, 1863, 4.
51. "Mr. McLachlin and Carleton," *The Ottawa Citizen*, June 20, 1863, 1.
52. *The Ottawa Citizen*, July 31, 1863, 2.
53. "The Hermaphrodite Politician," *The Perth Courier*, June 19, 1863, 2.
54. "The Nomination. South Lanark.," Ibid., 2.
55. "Choose Between Them!," Ibid., 2.
56. "The New Ministry," *The Globe*, May 14, 1863, 2.; "Electors of the West Division," *The Globe*, June 22, 1863, 2.
57. "Election Intelligence," *The Globe*, May 14, 1863, 2.
58. Stewart, *The Origins of Canadian Politics*, 66.
59. "Important Ministerial Demonstration at London," *St. Thomas Weekly Dispatch*, August 1, 1867, 1.
60. Ibid.
61. "The Canvass", "West Elgin," *St. Thomas Weekly Dispatch*, August 8, 1867, 2.
62. The Ottawa Citizen, August 9, 1867, 2.
63. "To the Electors of the City of Ottawa," Ibid.
64. "The Danger of the Hour," *The Globe*, August 10, 1867, 3.
65. "A Word to the Electors of North Lanark," *The Perth Courier*, August, 1867, 2.
66. "How the Tories are Satisfied," *The Perth Courier*, August 9, 1867, 2.
67. Ibid.
68. "Which Will You Support?," *The Globe*, August 6, 1867, 3.; "Coalition Converts," *The Globe*, August 5, 1867, 3.
69. Stewart, *Origins of Canadian Politics*, 59-60.
70. J. Murray Beck, *Pendulum of Power*, 19.
71. "The Election Returns," *St. Thomas Weekly Dispatch*, September 12, 1872, 2.
72. "The Right Man in the Right Place," *The Ottawa Citizen*, July 11, 1872, 1.
73. "Political Struggles," *The Globe*, September 4, 1872, 2.
74. "What is he?," *The Globe*, July 27, 1872, 2.
75. Ibid.
76. "The Result," *The Perth Courier*, August 16, 1872, 1.

77. "The Election Returns," *St. Thomas Weekly Dispatch*, September 12, 1872, 2.

78. For elected member categorization, see "Elections To-Morrow," *The Ottawa Citizen*, August 7, 1872, 1; "North Wellington," *The Globe* July 26, 1872, 2; *The Globe* August 9, 1872; "The State of the Poll!" *The Perth Courier*, August 16, 1872, 2. For party nomination meetings, see "To the Electors of the City of Hamilton," *The Globe* July 25, 1872, 3; "South Leeds," *The Globe*, August 8, 1872, 2; "Mr. Frank Shanly Accepts the Conservative Nomination," *The Globe*, July 23, 1872, 1; *The Ottawa Citizen*, July 11, 1872, 3; "Seaforth," *The Ottawa Citizen*, July 16, 1872, 4. For the consultation of party leaders, see "Political Meeting – Strong meeting of Irish Citizens," *The Ottawa Citizen*, July 10, 1872, 3.

79. "Political Meeting," *The Ottawa Citizen*, July 10, 1872, 3.

80. *The Ottawa Citizen*, July 11, 1872, 1.

81. Andrew Coyne, "Decency alone can't save Parliament," *Maclean's Online*, http://www2.macleans.ca/2011/11/28/decency-alone-can%E2%80%99t-save-parliament/.

Works Cited

Primary Sources

The Globe

"East Middlesex," *The Globe*, December 4, 1857, 2.
"City Election. The Nomination.," *The Globe*, December 15, 1857, 2.
"Brockville," "South Waterloo," *The Globe*, December 4, 1857, 2.
"Grenville," *The Globe*, December 15, 1857, 2.
"City Election. The Nomination.," *The Globe*, December 15, 1857, 2.
"The New Ministry," *The Globe*, May 14, 1863, 2.
"Electors of the West Division," *The Globe*, June 22, 1863, 2.
"Election Intelligence," *The Globe*, May 14, 1863, 2.
"The Danger of the Hour," *The Globe*, August 10, 1867, 3.
"Which Will You Support?," *The Globe*, August 6, 1867, 3.
"Coalition Converts," *The Globe*, August 5, 1867, 3.
"What is he?," *The Globe*, July 27, 1872, 2.
"Political Struggles", *The Globe*, September 4, 1872, 2.
The Globe August 9, 1872.
"To the Electors of the City of Hamilton," *The Globe* July 25, 1872, 3.
"Mr. Frank Shanly Accepts the Conservative Nomination," *The Globe*, July 23, 1872, 1.
"South Leeds," *The Globe*, August 8, 1872, 2.

The Ottawa Citizen

"The Coming Election," *The Ottawa Citizen*, June 11, 1861, 2.
"Election Meeting in South Osgoode," *The Ottawa Citizen*, June 21, 1861, 2.
"Ottawa City Election," *The Ottawa Citizen*, June 21, 1861, 2.
"To the Electors of the County of Russell," *The Ottawa Citizen*, June 28, 1861, 2.
"To the Free and Independent Electors of the County of Ottawa!," *The Ottawa Citizen*, July 2, 1861, 3.
"To the Independent Electors of the County of Renfrew," *The Ottawa Citizen*, June 21, 1861, 2.
"Representation by Population," *The Ottawa Citizen*, June 25, 1861, 2.
"Parties in Parliament," *The Ottawa Citizen*, July 23, 1861, 2.
"To the Free and Independent Electors of the County of Ottawa," *The Ottawa Citizen*, June 6, 1863, 3.
"To the Independent Electors of the County of Ottawa," *The Ottawa Citizen*, June 6, 1863, 3.
"To the Free and Independent Electors of the County of Carleton," *The Ottawa Citizen*, June 13, 1863, 4.
"Mr. McLachlin and Carleton," *The Ottawa Citizen*, June 20, 1863, 1.
The Ottawa Citizen, July 31, 1863, 2.
The Ottawa Citizen, August 9, 1867, 2.
"To the Electors of the City of Ottawa," *The Ottawa Citizen*, August 9, 1867, 2.
"The Right Man in the Right Place," *The Ottawa Citizen*, July 11, 1872, 1.
"Elections To-Morrow," *The Ottawa Citizen*, August 7, 1872, 1.
"Political Meeting – Strong meeting of Irish Citizens," *The Ottawa Citizen*, July 10, 1872, 3.
"Hamilton," *The Ottawa Citizen*, July 10, 1872, 3.
"Seaforth," *The Ottawa Citizen*, July 16, 1872, 4.
"Newburgh," *The Ottawa Citizen*, July 11, 1872, 3.

The Perth Courier

The Perth Courier, December 8, 1857, 2.
The Perth Courier, December 18, 1857, 2.
"The Hermaphrodite Politician," *The Perth Courier*, June 19, 1863, 2.
"The Nomination. South Lanark.," *The Perth Courier*, June 19, 1863, 2.
"Choose Between Them!," *The Perth Courier*, June 19, 1863, 2.
"A Word to the Electors of North Lanark," *The Perth Courier*, August, 1867, 2.
"How the Tories are Satisfied," *The Perth Courier*, August 9, 1867, 2.
"The Result," *The Perth Courier*, August 16, 1872, 1.
"The State of the Poll!" *The Perth Courier*, August 16, 1872, 2.

St. Thomas Weekly Dispatch

St. Thomas Weekly Dispatch, December 17, 1857, 2.

St. Thomas Weekly Dispatch, December 17, 1857.

"East Elgin Election," *St. Thomas Weekly Dispatch*, June 6, 1861, 2.

"Election Meeting," *St. Thomas Weekly Dispatch*, June 6, 1861, 2.

"Mapleton Meeting," *St. Thomas Weekly Dispatch*, June 13, 1861, 2.

"Mr. McCausland's Address," *St. Thomas Weekly Dispatch*, June 13, 1861, 2.

"Mr. Macdougall's opinion of George Brown a few years ago," *St. Thomas Weekly Dispatch*, July 4, 1861, 1.

"Election Intelligence – East Elgin," *St. Thomas Weekly Dispatch*, June 11, 1863, 2.

"Important Ministerial Demonstration at London," *St. Thomas Weekly Dispatch*, August 1, 1867, 1.

"The Canvass," *St. Thomas Weekly Dispatch*, August 8, 1867, 2. "West Elgin," *St. Thomas Weekly Dispatch*, August 8, 1867, 2.

"The Election Returns," *St. Thomas Weekly Dispatch*, September 12, 1872, 2.

"The Election Returns," *St. Thomas Weekly Dispatch*, September 12, 1872, 2.

82. ***Secondary Sources***

Beck, J. Murray. Pendulum of Power; Canada's Federal Elections. Scarborough: Prentice-Hall of Canada, 1968.

Coyne, Andrew. Maclean's Online. "Decency alone can't save Parliament." Accessed December 1, 2011. http://www2.macleans.ca/2011/11/28/decency-alone-can%E2%80%99t-save-parliament/.

Gourlay, Robert. General Introduction to Statistical Account of Upper Canada. East Ardsley, Eng: S.R. Publishers, 1966.

Gwyn, Richard J. John A.: The Man Who Made Us : the Life and Times of John A. Macdonald. Toronto: Random House Canada, 2007.

Hockin, Thomas A. "Flexible and Structured Parliamentarism: From 1848 to Contemporary Party Government, " Journal of Canadian Studies, Vol. 14, No. 2 (Summer 1979): 8-17.

Noel, S. J. R. Patrons, Clients, Brokers: Ontario Society and Politics, 1791-1896. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990.

McNairn, Jeffrey L. The Capacity to Judge: Public Opinion and Deliberative Democracy in Upper Canada, 1791-1854. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2000.

Stewart, Gordon T. The Origins of Canadian Politics: A Comparative Approach. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1986.

Taylor, M. Brook. Promoters, Patriots, and Partisans: Historiography in Nineteenth-Century English Canada. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1989.

Wise, S. F., A. B. McKillop, and Paul Romney. God's Peculiar Peoples: Essays on Political Culture in Nineteenth Century Canada. Ottawa: Carleton University Press, 1993.

Pour en finir avec le « séparatisme » Le projet d'indépendance de René Lévesque tel qu'exprimé dans le Canada hors-Québec

Raphaël Dallaire Ferland

Depuis la Confédération, le discours souverainiste au Québec connait des transformations fondamentales. Dans son discours du parc Sohmer en avril 1883, Honoré Mercier déclare: « il n'y a pas un Canadien qui ne désire cesser de s'appeler colon – colon, c'est-à-dire serviteur, chose d'autrui, propriété d'un autre peuple, ignoré, méprisé, bon tout au plus à être taxé et à se faire tuer dans une guerre suscitée par son maître. »[1] Le premier ministre souhaite l'indépendance du Canada par rapport à la Grande-Bretagne, et ses propos expriment une hargne explicite à l'encontre de la nation colonisatrice. Cette rhétorique d'opposition et d'hostilité sera parfois réutilisée dans les premiers discours sur l'indépendance du Québec. On commence alors à parler de « séparatisme »: on perçoit le projet de souveraineté comme un mouvement de contestation et d'insatisfaction, où la sécession de la Confédération est une fin en soi.

Ce qualificatif ne s'applique plus à l'ensemble du mouvement souverainiste québécois. Il est même bien peu représentatif du discours dominant. Prenons la déclaration finale du chef bloquiste Gille Duceppe suite à sa défaite aux élections fédérales de mai 2011: « toute nation trouve toujours les forces en son sein pour s'affirmer pleinement. Et s'affirmer pleinement, cela veut dire, pour le Québec, un pays libre. »[2] Ainsi, le séparatisme évolue en un souverainisme qui émerge de l'intérieur du Québec, plutôt que causé par une force extérieure. Autrement dit, la province ne se « séparerait » pas à cause de ses rancunes contre Ottawa, mais plutôt parce qu'elle se reconnaîtrait

comme un peuple mature capable d'autodétermination. Au lieu d'un combat contre le Canada, il s'agit d'un combat mené pour le Québec.

Le premier à avoir articulé ce qu'on pourrait appeler le « souverainisme renouvelé » est René Lévesque.[3] En 1967, alors ministre de la Famille et du Bien-être Social pour le Parti Libéral du Québec, Lévesque propose une nouvelle position constitutionnelle pour le Québec dans son manifeste *Un pays qu'il faut faire*, qui sera rejeté d'emblée par le parti. Il fonde le 19 novembre 1967 le Mouvement souveraineté-association et exprime l'essentiel de sa pensée indépendantiste dans *Option Québec*, en janvier 1968. Ces écrits expriment la volonté de rendre le Québec souverain tout en formant une association politique et économique avec le Canada qui impliquerait notamment l'utilisation de la même monnaie et des mêmes barrières douanières, ce qu'est la souveraineté-association. Après deux mandats en tant que chef du Parti Québécois et suite au référendum de 1980, René Lévesque entre dans la mythologie politique du Québec.

S'il est intronisé dans l'imaginaire collectif, ce n'est pas tellement à cause de ses accomplissements en tant que premier ministre, mais plutôt parce qu'il a aidé le peuple québécois à prendre conscience de ses aspirations collectives. En élisant le Parti Québécois, on votait pour un gouvernement ostensiblement orienté vers la majorité canadienne française, et non vers la minorité anglophone qui avait dominée l'économie québécoise d'avant la Révolution tranquille.[6] Si l'on considère l'héritage politique de Lévesque uniquement en fonction de son objectif ultime qui était la souveraineté du Québec, alors il fait partie de ces « héros-perdants,» dans la lignée du Marquis de Montcalm et de Louis-Joseph Papineau. Pourtant, après sa mort en 1987, René Lévesque apparaît comme l'un des grands Québécois, puisque malgré la défaite, il avait montré aux siens qu'ils pouvaient accomplir leur destinée eux-mêmes, sans l'intervention d'aucune puissance extérieure.

Cette conception proprement « québécoise » de l'héritage de René Lévesque explique que l'homme politique ait été traité de manière

introvertie par l'historiographie de la province: on étudie l'importance de son action en se bornant aux frontières du Québec, sans s'attarder sur son impact dans le reste du Canada. Il s'agit d'un grand paradoxe, puisque la souveraineté-association est divisée en deux étapes: d'abord l'indépendance, puis l'élaboration d'une alliance entre les deux pays. C'est pourquoi l'on doit obligatoirement étudier les rapports entre Québec et Ottawa lorsqu'on se penche sur le souverainisme de 1960 à 1980.

Notre objectif est donc d'interpréter le discours de René Lévesque lorsqu'il présente son projet dans les autres provinces. Il s'agit d'un sujet primordial, puisque le dialogue politique entre Québec et Ottawa était le fer de lance du projet souverainiste: Lévesque a toujours refusé l'idée d'un coup d'état, et Trudeau n'a jamais considéré de mettre un terme au mouvement pacifique par les armes – c'est donc par la négociation qu'on arrive à la souveraineté-association.

Notre approche consiste à cerner les grands axes de l'argumentation de Lévesque, puis de lire entre les lignes: De quoi essaie-t-il de convaincre les Canadiens? Était-ce efficace et pourquoi? Est-ce que son discours témoigne d'une compréhension lucide de la situation politique et historique du Canada? Il apparaîtra que l'objectif principal du discours de Lévesque est de rendre le Canada favorable aux négociations sur le statut politique du Québec. Ce faisant, Lévesque dément toute hostilité envers le Canada, mettant ainsi un terme à ce « séparatisme » fondé sur le ressentiment.

Avant de se lancer dans un examen des entrevues, discours et publications livrés aux provinces anglophones, penchons-nous sur quelques aspects de la vie de René Lévesque. Un angle biographique est essentiel à la compréhension de sa pensée indépendantiste, puisqu'elle n'est pas formatée par la ligne idéologique d'un parti. Au contraire, c'est lui qui crée un parti pour servir son projet. Cela implique que Lévesque est devenu souverainiste suite à une réflexion personnelle influencée par son expérience vécue.

Né à New Carlisle en août 1922, Lévesque apprend rapidement l'anglais dans une école primaire bilingue. L'histoire qu'on y enseigne

présente les Anglo-Saxons comme la minorité dominante au Québec. Bien que Lévesque est encore trop jeune pour être « politisé, » il pressent cette supériorité anglophone à travers certains signes comme la grosseur du commerce « Chez Eaton » par rapport au « Chez Dufour, » et du train Océan Limitée par rapport au petit train des francophones de New Carlisle. Avec recul, il avoue au magazine *Maclean's* qu'il ressentait ce sentiment de « colonisé, » sans pourtant ressentir d' « hostilité envers l'élément anglais. »[13] Vers la fin des années 30, au cœur de la crise économique, des coops et unions francophones de New Carlisle commencent à s'élever contre les patrons anglophones – Lévesque y voit pour la première fois une ébauche de son identité canadienne française, qui se développe par opposition à l' « Autre » anglo-saxon. C'est ainsi qu'en juin 1960, lorsque Lesage lui offre de choisir entre la circonscription de Laurier et le comté majoritairement anglophone de West Island, Lévesque choisit le premier: jamais il n'a eu l'intention de faire de la politique autrement que pour la majorité francophone, historique et culturelle du Québec.

Ce parti pris pour le Québec ne doit pas être perçu comme un mépris des Canadiens des autres provinces. René Lévesque porte une estime sincère à plusieurs de ses adversaires politiques, dont certains sont des amis personnels. Or, le Canada le lui rend bien: devenu un phénomène médiatique après la création du PQ, il est reconnu dans les sphères politiques comme un politicien de haut calibre qui possède une excellente maîtrise de l'anglais, ce qui lui confère la réputation d' « adversaire honorable, » pour reprendre les mots du *Toronto Star*.[18]

Si Lévesque entretient de bons sentiments avec les autres provinces, il projette une conception dualistique des identitées canadienne et québécoise. En février 1969, il confie au magazine *Maclean's*: « je n'ai jamais ressenti d'hostilité vis-à-vis les gens de langue anglaise, [mais] je ne me suis jamais senti capable d'être Canadien. »[19] Il ne camoufle jamais cette différence auprès des autres provinces; au contraire, il l'exprime souvent afin de faire comprendre aux Canadiens la situation des Québécois. Pour Lévesque, il y a deux nations au sein de la Confédération, fondée sur ces

composantes: l'identité, la langue, la culture, la tradition, la religion, le territoire, des siècles d'histoire commune, des origines communes, et la volonté de coexister. Mais le critère « origines communes » est mal défini: est-ce que les Québécois anglophones font partie de la nation québécoise, puisqu'ils sont nés en territoire québécois, » ou est-ce que leur « origine » est l'Angleterre? Une chose est sûre: pour Lévesque, la souveraineté et la reprise de contrôle des francophones sur l'économie provinciale sont la volonté du « peuple québécois, » qu'il associe aux Québécois francophones. Les intérêts de la minorité anglophone ne sont pas considérés dans les grandes visées nationales; elle doit suivre la destinée des Canadiens français, ou partir. Cela ne veut pas dire, cependant, que les Québécois anglophones ne peuvent faire partie de la nation québécoise:

> All that is required of the people of Québec is that a *majority* express their desire to take control of their political destiny [...] And this will be done with the utmost democratic respect for our English-speaking population – even if they do not extend the same to us! – because in our eyes they are true Québécois.[22]

Par « majorité, » Lévesque ne parle pas uniquement du camp du « OUI, » cette majorité qui doit reprendre le contrôle de sa destinée réfère explicitement aux Canadiens français, puisqu'ils avaient auparavant été soumis à la minorité anglophone. Bien que Lévesque parle souvent des anglophones comme des descendants des conquérants anglais, ils sont ici des « vrais Québécois. » Contradiction? Au fond, tout dépend d'une appartenance subjective à la nation québécoise: si un anglophone se sent Québécois et supporte le projet souverainiste, alors il fait partie de cette nation. Au final, peu importe à qui s'adresse la « destinée du peuple québécois, » tous les citoyens du Québec auront le droit de vote au référendum de 1980.

Certes, les notions de nation et d'identité sont à la limite de l'antinomie chez Lévesque; mais l'homme n'avait rien d'un théoricien du nationalisme. Sa position quant aux Québécois anglophones avait deux fonctions précises: faire valoir la détermination du peuple québécois,

émancipé de l'ancienne domination anglophone, et assurer aux Canadiens que le Québec sera clément après la souveraineté. On souhaite qu'Ottawa ait l'esprit tranquille, qu'elle soit consentante à « laisser » ses anglophones au Québec, à la manière d'une mère divorcée laissant ses enfants au père, dans la garde partagée qu'est la souveraineté-association.

La vision de Lévesque comporte une autre imprécision car pour affirmer que les Canadiens français ont une vision commune et unanime de leur destinée, il faut d'abord qu'ils soient tous conscients d'appartenir à l'entité abstraite qu'est le peuple québécois:

> Now the French people are becoming conscious that they themselves are really a national majority and that they better get themselves an institutional framework to replace what broke down 20 years ago [i.e. la domination de l'économie québécoise par la minorité anglophone].[25]

Bien que l'étendue de cette conscience nationale soit invérifiable, Lévesque révèle ici sa tendance à parler au nom de *tous* les Québécois. Dans la même entrevue, il dit: « we in Quebec think…» et dans le *Weekend Magazine* d'octobre 1975: « that collective realization [i.e. qu'un Québec indépendant est souhaitable] is now entrenched so strongly that nothing […] can destroy it. » Or, on peut douter qu'une majorité de Canadiens français soit alors pour la souveraineté. Bien que nous ne disposions pas des intentions de vote référendaire pour 1975, les sondages de début avril 1980 montrent que 46% des Québécois étaient pour le « OUI. »[27] René Lévesque exagère donc l'appui des Canadiens français pour la souveraineté. Il le fait pour créer une impression d'unité devant les détracteurs anglophones, et pour convaincre la Confédération que le référendum sera un succès. Lévesque augmente ainsi la pression sur Ottawa, afin qu'elle accepte de négocier la souveraineté-association après le vote.

Alors que Lévesque clame haut et fort les visées nationalistes du peuple québécois, il nie l'existence de la nation canadienne, et s'attaque aux mythes fondateurs de la Confédération:

> We in Québec think of Canada as a very artificial creation conned upon our forefathers whom we now call the 'Fathers of the Confederation', but who were really nothing but average politicians of the time who made money out of scandals like the Canadian Pacific.[28]

Qu'on imagine seulement les conséquences d'un tel discours sur les *Founding Fathers* des États-Unis! Comment Lévesque ose-t-il s'attaquer au mythe de la Confédération? Précisément parce que selon lui, il s'agit d'un mythe, et qu'en le détruisant, les provinces et Ottawa accepteront mieux un changement politique au sein de cette vache sacrée qu'est la Confédération canadienne.

Ensuite, Lévesque « ose » parce qu'il ne croit pas à l'existence du nationalisme canadien; par ses paroles contre les « Pères fondateurs, » il ne craint pas d'insulter quiconque.[29] Mais si sa pensée est cohérente, cela ne veut pas dire qu'elle soit véridique. Il existait certes un nationalisme canadien, symbolisé par l'adoption de l'unifolié en 1964 et servant à centraliser les pouvoirs au fédéral, puisqu'on présentait Ottawa comme le gouvernement national des Canadiens.[30] Mais le nationalisme canadien organique, provenant d'un authentique sentiment collectif plutôt que d'un sponsorat d'Ottawa, était faible. Selon Northrop Frye, les identités sont provinciales: il existe certes une « unité nationale, » qui est la volonté d'orienter toutes les politiques canadiennes dans une même direction, mais il y a une tension irréconciliable entre « identité » et « unité. »[31] L'appartenance provinciale est trop forte, et jamais l'unité nationale n'aboutira à un nationalisme canadien authentique et fort.

L'argument sonne particulièrement juste durant le premier mandat du Parti Québécois (1976-1980) et la campagne référendaire: si Trudeau tentait de promouvoir une centralisation des pouvoirs à Ottawa en parallèle à un sentiment national fort, cette approche allait à l'encontre de la volonté autonomiste (sinon indépendantiste) du Québec – avant de traverser le Canada *d'un océan à l'autre*, l'uniformité du nationalisme

canadien se brisait contre la Laurentie. En outre, le souverainisme québécois n'encourageait pas les autres provinces à s'unir plus fortement contre le Québec. Il y avait plutôt un malaise dans le pays, et même un sentiment de culpabilité.[32] On souhaitait réintégrer le Québec à l'unité nationale pour que la Confédération puisse fonctionner comme avant. Ainsi, la pensée de Lévesque est extrême, mais juste, et s'il niera toujours l'existence du nationalisme canadien, il acceptera l'existence de l' « unité nationale, » en excluant bien sûr le Québec de cette union.[33]

La culpabilité et le malaise sont aussi ressentis par le Québec. C'est ce qui pousse Lévesque à refuser catégoriquement l'offre du *special status*, (du moins, jusqu'à la défaite référendaire et au « beau risque »): il détestait voir Québec mendier toujours plus de pouvoir et de reconnaissance au sein de la Confédération. La souveraineté-association mettrait fin à ces incessantes réclamations, puisqu'elle conférerait au Québec le plein contrôle de ses politiques:

> All of this leads us to a dead-end which is called special status. Quebec gets power on immigration. Quebec gets power on special policies. Quebec has got everything more or less. What does Quebec want? Quebec wants more all the time – because more and more she can do her job and nobody else is doing it the way she wants it to be done. This is called special status.[34]

Lévesque réfère avec justesse à l'autonomie provinciale acquise durant l'époque duplessiste et, en ce qui concerne l'immigration et les politiques spéciales (incluant les relations internationales), au gouvernement Lesage et à la Révolution tranquille. Voici sa grande peur: « Canada is being Balkanized because of Quebec. »[35] Son argument est que l'*opting-out* (un avantage spécial remporté par Duplessis et par lequel le Québec peut se retirer de certaines politiques fédérales en échange d'une compensation) entraîne les autres provinces à vouloir le même avantage, et provoque ainsi la désintégration du Canada. Or, Lévesque est convaincu que « the only thing that will save Canada is a

well-organized, central government. »[36] Il n'est pas contre le système confédératif: il est contre la présence du Québec dans ce système. Par sa crainte de la balkanisation, il applique au Canada sa propre vision du Québec: Lévesque croit en des pays unifiés par une cause commune à tout un peuple. Pour le Québec, c'est la souveraineté; pour le Canada, c'est une Confédération forte. Lorsqu'il lance ce message au Canada anglais, il est donc en train de dire: « laissez-nous partir, nous en ressortirons tous plus forts. » L'argument est honnête; la malhonnêteté aurait été d'enjoindre les provinces à l'indépendance uniquement dans le but de diviser le Canada et d'affaiblir Ottawa lors des négociations sur la souveraineté-association.

Le seul bémol à cette argumentation est que, Québec ou pas, plusieurs provinces luttent elles aussi pour l'autonomie provinciale. Suite à la récession de 1957, les provinces doivent fournir plus de ressources aux affaires sociales et au financement de l'éducation, mais la Politique nationale échoue à cerner leurs besoins et à fournir un partage économique cohérent – il en résulte une plus forte volonté d'autonomie dans la plupart des provinces. Lors de la crise mondiale de l'énergie, l'Alberta et Terre-Neuve vont jusqu'à élaborer un front interprovincial contre Ottawa, et le Québec n'a rien à voir dans cette initiative. Les craintes de balkanisation sont bien réelles, et Ottawa se livrera à une lutte de pouvoir avec les provinces, qui culminera à l'approche du référendum de 1980.[37] Lévesque est donc lucide sur la situation du Canada, mais il omet de mentionner que le Québec n'est pas le seul à entraver le renforcement du gouvernement fédéral par une quête d'autonomie.

Si Lévesque croit à une Confédération forte, qu'est-ce qui lui fait croire que « the break-up of Confederation as a political structure is inevitable »?[38] Parce qu'une confédération devrait être fondée sur une association volontaire d'états égaux, comme en Allemagne ou en Suisse, et qu'au Canada, la majorité canadienne impose ses directions politiques à la minorité québécoise.[39] L'histoire lui a mainte fois donné raison et l'exemple le plus flagrant étant le Rapatriement de la constitution: Trudeau a joué le mode centralisateur, n'attendant pas le consentement

de toutes les provinces, tandis que Lévesque a joué la carte des deux peuples fondateurs, considérant la voix du Québec comme un veto. Le résultat est une constitution signée en secret, à l'insu de Lévesque.

Le premier ministre est lucide: depuis qu'il a perdu sa majorité démographique, le Québec ne peut plus espérer un pouvoir aussi grand que le reste du Canada. Puisque la Confédération ne fonctionnera jamais, Lévesque propose la souveraineté-association, qu'il présente comme un *partnership*, insistant ainsi sur l'amélioration des relations Canada-Québec dans un virage historique devenu inévitable. Malgré cette attitude conciliante, il affirme que le Canada a tout à perdre en refusant l'alliance économique. Le message est clair: le Québec ne craint pas l'indépendance ni les menaces selon quoi le Canada refuserait l'association après la souveraineté.[40]

S'il est impossible d'évaluer la portée exacte du discours de René Lévesque dans les provinces canadiennes, on peut affirmer qu'il respectait sa devise: « non pas de dire tout […] mais au moins ne jamais dire le contraire de ce que je pense. » René Lévesque parlait toujours honnêtement de ses projets et de ses idéaux, mais il exagérait parfois ses arguments afin d'améliorer l'efficacité de sa rhétorique; c'est le cas pour le nationalisme canadien, la balkanisation de la Confédération et l'enthousiasme des Québécois pour la souveraineté. Malgré leur maximalisme, ses paroles frappaient avec justesse dans les enjeux cruciaux de son époque. En proposant de remplacer une Confédération devenue étouffante pour le Québec par un *partnership* économique et politique, Lévesque sonna le glas de la doctrine hostile du « séparatisme. » Il ne fait aucun doute que ses pèlerinages politiques au Canada contribuèrent à la reconnaissance du Québec comme une société distincte, un statut officiellement consacré par Ottawa en novembre 2006. La grande ironie est que Lévesque refusait les offres de *special status*. S'il avait été vivant lors du vote de cette motion faisant du Québec « une nation dans un Canada uni, » il l'aurait assurément décriée comme une tentative d'éviter un autre référendum et d'enterrer définitivement le dossier constitutionnel.

Notes

1. Honoré Mercier, *L'Avenir du Québec. Discours prononcé le 4 avril 1893* (Montréal: Cie d'Imprimerie et de Lithographie Gebhardt-Berthiaume, 1893), 64.

2. Gilles Duceppe, « Déclaration du chef Gilles Duceppe. » Récupéré du site internet de Radio-Canada, http://elections.radio-canada.ca/audio-video/pop.shtml#urlMedia=http://www.radio-canada.ca/Medianet/2011/RDI2/ElectionsCanada2011201105022330_1.asx&epr=true, le 30 novembre 2011.

3. Ce terme serait l'autre penchant du « fédéralisme renouvelé, » une terminologie communément acceptée. Cette dernière idéologie reconnaît la nécessité du Québec dans la Confédération, et propose une centralisation accrue vers un gouvernement fédéral qui satisferait aux aspirations de toutes les provinces. Trudeau a tenu cette position lors de la campagne référendaire de 1980, puisqu'il promettait des réformes constitutionnelles à l'avantage du Québec si le « non » l'emportait. Puisque Trudeau et Lévesque sont des adversaires traditionnels, alors la dichotomie « souverainisme renouvelé » et « fédéralisme renouvelé » semble appropriée.

4. Pierre Godin a bien couvert l'émergence du projet souverainiste chez René Lévesque. Il voit le manifeste Un pays qu'il faut faire comme la première version du manifeste plus connu *Option Québec*, texte fondateur du Parti Québécois. Voir, Pierre Godin, *René Lévesque, un homme et son rêve* (Montréal: Boréal, 2007), 223-231.

5. Quoiqu'on lui doive en bonne partie la Loi 101 (août 1977) et la Loi sur le Zonage agricole (novembre 1978).

6. Lysiane Gagnon, « René Lévesque: Mythe et réalité, » dans Alexandre Stefanescu, dir., *René Lévesque: Mythes et réalité* (Montréal: VLB Éditeur, 2008), 14-17.

7. Daniel Jacques, « À la prochaine fois, » dans *René Lévesque: Mythes et réalité*, 19.

8. La nationalisation de l'électricité est un premier exemple, puisqu'elle est proposée par Lévesque alors qu'il est ministre des Richesses naturelles sous le gouvernement Lesage en 1966, et qu'elle est accomplie sans subvention du gouvernement fédéral. Mentionnons aussi sa réaction au fameux discours du « Québec libre » du général de Gaulle en juillet 1967: Lévesque dit que la phrase l'a estomaqué, mais qu'au final elle l'a laissé froid, puisque les Québécois ne devaient pas accomplir leur destinée sous l'influence de la France ni de quiconque – la souveraineté devrait être une action « autochtone » et non un produit d'importation. C.f. René Lévesque, A*ttendez que je me rappelle…* (Montréal: Éditions Québec-Amérique, 1994), 280-1. Pour l'héritage de René Lévesque, voir l'analyse de Lysiane Gagnon et de Daniel Jacques, *op.cit.*

9. Gérard Bergeron, *Notre miroir à deux faces* (Montréal: Éditions Québec-Amérique, 1985), 169.

10. Sur l'attitude de Lévesque face au pouvoir politique, consulter ses mémoires: René Lévesque, *Attendez que je me rappelle*, 60 et 253.

11. Ibid., 70 et 80.

12. Ibid., 78-80.

13. « Maclean's, février 1969, » dans René Lévesque, « *Si je vous ai bien compris, vous êtes en train de me dire à la prochaine fois…* » (Montréal: Les Éditeurs réunis, 2009), 201.

14. Lévesque, *Attendez que je me rappelle*, 96.

15. Ibid., 207.

16. Au Glendon College Forum en 1968, il dit croire au fédéralisme tant que cela peut servir le Québec, qui est sa seule préoccupation politique. Ce thème revient constamment dans son discours. Cité de René Lévesque, *Textes et entrevues, 1960-1987* (Québec: Presses de l'Université du Québec, 1991), 89.

17. Dans ses mémoires, Lévesque rend hommage à Joe Clark, « cet estimable Westerner qui s'était donné une peine de tous les diables pour apprendre le français, » voir René Lévesque, *Attendez que je me rappelle*, 400. Pour l'amitié qu'il entretenait avec Peter Lougheed, premier de l'Alberta, voir Patrick Resnick, *René Lévesque: Mythes et réalités*, 186.

18. La citation du *Toronto Star* est tirée de Bergeron, *Notre miroir à deux faces*, 106. Voir aussi Patrick Resnick, *Mythes et réalité*, 185.

19. « Maclean's, février 1969, » dans René Lévesque, *Textes et entrevues*, 109.

20. Voir entre autres: « Maclean's, 12 décembre 1977, » dans René Lévesque, *Textes et entrevues*, 229, « Report on Confederation,» dans ibid., 23, ainsi que le discours de René Lévesque à l'Empire Club de Toronto, 24 janvier 1980, dans René Lévesque, « *Si je vous ai bien compris…* », 318.

21. « So you say there's tension, bad feeling in some fields, well if these few hundreds of thousands of people don't like it, then they can get the hell out. If they want to live with us they'll share equal rights. We're not going to stop promoting our nationalism just because some guys don't like it, » dans « Entrevue de René Lévesque publiée dans Medium II, journal étudiant du College Erindale, Toronto, février 1975, » cité dans René Lévesque, *Textes et entrevues*, 138.

22. « Report on Confederation, » cité dans ibid., 236.

23. Il s'agit d'une réalité économique qui était en train de changer depuis la Révolution tranquille. Les études d'André Raynaud démontrent qu'entre 1961 et 1978, la propriété des entreprises au Québec augmente de 47% à 55% pour les francophones, alors qu'elle diminue de 39% à 31% pour les anglophones. Lorsque Lévesque réfère à la domination de la minorité anglophone, il réfère à un

phénomène en disparation.

24. C'est pourquoi Lévesque mentionne constamment que les Québécois anglophone conserveront tous leurs droits, qu'on leur garantira des écoles anglophones, etc. Voir, René Lévesque, *Textes et entrevues*, 147.

25. Dans la même entrevue au Medium II, 1975, dans René Lévesque, ibid., 142.

26. Ibid., 184.

27. Statistiques tirées de René Lévesque, *Attendez que je me rappelle*, 407.

28. « In English you would call Canada the nation. In French we wouldn't say "la nation canadienne" so easily,» entrevue du Medium II, 1975 dans René Lévesque, *Textes et entrevues*, 137-9. Pour d'autres exemples de banalisation du changement politique et de destruction du mythe confédératif, voir le discours de l'Empire Club de Toronto en janvier 1980, dans René Lévesque, « Si je vous ai bien compris… », 59, et l'entrevue du *Toronto Daily Star* du 1er juin 1963, dans ibid., 69.

29. Dans la même entrevue, il dit: « Canadian nationalism is more or less a throw-back to John A. Macdonald except in modern costume. The Canadian federal state was set up. I think mostly, on the ground of being scared of the United States... » Dans le *Maclean's* de février 1969 il dit: « Le nationalisme traditionnel me fait suer. […] je pense à la campagne pour un drapeau national distinctif pour le Canada… » dans René Lévesque, ibid., 234.

30. Linteau, Durocher, Robert et Ricard, *Histoire du Québec contemporaine: Le Québec depuis 1930, tome II* (Montréal: Les Éditions du Boréal, 1989), 681-683.

31. Northrop Frye. *The Bush Garden: Essays on the Canadian Imagination* (Toronto: Anansi, 1971), ii. Cette « unité nationale », au fond, n'est autre que le pacte confédératif, qui fonctionne tant que les intérêts des provinces convergent. Dès le début, on essayait de créer un nationalisme officiel – pensons au « A mari usque ad mare », sans que ce cela ait résulté en un sentiment patriotique fort dans les provinces.

32. En témoigne la campagne de séduction des provinces à l'aube du référendum – We love you Québec! Aussi, à l'approche de la campagne référendaire, plusieurs lettres ouvertes au *Toronto Star* avaient comme titre: « C'est notre faute, pas celle de Trudeau, » « Il faut davantage de français en Ontario, » « Il est vital de garder le Québec, » « Pas de Canada sans le Québec, » dans Richard Gwyn, *Le prince* (Montréal: France-Amérique, 1981), 293.

33. « Assemblée nationale, 4 mars 1980, » dans René Lévesque, « *Si je vous ai bien compris…* », 235.

34. « Erindale College Forum, 1978, » dans René Lévesque, *Textes et entrevues*, 98.

35. Ibid, 99. Voir aussi, « Maclean's, 12 déc.1977, » dans René Lévesque, *Textes et entrevues*, 228-9.

36. Ibid., 100. L'idée est que dans un monde industrialisé, un état faible est rapidement dévoré par les forts.

37. Linteau, et al., *Histoire du Québec contemporain*, 737-740.

38. « Erindale College Forum, 1968, » dans René Lévesque, *Textes et entrevues*, 91.

39. Une autre constante majeure; voir, « Maclean's, 12 déc. 1977, » dans René Lévesque, *Textes et entrevues*, 224, « Report on Confederation, 1978, » dans ibid., 234-5, « Ottawa, 30 oct. 1978, » dans René Lévesque, « Si je vous ai bien compris… », 217-8, et « Empire Club, » 24 jan. 1980, dans ibid., 105.

40. « Glendon College Forum, 1968, » dans René Lévesque, *Textes et entrevues*, 91, 105-7, « Medium II, 1975, » dans ibid., 143, « Maclean's, 12 déc. 1977, » dans ibid., 235-7, et dans « Empire Club Toronto, » René Lévesque, *« Si je vous ai bien compris… »*, 239, 259, 323.

Œuvres Citées

Sources primaires

Archives de Radio-Canada. René Lévesque: « Un parti à fonder, un pays à bâtir ». Récupéré du site/http://archives.radio-canada.ca/politique/partis_chefs_politiques/dossiers/1123-6136/ le 19 octobre 2011.

Bibliothèque et Archives du Canada. *Dossier sur René Lévesque provenant des archives de l'ancien Service de sécurité de la Gendarmerie royale du Canada*. Récupéré du site http://www.collectionscanada.gc.ca/quoi-de-neuf/013-314-f.html le 19 octobre 2011.

CBC Digital Archives. « René Lévesque's separatist fight. » Récupéré du site/http://archives.cbc.ca/politics/parties_leaders/topics/870/ le 19 octobre 2011.

Lévesque, René. *Attendez que je me rappelle…* Montréal: Éditions Québec-Amérique, 1994.

Lévesque, René. *Oui*. Montréal: Les Éditions de l'homme, 1980.

Lévesque, René. *La Passion du Québec*. Montréal: Éditions Québec-Amérique, 1978.

Lévesque, René. *René Lévesque par lui-même*. Recherche, mise en ordre et commentaires de Rénald Tremblay. Montréal: Guérin littérature, 1988.

Lévesque, René. « *Si je vous ai bien compris, vous êtes en train de me dire à la prochaine fois… » et autres paroles qui ont marqué le Québec*. Citations colligées par Rémi Maillard. Montréal: Les Éditeurs Réunis, 2009.

Lévesque, René. *Textes et entrevues 1960-1987*. Textes colligés par Michel Lévesque. Québec: Presses de l'Université du Québec, 1991.

Lévesque, René. *La Voix de René Lévesque: Une sélection de ses grands discours et de ses meilleures entrevues*. Extraits choisis et présentés par François Brousseau. Montréal: Société Radio-Canada et Éditions Fides, 2002.

Mercier, Honoré. *L'Avenir du Québec. Discours prononcé le 4 avril 1893*. Montréal: Cie d'Imprimerie et de Lithographie Gebhardt-Berthiaume, 1893.

Radio-Canada. *Déclaration du chef Gilles Duceppe*. Récupéré de: http://elections.radio-canada.ca/audio-video/pop.shtml#urlMedia=http://www.radio-canada.ca/Medianet/2011/RDI2/ElectionsCanada2011201105022330_1.asx&epr=true, le 30 novembre 2011.

Sources Secondaires

Cooper, Bary. "Regionalism, Political Culture, and Canadian Political Myths." Dans Archer, Young, Keith et Lisa, ed. Regionalism and Party Politics in Canada, 92-111. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.

Bergeron, Gérard. *Notre miroir à deux faces*. Montréal: Éditions Québec-Amérique, 1985.

Fraser, Graham. *René Lévesque & the Parti Québécois in Power*. Toronto: Macmillan of Canada, 1984.

Frye, Northrop. *The Bush Garden: Essays on the Canadian Imagination*. Toronto: Anansi, 1971.

Gagnon, Lysiane. « René Lévesque: Mythe et réalité. » Dans Stefanescu, Alexandre, dir. *René Lévesque: Mythes et réalité*, 14-17. Montréal: VLB Éditeur, 2007.

Godin, Pierre. *René Lévesque, un homme et son rêve*. Montréal: Boréal, 2007.

Gwyn, Richard. *Le prince*. Montréal: France-Amérique, 1981.

Jacques, Daniel. « À la prochaine fois. » Dans Stefanescu, Alexandre, dir. *René Lévesque: Mythes et réalité*, 18-28. Montréal: VLB Éditeur, 2008.

Linteau, Paul-André, René Durocher, Jean-Claude Robert et François Ricard. *Histoire du Québec contemporain: Le Québec depuis 1930, tome II*. Montréal: Les Éditions du Boréal, 1989.

Resnick, « René Lévesque et le Canada anglais. » Dans Stefanescu, Alexandre, dir. *René Lévesque: Mythes et réalité,* 184-190. Montréal: VLB Éditeur, 2008.

The Trumpet is Mightier than the Sword: Free Jazz In Post-Colonial Montréal

Matthieu Caron

The work of theory, criticism, demystification, deconsecration, and decentralization they imply is never finished. The point of theory therefore is to travel, always to move beyond its confinements, to emigrate, to remain in a sense in exile… This movement suggests the possibility of actively different locales, sites, situations for theory, without facile universalism or overgeneral totalizing.[1]

— Edward W. Said

Avant d'être un musicien, je suis révolutionnaire. Au lieu d'avoir une mitraillette, j'ai une trompette. Aux autres, je prêche la liberté en disant: jouez libre, vous aussi.[2]

— Yves Charbonneau

There are numerous examples of the appropriation of music within revolutionary circles to amass and create frivolous atmospheres. *La Marseillaise* in revolutionary France, and either *The World Turned Upside Down* or *God Save the King* (depending on one's side) during the American Revolutionary War are fine examples of such revolutionary anthems. Such songs dictated the purpose of a people's movement. In the case of Québec's Quiet Revolution in the 1960s, people tend to argue that Gilles Vigneault's famous *Mon pays* represented a revolutionary anthem.[3] Although French Canadian folk artists like Robert Charlesbois, Jean-Pierre Ferland, and Gilles Vigneault collectively represented the primary style of music at the time, intellectuals and political activists – those actually involved in shaping the revolution – chose to turn to another and more unconventional

medium, free-jazz, to diffuse their revolutionary ideals. This essay will focus primarily on the correlation between free jazz and the political movements in Montréal during the decade coined as the Quiet Revolution. It shall also demonstrate how jazz became the music of revolutionaries within the context of the decolonization movement of the 1960s.

Excluded and segregated from the Canadian project of rule, French-Canadian intellectuals effortlessly appropriated the post-colonial doctrine from Third World countries to find emancipation from the Canadian establishment; through this *prise de conscience*, French-Canadians embraced works from African and Caribbean intellectuals to define their position within Canada during the 1960s. Drawing from the black diaspora, political activists in Montréal appropriated the free jazz movement to convey their political notions. Most enthusiastic to the cause were four French-Canadians musicians who formed a quartet called Le Jazz Libre du Québec. Highly politicized, the band sought to decolonize Québec by playing free jazz, which, in its essence, was music of freedom.

Post-Colonial Activism in Montréal

During the great global struggle against colonialism in the years following the Second World War, national self-determination and anti-colonialist internationalism employed the attention of intellectuals throughout Africa, Asia, Latin America, eventually reaching Québec. The break-up of European Empires following the Second World War gave way to new ideologies; collectively, these new works created a post-colonial theory. From Aimé Césaire's *Discours sur le Colonialisme* (1955) to Frantz Fanon's *Les Damnés de la Terre* (1961), nation-building occupied the centre stage as a crucial element in the quest for anti-colonial emancipation. The alienation and political oppression experienced by Quebecers throughout the late 19th and 20th century reinforced the partition of nationhood within Canada and enabled Quebecers to imagine themselves as a population who had been colonized. As Sean Mills

argues, it is for this reason that post-colonial theory, which emerged in the Third World, affected no other western city more than Montréal.[4] Praised by Quebecers, post-colonial theory thus found its niche within the socio-political understanding of *La Nation Québécoise*.[5] In Québec, anti-colonial writings were embedded in the 1960s left-wing journals and poetry emanating from universities; journals such as *Québec Libre*, *Liberté*, *La Revue Socialiste*, and *Parti Pris* (who would also go on to publish Pierre Vallières' *White Niggers Of America* in 1968) insisted that French-Canadian alienation throughout the late 19th and 20th century was the material and psychological consequence of colonialism. Although often sombre and self-critical, anti-colonial expressions nonetheless contained an irrepressibly optimistic view of the inevitability of liberation and the potential achievements of post-colonial nationalism.[6] Radical leftists argued that because of colonialism, Quebecers were alienated on a political, economic, and cultural level, and that only through separation from Canada could they free themselves from colonial oppression.[7]

For Quebecers, emancipation meant liberation from the Anglophone powers that suppressed their very well-being. In 1963 the federal government, under Prime Minister Lester B. Pearson, commissioned a royal inquiry to study the status of bilingualism and biculturalism in Canada. This commission proved important for it exposed the differences between Francophones and Anglophones in Canada and throughout the Quiet Revolution, Québécois nationalists would widely cite its statistics as examples of the overpowering and constricting Canadian project of rule:

> The Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism… provided statistical proof of the discrimination that many Francophones had been experiencing for years. In 1961, a 35% difference in average income separated Anglophones and Francophones, and statistics which correlated income with ethnicity found that Francophones ranked twelfth of fourteen ethnic groups in the province.[8]

Statistics like the one mentioned above helped solidify into fact the sentiment that Quebecers were a nation whose destiny was subjugated by the Anglophone majority in Canada. In response, political activists in Montréal turned to works of African and Caribbean intellectuals to envision the emancipation of the Québécois nation. It is this context which provided the conditions in which theories surrounding the post-colonial doctrine travelled beyond their political boundaries and emigrated to Québec. The post-Second World War era thus entailed an arguably stronger force than any previous rebellion in Montréal: the French Canadian political discourse associated with post-colonial theory.

For many post-colonial theorists and activists, the most effective way to convey their message was through art. Most of these forms of art were very critical of their colonialized condition and dispensed a liberating discourse. The crisis signalled by the emergence of post-colonial literature, art, and music amongst Third World countries – including Québec – was the crisis confronting political movements for progressive social change around the world.[9] In *Postmodernism, or, the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*, Fredric Jameson challenges us to imagine a political form suited to "the invention and projection of a global cognitive mapping on a social as well as a spatial scale."[10] According to sociologist George Lipsitz, when properly contextualized as a part of a post-colonial culture and the rise of new social movements, the musical productions of the African diaspora provide one answer to Jameson's challenge with a cultural politics already underway.[11] Of these musical productions, no other means infiltrated and influenced Montréal's radical political activism more than jazz.

Jazz: the Medium

The years following the Second World War became ambivalent years of vast economic expansion in Montréal due to a tremendous growth in population. The Baby Boom was a principal component of this period of rapid population growth and between 1942 and 1967 Québec's population nearly doubled as a result. Another major factor in population increase was

immigration; between 1942 and 1972 more than 3.5 million immigrants arrived to Canada.[12] Throughout the forties and fifties most immigrants were Europeans, reflecting both the war-ravaged state of Europe and the preference accorded to European immigrants in Canada's immigration process. Nevertheless, in 1962 new international pretensions and a growth of public concern with human rights led to the formal removal of racial bars from Canada's immigration policy.[13] With racial restrictions on immigration dismantled in the early 1960s, a variety of races immigrated to Canada's largest urban centers. This led the way for an influx of black immigrants from Caribbean and African nations to settle in Montréal – the bilingual and cultural hub of Canada. Most importantly, these immigrants came to Montréal with the political discourse that they had inherited from the Caribbean and Africa. The concurrent diaspora of African-Americans who came to Montréal introduced yet another discourse of politics; from the United States, however, came the free jazz movement.

In the United States, free jazz was revered by its musicians as a medium to celebrate freedom – certainly because it liberated musicians of rhythmic constraints – but also because it became a means for them to brazenly express their anger and joy. In fact, free jazz also gained a political dimension as it came to be identified with the struggle of the black population against white oppression and social injustice; as John Gilmore noted, "the raw emotion of their music seemed to speak for the pain and the aspirations of black America, and in particular for the militant black youth."[14] Free jazz also created a political group of equals that, in accordance with Martin Luther King's idea of the redemptive community, maximized individual expression while maintaining great cohesiveness.[15]

It is important to understand that this socio-political movement was neither strictly formed nor imposed by the presence of immigrants in Montréal for it also sprouted from a need for Quebecers to find musical productions that were meaningfully revolutionary. Figures such as internationally acclaimed pianist, Clermont Pépin, also a teacher and the director of the Conservatoire

de Musique du Québec à Montréal from 1955 to 1973, expressed their concern for the negative influence of popular music on Quebecers:

> Il faudrait donc que le Québec se donne du muscle, se refuse à ces solutions de facilité. On pourrait, par exemple, commencer par remplacer la musique populaire facile par la musique populaire authentiquement québécoise ou par de bonnes créations, relevant d'une certaine exigence personnelle comme la musique de jazz de Brubeck, d'Ellington et du Modern Jazz Quartet.[16]

Although free jazz was neither intended nor written by a black population, as was the case in the United States, it still found a sympathetic audience in Montréal, precisely because of its social and political overtones. Cafés clustered around Stanley, Victoria, and Clark Streets, along with jazz nightclubs on Saint-Antoine, and the Librairie Tranquille – a crucially important meeting place for the francophone cultural avant-garde – provided spaces where culturally marginalized anti-conformist thinkers and musicians could congregate.[17] Le Mas, a third-floor loft on Saint-Dominique Street, embodied the stimulating atmosphere created within these spaces:

> Le Mas, was more evocative of Paris than of a North American folk house. Young Québécois artists, intellectuals, and students gathered at night to discuss politics and art, to play chess, to write poetry, and to applaud the chansonniers among them. They wore berets and smoked French tobacco, badges of a newly awakened pride in their French heritage.[18]

It was in these places that two different expressions of rebellion collided. Debates and the *chansons* were echoed in French while jazz musicians rubbed shoulders with the young intellectuals and artists of the Quiet Revolution: poets like Gaston Miron and Paul Chamberland exposed their works while free jazz was being played.[19] When Le Mas closed following a police raid for alcohol and drugs in the spring of 1962, Montréal's after-hours jazz and politically engaged scene shifted to

an equally bohemian coffeehouse called L'Énfer.[20] The cordial shift of both parties proved that one equally influenced the other. Late at night within these clubs, political activists engaged in discussions and debates on how Québec's liberation would occur while basking in the music of what had become the sounds of emancipation and liberation. In its essence, free jazz influenced and inspired francophone intellectuals and activists to create a movement of liberation in Montréal during the 1960s.

Le Jazz Libre au Québec

Free jazz became, for some, freedom music. Indeed, this statement certainly applies for the free jazz quartet, Le Jazz Libre du Québec. In an interview with journalist Jacques Larue-Langlois in 1969, members of the quartet identified themselves strictly through political ideals: "Yves [Charbonneau] se dit socialiste; Maurice [Richard] prétend être anarchiste; Jean [Préfontaine] affirme qu'il est socialiste québécois, alors que Guy [Thouin] se contente de constater: 'Je vis en pays capitaliste'. "[21] In this way, free jazz was touted in radical political circles in Québec – just as in the United States – as music of freedom and revolution.[22] The clarity of the message within their songs was undeniable; musicians were playing with a revolutionary agenda in mind. At the Casa Espagnole and other places where Le Jazz Libre du Québec performed, people talked of separatism, socialism, revolution, and of the Front de libération du Québec.[23] According to Thouin, journalists began identifying them as the representatives of the left-wing journal *Québec libre*. People within the movement, too, identified Jazz Libre du Québec with *Québec libre*: "It was the same thing as what was happening in the United States, with the black groups playing free jazz. It wasn't just music, it meant something more: it was a vehicle for a culture."[24]

The personal exposure of the intensity of free jazz and discussions with some of the American players at jazz clubs in Montréal inspired Jean Préfontaine and his musicians to experiment with the idiom. Having been playing mainly mundane commercial music in club and hotel

bands beforehand, they were now excited by the expressive possibilities of free collective improvisation and became deeply committed to the revolutionary ideology of Québec's radical left.[25] For Le Jazz Libre du Québec, to explore any other musical direction would have been senseless; Charbonneau, for example equated structure with oppression: "to impose any structure on the music would be to restrict the freedom of the musicians; and to content to that would be to symbolically accept limitations on Québec's demands for political and economic independence;" the ideology of total revolution thus demanded totally free music.[26] Their music, often unstructured to the point of anarchy, defied understanding in the traditional terms of more classical jazz being played in Montréal; not surprisingly, the band was dismissed with derision and contempt by many of the city's mainstream players and fans.[27] Yet, it is the exact sense of distress and revolt to being politically and culturally suppressed that they wished to convey to their audience:

> Certains auditeurs, particulièrement anxieux, ont peine à supporter certaines séquences où s'expriment la révolte et l'angoisse de vivre parce que, justement, ils trouvent cette musique trop angoissante pour être supportable. Mais la majorité des gens qui les ont écoutés, surtout les jeunes, et les plus âgés, qui ont gardé l'esprit ouvert, et en particulier les Canadiens français, manifestent un enthousiasme sans borne devant cette musique libre. Ils se sentent libérés. Ils participent à la communion qui règne entre les musiciens et qui se répand bientôt dans tout l'auditoire. Et tous se sentent transportés par le grand vent de liberté qui souffle présentement sur le Québec.[28]

Le Jazz Libre du Quebec's insistence of attaching a political message to its music only deepened its isolation and left it open to charges of musical charlatanism. Undaunted, the group pursued its musical and social ideals through seven of the most revolutionary years in Québec's history.

Their political message nevertheless went beyond jazz and affected

what some would call the heart of Québécois music. In 1969 they were hired to perform a number of shows province-wide, took part in Robert Charlesbois' *l'Ossitidcho*, and recorded albums with Robert Charlesbois, Louise Forestier, and Yvon Deschamps.[29] The importance of their music for political activists, as well as popular musicians, cannot be discounted. For the band, their music literally juxtaposed the French Canadian liberation movement to "Black Moslems" and "Black Power" movements in the United States all part of the global movement towards post-colonial liberation. In *Musiques Du Kébèk*, a collection of essays documenting influential music of the twentieth century unto Quebecers, Préfontaine asked readers:

> Est-ce une coïncidence si le premier groupe Canadien, et, à notre connaissance, le premier groupe de "Blancs" réellement "engagées" dans le jazz libre, est composé de Canadiens français, séparatistes, à tendance socialiste plus ou moins radicale selon les individus. N'a-t-on pas parlé des "nègres blancs" d'Amérique du Nord et de la "québécitude"?[30]

The movements of liberation brought forth by Third World ideologies to Montréal contested the established rule and became a focus as French Quebecers sought to establish an independent state. This sense of liberty and optimism was conveyed particularly within the unstructured boundaries of free jazz. The epitome of Québécois free jazz, Le Jazz Libre du Québec, enabled political activists to find a revolutionary soundtrack. Musicians, writers, activists, and revolutionaries all found an essence to *La Nation Québécoise* within the post-colonial doctrine of Third World countries. Jazz's effectiveness in creating political activism in Montréal in the 1960s was an undeniable lever towards the sovereignty movement that ensued in the 1970s and 1980s and which still persist today. Through the liberating message of free jazz, embodied in Jazz Libre's *gauchiste* music, revolutionaries found an earnest musical anthem to their movement.

Notes

1. Edward W. Said, "Travelling Theory Reconsidered," in *Reflections on Exile and Other Essays*, ed. Edward W. Said (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2000), 451-52.

2. Jacques Larue-Langlois, "Une Musique jaillie de l'âme québécoise," *La Presse*, May 10, 1969, 21.

3. Christopher Jones, "Popular Music in Québec," in *Québec Questions: Québec Studies For the Twenty-First Century*, ed. Stéphan Gervais et al. (Don Mills: Oxford University Press, 2011), 215-216.

4. Sean Mills, "Quebec/French Canada and Quiet Revolution," lecture given at McGill University, Montréal, QC, 18 October, 2010.

5. Robert Leroux, ""La nation" and the Québec Sociological Tradition (1890-1980)," *The Canadian Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 26, No. 3 (Summer, 2001): 368.

6. George Lipsitz, *Dangerous Crossroads: Popular Music, Postmodernism and the Poetics of Place* (New York: Verso, 1994), 28.

7. Sean Mills, *The Empire Within: Postcolonial Thought and Political Activism in Sixties Montreal* (Montréal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2010), 54.

8. Ibid., 20-21.

9. Lipsitz, *Dangerous Crossroads*, 29.

10. Fredric Jameson, *Postmodernism, or, the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1991), 54.

11. Ibid., 28.

12. J.M. Bumstead, *The Peoples of Canada: a Post-Confederation History* (Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1992), 347-348.

13. Ibid.

14. John Gilmore, *Swinging in Paradise: The Story of Jazz in Montréal* (Montréal: Véhicule Press, 1988), 235.

15. Charles Hersch, ""Let Freedom Ring!" Free Jazz and African-American Politics," *Cultural Critique* No. 32 (Winter, 1995-1996): 98.

16. Clermont Pépin, "Pour une decolonization de l'oreille," in *Musiques Du Kébèk*, ed. Raoul Luoar Yaugud Duguay (Montréal: Éditions du Jour, 1971), 155-156.

17. Mills, *The Empire Within*, 44-46.

18. Gilmore, *Swinging in Paradise*, 209.

19. Mills, *The Empire Within*, 81.

20. Gilmore, *Swinging in Paradise*, 213.

21. Larue-Langlois, "Une Musique Jaillie," 21.

22. Gilmore, *Swinging in Paradise*, 235-236.

23. Ibid., 249.
24. Ibid.
25. Ibid., 246.
26. Ibid., 248-249.
27. Ibid., 236.
28. Jean Préfontaine, "Jazz Libre = Musique – Action," in *Musiques Du Kébèk*, ed. Raoul Luoar Yaugud Duguay (Montréal: Éditions du Jour, 1971), 166.
29. Larue-Langlois, "Une Musique Jaillie," 24.
30. Préfontaine, "Jazz Libre," 164.

Works Cited

Bumstead, J.M. *The Peoples of Canada: a Post-Confederation History*. Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1992.

Gilmore, John. *Swinging In Paradise: The Story of Jazz in Montréal*. Montréal: Véhicule Press, 1988.

Hersch, Charles. ""Let Freedom Ring!" Free Jazz and African-American Politics." *Cultural Critique*, No. 32 (Winter, 1995-1996): 97-123.

Jameson, Fredric. *Postmodernism, or, the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1991.

Jones, Christopher. "Popular Music in Québec." In *Québec Questions: Québec Studies for the Twenty-First Century*. Edited by Stéphan Gervais, Christopher Kirkey, and Jarrett Rudy, 212-226. Don Mills: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Larue-Langlois, Jacques. "Une Musique jaillie de l'âme québécoise." *La Presse*, May 10, 1969.

Leroux, Robert. ""La nation" and the Québec Sociological Tradition (1890-1980)." *The Canadian Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 26, No. 3 (Summer, 2001): 349-373.

Lipsitz, George. *Dangerous Crossroads: Popular Music, Postmodernism and the Poetics of Place*. New York: Verso, 1994.

Mills, Sean. *The Empire Within: Postcolonial Thought and Political Activism in Sixties Montreal*. Montréal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2010.

Mills, Sean. "Quebec/French Canada and Quiet Revolution." Lecture at McGill University, Montréal, QC, 18 October, 2010.

Pépin, Clermont. "Pour une decolonization de l'oreille." In *Musiques Du Kébèk*, edited by Raoul Luoar Yaugud Duguay, 153-156. Montréal: Éditions du Jour, 1971.

Préfontaine, Jean. "Jazz Libre = Musique – Action." In *Musiques Du Kébèk*, edited by Raoul Luoar Yaugud Duguay, 157-166. Montréal: Éditions du Jour, 1971.

Said, Edward W. "Travelling Theory Reconsidered." In *Reflections on Exile and Other Essays*. Edited by Edward W. Said, 436-452. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2000.

The Red Scare on the Great White Way: Broadway Theatre in the 1950s

Annie MacKay

At the dawn of the 1950s, the field of "American theatre" did not extend beyond Broadway. Geographically, the theatrical activity of a nation of 150 million people was confined to the offshoots of New York City's Times Square. The life and death of the plays it housed was ordained by the eight drama critics of as many major daily newspapers.[1] The theatrical world was an insular one, but it did not prove immune to the Red Scare that ensnared America for a decade beginning in the late 1940s. The Cold War climate was one of censorship and, above all, one of fear. Gone was the social role of the artist as challenger of the status quo; Broadway played it safe. A study of 1950-1959 issues of the monthly periodical *Theatre Arts* conveys the disillusionment of critics and playwrights alike as Broadway descended into a safety net of musicals, with challenging drama left to the wayside. Stage content was made to subscribe to an ethos of containment that pervaded the American mores of the early Cold War. Explorations of ideology, race relations, and homosexuality fell victim to discerning playgoers and fiscally-minded producers. Broadway in the 1950s was deeply impacted by the pressures of a society that had elevated Senator Joseph McCarthy to prominence.

The Manhattan monopoly on theatre enabled the development of a unified dramatic identity that, by mid-century, had found its home in contemporary middle-class realism. Emotionally realist performance style was honed under the moniker of "the Method" by actors such as Marlon Brando at Lee Strasberg's Actor's Studio, and emblematized onstage in such plays as *A Streetcar Named Desire*.[2] Its author, Tennessee Williams, joined fellow playwright Arthur Miller in defining the

"serious American drama" of the era, while Richard Rodgers and Oscar Hammerstein II perpetuated the golden age of the American musical that had superseded the old-fashioned sentimental style popular during the Depression Era.[3] While the deeply psychological and internal dimensions of the drama contrasted sharply with the good-time fluff of its Broadway counterpart, both theatrical forms represented means by which to adhere to the social parameters of the Cold War climate.

When Stephen Whitfield wrote that "Political censorship did not affect the theatre," he was wrong.[4] If theatre was not debilitated by a congressional agenda in the way that film was, it did not unilaterally escape its impact. The House of Un-American Activities Committee (HUAC) waited until 1955, nearly a decade after its Hollywood siege, before launching an investigation attempting to link professional theatre with Communism. It was completely ineffective; the stage careers of performers, directors, and producers were unhindered.[5] Playwrights nonetheless found themselves constrained, if not by HUAC trial, by the prevailing containment ideology of financier and playgoer alike. The middle and upper class Broadway audiences possessed above average income and education. They represented the spirit of corporate liberalism, whose agenda governed postwar America and whose hypocrisies and intolerances were many.[6]

The 1950s reluctance to explore political questions on the Broadway stage gave rise to what Arthur Miller termed "an era of gauze."[7] His disdain was shared by many of his peers; the pages of *Theatre Arts* are replete with critics bemoaning the declining state of the American theatre. "The values of the immediate moment are tentative and unstable," director and critic Harold Clurman lamented in *Theatre Arts* in 1952. "Our serious writers for the theatre today…are afraid that anything construed as criticism of our society will be deemed unpatriotic."[8] Such was his rationale for the eminence of revivals of old favourites on the 1952 stage. Producers were proceeding with a caution many found regrettable. Leftist critic Eric Bentley wrote on the topic contemporaneously. "America is not yet as unsafe and unfree as certain liberals like to think," he contended. "If our

playwrights today are yes-men, it is not because it is impossible to say No."[9] Although the 1953 premiere of *The Crucible*, Miller's dramatization of the Salem witch hunt of 1692, was met with mixed reviews, one editor found its political engagement to be a much-needed breath of fresh air. "[T]he play is important to the contemporary theatre," the writer urged, "as a dramatic statement of an issue that besets our times and has even affected the theatre itself."[10] Bentley, though not singularly commending of Miller, applauded his embrace of topical material. "Why, one wonders," he wrote in his review of the play, "aren't there dozens of plays each season offering such a critical account of the state of the nation?"[11]

In January 1953, Miller's *The Crucible* indeed gave audiences something new. He later admitted that he was unprepared for the reluctance with which spectators faced the political immediacy of the play. On opening night, the playwright observed that this reluctance was manifest as nothing short of hostility.[12] The topicality of *The Crucible* was, Bruce A. McConachie writes in *American Theatre in the Culture of the Cold War*, "smothered" in an initial production that disguised it as "a creaky historical epic." The effort to rob the play of its potentially controversial "anti-McCarthyite punch" fell short; audiences were apparently not easily deceived.[13] In her book *Congressional Theatre: Dramatizing McCarthyism on Stage, Film and Television*, Brenda Murphy writes of one right-wing critic:

> What [he] found so infuriating was that Miller's depiction of the Salem outbreak impelled even right-wingers like him to think of the analogy with contemporary Red-baiting without the playwright's needing to draw any overt parallel. …The play was the more powerful because it was the spectator who constructed its meaning in the context of contemporary events.[14]

Theatre Arts suggests that virtually no audience member missed the analogy Miller was drawing. It is, however, worthwhile to note that such explicit terms as "Red-baiting," "McCarthy," or "HUAC" did not appear in any of the periodical's coverage of *The Crucible*. "That

Miller had contemporary parallels in mind is obvious," wrote one critic.[15] Another indicated that it was not his responsibility "to labor any parallels with the fear and hysterias of the present-day world."[16] "Obvious" though it was, neither critic dared call the "parallel" by name.

It was only upon the 1958 off-Broadway revival of *The Crucible* that *Theatre Arts* rendered the analogy explicit. Reflecting at that time upon the original 1953 production, Richard Watts, Jr. noted the play's "implied parallels with the McCarthy hysteria going on at that period."[17] In so doing, Watts divorced the analogy from his own political reality of 1958 and situated himself in a post-McCarthyist present. For his part, Miller had never shied from acknowledging the allegorical dimensions of his play. In October 1953, the printed text of *The Crucible* appeared in *Theatre Arts*. One of his comments responded to criticism from Bentley, who, unlike his *Theatre Arts* counterparts, had injected the word "Communist" into his review. "The analogy," Miller conceded, "seems to falter when one considers that, while there were no witches then, there are Communists and capitalists now."[18]

Though critics disagreed about the dramatic merit of Miller's use of allegory, he was not alone in employing such a strategy. Joan of Arc, a popular tool of historical analogy to the injustices of McCarthyism, made an appearance in various productions throughout the 1950s. One-time Broadway flop, *A Pin to See the Peep Show,* was revived mere months after the debut of *The Crucible*, its theme of "miscarriages of justice" having evidently gained new resonance in the climate of the Red Scare.[19] Another example was the thinly veiled account of the Alger Hiss trial, *A Shadow of My Enemy*, written by Sol Stein that premiered in 1958.[20] Unsurprisingly, one of the most "subversive" plays was pronounced so at the height of McCarthyism. The timeliness and contentiousness of Lillian Hellman's *The Children's Hour* rendered its Cold War-era Broadway production daring indeed.

Hellman had premiered her drama in 1934. It was revived in 1952, just seven months after the playwright had testified before HUAC, with

its "theme of the corrosive effects of false accusations [having] taken on new political relevance."[21] In Hellman's play, two women who run a girls' school are accused of lesbianism. Homosexual content had sufficed for Boston and Chicago to ban *The Children's Hour* from 1934 stages.[22] Two decades later, it was not merely homosexuality but political connotations that garnered controversy. As an analogy for McCarthyism, however, the play's conclusion is problematic. One of the women admits to harbouring romantic feelings for her female colleague, and goes offstage to shoot herself dead. What happens to audience indignation upon the revelation that the accusation was founded? The McCarthyist analogy loses its topical punch in *The Children's Hour* where *The Crucible* succeeds, evidenced most poignantly in June 1953. On June 19th, Julius and Ethel Rosenberg were executed for espionage in New York State's Sing Sing prison. That evening, the New York City audience of *The Crucible* responded to protagonist John Proctor's climactic execution by rising from their seats and bowing their heads in silence for several minutes.[23]

On that June night, as Miller's play became a means of resistance, his message that ordinary, flawed people could and should act to oppose injustice found a powerful significance. *The Crucible*'s John Proctor is both a confessed lecher and the play's hero; Miller thus invites that "[m]oral courage, not perfection, is the chief requisite [for opposing injustice]; even Broadway playgoers might join this ethical band to shape the future of the republic."[24] The playwright orchestrated a similar impetus in his late 1940s eight-page drama *You're Next*. A barber is advised to take down a collection can for the Spanish Relief Committee; its investigation by the Rankin Committee puts him at risk of being accused of being "red." Miller's HUAC stand-in throws subtlety to the wind, borrowing its name from one of HUAC's most notorious (and odious) members, John E. Rankin. The barber protests, demanding to know "whether this is Germany or America." The play ends when he sends a boy into the street shouting a warning call. This, Brenda Murphy suggests, operates as "a call to action

for the audience," crafted such that "his moment of enlightenment, when he realizes he must fight the Committee, might be theirs too."[25]

Howard Fast sought a similar provocation of his audience with *Thirty Pieces of Silver*. The play is anomalous in the "era of gauze" for its blatant, undisguised attack on contemporary red baiting. Fast's protagonist, a low-level employee of the Department of Treasury, is persuaded to confirm that his friend and benefactor "could very well be a Red." His convincer compares signing the indicting deposition to serving in the Armed Forces—a veritable act of patriotism. In the next act, the protagonist himself is fired for being associated with the "Red." His protest is a tellingly befuddled summary of McCarthyist logic: "[I'm] being fired for being a Communist without anyone asking me if I'm a Communist and without being given any chance to deny that I'm a Communist."[26] Declared "impossible" for Broadway, *Thirty Pieces of Silver* toured Australia, Canada, and a multitude of European cities before its American premiere in 1954.

Social penetrativeness and innovation were effectively barred from the Broadway stage in the Red Scare fever pitch of the late 1940s and early 1950s, as producers resorted to a safety net of classics and musicals. *Theatre Arts* contributors entered the 1950s with a general air of disillusionment. When one reviewer deemed February 1950's *Clutterbuck* "pleasant," he qualified the appraisal as "not too unkind criticism these days."[27] In the months preceding the early 1953 premiere of *The Crucible*, the periodical's critics were largely in a state of despair. "The Drama critics nowadays," Larry Eisenberg wrote in mid-1952, complain "about the plight of the American theatre. According to [them] the theatre is on its way to hell."[28]

Hell turned out to be a song and a dance. Fuelled by stunning box office returns, musicals ruled the day. Critically adored successes, such as *My Fair Lady* and *Guys and Dolls,* sailed into the American repertoire. Bentley was careful not to discount such achievements, but pleaded that audiences be treated to "other kinds of theatre as well."[29] In his monthly critical review for *Theatre Arts*, George Jean

Nathan suggested that the musical's domination left theatrical quality wanting. "The theatre," he wrote just weeks before Miller debuted *The Crucible*, "has over-all lost ground as a dramatic medium and has reduced itself largely to a light entertainment one, mainly in a musical-show direction."[30] When Miller's allegory became the exception to the fluff, one *Theatre Arts* critic in particular welcomed it with open arms:

> …only the most naïve are willing to believe that the theatre has remained free of fear, the demand for intellectual conformity and all the intimidation that goes with it: […] that automatic censorship which frightened writers impose on themselves by avoiding all issues likely to offend powerful individuals and pressure groups. Such fear has handed over much of the theatre to the trivial and the innocuous.[31]

The writer commended Miller's literary courage and faulted the Cold War climate of "fear" for inhibiting similar endeavours in other playwrights.

Fear held Broadway rapt for a period; in an era characterized by ideological consensus, the playgoing appetite for material that challenged the status quo was entirely unclear. The *Theatre Arts* review of Herman Wouk's 1949 play, *The Traitor*, suggests that audiences were only so willing to have the official political line of their country shoved down their throats. The reviewer derides Wouk for so bluntly injecting a topical message into his play. *The Traitor* was "an earnest tale of a young atomic scientist who decided that it was in the interest of peace to share his secret with the Russians, and died regretting it." The public was apparently unmoved.[32]

Lack of audience enthusiasm for such material, however, did not keep it off the stage altogether. *Darkness at Noon* premiered the next year, presenting a Russian hero of the Revolution's return to the Soviet Union following wartime torture by the Nazis. His disillusionment with the prevailing purging and policing in his beloved Russia causes "his belief in party infallibility" to falter. The protagonist's execution is prefaced by regret of his Communist past, as he reflects that "in his calculations for the salvation

of the human race he forgot the human soul."[33] In 1955, *Silk Stockings* dealt with similar themes. A Soviet composer convinces a Party official to escape to America with him, where her "bright future as an ex-Communist" awaits.[34] America is the beacon of light offering respite from the bleakness of Communism. J. Edgar Hoover himself could have written the plotline.

Broadway, then, became a space of containment in the climate of the early Cold War. In the "era of gauze," playwrights either disguised a message or reiterated the status quo. The production of politically or socially provocative drama never faced the threat of blacklist. Instead, financial consequences were what rendered certain material "impossible" in the eyes of producers. By the time Arthur Miller wrote *The Crucible*, he had made a name for himself on Broadway. Lesser renowned playwrights made for even less attractive gambles. In 1947 and 1948, respectively, Ted Ward's *Our Lan*', and Dorothy and DuBose Heyward's *Set My People Free*, premiered on Broadway. Both dealt with the enslaved past of African Americans, and both closed within weeks.[35] Langston Hughes was a well-known black literary figure, yet his 1950 play *The Barrier* was shut down after a scant four performances. *Theatre Arts* revered Hughes' treatment of a half-black son rebelling against his white father, yet the play failed to fill seats.[36]

Race relations joined homosexuality in falling victim to an ethos of containment. Cold War ideology in the United States associated both Civil Rights and homosexuality with domestic Communist subversion. On the commercial stages of Broadway, the two social inflammatories were censored in divergent ways. Black performers and patrons were increasingly being accepted in New York theatre houses, yet plays revolving around questions of race were repeatedly short-lived on the Broadway stage.[37] When producers took the plunge and staged them, it was the public who dealt the blow by withholding attendance. Louis Peterson's *Take A Giant Step* was warmly received by *Theatre Arts* in November 1953, but flatly rejected by audiences.[38] Only after several years had passed did it find a home on the more progressive off-Broadway stage. At the height of the Red Scare, New York's mainstream spectators had indicated that there

was little room for blacks in the theatre district of the Great White Way.

Nor did it admit much lavender, as the Lavender Scare and prevailing American hostility to homosexuality kept it off a stage that was, hypocritically, run in large part by homosexuals.[39] American homophobia did not begin or end with McCarthyism, but the Cold War ingrained it in the national ideology. McConachie explains how intolerance for homosexuality was amplified with the advent of the Korean War. Subscribing to a white, privileged, and masculinized heterosexual ideal, most Americans "believed that the American boy, an embodiment of what was best in the nation, was the first line of defence in the Cold War."[40] In such a climate, homosexuality was subject to explicit censorship, in contrast to the implicit censorship suffered by African American content. Mordaunt Shairp's homosexuality-themed *The Green Bay Tree,* first played on Broadway in 1933. The 1951 revival, by director Shepard Traube, attempted to remove the play's homosexual relationship altogether, completely reconstructing character motivations in the process. *Theatre Arts*' review openly noted the change.[41] *Time* decried the inferiority of the revival in relation to its 1933 premiere, which the magazine had counted among Manhattan's best that year.[42]

The onstage presentation of homosexuality was strictly contained. If accusations or implications of homosexuality among characters were not uncommon, plays of the early 1950s rarely substantiated those claims. Dorothy Parker and Arnaud D'Usseau's 1953 debut of *Ladies of the Corridor*, led Bentley to lament, "when the homosexual cries, 'But I never touched him,' we ask, When will there be a homosexual on Broadway who'll say he did?"[43] The critic—who himself came out as a homosexual in later years—essentially accuses the authors of writing around reality for the sake of politics and social norms. This resulted in a play that, in Bentley's opinion, handled "human life…without respect—mechanically, unscrupulously, tendentiously."[44] The next year, he found more to admire in Ruth and Augustus Goetz's *The Immoralist*. Penned as an advocacy of a "humane attitude" toward homosexuality, it took the playwrights nearly

a year to find a producer.[45] Once they did, Broadway's representation of homosexuality had moved in an encouraging direction. Homosexuality was no longer "an accusation." The Goetzs had, in fact, bested Broadway favourite (and frequent victim of censorship) Tennessee Williams. In his *Cat on a Hot Tin Roof* the next year, an accusation it remained.

If the Broadway stage provided a troubled home for homosexuality and African Americans, an answer was found Off-Broadway. It took until the mid-1960s for Off-Broadway theatre performances to outnumber their Broadway counterparts and dent the "financial and cultural pre-eminence" of the latter.[46] The 1950s had proven to be a landmark decade in the development of the Off-Broadway movement; a 1959 issue of *Theatre Arts* looked back on the decade and deemed Off-Broadway a prominent hot topic in contemporary American theatre.[47] *Theatre Arts* provides an effective map of Off-Broadway's rising status throughout the 1950s; in mid-1952, the periodical even integrated a "Theatre Off-Broadway" Section. Two and a half years later, synopses and production details of Off-Broadway shows were provided alongside their Broadway foils.

As Off-Broadway toiled in the shadow of the Great White Way, it was making contributions to American drama that the latter could not lay claim to. Audience popularity was restored to both Eugene O'Neill and Sean O'Casey by the Off-Broadway stage; the latter had been avoided on Broadway for years because of his perceived proximity to Communism.[48] The Broadway alternative also gave second chances to plays that, though worthy, were given the cold shoulder by audiences on the Great White Way.[49] Additionally, its less mainstream audience and financial bracket permitted the nurturing of African American theatre. Gay theatre also made a home for itself Off-Broadway, and in the 1960s went on to pioneer Off-Off-Broadway.

Off-Broadway made a huge contribution to the development of a national drama by performing new scripts authored by Americans. Throughout the 1950s, new indigenous material accounted for one

third of Off-Broadway shows. A genuine national drama became topical again, and regional theatre increasingly credible, which were both efforts that had been shut down in the 1930s, when the purportedly communist Federal Theatre Project had been targeted by HUAC.[50]

The 1950s were the last decade that American theatre was the exclusive property of Broadway. Its last hurrah, then, is a complicated legacy. The impact of Arthur Miller and Tennessee Miller on twentieth century drama in the United States can hardly be overstated, so integral is their work to the modern-day national canon. Nor can the golden age of the American musical be denied. These are lauded aspects of 1950s Broadway. What too must not be undermined or forgotten is how the social pressures exerted by a Red Scare climate constrained the Broadway theatre in real and troubling ways. The Broadway play reiterated the status quo rather than challenging it for audiences. As the 1950s came to an end, Off-Broadway brought a more progressive theatre to America and its theatrical capital befitting the far more progressive decade the country was about to face.

Notes

1. Richard B. Gehman, "The Critics," *Theatre Arts*, Vol. 35, No. 9 (September 1951), 11.

2. Gerald M. Berkowitz, *New Broadways: Theatre Across America 1950-1980* (Totowa, NK, 1982), 17.

3. Ibid., 13.

4. Stephen J. Whitfield, *The Culture of the Cold War*, 2nd Ed. (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1996), 180.

5. John H. Houchin, *Censorship of the American Theatre in the Twentieth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 167-168.

6. Bruce A. McConachie, *American Theater in the Culture of the Cold War: Producing and Contesting Containment, 1947-1962* (Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 2003), 8.

7. Robert A. Martin and Steven R. Centola, eds, *The Theater Essays of Arthur Miller* (New York: Da Copo Press, 1996), 232.

8. Harold Clurman, "Revivals, Arrivals and Quick Departures," *Theatre Arts*, Vol. 36, No. 7 (July 1952): 82.

9. Eric Bentley, *What is Theatre?: Incorporating the Dramatic Event and Other Reviews 1944-1967* (New York, 1968), 124.

10. *Theatre Arts* 37, no. 4 (April 1953): 65.

11. Bentley, *What is Theatre?*, 62.

12. James J. Martine, *The Crucible: Politics, Property, and Pretense* (New York: Twayne Publishers, 1993), 17.

13. McConachie, *American Theatre in the Culture of the Civil War*, 53.

14. Brenda Murphy, *Congressional Theatre: Dramatizing McCarthyism on Stage, Film and Television* (Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 156.

15. George Jean Nathan, "Monthly Critical Review," *Theatre Arts*, Vol. 37, No. 4 (December1953): 25.

16. *Theatre Arts*, Vol. 37, No. 4 (April 1953): 65.

17. Richard Watts., Jr., "Off-Broadway's Season in Summary," *Theatre Arts*, Vol. 42, No. 7 (July 1958): 19.

18. Arthur Miller, *The Crucible*, reprinted in *Theatre Arts*, Vol. 37, No. 10 (October 1953): 43.

19. *Theatre Arts*, Vol. 37, No. 11 (November 1953): 19.

20. Ibid., Vol. 42, No. 2 (February 1958): 25.

21. Whitfield, *The Culture of the Cold War*, 106.

22. Kermit Bloomgarden, "The Pause in the Day's Occupation," *Theatre Arts*, Vol. 37, No. 4 (April 1953): 33.

23. McConachie, *American Theatre in the Culture of the Cold War*, 273.

24. Ibid., 271.

25. Murphy, *Congressional Theatre*, 93.

26. Ibid., 86-87.

27. *Theatre Arts*, Vol. 34, No. 2 (February1950): 11.

28. Larry Eisenberg, "The Wall-Sitters," *Theatre Arts*, Vol. 36, No. 7 (July 1952): 31.

29. Bentley, *What is Theatre?*, vii.

30. George Jean Nathan, "Monthly Critical Review," *Theatre Arts*, Vol. 36, No. 12 (December 1952): 28.

31. *Theatre Arts*, Vol. 37, No. 4 (April 1953): 65.

32. Ibid. Vol. 34, No. 1 (January 1950): 47.

33. Ibid. Vol. 35, No. 3 (March 1951): 19.

34. Ibid. Vol. 39, No. 5 (May 1955): 19.

35. William Marshall, "Let My People Speak," *Theatre Arts*, Vol. 37, No. 6 (June 1953): 71.

36. Theatre Arts, Vol. 35, No. 1 (January 1951): 12.

37. Loften Mitchell, "Harlem Has Broadway On Its Mind," Theatre Arts, Vol. 37, No. 6 (June 1953): 70.

38. *Theatre Arts*, Vol. 37, No. 11 (November 1953): 24.

39. Michael Paller, *Gentlemen Callers: Tennessee Williams* (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2005), 58.

40. McConachie, *American Theatre in the Culture of the Cold War*, 60.

41. *Theatre Arts*, Vol. 35, No. 4 (April 1951): 15.

42. "Theater: Old Play in Manhattan," *Time Magazine* (12 February 1953).

43. Bentley, *What is Theatre?*, 112.

44. Ibid.

45. Paller, *Gentlemen Callers*, 90.

46. McConachie, *American Theatre in the Culture of the Cold War*, 7.

47. Joseph Wood Krutch, "Off-Broadway—Then and Now," *Theatre Arts*, Vol. 43, No. 1 (January 1959): 12.

48. Bentley, *What is Theatre?*, 25.

49. Krutch, "Off-Broadway," 26.

50. David Kaplan, *The Five Approaches to Acting Series* (East Brunswick, NJ: Hansen Publishing Group, 2007), 148.

Works Cited

Bentley, Eric. *What is Theatre?: Incorporating the Dramatic Event and Other Reviews 1944-1967*. New York: Atheneum, 1968.

Berkowitz, Gerald M. *New Broadways: Theatre Across America 1950-1980*. Totowa, NJ: Rowman and Allanheld, 1982.

Bloomgarden, Kermit. "The Pause in the Day's Occupation." *Theatre Arts*, Vol. 37, No. 4 (April 1953): 33.

Clurman, Harold. "Revivals, Arrivals and Quick Departures." *Theatre Arts*, Vol. 36, No. 7 (July 1952): 16-17, 82.

Eisenberg, Larry. "The Wall-Sitters." *Theatre Arts*, Vol. 36, No. 7 (July 1952): 31.

Houchin, John H. *Censorship of the American Theatre in the Twentieth Century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Gehman, Richard B. "The Critics." *Theatre Arts*, Vol. 35, No. 9 (September 1951): 10-14.

Kaplan, David. *The Five Approaches to Acting Series: The Collected Series*. East Brunswick, NJ: Hansen Publishing Group, 2007.

Krutch, Joseph Wood. "Off Broadway—Then and Now." *Theatre Arts*, Vol. 43, No. 1 (January 1959): 12-14.

Marshall, William. "Let My People Speak." *Theatre Arts*, Vol. 37, No. 6 (June 1953): 71, 91.

Martine, James J. *The Crucible: Politics, Property, and Pretense.* New York: Twayne Publishers, 1993.

McConachie, Bruce A. *American Theater in the Culture of the Cold War: Producing and Contesting Containment, 1947-1962*. Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 2003.

Miller, Arthur. *The Crucible*. Reprinted in *Theatre Arts*, Vol. 37, No. 10 (October 1953): 35-67.

Robert A. Martin and Steven R. Centola, eds. *The Theater Essays of Arthur Miller*. New York: Da Copo Press, 1996.

Mitchell, Loften. "Harlem Has Broadway On Its Mind." *Theatre Arts*, Vol. 37, No. 6 (June 1953): 68-70.

Murphy, Brenda. *Congressional Theatre: Dramatizing McCarthyism on Stage, Film and Television*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Nathan, George Jean. "Monthly Critical Review." *Theatre Arts*, Vol. 36, No. 12 (December 1952): 24-28.

"Monthly Critical Review." *Theatre Arts*, Vol. 37, No. 4 (April 1953): 24-28.

Paller, Michael. *Gentlemen Callers: Tennessee Williams, Homosexuality, and Mid-Twentieth-Century Broadway Drama*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2005.

"Theater: Old Play in Manhattan." *Time Magazine*. February 12, 1951.

< http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,820692,00.html>.

Theatre Arts. Vol. 34, No. 1 (January 1950): 47.

Theatre Arts. Vol. 34, No. 2 (February 1950): 11.

Theatre Arts. Vol. 35, No. 1 (January 1951): 12.

Theatre Arts. Vol. 35, No. 3 (March 1951): 19.

Theatre Arts. Vol. 35, No. 4 (April 1951): 15.

Theatre Arts. Vol. 37, No. 4 (April 1953): 65.

Theatre Arts. Vol. 37, No. 11 (November 1953): 19.

Theatre Arts. Vol. 39, No. 5 (May 1955): 19.

Theatre Arts. Vol. 42, No. 2 (February 1958): 25.

Watts, Richard, Jr. "Off-Broadway's Season in Summary." *Theatre Arts*, Vol. 42, No. 7 (July 1958): 88-89.

Whitfield, Stephen J. *The Culture of the Cold War.* 2nd Ed. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1996.

Representations of Childhood in the Slums of London in the Accounts of Social Reformers, 1870-1914

Josh Mentanko

In 1883, Andrew Mearns urged action on behalf of the "infancy that knows no innocence, youth without modesty or shame" that he discovered in the slums of London's East End.[1] This essay is an attempt to uncover the origins of a notion of childhood that saw innocence, modesty, and shame as necessary preconditions for development into respectable adulthood. It is also a consideration of why the child proved to be such an effective trope in the late nineteenth-century charitable marketplace, particularly in accounts that argued for a restructuring of family life found in the slums. Calls for intervention raised by informants like Mearns worked by premising their claims on an implicit universalization of the notion of childhood itself. The severe discrepancy revealed between an ideology of domesticity to which the slums were silently compared urged action across the real differences of class, and demanded that the British take an unprecedented role in organizing the family lives of its poorest inhabitants.

While avoiding causal strategies of linking specific texts to particular legislative outcomes, this essay will use seven works published between 1869 and 1911 as an entry point into what constituted middle-class presumptions about slum life. Through the prominence of their authors at the time of writing or because of their acknowledged influence on legislation that targeted children, a case can be made for the influence of the following texts in contributing to middle-class knowledge about slum children. All of the pieces examined relied on the child as an emotive signifier and called for greater attention to the organization of lower-class family life by the British state. A close reading of how the accounts from the slum

represented the child yields insights into how their authors understood childhood and how they attempted to apply this understanding across class.

The Works

- *Bitter Cry of Outcast London* by Andrew Mearns
- *Prevention of Destitution* by Beatrice and Sidney Webb
- *In Darkest England* by William Booth
- *How the Poor Live and Horrible London* by George Sims
- *Seven Curses of London* by James Greenwood
- *Children of the Nation* by John Gorst
- "The Maiden Tribute of Modern Babylon" by W. T. Stead

This essay will proceed by outlining the significant works on the history of childhood in Western Europe whose conclusions and source readings have established the parameters of the field, and will then undertake a limited foray into some of the theoretical questions that have followed from a historicized concept of childhood. An examination of the material differences in childhood experienced at the end of the nineteenth-century will be followed by an introduction to the ideology of domesticity, and particularly its role in moralizing the relationship between the middle and lower classes. The above-mentioned sources will then be read with an eye to understanding how their representations of slum children functioned both to signal the "otherness" of the slum children to a middle-class audience and to reveal the unspoken ideology of domesticity of the authors. By employing the dualisms of bodies/minds, victims/threats, and distance/intimacy, these texts created ways of seeing children as both dangerously precocious and the only hope for the slum's salvation. By calling on highly gendered visions of childhood and imperial anxieties associated with urban poverty at the heart of the empire, these texts made the case for state intervention to reorder poor urban family life.

Historiography

The 1962 publication of Philippe Ariès' *Centuries of Childhood: A Social History of Family Life* initiated the modern study of children by historians.[2] Looking at the French upper and middle-class family from the Renaissance to the end of the eighteenth century, Ariès' work is less notable for its account of the changing treatment of the child than for the ways it historicized the idea of childhood and made these changes visible by analysing representations of children across time. Drawing on readings from iconography, royal court memoirs, and prescriptive literature, Ariès makes the case for the development of the idea of the child as a distinct species of person in the middle-class family by the eighteenth century; requiring distinctive clothing, treatment, and language, children's health became a subject of special concern for medicine[3] while their moral development anchored the mother in the home and gave rise to a new pedagogical literature.[4] Ariès places the development of a notion of childhood within a larger readjustment of the middle-class family to its society, concluding that as the correct development of children into adults became the primary concern of the family unit, the family turned in upon itself and experienced a greater isolation from society.[5]

While subsequent scholarship in the history of childhood has criticized Ariès' generalizations, selective scholarship, and has disputed the universal applicability of his conclusions,[6] any scholar attempting to understand childhood beyond the essentializing strictures of age and developmental stages is working in the tradition of Philippe Ariès. An equivalent figure for the history of the child in England and an early critic of Ariès is Lawrence Stone, whose *The Family, Sex, and Marriage in England, 1500-1800* covers a similar temporal scope, but looks to England for its sources.[7] Stone describes how the middle-class English family evolved from an "open-ended, low key, unemotional, authoritarian institution which served certain essential political, economic, sexual, procreative, and nurturant purposes"[8] to a closed domestic nuclear family characterized by a decline in patriarchal authority, expanding

autonomy for wife and child, and the lessening influence of community or kin on the family.[9] The spread of this model of the ideal family to the lower classes and the elite from the "key middle and upper sectors of English society" was the only change that Stone finds from the end of the eighteenth until the end of the nineteenth century.[10]

While both Stone, and to a lesser extent, Ariès note the diffusion of ideals of childhood from the middle and upper classes upward to the aristocracy and downward to the lower classes, neither offers a compelling description of how this diffusion of knowledge was carried out. Jacques Donzelot reflects on how ideals of childhood were transferred across class in late nineteenth-century France in *The Policing of Families*,[11] arriving at a set of theoretical tools whose utility for historical study will be tested by applying them to reformist literature from late nineteenth-century England. Donzelot describes policing as "not understood in the limiting, representative sense we give the term today, but according to a much broader meaning that encompassed all the methods for developing the qualities of the population and the strength of the nation."[12] From this definition of policing, he builds on an understanding of the historicity of the family and the child that is broadly similar to Ariès and Stone, but attempts to uncover the operations of psychiatry, compulsory mass education, and philanthropy in the diffusion of practices that placed the child at the center of household concern. In this respect, Donzelot is also working in the tradition of Foucault, placing the family as a site for the strategic operation of discourses contributing to regulation of the subject.

Donzelot concludes that the severing of the working-class family from its traditional mode of organization, including its extensive reliance on community and kin and the non-sentimental inclusion of the labor of its youngest members as contributive to the household economy, was carried out by the family itself. The *rabbatement* (turning back) through which the working-class family was forcibly reformed occurred at "a loss of its coextensiveness with the social field; it was dispossessed of everything that situated it in a field of exterior forces. Being isolated, it was

now exposed to the surveillance of its deviations from the norm."[13] The privileging of a norm through the enactment of institutional constraints and stimulants incited the lower classes to police their own behaviour as well as that of their neighbours. To move to an English example, *rabattement* exposed the family to the surveillance of philanthropists keen to apply charity, but only to the "respectable" poor and to the educational establishment, which was empowered to fine the parents of children who arrived at school in dirty uniforms. To reiterate Donzelot's conclusion, the effect of these restraints and stimulants was to atomize the working-class family in much the same way that Ariès and Stone agree that the upper and middle classes had already isolated themselves.

While Ariès and Stone offer sweeping studies of changes in the family structure in the modern and early-modern West, Harry Hendrick provides a succinct study of literary representations of childhood in nineteenth-century England, and concurs with many of the conclusions established by Stone and Ariès, seeing, first:

> [T]he gradual shift away from an idea of childhood fragmented by geography — urban/rural — and by class life-experiences, to one that was much more uniform and coherent; second, the rise and development of what historians refer to as the 'domestic ideal' among the early nineteenth-century middle class, which helped to present the family as the principal institutional influence; third, the evolution of the compulsory relationship between the State, the family and welfare services; and, fourth, the political and cultural struggle to extend the developing concept of childhood through all social classes, to universalize it.[14]

According to Hendrick, the Romantic poets, Wordsworth, Blake, and Coleridge among them, used the child as a foil for the exploration of the Self, relying on the sentimentalized notions of childhood innocence as a protest against "the Experience of Society" as well as the alarming conditions of the early industrial city.[15] The scale and horrors of early

industrialization were at odds with much of the Romantics' stock material, but the incorporation of children into the industrial economy was anathema to a healthy transition from childhood to respectable adulthood. Hendrick claims that the Romantic images of childhood had an especially profound impact on the Factory Acts of 1802, 1819, and 1833, all of which regulated child labour in textile mills.[16]

Reflecting more than the need for accurate literary foils, the Factory Acts, because they treated the category of child labour as a special case of wage labour, signalled that the state no longer considered children capable of negotiating their own contracts.[17] Hendrick pushes his claim that the Factory Acts contributed to the gathering strength of the domestic ideal[18] by noting how they hardened spatial associations between children and the home.[19] Implicitly, at least, the Factory Acts established the legislative precedent that the proper place for the child was not the workplace. Hendrick's claim that the first legislation targeting children in the nineteenth century, the Factory Acts, was already working under an implied domestic ideal is perhaps a bit premature. Frederick Engels' 1845 *The Condition of the Working Class in England* takes the effects of labour on the children's health, which diminished their future productivity, as a signal of the greed and insensitivity of their bourgeois employers.[20] The notion that the child does not belong in a factory is, once again, implicit, but the case is never made against the incorporation of child labour into the household economy; instead, criticism is reserved for the bourgeoisie who make child labor a particularly gruesome requirement in the factory setting.

Hendrick contends that early nineteenth-century critics of child labour deployed the Romantic poets' notions of childhood in the campaigns that resulted in the first Factory Acts. Although the early Factory Acts implicitly designated the home as the proper space for the child, they did not authorize intervention into the working-class home. The Factory Act of 1847 mandated a maximum ten-hour workday for both women and children. Subsequent Acts extended the scope of the law beyond textile mills and continued to treat women and children in the

same breath. The passage of the consolidated Factory Act of 1878 made it illegal to employ any child under ten and as the regulations concerning the work of women and children diverged, children were moved into the classroom by the Elementary Education Act of 1870, which made school attendance for all children up to the age of ten compulsory. As will be demonstrated later in the paper, enforcing compulsory education eventually entailed a more intense intrusion into the home life of the working classes than anything that had been mandated by the Factory Acts.

Hendrick's proposed link between the function of children in the early Factory Acts and later social welfare legislation in the Edwardian era seems less tenable in light of the decades that passed in which children did not figure as a special case in the Factory Acts. Certainly, the unprecedented state intervention into the home of the child only becomes a feature of legislation after the Education Acts. This essay does not claim that *attempts* to pass legislation restraining children's ability to work for wages were nonexistent during this period. However, there is an important distinction between earlier representations that sought to remove children from the factory setting and later legislation that evinced a desire to reform the intellectual and moral quality of children. It is the contention of this essay that literary representations of childhood after the Elementary Education Act of 1870 continued to rely on the child's ability to evoke emotive responses, but accomplished this by calling on the reader's intimate knowledge about home, family, and the proper procedures of childhood. Calls for action on behalf of slum children shifted around the 1870s and 1880s to pivot on their family and community rather than work life. In turn, representations of these children that argued for changes in family practice made their case by situating their subjects in the more intimate environments of the neighbourhood, the home, and the family.

The Experience of Childhood

Economic inequality under capitalism provides an important lens for understanding the relationship between the authors of representations

of childhood and their subjects. Without exception, the accounts analyzed in this paper are written by members of the middling classes reaching across the real and imagined differences of class to represent the poorest inhabitants of late nineteenth-century London. Their framing of lower-class children reproduces a relational economic inequality both constituted and signified by differences in space, materials, and habits. As they moved to first-hand observation of lower-class life, they brought with them the accumulated notions that constituted their own positions. The accounts that they produced, in turn, reveal as much about the authors as they do about the children they encounter. Indeed, their accounts of what deviated from proper childhood provide an especially critical opportunity to get at the kind of childhoods they inhabited and sought to promote through state legislation.

But were working-class childhood experiences significantly different from those of the middle classes? Stepping outside the study of "representations," it is clear that economic differences guaranteed a different *experience* of childhood in Victorian England. F. M L. Thompson's *Rise of Respectable Society* claims that close proximity of family members and material uncertainty were a "fundamental feature" of working-class family life.[21] He also notes how reformers' accounts were "starkly disapproving because what they saw offended the sense of order, authority, decency, morality and Christianity which many of them held."[22] Working-class homes were undoubtedly less spacious than those of the middle classes, making strict separation of genders and ages impossible for most. In addition, the variety of domestic tasks that had to be accomplished without the help of servants rendered a strict sexual division of labour impractical in the working-class household, at least for its youngest members.[23] Reliance on child labour is only one of the more obvious points of difference between middle and lower-class family lives. The function of economic inequality behind it is self-evident. As Anna Davin writes in a slightly teleological account of Victorian childhood experience, "work and responsibility were not the separate providence

of adults, but co-existed with growth, with play and with school; they anticipated full adulthood."[24] The problematic feature of later Factory and Education Acts was their total presumption of separate developmental stages. As revealed by Ellen Ross, working-class children often expressed a *desire* to help out at home, particularly to ease their mother's work burden.[25] Without idealizing the real difficulties borne by the poor of late nineteenth-century London, it is equally important to appreciate how notions of a complete and proper childhood derived from circumstances very different from those where they were eventually applied.

When Andrew Mearns wrote "that seething in the very centre of our great cities, concealed by the thinnest crust of civilization and decency, is a vast mass of moral corruption, of heart-breaking misery and absolute godlessness," he broke no new ground in his use of valenced and exoticized language.[26] The early pieces studied in this paper make special use of the trope of "discovery" and "exploration." However, this shock at viewing the lived effects of economic inequality never resulted in calls for a restructuring of the economic order; rather, reformers focused their reform efforts on the moral and spiritual conditions of family life.[27] Although not a primary concern for this essay, private charity was one response to the horrific ways slum children were represented in social reform literature. As Oscar Wilde wrote in his 1891 essay, "The Soul of Man under Socialism:"

> [Reformers] find themselves surrounded by hideous poverty, by hideous ugliness, by hideous starvation. It is inevitable that they should be strongly moved by all this. The emotions of man are stirred more quickly than man's intelligence; and, as I pointed out some time ago in an article on the function of criticism, it is much more easy to have sympathy with suffering than it is to have sympathy with thought. Accordingly, with admirable, though misdirected intentions, they very seriously and very sentimentally set themselves to the task of remedying the evils that they see. But their remedies do not cure the disease: they merely prolong it. Indeed, their remedies are part of the disease.[28]

The accounts analyzed here share Wilde's doubts about the efficacy of private charity but, rather than argue against the economic inequalities that imposed the problem of poverty in the first place, the authors made strategic use of class distinctions and the knowledges/ignorances derived from them. By urging working-class families to divide their space, spend their time, and educate their children according to a method formed from an ideology of domesticity, the misery of poverty could be conceptualized through a moralizing schema where one class required uplifting and one class felt superior by providing it.

This essay has not troubled itself with the vexed question of what demographics constituted the middle classes. The questions posed by the accounts of children in the slum are largely moral ones, though they would be impossible, for both author and subject, were it not for the relationships structured around and created by economic inequality under capitalism. The shock and horror aroused at the discovery of lower-class family life was sometimes strengthened by noting the relative indifference of the slums' inhabitants to the conditions they were living in.[29] Economic difference was partially signalled by a type of moral outlook, the reiteration of which contributed to distinctions that have sometimes been collapsed into the category of "class," a classification system of dubious analytical value. Whilst wading through reformist literature which defines classes variously when it bothers to do so at all, this paper will make use of class as a flexible notion indicating the accoutrements of distinctions born of and in a symbiotic relationship with economic inequality. Of particular relevance in this study is the determined way in which authors distinguished themselves from those they encountered by noting a moral difference.

Could the middling classes, then, be said to have a different moral outlook that precipitated a different kind of family life from those of the labouring classes? A more relevant question for the duration of this paper will be: how did the assertion of difference through the figure of the child attempt to *universalize* a notion derived from middle-class family life while simultaneously affirming the moral *superiority* of those

middle classes? Leonore Davidoff and Catherine Hall's *Family Fortunes* details the ideological background of England's provincial middle classes with a special emphasis on unpicking familial relations.[30] Their study concludes that "social, personal, and sexual identity depended on defining a place within a family" strictly segregated by gender and age.[31] An ideology of domesticity, as discussed by John Tosh, was crucially enacted through demonstrations of manliness and masculinity by male heads of households.[32] While the requirements to demonstrate manliness varied across class, they were always predicated on subordinating masculinities "whose crime is that they undermine the patriarchy from within or discredit it in the eyes of women."[33] Accounts of the slum families often represented fathers as neglectful, with a reformer or an explorer stepping in to assert moral judgement and prescribe solutions. The accounts described, with the exception of the contributions by Beatrice Webb, are issued from men of the middling classes whose mundane professional routines formed a fretful foundation for their masculinity.[34] Historian Dan Bivona writes in *The Imagination of Class* that "the outlaw nature of these discourses suggests that they served as emotional or psychological compensation to the increasingly domesticated nature of middle class life."[35]

Treading cautiously, it is possible to imagine how the symbolic and literal excitement of transgressing class and peering into debauchery authorized a moral judgement, flowing from an unquestioned superiority, to use the slum as a site for the displaced enactment of middle-class masculinity.[36] There was an obvious tension between the state's intervention into family life and the idealized isolation of the family embodied in an ideology of domesticity. Nevertheless, the thrust of legislation resulting from some of these accounts demonstrates on a macro-level how middle-class reformers and legislators assumed masculinity in the household of the slums.[37] The figure of the child and the representations of childhood emerging in the accounts from the slums authorized this intervention by playing on the emotive significance of the child in the middle-class household, both as an object of innocence

and sentimentality and as a harbinger of the family's future fortune. By representing working-class fathers as neglectful, slum explorers called on their middle-class readership to demonstrate masculinity through an unprecedented intervention into lower-class family life.

Discursive Strategies in Representations of Slum Children

Harry Hendrick proposes three dualisms as "ways of seeing" the child in England between 1870 and 1914: bodies/minds, victims/threats, and normal/abnormal.[38] This essay will employ bodies/minds and victims/threats and will propose a third dualism that may be used to examine representations of slum children: distance/intimacy. Normal/abnormal attempts to denote a trans-historical and contemporary process that forms the Other.[39] Much of this discourse at the turn of the century was developed by emerging social science and medical establishments, best exemplified by the Child Study Movement.[40] For the purposes of this paper, it is not useful to employ normal/abnormal as an analytical device as this discourse was only in its emergent stages before the First World War. Instead, Donzelot's theory, which sees familial restructuring occurring through the quasi-coerced adoption of a norm encouraged by stimulants and deterrents, provides an opportunity to think about how normal/abnormal engaged with calls for state intervention. Distance/intimacy as "way of seeing" accounts for the ways representations of slum children called on and then refuted intimate knowledge of the family in order to reinforce the slum's alterity.

Sally Shuttleworth observes in her comprehensive history of the study of the child's mental state in nineteenth-century England that "lying and sexuality were linked together as forms of alternate, hidden childhood experience, not amenable to adult control, and disruptive of the ideals of childhood innocence."[41] Published in instalments in the sensationalist *Pall Mall Gazette*, W. T. Stead's 1885 "The Maiden Tribute of Modern Babylon" was an exposé of the partially fantastic

"London Slave Market" where young girls were sold as prostitutes.[42] Stead's piece was written "in order to arouse sufficient public interest"[43] in the passage of an amendment to the Criminal Law Act and is generally credited with contributing to the passage of the Criminal Law Amendment Act of 1885, which, among its many features, raised the age of sexual consent for girls from thirteen to sixteen years of age.[44]

Virgins were especially prized in Stead's vision of this underworld, and one brothel keeper's confession of how to lure a young girl pivots on the needs, conscious and unconscious, of her body. He describes bringing a girl to London to "see the sights... giving her plenty to eat and drink – especially drink... By this time she is very tired, a little dazed with the drink and the excitement and very frightened at being left in town with no friends. I offer her nice lodgings for the night... and then the affair is managed."[45] For the daughters of women of the streets, the process was facilitated by the fact that they had been "bred and trained for the life."[46] One of the brothel keepers that Stead interviews joked that "drunken parents always sell their children.... you might buy a dozen."[47]

Stead's "The Maiden Tribute" makes a clear connection between moral debasement through prostitution and the needs of the physical bodily. Impairment of the body through drink is a slippery slope to a mental state conducive to inducement to prostitution, among both parents and young girls. Hunger also plays a role: "plenty to eat" and the dizzying effects of alcohol produce a pliable body through the dual satisfaction of physical needs and relaxation of mental constraints. The female child's body is rendered malleable through the unconscious need for food and improper consumption of alcohol. The opportunity to spend the night in "nice lodgings" as opposed to the frightening and dangerous space of fin-de-siècle London presents a comforting, almost domestic, prospect. Once again, the home as a refuge is inverted to become the turn of the key in a process of rendering the child vulnerable through the unconscious desires of its body.

The connection between bodily needs, sexual debasement, and

subsequent mental anguish is made clear when Stead, upon meeting a former child prostitute, remarked how "the horror seemed to cling to her like a nightmare."[48] According to Stead's relation of her account, she was practically forced into prostitution with her "head aching with the effect of the drowse and full of pain and horror."[49] Drugs may work on the body but the uncertainty born of parental neglect, corrupt company, and poverty have already rendered the body and mind of the child amenable to a loss of innocence. Quoting a report of the Rescue Society from 1883 under the subtitle "The Ruin of the Young Life – 'The Demon Child', " Stead asserts that "these young girls are more difficult to deal with than women, because they are made familiar with sin so young that the modesty which is so natural to a woman they never attain."[50] In addition to pushing the stalled Criminal Law Amendment Act through Parliament, Stead's account is also credited with subsequently encouraging private charitable organizations to lobby Parliament for stronger child protection legislation.[51]

Both boys and girls were represented as victims of neglect, indifference, sexual and physical abuse, and material deprivation. By 1878, London had over fifty philanthropic societies devoted to children.[52] The London Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children's efforts to pass a "Children's Charter" paid off when Parliament passed the Act for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children in 1889. As George Behlmer notes, the Act was England's "first attempt to deal comprehensively with the domestic relationship between the parent and child."[53] This Act explicitly laid out limits of parental control over the bodies of their children and empowered the state to intervene in cases of cruelty and order a change of custody over the child, turning the children over to a relative or charity.[54] The 1889 Act was enforced by the "blue uniforms" of the National Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children, a group whose continued lobbying efforts for an expansion of the 1889 Act resulted in an 1894 Amendment.[55] The 1894 Amendment Act now empowered authorities to imprison parents for intentional neglect or cruelty to children.[56]

Stead's piece suggested that the development of girls into respectable

women was interfered with through their sexual precocity, and is thus best read through the dualism of mind/body. In contrast, representations of young boys from the slums played on the dualisms of victim/threat. The Juvenile Offenders Amendment Act of 1862 permitted greater discretion for judges in sentencing boys under fourteen for certain crimes.[57] By the 1870s and 1880s, charitable discourse had moved to representing children as victims of circumstance to such an extent that targeted intervention was made against their parents.[58] The establishment of Ragged and Industrial schools and their use as alternatives to jail sentences in the middle part of the century also built on the premise that the threat of poor children could be limited through proper education. The Settlement Movement of the last few decades of the nineteenth century took this impulse to educate young boys out of criminality a step further by establishing live-in schools with the goal of "civilizing" their charges and not merely educating them in a suitable trade. A commemorative history of Toynbee Hall, one of the most famous examples of the Settlement Movement in East London, noted how attention was drawn to the condition of slum children by accounts like James Greenwood's *Seven Curses of London*.[59] According to the history, "groups of boys and youths with nothing better to do turned inevitably to mischief."[60] Greenwood is adept at showing the uncertain and anxious boundary between boys as victims and boys as threats. A "little faltering step that shuffled from the right path to the wrong" was the only thing preventing a young boy from getting "drafted into our great criminal army."[61] Greenwood supported the Rescue Homes which provided shelter, food, and recreation in lieu of mischief,[62] but also expressed doubts about rescuing "the genuine alley-bred Arab of the City; the worthy descendant of a tribe that has grown so used to neglect that it regards it as its privilege, and fiercely resents any move that may be taken toward its curtailment."[63] The threat of the "street Arab" could be contained and diverted, but left unchecked, the hardening of habits could also lead to a permanent criminality. Greenwood's proposal is given added force through the orientalist image of an untrustworthy and dangerous Arab.

The third way of viewing the children of the slums was through a lens which rendered them as both familiar and strange, English but savage, Christian or demanding of a civilizing mission on the scale of what was happening in Africa.[64] In his *The Bitter Cry of Outcast London*, Andrew Mearns describes slum life as absolutely savage but still recognizably human by deftly moving between images of animal savagery and familiar domesticity. "Compared with the lair of a wild beast [the slum home] would be a comfortable and healthy spot," he records after entering a domestic scene.[65] The air of the home was also constructed as unsuitable for healthy human life, and even seeking relief in the attic one discovers "that the sickly air which finds its way into the room has to pass over the putrefying carcases of dead cats or birds, or viler abominations still."[66] The home was the sacred site for the enactment of the middle-class ideology of domesticity, and only in separate rooms with specialized functions under the absorbed supervision of a mother could proper children hope to become respectable adults. Mearns is careful to invert the domestic scenes he encounters by showing the lower-class home as polluted, unhealthy, and more akin to the lair of a wild beast than that of a human being. The home was something intimately experienced and its sacredness was partially attuned to protecting the innocence of children, but from Mearns' description of "a man ill with small-pox, his wife just recovering from her eighth confinement, and the children running about half-naked and covered with dirt," it is clear that these representations owe much of their power to the ways they undermine the separation of genders and ages, the protection of children from sights that might imperil their innocence, and the gendered division of parental duties and authority.[67] More than describing a lower-class home, Mearns demonstrated the inversion of an ideal middle-class family.

A Universal Notion of Childhood or The Fallen Middle-Class Ideal

At the heart of this domestic setting, intimately known yet represented in its alterity in East London slums, was the figure of a child who could

still provide an empathetic jolt to intervene in settings that were not quite hopeless. Mearns writes that the "child misery that one beholds is the most heart-rending and appalling element in these discoveries."[68] In *How the Poor Lived and Horrible London*, George Sims constructs slum children attending school as the racial and moral Other: "it was no light task to catch the children of a shifting race, to schedule street Arabs and the offspring of beggars and thieves and prostitutes."[69] Greenwood also employs the term "street Arabs" and refers to groups of young boys as members of an unruly "tribe."[70] As Hugh Cunningham has observed about representations of poor children in the nineteenth century, "[i]n an age of racism and imperialism.... the representation of the child as a savage was much more likely to lead to politics which emphasized the insubordination, incapacity, and undesirable traits in children."[71] Representations of the child in the fashion of Greenwood and Sims made use of literary techniques that had already proven their utility in promoting civilizing efforts in the British Empire, but pleas for intervention took on an added urgency when they spoke about a need to civilize at the very heart of that empire.

Harry Hendrick's "ways of seeing" illuminate the techniques upon which representations of children in the slum rendered their subjects emotive and effective, but in and of themselves they do not provide a satisfactory response to *why* these representations mobilized such sentiment and action among the middle-class reformers who conducted charity work in the slums, explored the slums, and attempted to legislate a restructuring of the family lives they encountered. The representations were the illusory bridges across real and imagined differences born of economic inequality. In their quest to create a scene that justified an intrusion into the family unit by the state, they relied on an implicit contrast with a childhood that was proper, necessary, and, most importantly, universal. The norm was grounded in the unutterable sanctity of the domestic ideal. Representations of slum children were shaped by notions of childhood derived from a middle-class ideology of domesticity, but in diverging from it they produced subjects that had "fallen" from the

ideal types. This essay will now proceed to delineate how the techniques of representing poor children functioned under the implicit assumption of the universal applicability of an ideology of domesticity and, by confirming slum children as endangered but still salvageable because of their status as *children*, the representations provided the suitable backdrop for an unprecedented intervention into the homes of the labouring classes.

Part One: Neglect

The Children Act of 1908, which consolidated all existing legislation concerning the child, was the culmination of decades of changing understandings of parental neglect.[72] Neglect was one of the tropes utilized by explorers of the slum to demonstrate the impropriety of lower-class family life. Children in the ideal middle-class household were under nearly constant supervision in a hierarchy that extended from the servants to the mother. Working-class mothers who lacked the help of servants could hardly aspire to this ideal, and young children were often called upon to supervise their even younger siblings.[73] Ellen Ross's study of working-class motherhood in London notes how "neighbours and neighbourhoods also functioned as auxiliary parents whose care demonstrated the youngsters' community affiliation" by providing surveillance, discipline, and even fulfilling material and physical needs.[74] Reflecting on his childhood at the turn of the century in *East End Underworld*, Arthur Harding noted how "[a]part from breakfast, you had to trust to luck for your meals," for children spent a substantial part of the day foraging or taking advantage of charity before heading home for supper.[75]

Observers of the slum constantly described material deprivation as a kind of neglect, but it was not the only reason for which lower-class parents could be accused of neglect. Ellen Ross has demonstrated how parenting guidebooks created increasingly complex and labour intensive child care regimens from the middle to the end of the nineteenth century, and failure to fulfil these duties came to be

considered as neglectful behavior.[76] Neither Harding nor the accounts Ross looks at reveal any working-class children expressing animosity or bitterness towards their parents because of material uncertainty; indeed, the "pleasure of being grown-up enough to help" often went hand-in-hand with a desire to not demand too much from the parents.[77]

At first glance, Andrew Mearns' claim that "[c]hildren who can scarcely walk are taught to steal" might seem to fit with this dynamic of self-reliant children and parents who depended on their children's self-reliance to help the family economy.[78] However, an oral history of working-class childhood in Britain which covers the period between 1889 and 1939 revealed no instances of parent-instigated stealing.[79] As Arthur Harding's story reveals, theft was not insignificant in sustaining the lower-class household, but, crucially, in the case of Harding, it was he who made the decision that it was easier to either steal food or trick charity workers than it was to work one of the few menial and low paying jobs available to working-class boys. Mearns' assertion that theft by young boys from the slums was the result of parental instigation reveals how accounts of the slums obscured the agency of children and wrote over their awareness of the difficulty of sustaining a household that they often took an interest in helping out with.

Hendrick has concluded that Acts between 1854 and 1866 dealing with juvenile delinquency as a special category of crime,

> ...reinforced the view that [children] were not 'free' agents; drew attention to the child-parent relationship with the latter expected to exercise control and discipline; and emphasized the danger of those in need of 'care and protection' becoming delinquents: neglect and delinquency were seen to stand side-by-side.[80]

If neglect and delinquency fed into one another and were always traceable to the parent, it was no longer prudent to punish the child; rather, as echoed by Beatrice and Sidney Webb in their 1911 *The Prevention of Destitution*, proper education of children and "enforcing parental responsibility so as to preserve all children from neglect"[81] could eliminate the crime and

destitution that represented "a disease of society itself."[82] The implicit though unacknowledged ideology at play here is that of the middle classes, for whom childhood was a state of formation that precluded making "adult" decisions such as the decision to commit a crime. According to the Webbs, successful adults could still be formed from these delinquent children, but only by encouraging the parents to take responsibility. The Webbs, demonstrating the ease with which poverty and neglect were related, even went so far as to advocate that all children under the provisions of the local Poor Law be made provisional wards of the Local Education Authority.[83] Conspicuously absent from their proposals is the notion of the independent child capable of making strategic decisions based on a position of practically guaranteed economic inequality. The voices of delinquents, like Harding, proudly proclaim their difference from literary representations:

> The children of the Nichol were far superior to a normal child coming from a respectable family. The poverty had sharpened his wits. When Dickens described Oliver Twist, he didn't describe him properly. Oliver Twist could never have existed because he wasn't able to help himself.[84]

Part Two: Street Life

If reformers targeting parental neglect, a category which hurdled the clear demonstrations of agency among the children of the slums, sought to rescue children by placing them under state authority or by inciting parental "responsibility" through fines – both examples of re-ordering the working-class family through stimulants and restraints – it was because the atmosphere in which neglected children were left to develop was always represented as dangerously disordered and leading inevitably to corruption. The community life of the streets was what took over where parental neglect left off.[85] In defining the destitution of the lower classes in the slums, the Webbs are keen to specify that "[b]y destitution we mean the condition of being without one or other of

the necessaries of life, in such a way that health and strength, and even vitality, is so impaired as to eventually imperil life itself."[86] They then go on to highlight how this is also a "degradation of the soul" caused by

> ...infants and children, boys and girls, men and women, [who] together find themselves subjected – in an atmosphere of drinking, begging, cringing and lying – to unspeakable temptations to which it is practically inevitable that they should in different degrees succumb, and in which strength and purity of character are irretrievably lost.[87]

Mearns notes how in some parts of East London "the vilest practices are looked upon with the most matter-of-fact indifference."[88] This is a point which Greenwood can always be trusted to specify with some detail: "At fifteen the London factory-bred girl in her vulgar way has the worldly knowledge of the ordinary female of eighteen to twenty."[89]

The accounts by the Webbs, Mearns, and Greenwood all hint at the unmentionable consequences that seem to follow inevitably from the mixing of genders and ages so characteristic of the public life of the slums. This is what happens when neglectful parents do not live up to their responsibilities: the child is socialized into the atmosphere of the street. The public life of the streets is never noted for the various ways it sustains the physical and social requirements of childhood, but is instead represented as detrimental to respectable development. Mearns points out how familiarity with prostitution, drunkenness, and petty crime lessened the horror associated with the criminal. The Webbs describe the social life of the streets as inevitably corrupting. Greenwood, too, bemoans the incongruity of age and knowledge of the young women working in factories, as if there were a threshold after which acquaintance with "worldly knowledge" would not be considered "vulgar." Together, the authors decry working-class socialization outside of the home and demand action to reconstitute the home as a bulwark against the corrupting influence of slum street life.

Greenwood and Arthur Harding provide contrasting interpretations

of one aspect of slum street life that figured prominently in descriptions of young poor people in nineteenth-century London: the penny gaff theatre.[90] The cultural historian John Springhall records how the gaff was the subject of several "moral panics" in the latter part of the nineteenth century; the performance of *Tales of Highwaymen* was regarded by at least one police officer from 1872 as "almost synonymous with criminal intent."[91] The fact that gaffs were especially popular among a class of boys already associated with criminality and that they took their content from cheap printed fiction, which, in the case of *Tales of Highwaymen*, dramatized criminal acts, contributed to their scapegoating for juvenile delinquency. Explorers of the slums frequently noted the presence of gaffs in their tours. Greenwood reliably provides a lurid description of a gaff in *Seven Curses of London*:

> A gaff is a place in which, according to the strict interpretation of the term, stage plays may not be represented. The actors of a drama may not correspond in colloquy, only in pantomime, but the pieces brought out at the "gaff" are seldom of an intricate character, and the not over fastidious auditory are well content with exhibition of dumb show and gesture, that even the dullest comprehension may understand. The prices of admission to these modest temples of the tragic muse, are judiciously regulated to the means of the neighbourhood, and range from a penny to threepence... They are all children who support the gaff. At the best of times they are dangerous... when current topics of highly sensational character are lacking, and the enterprising manager is compelled to fall back on some comparatively harmless stock piece... As they at present exist, they are nothing better than hot-beds of vice in its vilest forms. Girls and boys are herded together to witness the splendid achievements of "dashing highwaymen." But bad as this is, it is really the least part of the evil...[92]

The "least part of evil" comprised seating underneath the stage where young boys and girls might spy up one of the actors' garments through cracks in the floor. The reactions given by the children, noted in both

Greenwood's and Arthur Harding's accounts of the gaff, exhibit none of the moral outrage and shock displayed by Greenwood. For many young boys, charging a penny for putting on a gaff was a decidedly non-criminal way to make money. For Harding, who recalled performing somersaults and cartwheels for donations outside of gaffs as a young boy in Bethnal Green, the gaffs provided a venue for recreation, socializing, and earning money.[93] The above-mentioned combination of activities probably comprised a significant amount of the time of young working-class children, and the gaff's utility in combining all three undoubtedly contributed to its attractiveness.

In the end, most of Greenwood's disgust is caused by the mixing of genders as well as the suspicious presence of shady older men.[94] In relating the content of the production, Greenwood highlights images of boys as threatening, and he decries the presence of girls in such rough and varied company by implying the danger of sexual precocity. The scene of the gaff contrasted sharply with the clean, cosseted, and neatly separated world supposedly inhabited by middle-class children. Playing on the tension between distance and intimacy in representing slum children, William Booth described how

> [t]he rankings of human cesspool are brought into the school-room and mixed up with your children. Your little ones, who have never heard a foul word and who are not only innocent, but ignorant of all the horrors and vice and sin, sit side by side with little ones whose parents are habitually drunk, and play with others whose ideas of merriment are gained from the familiar spectacle of the nightly debauch by which their mothers earn the family bread.[95]

While it is unlikely children of the middle classes would attend classes with children from Whitechapel, Booth does signal the chain of corruption wrought by the family life of the slums: neglectful parents, the development of an unresponsive moral consciousness, and the gross mixing which, through crime or school, inevitably corrupted the children of others. The response from Booth was to call for an effort to "reconstitute the Home."[96]

Part Three: The Salvation of the Slum

The third technique of representing children from the slums which helped to authorize an intervention into their family lives was a universalization of the potential of all children: all that was necessary for a child to become a respectable adult was an upbringing modelled from a middle-class ideology of domesticity. This presumption allowed reformers to represent the fallen children of the slum as its only salvation, and to place all hope for the elimination of the lower classes' misery in the project of rescuing their children. In this way, efforts to rescue and reform slum children were figured from an ideology of domesticity that required the middle classes to see their dreams for the future embodied in the correct formation of their children. In 1869, Greenwood expressed his frustration with charity by calling it a "tedious and roundabout method of reform that can only be tolerated until a more direct route is discovered, and one that can scarcely prove satisfactory to those who look forward to a lifetime return for some of their invested capital."[97] The sentiment that private charities would not alone suffice was widely shared and reinforced by representations of the problem as huge and a matter of national concern. Mearns, writing in 1883, affirmed, "that without State interference nothing effectual can be accomplished upon any large scale. And *it is* a fact."[98] Beatrice and Sidney Webbs' 1911 *The Prevention of Destitution* took state initiative in restructuring the home as a foregone conclusion and explicitly targeted public policy makers with their proposals: they "set forth, as an independent and substantive proposal, a constructive policy, by the adoption of which, as we believe, the nation could, within a very few years, get rid of the great bulk of involuntary destitution."[99] By 1911, they reassuringly claimed that a proposal to empower school inspectors to remove children from unsuitable homes was not "some new and revolutionary principle... but is actually embodied in our legislation."[100]

John Gorst's 1907 *The Children of the Nation: How their Health and Vigour Should be Promoted by the State* laid out a tripartite justification

for interfering in the family life of the working class: if the economic, security, and imperial interests of the nation were threatened by parental neglect, the state had a right to intervene and possibly remove the children from their home.[101] Gorst's pleas were given extra urgency by claiming that by the age of sixteen or seventeen, one's character was permanently formed.[102] He was also keen to emphasize his respect for the role of the parents in running their households, but advocated intervention in the form of advice and, failing the effect of that, by removal of the children.[103] As is clear from the title of his tract, Gorst's concerns extended beyond the domestic setting and this is confirmed by his incessant references to competition from Germany.[104] Concern over the quality of young working-class men from urban England as soldiers had only gathered in strength since the Boer War.[105] Gorst bemoaned the loafing hooligans in East London streets, calling them "very good material running to waste"[106] and promoted school medical inspections and free meals on the grounds that not to do so "flings away any opportunity of securing that the coming race of Englishmen shall be strong and vigorous."[107]

In Carolyn Steedman's biography of Margaret McMillan, the Independent Labour Party activist and author of several books about lower-class childhood, she describes the role of children in campaigns to legislate state involvement in the family life of the lower classes:

> Children allowed her to present the existence of the unskilled labouring poor not as some blind or motiveless horror, but as a thwarted potential. An apprehension of this life, through both the image and the sociological reality of childhood, enabled her, too, to measure the psychological and emotional costs of capitalism, and thus to approach the subjects of her writing and her theorizing with a full human sympathy. It was inevitable, however, that an understanding of adults forged by analogy with childhood led finally to a more complete definition of working people as those who had to be acted for, uplifted and rescued.[108]

By extension, representing the child as the salvageable human product of all the misery encountered in the slum made the rescue of these children a task whose impact was greater than the uplifting of a single life. The ideology of domesticity, which placed the children of the home at the centre of the family's hopes and desires, provided the bridge for making lower-class children the responsibility of the nation. The degraded state of parents was frequently counterpoised with the potential of their children, and George Sims notes how "with their children the case is different: *and here it is the great hope of the reformer*."[109] For Sims, the struggle to save the children is extrapolated to the scale of a Biblical epic:

> In the old biblical times water and fire were the elements which solved the knotty problem of regenerating a seething mass of humanity sunk in the lowest abysses of vice and degradation. The flood can rise high enough to cleanse those who have grown up ignorant – at best it can wet their feet; but the children cannot escape it – the waters will gather force and volume and grow into a broad and glorious river, through which the boys and girls of to-day will wade breast high until they gain the banks of the Promised Land.[110]

While the parents may be lost, the conceptualization of childhood as a stage of formation, critical to forming respectable adults but demanding close supervision, provided the ideological basis for legislation, such as the Elementary Education Act of 1870, which even the Webbs acknowledged was viewed by some of the working classes as "confiscation of income by the state."[111] *Hooligans and Rebels* documents how liberal education ideology was often experienced as an "oppressive constraint," and the oral histories presented reveal how public schools were perceived as "fundamentally middle-class institutions."[112] In their attempt to inculcate a concern for hygiene, punctuality, and regularity of habits, schools mandated an interior reformation of children. The education they received has been described by one historian as the "consequence of the dictates of central government,

which fundamentally demanded the creation of a malleable and disciplined labour force to perform simple manual and clerical tasks efficiently."[113]

Conclusion

It is more than merely generous to note the varied motivations and intentions of reformers and charity workers who represented children of the slum, and this essay does not presume that the assemblage of works analyzed here denote a unity of purpose or explicit desire to re-order the family life of the working classes along the lines of the ideology of domesticity. What is clear is that they implicitly worked with a definition of childhood that drew its ideas of the necessity of safeguarding the potential of the child as the hope of the family from material backgrounds and epistemological frameworks that had little to do with the reality of working-class life. Indeed, the accounts this paper has considered reveal more about what was *not* middle-class about slum family life than what was so characteristically lower-class about it. What is also clear from the limited engagement that this paper has made with accounts from people who received charity and re-ordered their habits around the requirements of state legislation is that attempts to intervene in the family life of the slums did not always produce the desired ends. From the resistance to school discipline described in *Hooligans and Rebels*[114] to Arthur Harding's recollection of how his mother performed respectable poverty while stealing clothes from the church clothing sale,[115] charity and state intervention that worked with emergent social welfare and medical establishments to re-order the working-class family[116] did demand a rerouting of energies and routines to profit from the stimulants and avoid the constraining effects of the law. That said, the result was less a replication of middle-class family life in the slum than it was a working class more attuned to the rewards and punishments determined by a surveilling state.

Between 1870 and 1914, over fifty legislative Acts were passed that concerned children. Part of the recorded backdrop for this unprecedented

concern, which hovered particularly over the state of working-class children, is the literature examined for this essay. Working within a universalizing depiction of childhood that was inflected by a middle-class ideology of domesticity, reformers and sensationalist journalists implicitly called on the imperative of demonstrating masculinity to promote an intervention into working-class family life. Their representations showed the lives of slum children as the veritable Other of a notion of childhood that was necessary to produce respectable adults and maintain empire. In the end, regulations put forward in legislation like the Education Acts posed fundamental hurdles to a working-class family life that had traditionally incorporated the labour of its youngest members into fulfilling the needs of the household economy. Some of this burden would be lessened with the expanding services offered by the social welfare state, but always at the cost of increased surveillance of working-class life. This increased surveillance and the multiple re-orderings of habits around the requirements of social welfare legislation were the effects of the legislation. The representations of children contributed to this transformation by creating and then insisting on an endangered childhood that it was in the national interest to preserve.

Notes

1. Andrew Mearns, *The Bitter Cry of Outcast London* (New York: Humanities Press, 1970), 63.

2. Philippe Ariès, *Centuries of Childhood: a Social History of Family Life*, trans. Robert Baldick (New York: Knopf, 1962).

3. Ibid., 129.

4. Ibid., 119.

5. Ibid., 398.

6. For a summary of criticisms see Adrian Wilson, "The Infancy of the History of Childhood: An Appraisal of Phillip Ariès," *History and Theory*, Vol. 19, No. 2 (1980): 132-153.

7. Lawrence Stone, *The Family, Sex, and Marriage in England, 1500-1800* (New York: Harper & Row, 1977).

8. Ibid., 7.

9. Ibid., 8.

10. Ibid., 9.

11. Jacques Donzelot, *The Policing of Families*, trans. Robert Hurley (New York: Random House, 1979).

12. Ibid., 6-7.

13. Ibid., 45.

14. Harry Hendrick, *Child Welfare: England, 1872-1989* (New York: Routledge, 1994), 19.

15. Ibid., 22.

16. Ibid., 25.

17. Ibid.

18. Ibid.

19. Ariès, 398.

20. Frederick Engels, *The Condition of the Working Class in England* (Moscow: Institute of Marxist-Leninism, 1969); "Single Branches of Industry," http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1845/condition-working-class/.

21. F. M. L. Thompson, *Rise of Respectable Society: A Social History of Victorian Britain, 1830-1900* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1988), 129.

22. Ibid., 129.

23. Ibid., 130-1. Thompson notes how boys could be found sewing buttons in working-class homes.

24. Anna Davin, *Growing Up Poor: Home, School, and Street in London, 1870-1914* (London: Rivers Oram Press, 1996), 85.

25. Ellen Ross, *Love and Toil: Motherhood in Outcast London, 1870-1918* (USA: Oxford University Press, 1993), 151.

26. Mearns, 55.

27. The Webbs are an exception to this last point, although the substance of their proposal remains state intervention into the family life. See Sidney and Beatrice Webb, *The Prevention of Destitution* (New York: Longmans, Green, and Company, 1911), 8.

28. Oscar Wilde, "The Soul of Man Under Socialism," 1891, http://marxists.org/reference/archive/wilde-oscar/soul-man/index.htm.

29. See George R. Sims, *How the Poor Live* (New York: Garland Publishing, 1984), 12: "though they were respectable people themselves, they saw nothing criminal in the behavior of their neighbors." Here, distinctions between the respectable and morally corrupt poor merge once more at the site of moral judgement. The structure of economic inequality is not constituted solely by material indicators, but by a shared sense of moral judgement derived primarily from familiarity.

30. Leonore Davidoff and Catherine Hall, *Family Fortunes: Men and Women of the English Middle Class, 1780-1850* (London: Hutchison, 1987), 29.

31. Ibid., 356.

32. John Tosh, *Manliness and Masculinities in Nineteenth-Century Britain: Essays on Gender, Family and Empire* (Great Britain: Pearson Longman, 2005).

33. Ibid., 43.

34. Ibid., 204-5.

35. Dan Bivona and Roger Henkle, *The Imagination of Class: Masculinity and the Victorian Urban Poor* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 2006), 8-9.

36. See Allon White and Peter Stalleybrass, *Politics and Poetics of Transgression* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1986).

37. See Seth Koven, *Slumming: Sexual and Social Politics in Victorian London* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2002), 229: male reformers' attempt to reform the subjects of the slum, "found themselves promoting particular visions of relations between men and men, men and women, rich and poor. Remaking men and redefining masculinity were explicit aims of many of their class-bridging projects in the slums and grew out of their need to understand their own gender and sexual identities."

38. Harry Hendrick, *Child Welfare: Historical Dimensions, Contemporary Debate* (Great Britain: The Policy Press, 2003), 9.

39. Ibid., 13.

40. Ibid.

41. Sally Shuttleworth, *The Mind of the Child: Child Development in Literature, Science, and Medicine, 1840-1900* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 73.

42. W. T. Stead, "The Maiden Tribute of Modern Babylon," *Pall Mall Gazette*, July 1885, 3.

43. Ibid., 2.

44. Deborah Gorham, "The "Maiden Tribute of Modern Babylon" Re-Examined: Child Prostitution and the Idea of Childhood in Late-Victorian England," *Victorian Studies*, Vol. 21, No. 3 (1978): 355.

45. Stead, 3.

46. Ibid.

47. Ibid.

48. Ibid.

49. Ibid., 4.

50. Ibid., 12.

51. George K. Behlmer, *Child Abuse and Moral Reform in England, 1870-1908* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1982), 78.

52. Eric Hopkins, *Childhood Transformed: Working-Class Children in Nineteenth-Century England* (New York: Manchester University Press, 1994), 200.

53. Behlmer, 109.

54. Ibid., 109.

55. Prior to 1895, the NSPCC was known as the London Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children.

56. Behlmer, 159.

57. Ibid., 197.

58. Hugh Cunningham, *The Children of the Poor: Representations of Childhood Since the Seventeenth Century* (Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, 1991), 150.

59. J. A. R. Pimento, *Toynbee Hall: Fifty Years of Social Progress, 1884-1934* (London: J. M. Dent and Sons, 1935), 7.

60. Ibid., 178.

61. James Greenwood, *The Seven Curses of London* (London: Stanley Rivers and Company, 1869), 40.

62. Ibid., 42-3.

63. Ibid., 50.

64. Andrew Mearns, *The Bitter Cry of Outcast London* (New York: Humanities Press, 1970), 56.

65. Ibid., 58.

66. Ibid., 58-9.

67. Ibid., 59.

68. Ibid., 67.

69. Sims, 48.

70. Greenwood, 50.

71. Cunningham, 132.

72. Hendrick, *Child Welfare*, 120.

73. Ross, 159.

74. Ibid., 156.

75. Raphael Samuel, *East End Underworld: Chapters in the Life of Arthur Harding* (London: Rutledge, 1981), 27.

76. See Ross, 138: in the mid-nineteenth century, childrearing handbooks recommended changing diapers twice a day. By the end of the nineteenth century, recommendations were to change the diaper every time it became wet. This meant changing diapers up to two dozen times in addition to more time spent doing laundry.

77. Ross, 151.

78. Mearns, 62.

79. Stephen Humphrey, *Hooligans or Rebels: An Oral History of Working-Class Childhood and Youth, 1889-1939* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1981), 166.

80. Hendrick, 77.

81. Webb, 62.

82. Ibid., 2.

83. Ibid., 73.

84. Samuels, 76.

85. The vexed notion of "community" is used here to denote the multiplicity of interactions in the course of fulfilling daily needs and routines within a specified group.

86. Webb, 1.

87. Ibid., 2.

88. Mearns, 61.

89. Greenwood, 15.

90. John Springhall, *Youth, Popular Culture, and Moral Panics: Penny Gaffs to Gangsta-Rap, 1830-1996* (New York: Saint Martin's Press, 1998), 19-22.

91. Ibid., 78.

92. Greenwood, 45-6.

93. Harding, 46.

94. Greenwood, 48.

95. William Booth, *In Darkest England and the Way Out* (New York: Garrett Press, 1970), 63.

96. Ibid., 66.

97. Greenwood, 52.

98. Mearns, 69.

99. Webb, v.

100. Ibid., 74.

101. John Gorst, *The Children of the Nation: How Their Health and Vigour Should be Promoted by the State* (New York: E. P. Dutton and Company, 1907), 2-10.

102. Ibid., 2.

103. Ibid.

104. Gorst, 70.

105. J.A.R. Pimlott, *Toynbee Hall: Fifty Years of Social Progress, 1884-1934* (London: J. M. Dent and Sons, 1935), 179.

106. Gorst, 204.

107. Ibid., 76.

108. Carolyn Steedman, *Childhood, Culture, and Class in Britain: Margaret McMillan, 1860-1931* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1990), 176.

109. Sims, 116.

110. Ibid., 48.

111. Webb, 71.

112. Humphrey, 60-62.

113. Ibid., 46-48.

114. Humphrey, 61.

115. Samuels, 25-27. "She would tell the hard-luck story so as to get herself in. The whole thing was having your poverty well known to the people who had the giving of charity. They made out she was 'deserving.' They were always asking whether we was good children or not, and whether we were clean, and whether we went to Sunday school...If you wasn't poor, you had to look poor... But you had to be clean and that was easy – soap and water didn't cost a lot of money... There were ladies who used to come round from the wealthy part of London. My mother used to be on the top of the list, being a cripple, that appealed to them."

116. Steedman, 62-80.

Works Cited

Ariès, Philippe. *Centuries of Childhood: A Social History of Family Life*. Translated by Robert Baldick. New York: Knopf, 1962.

Behlmer, George K. *Child Abuse and Moral Reform in England, 1870-1908*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1982.

Bivona, Dan and Roger Henkle. *The Imagination of Class: Masculinity and the Victorian Urban Poor*. Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 2006.

Cunningham, Hugh. *The Children of the Poor: Representations of Childhood Since the Seventeenth Century*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, 1991.

Davidoff, Leonore and Catherine Hall. *Family Fortunes: Men and Women of the English Middle Class, 1780-1850*. London: Hutchison, 1987.

Davin, Anna. *Growing Up Poor: Home, School, and Street in London, 1870-1914*. London: Rivers Oram Press, 1996.

Donzelot, Jacques. *The Policing of Families*. Translated by Robert Hurley. New York: Random House, 1979.

Engels, Frederick. *The Condition of the Working Class in England*. Moscow: Institute of Marxist-Leninism, 1969. http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1845/condition-working-class/.

Gorham, Deborah. "The "Maiden Tribute of Modern Babylon" Re-Examined: Child Prostitution and the Idea of Childhood in Late-Victorian England." *Victorian Studies*, Vol. 21, No.3 (1978): 353-379.

Gorst, John. *The Children of the Nation: How Their Health and Vigour Should be Promoted by the State*. New York: E. P. Dutton and Company, 1907.

Greenwood, James. *The Seven Curses of London*. London: Stanley Rivers and Company, 1869.

Hendrick, Harry. *Child Welfare: England, 1872-1989*. New York: Routledge, 1994.

Hendrick, Harry. *Child Welfare: Historical Dimensions, Contemporary Debate*. Great Britain: The Policy Press, 2003.

Hopkins, Eric. *Childhood Transformed: Working-Class Children in Nineteenth-Century England*. New York: Manchester University Press, 1994.

Humphrey, Stephen. *Hooligans or Rebels: An Oral History of Working-Class Childhood and Youth, 1889-1939*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1981.

Koven, Seth. *Slumming: Sexual and Social Politics in Victorian London*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2002.

Mearns, Andrew. *The Bitter Cry of Outcast London*. New York: Humanities Press, 1970.

Pimlott, J. A. R. *Toynbee Hall: Fifty Years of Social Progress, 1884-1934*. London: J. M. Dent and Sons, 1935.

Ross, Ellen. *Love and Toil: Motherhood in Outcast London, 1870-1918*. USA: Oxford University Press, 1993.

Samuel, Raphael. *East End Underworld: Chapters in the Life of Arthur Harding*. London: Rutledge, 1981.

Shuttleworth, Sally. *The Mind of the Child: Child Development in Literature, Science, and Medicine, 1840-1900*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Springhall, John. *Youth, Popular Culture, and Moral Panics: Penny Gaffs to Gangsta-Rap, 1830-1996*. New York: Saint Martin's Press, 1998.

Steedman, Carolyn. *Childhood, Culture, and Class in Britain: Margaret McMillan, 1860-1931*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1990.

Stone, Lawrence. *The Family, Sex, and Marriage in England, 1500-1800*. New York: Harper & Row, 1977.

Thompson, F. M. L. *Rise of Respectable Society: A Social History of Victorian Britain, 1830-1900*. Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press, 1988.

Tosh, John. *Manliness and Masculinities in Nineteenth-Century Britain: Essays on Gender, Family and Empire*. Great Britain: Pearson Longman, 2005.

Webb, Beatrice and Sidney. *The Prevention of Destitution*. New York: Longmans, Green, and Company, 1911.

White, Allon and Peter Stalleybrass. *Politics and Poetics of Transgression*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1986.

Wilde, Oscar. "The Soul of Man Under Socialism." 1891. http://marxists.org/reference/archive/wilde-oscar/soul-man/index.htm.

Wilson, Adrian. "The Infancy of the History of Childhood: An Appraisal of Phillip Ariès." *History and Theory*, Vol. 19, No. 2 (Feb., 1980); 132-153.

Fleeing for Poland: Understanding the "Great Emigration" of 1831

Gregory Kerr

Sleep, my little one, you cannot say
what makes you cry.
Sleep on. Despite the pain, some day
I'll tell you why.

Sleep on, dear Heart. Why such misery
at the triumph of our foes?
Your father died for you and for me
in a war of heroes.

Soon you'll be taught and enslaved in the ways
of Russian Tsardom.
Yet you were borne and delivered in the days
of Poland's Freedom.[1]

The November Uprising of 1830-1831 in Poland, however ill devised, was one of those rare events that elicited popular sympathy and enthusiasm across state boundaries and oceans, and drew various nationalities together – if only for a time – in what was construed as a common struggle for the *greater good*. Indeed, Polish freedom from the tsarist yoke was arguably the foremost liberal cause in the Western world in the early 1830s, and it was able to outlive the suppression of the uprising in 1831 largely because of what historians have come to call the "Great Emigration."[2] Roughly 10,000 Poles left the Congress Kingdom during this time – some, admittedly, returned shortly thereafter – to

settle chiefly in France, England and the United States. They did not just flee from persecution; many of the exiles believed that the fate of Poland rested squarely on their shoulders. This was not altogether untrue for this was not the first time, nor the last, that Polish culture would be preserved in exile. And when the initial outburst of international support for the Polish cause dwindled and faded, it was nevertheless kept alive by the active émigré communities – politically, culturally, and spiritually.

This essay will address and elaborate on several questions raised by the phenomenon of the Great Emigration: Why did Poles choose to emigrate after the uprising was suppressed? How did they fare on their journey? What was their financial state upon arrival in their host country? How were Poles typically perceived in Western Europe and in America, and what aid did they receive? And, finally, what explains the great enthusiasm, sympathy, and support with which they were greeted throughout? In the last part of this essay, I will discuss the situation of the Polish exiles after popular support for their cause had largely dissipated. Throughout, I intend to show that while popular support for the Polish cause was immensely salutary in providing emergency aid for Polish refugees, its fervour was relatively short-lived and ultimately could not sustain the Polish cause in exile.

When word of the brutal suppression of the Warsaw insurrection reached Frédéric Chopin in Stuttgart, while en route to Paris, the pianist became tormented by vivid images of death and destruction: "My poor Father! The dear old man may be starving, my mother not able to buy bread? Perhaps my sisters have succumbed to the ferocity of Muscovite soldiery let loose! Where is she [his first love, Konstancja Gladkowska]? Poor girl, perhaps in some Russian's hands – a Russian strangling her, killing, murdering!"[3] He saw the suburbs burned, his friends dead or imprisoned, and his entire family either violated or killed by Russian soldiers. While Chopin's fears were certainly exaggerated – his loved ones were, in fact, quite safe – he was not altogether off the mark. Polish exiles who eventually emigrated to the United States described the crushing of the insurrection in strikingly similar terms:

> Warsaw immediately became a pandemonium of massacre, rapine and cruelty… Fathers and husbands, pinioned for the dungeon and the gallows, witnessed the dishonour of their daughters and wives. The sleeping infant attracted no compassion, and kneeling children were not spared. Similar scenes occurred in all the principal cities of the kingdom. Of the military and civil officers, great numbers were shot and hanged, hundreds of others were chained together and marched off to the mines of Siberia.[4]

This is not the only such account, but it is among the more sensationalized. Embarrassed by the number of Poles seeking refuge in foreign lands from the brutal suppression of the insurrection, Tsar Nicholas I issued a proclamation of amnesty on November 1, 1831. He had Russian agents sneak into Polish military camps in Austria and Prussia to convince Poles that the amnesty was legitimate and that they should return to their homeland.[5] Some groups of Polish soldiers stationed in Prussia were coerced into returning to the Congress Kingdom by the local Prussian authorities, and many who did not comply were discretely killed or marched to the border to be handed over to Russian troops.[6] At any rate, amnesty or not, the fate of those who returned to the Congress Kingdom or who had stayed behind was bleak. Officers who had participated in the uprising were dismissed from the army, and many were deported to the far reaches of Russia. Another 80,000 Poles, mainly rebels and the families of those who had participated in the insurgency, joined them while ordinary Polish soldiers were both incorporated into the Russian army and sent to serve in the Caucasus. Nobles implicated in the uprising had their property confiscated, and several hundred of the uprising's leaders were sentenced to death – the amnesty, admittedly, excluded the leaders, Prince Adam Czartoryski among them.[7] Many, like Czartoryski, were already in exile, so they were sentenced *in absentia*.

Perhaps equally disturbing for Poles were the imperial *ukases* (decrees) issued in rapid-fire succession after crushing the uprising. The Kingdom of Poland's Constitution was replaced by an Organic

Statute, the Sejm was abolished and stringent censorship policies were introduced. The Universities of Warsaw and Wilno were closed as well as other Polish schools, Russian became the official language of instruction, the Uniate Church was outlawed, and Russians flooded the government and educational institutions. Moreover, Nicholas ordered that homeless and orphaned Poles (children included) be deported and conscripted into the Russian army.[8] Jules Michelet perhaps best summed up this systematic procedure when he wrote:

> It was undertaken not only to kill Poland, her laws, her religion, her language, literature and national civilization, but to *kill the Poles*, to annihilate them as a race, to paralyse the very nerve of the population in order that, if it should still continue to live, it would be nothing but a herd of human creatures whence the Polish people, as a living, potentional (sic) energy, would vanish completely.[9]

What I have tried to show above is that the Polish émigrés had ample grounds for believing that in going into exile they were keeping Poland *alive*. One of the exiles, for instance, noted that emigration was "as instinctive as the autumnal migration of birds… an urge to escape destruction, and a quest for the renewal of energy and replenishment of strength."[10] Not all Poles shared his feelings, however, and they were in fact quite divided about whether or not to go into exile – this was particularly true in the Polish military camps on the borders of Prussia and Austria.[11] One of the emigrants of 1831 later opined, "[n]ot one of us, had he been able to foresee that our road was one leading to long and inglorious exile… but would have let himself be beaten to the last drop of blood, but would rather have died, than to have doomed himself voluntarily to the fate which lay in store for us."[12] Even after the uprising had been crushed, however, many still held out hope for British or French intervention, despite the evidently tepid stance taken by their respective governments vis-à-vis the Polish imbroglio.

That the defeated Poles should have remained hopeful is not all

that surprising given the extraordinary explosion of popular sympathy and support for their cause, both during the November Uprising and after it had been suppressed. Shortly after news of the uprising reached the four corners of Europe and America, pro-Polish committees began to form with the aim of funding and promoting the Polish uprising. The two most important committees at this time were the Franco-Polish committee headed by General Lafayette in Paris, and the American-Polish committee led by the American writer James Fennimore Cooper also established in Paris. As Lloyd S. Kramer has shown, Lafayette's enthusiasm for the Polish cause was largely a product of his belief that the right to nationhood is of paramount importance in the preservation of liberty – a belief that, Kramer argues, Lafayette developed as an expatriate soldier fighting in the American Revolution. He saw the world in black and white, with despotism on one side and liberty on the other. Thus, the cause of Poland was the cause of the entire "free" world:[13]

> Whenever a people or country of Europe… reclaims its rights or wants to exercise its sovereignty, any intervention by foreign governments to oppose that [action] is equivalent to a direct and formal declaration of war against France… because it is a direct attack against the principle of our existence… the justification for a future attack against us, and clearly a plan to crush our natural allies in order to destroy afterwards the germ of liberty in our midst…[14]

Lafayette was certainly not the only one who thought along these lines, though among the officials of the Orléanist government he was a rare breed. Cooper's personal investment in the Polish cause was spurred on for different reasons, however. The American writer had met the great Polish poet Adam Mickiewicz during his stay in Rome in 1830, and the two became friends. They explored Rome together, and Mickiewicz would often tell Cooper of Poland and its people. Cooper's daughter would later recall, "there was none, perhaps, whose society gave [Cooper] more pleasure than that of the distinguished Polish poet…"[15]

Though Cooper's sympathy for the Polish cause may thus have had more intimate origins than that of his fellow Americans, popular enthusiasm for the uprising in the United States was no less spirited. When news of the uprising reached New York on January 31, 1831, the American press treated it very sympathetically. Considerable space was given to the uprising in the *Globe*, the *New York American*, and the *New York Herald*, which also started a collection to aid the Poles in the uprising. It was argued in the papers that the Polish cause should be made international, and articles about Poland stood out because of their positive tone and highly informed content.[16] Odes to Poland appeared in daily newspapers, such as the following poem, which appeared in the *New York Whig* on September 15, 1831:

> Poland wakes from slavery's charm;
> Poland lifts up her ancient arm
> In her heroes' every vein,
> Poland's life blood burns again.[17]

Pro-Polish committees similar to those established in Paris began to form across the United States. They collected and sent thousands of dollars to the American-Polish and Franco-Polish committees in Paris, and the youths of Boston even purchased two standards for the Polish army – a symbol of solidarity between Poles and Americans.[18] But American interest in the uprising did not stop there. Many men volunteered to fight with the Polish army, among them Edgar Allan Poe who wrote to Colonel Thayer of the United States Army in order to obtain help in getting "an appointment in the Polish Army… in the event of the interference of France in behalf of Poland."[19] France, of course, did not declare war on Russia, and the only American who actually participated in the uprising was the surgeon Paul Fitzsimmons Eve, who joined 600 French physicians on a mission to treat wounded Poles in the Congress Kingdom.[20]

American support for the Polish cause was chiefly characterized by the symbolic ties that bound both nations together, and by the popular

belief that Poles and Americans shared a common cause – namely that of freedom. The articles supporting the uprising that appeared in American newspapers and the rhetoric of public advocates of the Polish cause were suffused with references to the great deeds of Kazimierz Pulaski and of Tadeusz Kosciuszko, who both fought on the Patriot side during the American Revolution.[21] That the two countries shared national heroes was instrumental in solidifying the amicable relationship that they shared since the late 18th century. The two aforementioned standards sent to Poland by the youths of Boston are an excellent example of this kind of binding symbolism. The first standard featured Lady Liberty on one side, with the inscription "An offering of freemen to the brave defenders of national rights." The other side of the flag depicted the death of Prince Joseph Poniatowski, with an inscription in French: "*Il vaut mieux mourir avec honneur que de se rendre*" ("It is better to die with honour than to surrender"). It also bore the names of American and Polish heroes and a picture of the Polish national emblem surrounded by Polish, French, and American flags. The second flag featured Lady Liberty giving a Polish soldier a cross and arms, surrounded by the names of the heroes of the November Uprising. Beneath this image were the words: "A token of admiration to the heroes who revived their country's glory." On the other side of the second standard there was a picture of George Washington's crossing of the Delaware River, with portraits of Washington, Lafayette and Kosciuszko. Polish, French, and American flags surrounded these images. Above the flags was the Polish national emblem with the dedication: "To the brave sons of Poland from the young men of Boston."[22]

It is clear from these symbols that American support for the Polish cause was moved by feelings of a kindred cause and a shared history. But this was not so much a national history as it was a history of liberty and freedom of peoples. And, as such, it bridged land and sea between the United States and partitioned Poland. American antipathy and distrust of Russia, however, cannot be ignored as an important factor in the conditioning of public opinion. It came second, though, to the brotherly spirit that

animated the sympathy of ordinary Americans for the Polish cause. Even in 1833, long after the suppression of the uprising, American sympathy for Poles continued to manifest itself in various and sometimes unexpected forms. For instance, Robin Carver, an author of children's books, published *Stories of Poland* in 1833, in which he encouraged youngsters to learn about Poland, because it "is the history of a brave, though an unfortunate people. It is a people now fallen but not dishonoured, scattered but not destroyed, chained but not crushed. We may yet see them a free and happy nation."[23]

News of the uprising elicited similar reactions in France as in the United States. However, in France there was a marked contrast between the reports of the moderate and of the radical press. The latter immediately proclaimed that the Polish uprising was "a new proof of the resilience of the principles of liberty and self-determination in Europe." Moreover, the French held out hope that the insurrection would usher Europe into a new campaign against the despotic powers behind the treaty of Vienna. The Franco-Polish committee, which had been formed in January 1831, managed to raise 420,000 francs by September to aid Polish insurrectionists.[24] Pamphleteers echoed Lafayette's beliefs about the shared fate of France and Poland once they received word of the uprising.[25] One of them, Lucien de Saint-Firmin, wrote, "Poland is on the road to Paris. Without the glorious revolution it has just begun, the enemy [Russia] would perhaps already be at our borders."[26] It was indeed commonly believed that the November Uprising had stayed a Russian invasion and had protected both the July Monarchy and the Belgian Revolution.[27] Moreover, Polish revolutionary conspirators in Warsaw had warned the French government of Tsar Nicholas' plans to attack France. When the Polish advanced guard marched into Prussia with the Russians bringing up the rear, it turned against the Russian army to shield the French from a likely Russian offensive.[28] The French people were, of course, very grateful for this.

It is important, however, to note that Polish émigrés operating in France prior to 1830 laid the foundations for a positive reception of the Polish Uprising. A group of Poles, including historian Leonard Chodzko,

wrote articles about the literature, history, culture, and scientific innovations of Poland. They also published articles describing the oppression of the Poles at the hands of the Russians in the Congress Kingdom.[29]

Therefore, it is not surprising that when news of the suppression of the uprising in Warsaw reached Paris on September 15, 1831, it triggered a great public outcry. Massive crowds assembled and marched on the Russian embassy crying "Down with the Russians," "War with Russia," "Vengeance," and "Long live the Poles!"[30] They also shattered many of the embassy's windows. Samuel F. B. Morse, an American artist who later invented the telegraph, was in Paris at the time and wrote the following in a letter to his brother on September 18, 1831:

> The news of the fall of Warsaw is now agitating Paris to a degree not known since the trial of the ex-ministers… The troops were assembling and bodies of infantry and cavalry were moving through the various streets… Most of the shops were also shut and the stalls deserted… [in front of the hotel of General Sebastiani] We found before the gates a great and increasing crowd… Here there was an evident intention in the crowd of doing some violence, nor was it at all doubtful what would be the object of their attack. They seemed to only wait for the darkness and for a leader.[31]

The crowd was eventually dispersed by a sword-drawn charge of carabineers. Morse's eyewitness account is supported by a slew of contemporary police bulletins that report great unrest in Paris in the days after the suppression of the Polish uprising had been announced.[32] Many prominent Frenchmen also condemned Russia's violent suppression of the uprising, including Victor Hugo, the poet Pierre-Jean de Béranger, members of the French Chambers, and, of course, Lafayette.[33]

Both the Franco-Polish committee and the American-Polish committee had previously endeavoured to support the uprising financially. Now they converted their efforts to the relief of Polish refugees who had fled the Congress Kingdom in the wake of the uprising's suppression.

Due to the weight of popular opinion, in November 1831 the French government of Périer sent 300,000 Francs to French ambassadors in Berlin, Dresden, and Vienna to ease the Poles' trip to France. The government also ordered embassies to simplify passport formalities and to facilitate by any means the movement of Poles to France.[34] Samuel Howe, a Bostonian who arrived in France after the fall of Warsaw, was sent on a relief mission to distribute 20,000 francs to Polish refugees travelling along the Prussian-Polish border.[35] Unfortunately, local authorities distributed much of the money sent to help Polish refugees in Prussia and Austria, and Poles who had chosen to return to the Congress Kingdom under Nicholas' amnesty received the majority of those funds.[36] Nevertheless, thousands of Polish refugees slowly made their way to England, Italy, and other European countries, though the bulk of them—roughly 5,000—headed to France.[37] Germans, Frenchmen, and fellow Poles greeted the emigrants as heroes everywhere they went. In Dresden, a relief committee was organized to help tend to the wounded and fund the emigration. Claudine Potocka, a Polish countess, herself raised 40,000 florins for Polish refugees in Dresden by selling what jewels she still had after the flight from the Congress Kingdom.[38] Aleksander Jelowicki, a young Polish officer accompanying Mickiewicz to Paris, even remarked that "[a] Pole could make his way from the first German town to France without a penny; in every town his needs were seen to and the [Polish national anthem] was sung to see him off."[39] The Poles, even in defeat, had become the new heroes of Europe – martyrs of liberty, the "France of the north."[40]

This outburst of support was timely, as evidence suggests that Polish refugees (even those who were well-off prior to the November Uprising) were in dire need of assistance. Mickiewicz had noted that Polish soldiers in Dresden were "trekking to France in poverty and need."[41] Because of a cholera epidemic that had started in India swept westwards through Russia and Poland, Prussian and Austrian authorities kept most of the Polish soldiers in Dresden in quarantine for four weeks. They were once again quarantined when they arrived in France before finally being permitted to

settle somewhere.[42] The French government had agreed reluctantly to grant the Polish refugees a subsidy, but it came at a cost. Poles who accepted the government subsidy were prohibited from living in Paris or even visiting the capital. They were required to live in provincial military depots left over from the Napoleonic era. Thus, Poles who had come to France to carry on their fight and plead their case for Poland in the French capital could not accept government aid. They instead had to seek out the help of Lafayette, the Franco-Polish committee, and other friendly organizations or personal acquaintances that could help them get back on their feet.[43] This could take a long time, even for members of the nobility, who did not immediately have access to their personal funds. Lafayette, at one time, even accused the Prussians of blocking the transfer of Polish funds in Berlin banks.[44] The situation of Prince Czartoryski, for instance, is illuminating. Czartoryski first went to England, where he was said to have arrived "without a servant, deprived of all property, and his whole luggage represented by a small trunk…"[45] The Russians had confiscated Czartoryski's estates, as well as those of many of his noble counterparts who had also participated in the uprising. Upon learning that the Russians had seized his estates, Czartoryski is said to have simply remarked: "[i]nstead of riding, I must walk, and instead of sumptuous fare, I must dine on buck-wheat" and, "I feel happy to be released (although in a costly and rather violent manner) from bonds by which I had been fettered, and surely I shall not return to take them again, even at the cost of all my fortune."[46] His fortunes evidently improved, however, and once in France he eventually purchased the Hotel Lambert, which became the headquarters of the liberal-aristocratic faction of the emigration and was famed for the opulent soirées held there.[47]

Mickiewicz himself was only saved from impoverishment by Aleksander Jelowicki, who had become a publisher in Paris, and offered the poet 2000 francs for volume four of his *Forefather's Eve*.[48] Other means of income for Polish aristocrats in exile included playing the stock market, while many members of the Polish army in exile entered the service of the French army and received a military salary based on

their rank.[49] Old, noble Polish families established in Paris long before the insurrection welcomed émigrés into their homes, and Lafayette himself also harboured Polish exiles, most notably Joachim Lelewel, whom Lafayette invited to stay at La Grange, one of his properties just outside of Paris.[50] Not all Poles were so fortunate, however, as poverty remained a problem for the exiled community. "Little Poland" in Paris was described as "a filthy jumble of hovels and shacks, the wretched abode of ragpickers, scrap collectors and immigrants;" by 1832 there were roughly 200 Poles living in Paris, many of them being poverty-stricken since they had evidently opted out of the government subsidy.[51]

Again, I stress that most Poles were, in the early 1830s, quite optimistic and hopeful that the French or British or both would intervene in Poland's favour, despite many Poles' bitterness that neither France nor England had done anything *during* the uprising to prevent the Russians from quashing it. Chopin wrote in his notebook: "God, shake the earth, let it swallow up the men of this age, let the heaviest chastisement fall on France, that would not come to help us."[52] When Samuel Morse asked Lafayette, after receiving the news of Warsaw's fall, if there was still hope for Poland, the latter answered: "Oh, yes! Their cause is not yet desperate; their army is safe; but the conduct of France, and more especially England, has been most pusillanimous and culpable."[53]

Unfortunately for the Poles who still held out hope for a quick turnaround, the initial enthusiasm with which they were greeted eventually petered out, as the caprices of public opinion shifted and swayed, leaving them alone with intransigent governments that were increasingly suspicious of Polish exiles. In Czartoryski's memoirs, he recorded that

> … the Liberal Government [of England], alarmed at the excitement in France and the cries of revenge for Waterloo, had come to the conclusion that the policy of England should be 'not to weaken Russia, as Europe might soon again require her services in the cause

> of order,' and to prevent Poland, whom it regarded as the natural ally of France, from becoming 'a French province on the Vistula.[54]

The French government of Louis-Philippe, not yet fully confident of its own supremacy, was equally reluctant to pledge itself to support the Polish cause. Many politicians were openly disdainful of the Poles. Adolphe Thiers thought of them as petty "adventurers," and Minister Horace Sebastiani voiced his gratefulness to the Russians for restoring "order." Many members of the aristocracy probably shared the opinion of the duchesse of Dino, Prince Talleyrand's niece: "What a host of miserable creatures… It is natural to want to shelter them, but it must be admitted that in the present state of France they can only be a new element of disorder."[55] Indeed, the French government feared the presence of "radical" Poles. They did not want help for an already strong radical movement in France. Police placed Polish refugees under surveillance as soon as they entered France, and they monitored the depots – where schools and teaching societies were formed – especially well.[56] Gisquet, a French prefect, viewed the exiles as "amateur troublemakers," who were "animated by fanaticism" and hoped "to demonstrate their ardor in a new revolution."[57] One victim of the government's fears was the historian Leonard Chodzko who was arrested on suspicion of revolutionary conspiracy on November 17, 1831; he was released 13 days later on Lafayette's insistence.[58] Chodzko was not the only Pole subjected to this kind of treatment. The French government expelled Joachim Lelewel from Paris, and eventually from France entirely, for signing an anti-Russian text.[59]

The American-Polish Committee dissolved in the summer of 1832 after running out of funds. Similarly, the Franco-Polish Committee disbanded after Lafayette passed away.[60] During their short-lived operations the committees managed to collect substantial funds to support Polish refugees wishing to settle in Europe or America. But as Roman Koropeckyj noted, from Lafayette's Franco-Polish committee to "donations of money from veterans, merchants,

workers, and schoolchildren, the Polish cause galvanized every stratum of French society, with the exception, however, of those that mattered."[61] No European country would intervene on behalf of Poland.

Poles had to rely on themselves if they were to "save Poland." But this meant something different to various groups of Poles. For the liberal-aristocratic faction that coalesced around Prince Czartoryski and the opposing radical-democratic faction that gathered around the figure of Lelewel, this meant representing the government of Poland in exile. Indeed, on November 20, 1831, Lelewel proclaimed: "We, Poles, refugees on French soil, we have not come for the sole reason of personal safety, or simply to escape our enemies; we are searching for a safe refuge to plead our case, to constitute ourselves the interpreters of the true feelings of our compatriots…"[62] But for other Poles, saving Poland meant something entirely different. The following proclamation, made on October 31, 1831, endorsed by Poles living in England, is telling in this regard:

> Poles, let us leave this unfortunate country which, although soaked with the blood of its best defenders, is at present not our own. Let us leave Europe, the cold-hearted witness of our battle and despair. America is the only country where it is worth it for people to seek asylum who sacrificed everything for the cause of freedom. There Poland will be preserved sacrosanct in our hearts and heaven will be able to bless our sacrifice.[63]

The parallels between the last sentence of this proclamation and the advice of Jean-Jacques Rousseau in his *On the Government of Poland* (1772) are rather striking:

> As matters now stand, I see only one means of giving Poland the stability it lacks, namely, to infuse into the entire nation, so to speak, the spirit of your confederates, and to establish the republic in the Poles' own hearts, so that it will live on in them despite anything your oppressors may do.[64]

Rousseau's advice would find yet another echo in the writings of a contemporary American author, who wrote that the Great Emigration kept "the sacred fire of Polish national tradition and national consciousness alive in the bosom of the Poles themselves."[65] Faced with military defeat at the hands of the Russians and diplomatic failure in a sympathetic but immobile Europe, Poles searched for alternative ways to keep Poland alive. It is no wonder that Poles looked to the music of Chopin and the poetry of the Three Bards of Poland – Mickiewicz, Slowacki and Krasinski – as the sacred arks of Polish culture and identity. These, certainly, the Russians could not destroy! Thus, just as a great many Polish refugees had once written to Lafayette seeking advice, protection or encouragement, others – those in the Besançon depot, for instance – wrote gratefully to Mickiewicz, affirming that he had come to France "to gild hearts longing for the Fatherland with the star of hope," who, "God willing, will before long strike the heavens with a hymn of thanksgiving for the good fortunes of peoples."[66] Mickiewicz himself sincerely thought of his literary work as a continuation of the war but abhorred émigré politics, which he described as a "wound… festering with maggots."[67] According to Robert Vlach, Mickiewicz expressly wrote *The Book of the Polish Nation* and *The Book of the Polish Pilgrimage* with the purpose of offering spiritual and moral support to Polish exiles.[68] Indeed, in his later poetry, Mickiewicz expanded on the messianic role of the Polish Nation, which was to lead the tyrannized peoples of the world to freedom. The thought of such a divine mission was of great succour to many Polish refugees and helped to sustain them in exile.[69] A. P. Coleman reaffirms this: "The poets of the Emigration… gave their fellow countrymen spiritual nourishment in an era when, if they had lacked it, they might have been tempted to abandon their lease on national immortality."[70]

Similarly, many people viewed Chopin's music as the musical incarnation of the Polish condition, although this was probably not the composer's intention. Poles appropriated his work and gave it a national character. Poles were particularly sensitive at this time to the

Herdian theories that accounted for the concept of "national art."[71] Some even identified the sorrowful sound of Chopin's music with the sad fate of the Polish nation.[72] Whether Chopin intended his music to become such a powerful rallying point for Polish nationalism is doubtful. But this does not alter the fact that Poles *did* look to his compositions for moral and spiritual support, just as they drew from Mickiewicz's poetry the conviction that all was not lost for Poland — not just a territory or state but, first and foremost, an *identity*.

Czartoryski and his political coterie were, of course, not oblivious to the powerful influence of culture on the minds and national faith of Polish exiles, so he founded the Polish Literary Society alongside other efforts, such as annual bazaars held for Polish refugees, the founding of the Charitable Society of Polish Ladies, and the Polish Polytechnical Society.[73] Moreover, culture was of great importance in holding the Polish exile community together in the wake of political fragmentation. To borrow an image of Sokolniki's, the Polish emigration woke from a dream of unity and fraternity to find that opposing factions left it helplessly fettered. The Great Emigration nevertheless largely succeeded in keeping Poland alive not only in the hearts and minds of Poles but also in the hearts and minds of many of Europeans and Americans — even if it was often overshadowed and only thereafter enkindled in times of crisis and revolt. In other words, the Polish exiles helped to preserve Poland and its culture from extinction, contrary to the wishes of Tsar Nicholas. If anything, the November Uprising and subsequent Great Emigration only strengthened Polish national consciousness, henceforth governed for almost two centuries by an earnest longing for the "days of Poland's *freedom*" — in every sense of the word.

Notes

1. This is an example of one of many *Polenlieder* (Songs of Poland) that were written in Germany shortly after the suppression of the November Uprising in Poland. See, Norman Davies, *God's Playground: A History of Poland, Volume II* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1982), 328-329.

2. Lloyd S. Kramer, "The Rights of Man: Lafayette and the Polish National Revolution, 1830-1834", in *French Historical Studies*, Vol. 14, No. 4 (Autumn 1986): 526.

3. Frédéric Chopin, *Chopin's Letters*, comp. Henryk Opienski and trans. E. L. Voynich (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1931), 149.

4. Quoted in Jerzy Jan Lerski, *A Polish Chapter in Jacksonian America: The United States and the Polish Exiles of 1831* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1958), 8.

5. Michel Sokolniki, *Les Origines de l'Émigration Polonaise en France, 1831-1832* (Paris: Félix Alcan, 1910), 145-146, and Lerski, 9.

6. Sokolniki, 145-146.

7. Historians differ over the number of Poles that were deported, and over the number of those sentenced to death; see Norman Davies, 331, R. F. Leslie, *Polish Politics and the Revolution of November 1830* (Bristol: The Athlone Press, 1956), 260, 267, M. Kukiel, *Czartoryski and European Unity, 1770-1861* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1955), 193, and Lerski, 8.

8. Lerski, 7-8.

9. Ibid., 8.

10. Ibid.

11. Sokolniki, 142-143.

12. Quoted in A. P. Coleman, "The Great Emigration," in *The Cambridge History of Poland: From Augustus to Pilsudski*, ed. W. F. Reddaway, et al. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1941), 311.

13. Lloyd S. Kramer, "The Rights of Man: Lafayette and the Polish National Revolution, 1830-1834," in *French Historical Studies*, Vol. 14, No. 4 (Autumn 1986): 526.

14. Ibid., 529.

15. Quoted in Roman Koropeckyj, *Adam Mickiewicz: The Life of a Romantic* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2008), 138.

16. Florian Stasik, *Polish Political Emigrés in the United States of America, 1831-1864*, trans. Eugene Podraza (New York: Columbia University Press, 2002), 6-7.

17. Quoted in Lerski, 25.

18. Stasik, 9-11, and Lerski, 19-23.

19. Quoted in Lerski, 18.

20. Stasik, 12.

21. Ibid., 6.

22. Lerski, 24.

23. Quoted in ibid., 26.

24. Kramer, 532, and Lerski, 6.

25. Mark Brown, "The Comité Franco-Polonais and the French Reaction to the Polish Uprising of November 1830," in *The English Historical Review*, Vol. 93, No. 369 (October 1978): 776-777.

26. Quoted in ibid., 777. (Translation is the author's own)

27. Kenneth F. Lewalski, "Fraternal Politics: Polish and European Radicalism during the Great Emigration," in *Polish Democratic Thought from the Renaissance to the Great Emigration and Documents*, ed. M. B. Biskupski and James S. Pula (New York: Columbia University Press, 1990), 99-100; Coleman, 311.

28. Lerski, 5-6, and Kukiel, 180.

29. Brown, 777-778.

30. Quoted in William G. Atwood, *The Parisian World of Frédéric Chopin* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999), 42.

31. Samuel F. B. Morse, *His Letters and Journals, Vol. I*, ed. Edward Lind Morse (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1914), 409-410.

32. Kramer, 528.

33. Atwood, 42.

34. Sokolniki, 149.

35. Kramer, 542.

36. Sokolniki, 149.

37. Lewalski, 94.

38. Joseph Straszewicz, *Les Polonais et les Polonaises de la Révolution du 29 novembre 1830* (Paris, 1832), 56, Coleman, 318, Koropeckyj, 169, 180, and Lerski, 11.

39. Quoted in Koropeckyj, 182.

40. Brown, 787.

41. Quoted in Koropeckyj, 169.

42. Atwood, 44, Lewalski, 94, and Sokolniki, 143.

43. Kramer, 533, Koropeckyj, 186, and Atwood, 46.

44. Kramer, 530-532.

45. Adam Czartoryski, *Memoirs, Prince Adam Czartoryski and his*

Correspondence with Alexander I, ed. Adam Gielgud (Orono, ME: Academic International, 1968), 321.

46. Quoted in James Fletcher, *The History of Poland from the Earliest Period to the Present Time* (London: Cochrane and Pickersgill, 1831), 420, and Kukiel, 194.

47. Atwood, 54.

48. Koropeckyj, 192.

49. Sokolniki, 99, and Atwood, 45.

50. Kramer, 337-338, and Sokolniki, 74.

51. Coleman, 313, and Atwood, 46.

52. Chopin, 149.

53. Morse, 408.

54. Czartoryski, 317.

55. Quoted in Atwood, 42-43.

56. Sokolniki, 103-104, 189, 196-197.

57. Quoted in Kramer, 528.

58. Sokolniki, 103-104.

59. Kramer, 537-538.

60. Ibid., 543.

61. Koropeckyj, 161.

62. Quoted in Sokolniki, 127. (Translation is the author's own.)

63. Quoted in Stasik, 15-16.

64. Jean-Jacques Rousseau, *On the Government of Poland*, trans. Willmoore Kendall (Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company, 1985), 10.

65. Quoted in Lerski, 10.

66. Quoted in Koropeckyj, 188. See also, Kramer, 535.

67. Quoted in ibid., 202.

68. Robert Vlach, *L'exil et le poète: essai sur la psychologie de l'exil dans l'oeuvre d'Adam Mickiewicz* (New York: Czech Cultural Council Abroad, 1958), 86.

69. Atwood, 58.

70. Coleman, 321.

71. Zofia Chechlinska, "Chopin's Reception as Reflected in Nineteenth-Century Polish Periodicals: General Remarks," in *The Age of Chopin: Interdisciplinary Inquiries*, ed. Halina Goldberg (Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 2004), 247-256.

72. Maja Trochimczyk, "Chopin and the 'Polish Race'" in ibid, 288-291, and Atwood, 57.

73. Ibid, 50, and Kukiel, 215.

74. Sokolniki, 197-198.

Works Cited

Atwood, William G. *The Parisian World of Frédéric Chopin*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999.

Atwood, William G. *Fryderyk Chopin: Pianist from Warsaw*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1987.

Brown, Mark. "The Comité Franco-Polonais and the French Reaction to the Polish Uprising of November 1830." In *The English Historical Review*, Vol. 93, No. 369 (October 1978): 774-793.

Chopin, Frédéric. *Chopin's Letters*. Collected by Henryk Opienski and translated by E. L. Voynich. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1931.

Czartoryski, Adam. *Memoirs, Prince Adam Czartoryski and his Correspondence with Alexander I.* Edited by Adam Gielgud. Orono, ME: Academic International, 1968.

Coleman, A. P. "The Great Emigration." In *The Cambridge History of Poland: From Augustus to Pilsudski.* Edited by W. F. Reddaway, J. H. Penson, O. Halecki and R. Dyboski, 311-323. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1941.

Davies, Norman. *God's Playground: A History of Poland*, *Volume II*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1982.

Fletcher, James. *The History of Poland from the Earliest Period to the Present Time*. London: Cochrane and Pickersgill, 1831.

Koropeckyj, Roman. *Adam Mickiewicz: The Life of a Romantic*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2008.

Kramer, Lloyd S. "The Rights of Man: Lafayette and the Polish National Revolution, 1830-1834". In *French Historical Studies*, Vol. 14, No. 4 (Autumn 1986): 521-546.

Kukiel, M. *Czartoryski and European Unity, 1770-1861*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1955.

Leslie, R. F. *Polish Politics and the Revolution of November 1830*. Bristol: The Athlone Press, 1956.

Lerski, Jerzy Jan. *A Polish Chapter in Jacksonian America: The United States and the Polish Exiles of 1831*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1958.

Lewalski, Kenneth F. "Fraternal Politics: Polish and European Radicalism during the Great Emigration." In *Polish Democratic Thought from the Renaissance to the Great Emigration and Documents*. Edited by M. B. Biskupski and James S. Pula, 93-108. New York: Columbia University Press, 1990.

Morse, Samuel F. B. *His Letters and Journals*, *Volume I*. Edited by Edward Lind Morse. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1914.

Pekacz, Jolanta T. "Deconstructing a "National Composer": Chopin and the Polish Exiles in Paris, 1831-49." In *19th- Century Music*, Vol. 24, No. 2 (Autumn 2000): 161-172.

Rousseau, Jean-Jacques. *On the Government of Poland*. Translated by Willmoore Kendall. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company, 1985.

Sokolniki, Michel. *Les Origines de l'Émigration Polonaise en France, 1831-1832*. Paris: Félix Alcan, 1910.

Straszewicz, Joseph. *Les Polonais et les Polonaises de la Révolution du 29 novembre 1830.* Paris, 1832.

Stasik, Florian. *Polish Political Emigrés in the United States of America, 1831-1864*. Translated by Eugene Podraza. New York: Columbia University Press, 2002.

Vlach, Robert. *L'exil et le poète*: *essai sur la psychologie de l'exil dans l'oeuvre d'Adam Mickiewicz*. New York: Czech Cultural Council Abroad, 1958.

The Jerusalem Swimming Pool Controversy, 1958: Orthodox Jews, Secular Nationalists, and Conceptions of Sacred Space

Vanessa Fernando

In his essay "Invention, Memory and Place," postcolonial theorist Edward Said refers to Jerusalem as "a city, an idea, an entire history… over-determined when it comes to memory, as well as all sorts of invented histories and traditions[.]"[1] Jerusalem, a location which Islam, Christianity, and Judaism believe to be sacred, is imbued with symbolic meaning. Within Judaism, there are competing narratives about the conceptualization of Jerusalem, as well as the state of Israel as a whole. For secular nationalists, the land of Israel represents Zion, the homeland. Jerusalem is important for them because it represents a return from Babylonian exile.[2] For Orthodox Jews, however, Jerusalem is conceptualized as a space in which Jewish life can be fully realized through adherence to the commandments set forth in the Hebrew Bible.[3] Although Orthodox Jews also want a return to the homeland, certain strands of Orthodox thought maintain that this return must take place according to God's will, and should not be a secular nationalist project.

In her 2003 work *Gender and Israeli Society: Women's Time*, Israeli intellectual Hannah Naveh argues that, in many socio-historical contexts, "women serve to signify the sites where the social boundaries of the collective are negotiated and fought."[4] Debates around the character of Israel are often coded in gendered terms. Whereas secular nationalists build on the idea of the 'liberated, modern' women in order to frame Israel as a modern, legitimate state, Orthodox women are to abide by the proper codes of behaviour outlined in the Halakah, the complete body of Jewish law. This is in order to preserve their

modesty, or else risk being accused of desecrating the holy land of Jerusalem.[5] As such, women's bodies are seen as crucial terrain on which community and national boundaries are both preserved and contested.

From April to September of 1958, a controversy between Orthodox Jewish communities, Anglican missionaries and administrators, and secular Zionists, took place in Jerusalem over the building of a co-ed swimming pool. Orthodox Jews protested the building of a co-ed swimming pool on the former Bishop Gobat School playing field in Greek Colony, Jerusalem, land owned by the Anglican Church Missionary Society.[6] Protestors argued that a mixed bathing facility needed to be resisted because it could ultimately jeopardize the sacredness of the land itself, as well as the morality of the community.[7] This debate illustrates the way in which different views about the centrality of religion in society manifested itself onto women's bodies.

According to Rev. Canon Wittenbach, the Church Missionary Society's East Asia Secretary from 1947-1957, discussions concerning the construction of this pool began in 1956, with its plans subsequently approved by the Orthodox-controlled municipality shortly thereafter.[8] Public outcry surrounding the pool, however, did not arise until 1958.[9] A July 28, 1958 letter from Rabbi Dr. Soloman Schonfeld, a member of the Union of Orthodox Hebrew Congregations, suggests that the initial approval of the plan was made without fully understanding that the pool would be co-ed. Rabbi Dr. Schonfeld states that "[w]hen the permit of the Jerusalem Town Council was originally given, the members were unsure of the real character of the proposed use" because "[i]t may have been hidden away in verbose circumlocution."[10] This debate brings to light underlying tensions around women's access to public spaces. Concerns surrounding men and women bathing together reveal deeply-rooted fears within the Orthodox Jewish community; fears of essentially being marginalized in a secular majority Israeli state. This paper will examine the swimming pool debate as a lens through which to view the tensions between secular nationalists and the Orthodox religious community

in Jerusalem in 1958. It will argue that giving women access to public spaces was simply seen as a continuation of gender transgressions imposed on the Orthodox community by the secular Israeli state.

Sources

The primary sources used in this paper were found in the Church Missionary Society Archives from their Palestine Mission, in operation from 1935 to 1959. The first permanent Church Missionary Society station in Jerusalem was established in 1833. Originally Anglo-Prussian, the Church Missionary Society became completely Anglican in 1887 and was based at the Cathedral Church of St. George in Jerusalem.[11] By 1910, the Church Missionary Society's activities had spread to Jaffa, Nazareth, and Transjordan. In addition to buying and renting out land, the Mission operated in hospitals and educational institutions.[12] The sources used are of internal correspondences between Church Missionary Society employees and clerical authorities as well as letters and telegrams from representatives of Orthodox and religious organizations, and newspaper articles from both the *Jewish Chronicle* and the *New York Times*.

In analyzing these sources, certain limitations do appear. These sources are primarily conversations between a select few, particularly Rabbi Dr. Schonfeld, the Presiding Rabbi of the Union of Orthodox Hebrew Congregations of Great Britain and the Commonwealth, Rabbi P. Epstein, the Chief of the Orthodox Rabbinical Tribunal, Rev. Canon Wittenbach, East Asian Secretary of the Church Missionary Society, and Archbishop Campbell of Jerusalem. The majority of the correspondences are from the point of view of men who present themselves as prominent leaders of the Orthodox community. None of the sources being used directly feature the voices of those in less prominent positions or those whose views may have been marginalized. Further, despite this debate being centered around the presence of female bodies in public spaces, none of the sources feature the voices or perspectives of either Orthodox or secular women. This absence is striking, considering the strong discursive presence of women in the debate.

"[Putting] the nation in place of G-d"[13]: The Labour Zionist Project

An unsigned "Memorandum on the proposed establishment of a lido in the Holy City," dated April 10, 1958, describes secular nationalists and Orthodox men and women as having fundamentally incompatible interpretations of Israel's character and purpose: "[t]he conflict between Judaism and secular nationalism has persisted ever since the Zionist movement first emerged," the author claims.[14] Zionism is described as having originated from a religious Jewish framework. Rather than upholding Jewish life, however, Zionism has "[secularized] Jewish life and [deprived] it of the beliefs and practices cherished . . . throughout generations" by "[putting] the nation in place of G-d[.]"[15]

Zionism emerged in the nineteenth century as a result of the persecution Jews faced in Europe.[16] Theodor Herzl, one of the founders of political Zionism, spurned the assimilationist techniques historically used by Jews living in the Diaspora. Herzl argued that no matter how much Jews tried to conform, they would still be the targets of persecution, as praying for salvation would not be adequate to confront the anti-Semitism they faced.[17] A largely secular project, early Zionism sought to move away from the religious approach of awaiting salvation, advocating instead for a Jewish national home that would truly end anti-Semitism.[18] Thus, Herzl believed in "[keeping] . . . priests within the confines of their temples . . . [and keeping the] professional army within the confines of their barracks."[19]

The Labor Zionist party, Mapai-Mifleget Paolei Eretz Israel (The Land of Israel Workers' Party), was dominant in Jewish nationalist politics from 1933 to 1977.[20] Since its inception, the Labor Zionist movement wanted to provide a homeland for Jews who believed in secular socialist principles.[21] The Labour Zionists rejected religious frameworks on the basis of socialist analyses of the hierarchical nature of religious structures, and out of a belief that being Jewish was a national and cultural identification rather than necessarily a religious affiliation.[22] Both political Zionist and Labor Zionist frameworks distanced themselves from the notion that life should be lived

in close accordance with the commandments set forth in the Hebrew Bible.

Secular nationalist Jews had a variety of attitudes towards those subscribing to Orthodox religious beliefs. Some secular Jews conceived Orthodox Jews as, in the words of political scientist Yaacov Yadgar, "zealous…exaggerated and unrealistic" believers who refused to adapt to the push for secular modernization.[23] In "Discourses of Negotiation: The Writing of Orthodox Women in Israel," Tsila Ratner states that many secular Israelis perceived the world of Orthodox Jews as "closed and exclusive…excluded and inaccessible."[24] The sense of inaccessibility Ratner describes, however, also sparked curiosity to explore the inner world of the Orthodox community.[25] Moreover, Orthodox lives were commonly romanticized, as they could be seen as representing "a model of Jewish life" in the eyes of some less observant Jews.[26] Further, Shafir and Peled argue that the religious status of Orthodox Jews' gave legitimacy to the claim for a Homeland based on Jewish identity and, consequently, the colonization leading to the foundation of the state of Israel.[27] Secular perceptions of Orthodox Jews varied considerably, depending on how the national/ethnic boundaries were conceptualized. They could be seen as 'Other' (to be exoticized and romanticized), but also as common members of a shared Jewish community.

Orthodox Jewish Conceptions of the State

For Orthodox Jews, the founding of the state of Israel gave rise to mixed emotions. Although Orthodox Jews had long hoped for a return to Zion, many believed that this return could not be brought about by a secular political movement.[28] Some Orthodox Jews supported the founding of Israel as a way to provide a homeland for Jews, especially in the wake of the Holocaust while others feared that their religious beliefs would be threatened in a secularly dominated civil society.[29] The Orthodox ideal of the Jewish homeland is based in the teachings of the Torah. In the opinion of Israeli politician Zalman Abramov, an independent government in

Israel should take the form of a theocracy ruled by God, as an expression of his will, and should be based in the values of justice and compassion.[30] Abramov further argues that inhabitants of this theocracy should be careful to behave in accordance with the precepts outlined in the Halakah.[31] He concludes that Jews must obey God's commandments by conforming to *mitzvot* (precepts) that detail proper actions.[32] As such, Orthodox Jews' ultimate allegiance should be to God, rather than to a secular head of state.

As citizens of Israel and observant Jews, members of the Orthodox community had to negotiate when to perform their civic duties as members of the state and when to give priority to their religious observance. Whether or not to work on the Sabbath, for example, provided an obstacle.[33] Anthropologist Tamar El-Or describes the negotiations Orthodox Jews faced by living surrounded by secular Jews as "the central dilemma of their lives."[34] Secular Jews, in relation to Orthodox Jews, are "brothers and renegades, partners and traitors, allies and enemies."[35] When places of leisure, such as museums and entertainment houses, remained open on the Sabbath, this was viewed by the Orthodox community as a perversion of the holy day. It was a compromise that they were forced to live with as citizens of Israel and yet it could be experienced as profoundly distasteful, particularly coming from those who nonetheless identified themselves as Jews.[36] These negotiations are important to note when looking at the swimming pool debate.

In order to prevent the opening of the pool, Rabbi Dr. Schonfeld proposed, in May of 1958, that the Union of Orthodox Hebrew Congregations buy out the present lessee by compensating him for the sum he spent on the land.[37] The Union, however, was unable to raise enough money to do so, leading the land to be sold to the Mapai party. [38] The religious leaders thus lost an opportunity to control the contested land. In an attempt to avoid offending Orthodox sensibilities, the Labor Zionist buyers promised to build a boundary wall around the pool, but Rabbi Dr. Schonfeld was not convinced that this would be adhered to. In a July 28, 1958 letter to the Archbishop of Jerusalem,

Rabbi Dr. Schonfeld revealed his mistrust for secular Jews, stating that:

> [t]hey may promise to have a high boundary wall, but it will not be fully implemented and in due course may disappear. They may undertake to prohibit exit in bathing dress- but it will be quite outside their power to enforce any such restrictions. They may even give assurances concerning Saturday closing- but unfortunately we know that where there are no strong Sabbatarian convictions the pull of a balanced budget and of profits must soon lead to circumvention of Sabbath laws.[39]

For Rabbi Dr. Schonfeld, secular Jews are ultimately concerned with personal profit, not with religious observance. He concludes that their lack of faith undermines their credibility, and they are portrayed in this letter as likely to go back on their word.

Rabbi Dr. Schonfeld's uncertainty concerning the secular government's commitment to safeguarding religious beliefs seems justified considering that Gershon Agron, Mayor of Jerusalem from 1955-1959, is quoted in the Jewish Chronicle as saying the swimming pool controversy "has nothing to do with the Municipality."[40] The government's only concern, he says, is that the leaseholders comply by the building licensing regulations.[41] It is important to note that addressing the concerns of the Orthodox community was not a priority for Jerusalem's mayor. Agron's comments show that Orthodox Jews and the secular government did not share priorities concerning appropriate gender interactions, religious observance, and use of public spaces.

Orthodox Persecution in a Jewish State?

On July 31, 1958, a co-ed swimming pool opened in the Greek Colony neighbourhood of Jerusalem.[42] Representatives of local religious Orthodox communities interpreted the building of the co-ed swimming pool as the latest of a long series of affronts against religious practice in the city. Six days prior, individuals identifying themselves as representatives

of the Orthodox Ashkenasic Community Admon Street sent a telegram to the Church Missionary Society authorities in London, describing a protest that had occurred against the opening of the pool. Members of the religious Orthodox community, led by Chief Rabbi Epstein of the Orthodox Rabbinical Tribunal, had gathered at a public square near the proposed location of the pool and had "arranged mourning prayers all sitting on the earth and weeping[.]"[43] The Church Missionary Society representatives who received the letter were not surprised, as protests against the swimming pool had been taking place since April of 1958.[44]

Correspondence from Orthodox leaders states that the Israeli authorities harshly penalized the protestors. An undated letter from the Central Keren Hatorah Committee petitioned benevolent "friend[s]" to donate money to the families of "twenty-two rabbis and Yeshivah students" who were imprisoned by the Israeli state for between four to nine months "for alleged unlawful assembly."[45] The imprisonment of the protestors, who were rabbis and religious students, re-enforced the religious Orthodox sentiment of being specifically targeted and persecuted by the secular state.[46] In a New York Times article, Chaim Roth, Executive Vice President of the National Committee for Freedom of Religion in Israel, claimed that the arrested protestors, some of them "[e]minent rabbis[,]" were kept in jail with "common criminals" and denied access to kosher food.[47] These rabbis are described as "innocent victims of the war against religion" that, Roth alleged, is being fought by the secular state.[48] Public letters of prominent rabbis' subsequently elevated the protestors to the status of "people of outstanding scholarship and piety" who had "[suffered] prosecution and mishandling for defending selflessly the holiness of Jerusalem[.]"[49] The conflict over the opening of the swimming pool was thus linked to a larger struggle over the place of religion in the State of Israel, a struggle rooted in the foundations of Zionist thought.

Jerusalem as Sacred Space

The swimming pool debate is a negotiation centered around which group has the right to define the nature of space in the state of Israel. It is a conversation concerned with the conceptualization of Jerusalem as holy geography, and what that entails in terms of appropriate use of space, which has been presumed sacred. Due to differing religious affiliations, secular nationalists and Orthodox believers have different conceptions regarding to whom citizens should be held accountable. While the secular mayor promotes bylaws, the religious rabbis promote God's will.

This swimming pool debate reveals the Rabbis' deep fear that Jerusalem's sanctity will be jeopardized by increased secularism. Questions that need to be asked, however, are: to what degree is Jerusalem sacred, and in what ways would the swimming pool threaten this sacred status? In her 2002 piece "Jerusalem: The problems and responsibilities of sacred space," Karen Armstrong describes sacred space as "not simply dictated by strategic or economic considerations," but rather as representing a devotion "rooted deeply in the human psyche."[50] A physical space comes to symbolize a vision of the past that is seen as harmonious and whole.[51] The sacredness of Jerusalem, for Jews, is not necessarily rooted in textual justifications. It is not explicitly mentioned in the Torah, and is only mentioned as enemy soil in Joshua and Judges.[52] Regardless, Armstrong argues that Jerusalem became central to Jewish self-conception and belief following its destruction in 586 BC by Ancient Babylonia King, Nebuchadnezzar. It was at this point that many Israelites were sent into exile.[53] Thus, Jerusalem's symbolic importance is intrinsically linked with its destruction and loss, as well as with the lasting desire to return from exile.[54]

Jerusalem's sanctity is a matter of daily negotiation. According to Jewish scripture, Jerusalem's value is determined by its inhabitants' behavior.[55] This fact helps explain why the construction of a co-ed swimming pool is threatening to the overarching sanctity of Jerusalem. Furthermore, Armstrong argues that in Jewish tradition, objects are made sacred through

their separation. The Hebrew word for 'holy', *kaddosh*, in fact means 'separate'; this principle is applied through separating milk and meat, Jews and gentiles, men and women.[56] A co-ed swimming pool thus threatens morality at its core by bringing together that which must be kept separate.

Through a Gendered Lens: Women's Bodies and Public Space

Chaim Roth links the swimming pool issue with other instances of perceived gender transgression in Israel, specifically the conscription of women. He states that

> [t]he sole purpose of forcing women into the army is to achieve the collapse of all religious values… Now, to the endless list of oppression and encroachment, the Israeli authorities have added a new injury to religion: an open air swimming pool for both sexes in the streets of Jerusalem.[57]

For Roth, the issue does not only relate to the particular use of the land. It is about competing conceptions of gender, linked to anxieties around the religious character of the state.[58] In Israel, both secular and Orthodox discourses concerning the state take place around the concept of female bodies, and the ways in which they must be regulated and contained.

Israel's secular nationalistic narrative prides itself on its adherence to Western conceptions of gender equality.[59] Women in Israel were conscripted into the army with the Defense Service Law of 1949 and equality formally enshrined with the Equal Rights for Women Law of 1951.[60] Nevertheless, the image of Israel as a champion for women's liberation remains problematic. It neglects the struggles women fought in order to win equality rights for themselves.[61] Further, although these rights were formally ratified, one cannot take for granted that they necessarily translate into a more positive social position. In her 2008 article "Re/visioning the women's movement in Israel," sociologist Hanna Herzog argues that women's rights in fact declined following the passing of these

laws because they stifled feminist critiques and, in a heated political context where demographics played a large role, valorized reproduction and child-rearing as the most important ways for women to gain status and participate in civil society.[62] Thus, secular nationalist discourse around women's rights must be viewed critically to disparage superficial claims of equality that serve to mask deeply rooted gender-based inequalities.

The bodies of Orthodox Jewish women are further used in imagining and policing community and state boundaries. In the eyes of many secular Jews, Orthodox women represent an oppressed, homebound femininity, with no sense of agency.[63] For example, Yadgar argues that discrimination against women exists in Israel, but it is rooted in the particular religious norms of the Orthodox community rather than in Judaism in general.[64] Despite the difference in sex role organization between Orthodox and secular communities, however, it would be false to say that Orthodox women are 'more oppressed' than secular Jewish women or that they lack agency. In *Next Year I Will Know More: Literacy and Identity among Young Orthodox Women in Israel*, Tamar El-Or argues that, in Western societies, there appears to be gender equality, however this discourse simply masks underlying inequalities. Nevertheless, in the Orthodox community, an explicit differentiation between male and female roles does not mean that women are uniformly oppressed victims, but rather it is women that exercise their agency in daily life through complex negotiations with their gendered roles.[65]

Gendering Orthodox Conceptions of Modesty

Anthropologist Rhonda Berger-Sofer, who studies the women of Ha'eda Haharedit in the devout Mea She'arim neighbourhood of Jerusalem, argues that the boundaries between the religious and the profane are negotiated through the bodies of women.[66] She argues that this is because women come into more frequent contact with the profane secular world, and maintaining modesty rules around women's dress

and actions is a way to ensure that women stay unsullied by outside contact.[67] This cannot be dismissed as an instance of an ideology being imposed on women by a patriarchal structure. Women themselves enforce modesty norms because they are invested in their meaning, whether religious, familial, or communal, as well as because they are invested in the status that comes along with adhering to these norms. Boundaries around modest dress and behavior are a product of an Orthodox Jewish world that is actively trying to turn away from the secular mainstream.

The Orthodox conception of modesty is broad and encompassing.[68] El-Or describes modesty as "the basic, broadest, and most inclusive standard of a woman's behavior."[69] It is broad because it can be applied to virtually any sphere of life. Modesty is "an efficient and important tool" in regulating women's behaviour both externally and internally, because adhering to the rules of modesty is associated with an enhanced social status.[70] Women's worth in the Orthodox community is based upon their ability to behave in ways that align with God's precepts, rather than on sexual appeal.[71] According to the Halakah, remaining modest entails living a lifestyle without luxuries, as well as covering one's hair with a wig or kerchief,[72] dressing in long sleeves, long skirts, and dresses instead of pants,[73] as well as educating one's children to do the same.[74] If women fail to do so, their reputation will be negatively affected.[75] Modesty provides a way to police women's behaviour and women's appearances. Loss of morality is both a threat that can be deployed to keep women's behaviour in line and a standard by which women can judge one another.[76]

The objection to the opening of the co-ed pool rests on the ground of "immodesty," due to the fact that the pool would involve "public undress."[77] The instances when male and female bodies can be viewed, especially in proximity to one another, must be regulated. Any attempt to breach these barriers is perceived as a threat to modesty and therefore to sanctity. As Roth states, "a massive ruination of public morality is taking place," with Israel's decision to draft women into the army, meaning that "Jewish girls are being trained to a mode of life where religion and morality

count for nothing."[78] In the opinion of Orthodox believers, the opening of the pool is seen as merely the latest in ongoing secular nationalist attempts at compromising the morality of the Jewish community.

Maintaining modest behaviour would be important not only for the current state of the community, but to avoid corrupting subsequent generations as well. Bringing male and female bodies into contact in an unsanctioned way would risk "the spreading of atheism and irreligiousness, vice and immoralisation of the youth," which Roth argues would "[set] a bad example to the world."[79] Within the Orthodox view, Jewish youth risk being corrupted through conscription, as well as by popular entertainment. Roth argues that the morality of Orthodox youth is slowly being eroded by these negative influences, demonstrated by "statistics of crimes and particularly of sexual crimes."[80] The reference to sexual crime explicitly illustrates the connection between loss of morality, disintegration of the social fabric, and the need to regulate female bodies and sexualities. The nature of the sexual crimes in question is not specified here, but one can assume that Roth is referring to anything from adultery to sexual assault. The underlying fear is that any disruption to the segregation of the gender order will result in violence, loss of morality, and disorder, all of which must be avoided at all costs. Women therefore have a responsibility not only to control their own bodies and their own urges, but to teach morality to their own children so that they will not be seduced by secularizing forces that threaten the community as a whole.

Conclusion

Taking place in a land loaded with sacred meaning, the debate around the opening of a co-ed swimming pool serves as a microcosm for larger tensions regarding the nature of the state of Israel itself. In order to gain legitimacy internationally, Israel claimed to promote women's rights by allowing women to join the army, bathe in co-ed facilities, and vote. Orthodox communities in Jerusalem, however, perceive these actions as jeopardizing men and women's ability to live

in accordance with the will of God. Orthodox communities associate gender demarcations with the maintenance of morality, which are held as particularly important, given the close proximity and political dominance of secular Zionists. Nevertheless, in the swimming pool debate, these codes of morality came into conflict with the secular desire to integrate male and female bodies within public spaces. Thus, the debate reveals two opposing conceptions of the then newly founded Jewish state. Should Israel be a secular and modernizing nation state, grounded in equal participation within a secular civic society? Or should its Jewish character be expressed in religious terms, by creating a context in which observant Jews can live in full accordance with their religious beliefs?

Furthermore, despite the centrality of gender distinctions in the Orthodox community, there are no women's voices in the Church Missionary Society sources. As such, the extent to which women were themselves invested in gaining access to the public space of the mixed bathing pool remains unknown. However, the fact that the presence of their bodies could be seen as jeopardizing the sanctity of a space, and the efforts expended to keep the genders separate, demonstrates the power imbued within the Orthodox female role. Lastly, Orthodox notions of modesty could be used in ways that constrained women's activities. For women themselves, however, taking part in these sacred rituals could also be an immense site for feelings of self-worth, spiritual meaning, and community belonging. The complex relationship that Orthodox women maintain with their own religious beliefs reveals women's agency in interpreting their own realities.

Notes

1. Edward W. Said, "Invention, Memory, and Place," *Critical Inquiry*, Vol. 26, No. 2 (2000): 180.

2. Gershon Shafir and Yoav Peled, *Being Israeli: The Dynamics of Multiple Citizenship* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 137-138.

3. S. Zalman Abramov, *Perpetual Dilemma: Jewish Religion in the Jewish State* (Cranbury, New Jersey: Associated University Presses, 1976), 12.

4. Hannah Naveh, ed. *Gender and Israeli Society: Women's Time* (London, Portland: Vallentine Mitchell, 2003), 8.

5. Tamar El-Or, *Educated and Ignorant: Ultraorthodox Jewish Women and Their World*, trans. Haim Watzman (Boulder and London: Lynne Rienner, 1994), 197.

6. "Orthodox Jews Picket White House: Israel's Alleged 'Anti-Religious' Campaign," *The Jewish Chronicle*, 32, July 27, 1958, Reel 3, Church Missionary Society Archive, Section IX. (Oxfordshire: Adam Matthew Publications, 2009).

7. "Memorandum on the proposed establishment of a lido in the Holy City," April 10 1958, Reel 3, Church Missionary Society Archive, Section IX. (Oxfordshire: Adam Matthew Publications, 2009).

8. Campbell, Archbishop in Jerusalem to Rev. Canon Harry Wittenbach, Letter, May 3 1958, Reel 3, Church Missionary Society Archive, Section IX. (Oxfordshire: Adam Matthew Publications, 2009).

9. Canon Wittenbach to the Archbishop in Jerusalem, Letter, May 2 1958, Reel 3, Church Missionary Society Archive, Section IX. (Oxfordshire: Adam Matthew Publications, 2009).

10. Dr. S. Schonfeld to His Grace the Archbishop of Jerusalem, Letter, July 28 1958, Reel 3, Church Missionary Society Archive, Section IX. (Oxfordshire: Adam Matthew Publications, 2009).

11. "Publisher's Note, Church Missionary Society Archive, Palestine Mission, 1935-1959," Reel 3, Church Missionary Society Archive, Section IX (Oxfordshire: Adam Matthew Publications, 2009).

12. Ibid.

13. April 10 1958, "Memorandum on the proposed establishment of a lido in the Holy City."

14. Ibid.

15. Ibid.

16. Nadav G. Shelef, *Evolving Nationalism: Homeland, Identity, and Religion in Israel, 1925-2005* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2010), 2.

17. Theodor Herzl, "Der Judenstaat," in Laquer & Rubin, *The Israel-Arab Reader* (New York: Penguin Books, 1995), 6-7.

18. Nadav G. Shelef, Evolving Nationalism, 3.

19. Theodor Herzl, The Jewish State (New York: Dover Publications, 1988), 147.

20. Nadav G. Shelef, *Evolving Nationalism*, 4.

21. Ibid.

22. Ibid., 120.

23. Yaacov Yadgar, *Secularism and Religion in Jewish-Israeli Politics: Traditionists and Modernity* (London, New York: Routledge, 2011), 189-198.

24. Tsila (Abraovitz) Ratner, "Discourses of Negotiation: The Writing of Orthodox Women in Israel," in *Gender and Israeli Society: Women's Time*, ed. Hannah Naveh (London, Portland: Vallentine Mitchell, 2003), 139.

25. Ibid., 139.

26. Yaacov Yadgar, *Secularism and Religion in Jewish-Israeli Politics: Traditionists and Modernity* (London, New York: Routledge, 2011), 189.

27. Gershon Shafir and Yoav Peled, *Being Israeli*, 137.

28. Ibid., 137-138.

29. Gershon Shafir and Yoav Peled, *Being Israeli*, 138.

30. S. Zalman Abramov, *Perpetual Dilemma*, 11.

31. Ibid., 12.

32. Tamar El-Or, *Next Year I Will Know More: Literacy and Identity among Young Orthodox Women in Israel* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 2002), 11.

33. S. Zalman Abramov, *Perpetual Dilemma*, 204.

34. Tamar El-Or, *Educated and Ignorant*, 149-150.

35. Ibid.

36. S. Zalman Abramov, *Perpetual Dilemma*, 223.

37. Dr. S. Schonfeld to Canon Wittenbach, Letter, May 16, 1958, Reel 3, Church Missionary Society Archive, Section IX. (Oxfordshire: Adam Matthew Publications, 2009).

38. Dr. S. Schonfeld to His Grace the Archbishop of Jerusalem, Letter, July 28 1958, Reel 3, Church Missionary Society Archive, Section IX. (Oxfordshire: Adam Matthew Publications, 2009).

39. Ibid.

40. "Bathing-Pool Dispute: Jerusalem Mayor's Comments," *The Jewish Chronicle*, Reel 3, Church Missionary Society Archive, Section IX. (Oxfordshire: Adam Matthew Publications, 2009).

41. "Publisher's Note, Church Missionary Society Archive, Palestine Mission, 1935-1959," Church Missionary Society Archive.

42. H.A. Goodman to Canon Wittenbach, July 31 1958, Letter. From Reel 3, Church Missionary Society Archive, Section IX. (Oxfordshire: Adam Matthew Publications, 2009).

43. "Orthodox Ashkenasic Community Admon Street," Telegram, July 25 1958, Reel 3, Church Missionary Society Archive, Section IX. (Oxfordshire: Adam Matthew Publications, 2009).

44. Chaim Roth, "In Defense of Freedom of Religion in Israel," *The New York Times*, April 25 1958, Reel 3, Church Missionary Society Archive, Section IX. (Oxfordshire: Adam Matthew Publications, 2009).

45. Letter (undated) from Central Keren Hatorah Committee (signed S. Rabinow, Solomon Schonfeld, and H.A. Goodman), to "Friend", Reel 3, Church Missionary Society Archive, Section IX. (Oxfordshire: Adam Matthew Publications, 2009).

46. Ibid.

47. Chaim Roth, "In Defense of Freedom of Religion in Israel," April 25 1958.

48. Ibid.

49. Public Letter from 63 rabbis, undated, Reel 3, Church Missionary Society Archive, Section IX. (Oxfordshire: Adam Matthew Publications, 2009).

50. Karen Armstrong, "Jerusalem: The problems and responsibilities of sacred space," *Islam and Christian-Muslim Relations*, Vol. 13, No. 2 (2002): 189-190.

51. Ibid.

52. Karen Armstrong, "Jerusalem: The problems and responsibilities of sacred space," 189.

53. Ibid., 190.

54. Ibid.

55. Ibid., 192-193.

56. Karen Armstrong, "Jerusalem: The problems and responsibilities of sacred space," 193.

57. Chaim Roth, "In Defense of Freedom of Religion in Israel," April 25 1958.

58. Ibid.

59. Hanna Herzog, "Redefining Political Spaces: A Gender Perspective on the Yishuv Historiography," in *Gender and Israeli Society: Women's Time*, ed. Hannah Naveh (London, Portland: Vallentine Mitchell, 2003), 17.

60. Hanna Herzog, "Re/visioning the women's movement in Israel," *Citizenship Studies* 12:3 (2008): 269-270.

61. Hanna Herzog, "Redefining Political Spaces: A Gender Perspective on the Yishuv Historiography," 17.

62. Hanna Herzog, "Re/visioning the women's movement in Israel," 269-270.

63. Yaacov Yadgar, *Secularism and Religion in Jewish-Israeli Politics*, 173.

64. Ibid., 174.
65. Tamar El-Or, *Educated and Ignorant*, 188.
66. Ibid., 199.
67. Ibid.
68. Ibid., 193.
69. Ibid., 197.
70. Tamar El-Or, *Educated and Ignorant*, 193.
71. Ibid., 195.
72. Tamar El-Or, *Next Year I Will Know More*, 12.
73. Ibid.
74. Tamar El-Or, *Educated and Ignorant*, 197.
75. Ibid., 193.
76. Tamar El-Or, *Educated and Ignorant*, 197.
77. April 10, 1958, "Memorandum on the proposed establishment of a lido in the Holy City".
78. Chaim Roth, "In Defense of Freedom of Religion in Israel," April 25 1958.
79. Rabbi Pinchas Epstein to Canon Wittenbach, Letter, May 15 1958, Reel 3, Church Missionary Society Archive, Section IX. (Oxfordshire: Adam Matthew Publications, 2009).
80. April 10 1958, "Memorandum on the proposed establishment of a lido in the Holy City."

Works Cited

Abramov, S. Zalman. *Perpetual Dilemma: Jewish Religion in the Jewish State*. Cranbury, New Jersey: Associated University Presses, 1976.

Armstrong, Karen. "Jerusalem: The problems and responsibilities of sacred space." *Islam and Christian-Muslim Relations*, Vol.13, No. 2 (2002): 189-196.

El-Or, Tamar. *Educated and Ignorant: Ultraorthodox Jewish Women and Their World*. Translated by Haim Watzman. Boulder: Lynne Rienner, 1994.

El-Or, Tamar. *Next Year I Will Know More: Literacy and Identity among Young Orthodox Women in Israel*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 2002.

Epstein, Rabbi to Canon Wittenbach, August 1 1958. Telegram. From Reel 3, Church Missionary Society Archive, Section IX. Oxfordshire: Adam Matthew Publications, 2009.

Epstein, Rabbi Pinchas to Canon Wittenbach, May 15 1958. Letter. From Reel 3, Church Missionary Society Archive, Section IX. Oxfordshire: Adam Matthew Publications, 2009.

Gavison, Mr. E to Canon Wittenbach. "Sale of Bishop Gobat's School Playground, Jerusalem." Letter. From Reel 3, Church Missionary Society Archive, Section IX. Oxfordshire: Adam Matthew Publications, 2009.

Goodman, H.A. to Canon Wittenbach, July 31 1958. Letter. From Reel 3, Church Missionary Society Archive, Section IX. Oxfordshire: Adam Matthew Publications, 2009.

Herman, Simon N. *Israelis and Jews: The Continuity of an Identity*. New York: Random House, 1970.

Herzl, Theodor. "Der Judenstaat," in *The Israel-Arab Reader*, ed. Laquer and Rubin. New York: Penguin Books, 1995.

Herzl, Theodor. *The Jewish State*. New York: Dover Publications, 1988.

Herzog, Hanna. "Re/visioning the women's movement in Israel." *Citizenship Studies*, Vol. 12, No. 3 (2008): 265-282.

Hitzer, Bettina and Joachim Schlor. "Introduction to God in the City: Religious Topographies in the Age of Urbanization." *Journal of Urban History*, Vol. 37, No. 6 (2011): 819-827.

Liebman, Charles S. and Eliezer Don-Yehiya. *Religion and Politics in Israel.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1984.

Maier, Christl M. *Daughter Zion, Mother Zion: Gender, Space, and the Sacred in Ancient Israel*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2008.

McClintock, Anne, Aamir Mufti, and Ella Shohat, eds. *Dangerous Liaisons: Gender, Nation, & Postcolonial Perspectives.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1997.

"Memorandum on the proposed establishment of a lido in the Holy City," April 10 1958. From Reel 3, Church Missionary Society Archive, Section IX. Oxfordshire: Adam Matthew Publications, 2009.

Naveh, Hannah, ed. *Gender and Israeli Society: Women's Time*. London: Vallentine Mitchell, 2003.

Nussbaum, Martha C. *Sex & Social Justice*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.

"Orthodox Jews Picket White House: Israel's Alleged 'Anti-Religious' Campaign." *The Jewish Chronicle*, 32. July 27, 1958. From Reel 3, Church Missionary Society Archive, Section IX. Oxfordshire: Adam Matthew Publications, 2009.

Peled, Yoav. "Inter-Jewish Challenges to Israeli Identity." *The Palestine-Israel Journal*. Vol. 8, No.4 (2001).

Public Letter from 63 rabbis, undated, Reel 3, Church Missionary Society Archive, Section IX. (Oxfordshire: Adam Matthew Publications, 2009).

Roth, Chaim. "In Defense of Freedom of Religion in Israel." *The New York Times*, April 25 1958. From Reel 3, Church Missionary Society Archive, Section IX. Oxfordshire: Adam Matthew Publications, 2009.

Said, Edward W. "Invention, Memory, and Place." *Critical Inquiry*, Vol. 26, No. 2 (2000): 175-192.

Shafir, Gershon and Yoav Peled. *Being Israeli: The Dynamics of Multiple* Citizenship. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Shelef, Nadav G. *Evolving Nationalism: Homeland, Identity, and Religion in Israel, 1925-2005.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2010.

Schonfeld, Rabbi to Canon Wittenbach, July 25 1958. Letter. From Reel 3, Church Missionary Society Archive, Section IX. Oxfordshire: Adam Matthew Publications, 2009.

Schonfeld, Rabbi to Canon Wittenbach, May 16 1958. Letter. From Reel 3, Church Missionary Society Archive, Section IX. Oxfordshire: Adam Matthew Publications, 2009.

Schonfeld, Solomon to Canon Wittenbach, May 22 1958. Letter. From Reel 3, Church Missionary Society Archive, Section IX. Oxfordshire: Adam Matthew Publications, 2009.

Solomon, Norman. "Religion and Human Rights with Special Reference to Judaism." In *Does God Believe in Human Rights?* Edited by Nazila Ghanea, Alan Stephens, and Raphael Walden. Boston: Brill, 2007.

Wittenbach, Canon to Archbishop, August 1, 1958. Letter. From Reel 3, Church Missionary Society Archive, Section IX. Oxfordshire: Adam Matthew Publications, 2009.

Wittenbach, Canon to Archbishop, June 17 1958. Letter. From Reel 3, Church Missionary Society Archive, Section IX. Oxfordshire: Adam Matthew Publications, 2009.

Wittenbach, Canon to Archbishop, September 18, 1958. Letter. From Reel 3, Church Missionary Society Archive, Section IX. Oxfordshire: Adam Matthew Publications, 2009.

Wittenbach, Canon to Mr. E. Gavison, August 1 1958. Letter. From Reel 3, Church Missionary Society Archive, Section IX. Oxfordshire: Adam Matthew Publications, 2009.

Wittenbach, Canon to Mr. Gavison, May 20 1958. Letter. From Reel 3, Church Missionary Society Archive, Section IX. Oxfordshire: Adam Matthew Publications, 2009.

Wittenbach, Canon to Rabbi P. Epstein. May 23 1958. Letter. From Reel 3, Church Missionary Society Archive, Section IX. Oxfordshire: Adam Matthew Publications, 2009.

Wittenbach, Canon to Rabbi Dr. S. Schonfeld, August 1, 1958. Letter. From Reel 3, Church Missionary Society Archive, Section IX. Oxfordshire: Adam Matthew Publications, 2009.

Wittenbach, Canon to Rabbi Dr. S. Schonfeld, May 19 1958. Letter. From Reel 3, Church Missionary Society Archive, Section IX. Oxfordshire: Adam Matthew Publications, 2009.

Wittenbach, Canon to Rabbi Dr. S. Schonfeld, May 20 1958. Letter. From Reel 3, Church Missionary Society Archive, Section IX. Oxfordshire: Adam Matthew Publications, 2009.

Yadgar, Yaacov. *Secularism and Religion in Jewish-Israeli Politics: Traditionists and modernity*. New York: Routledge, 2011.

A Rose By Any Other Name: Crack Cocaine and Cocaine Hydrochloride in the 20th Century

Rebecca Rodin

On March 17, 1986, *Newsweek* ran a cover story with a headline that read, "Kids Getting Hooked on Cocaine," in which 'drug experts' were quoted as saying, "crack is the most addictive drug known to man" and produces an "instantaneous addiction."[1] This article is just one among the thousands of related news stories regarding the "epidemic," or "plague," of crack in America.[2] This anti-drug, and more specifically anti-crack, media frenzy began in the spring of 1986, less than a year after crack cocaine was first introduced into America, and lasted until 1992. However, the introduction of this seemingly new drug, called 'crack,' might be more accurately described as a new innovation in the method of consumption of an already well-known and familiar drug called 'cocaine,' or cocaine hydrochloride (HCl).

Crack and cocaine share the same active ingredient, but their historical trajectories and identities are radically different. This paper will explore the evolution of cocaine's place in society and the unique social and cultural factors that gave rise to the "cocaine boom" in the 1970s and early 1980s and to the subsequent "crack epidemic." With this historical perspective, we will begin to understand why crack in America has been demonized as a "deadly nightmare," while cocaine has enjoyed a period of relative tolerance and glamorization.[3] I will argue that, in addition to crack cocaine's greater addictive potential, crack was demonized by the media and government officials because it was disproportionately consumed by marginalized and underprivileged populations in America.[4]

From the Coca Leaf to Cocaine: A Brief History of Cocaine

Cocaine is a salt alkaloid that is generally snorted as a powder or dissolved in water and injected as an aqueous solution. It is derived from the coca leaf, mostly the *Erythroxylum coca* genus, which primarily grows in South America, but is also seen in Hawaii.[5] For over two thousand years, these coca leaves had been popular amongst the native Incan population in the Peruvian Andes, but their cultivation was limited to local consumption of the leaves in tea or by chewing. The Spanish conquistadors in Peru in the sixteenth century were among the first Europeans to encounter the leaves and appreciate their stimulating effects, but coca leaves, or cocaine, did not make their way into European society in any meaningful way until the nineteenth century. This delay of its entry into the Old World was partly due to social and cultural factors, but, more importantly, reflected technological limitations in the transportation and preparation of the leaves.[6]

The centuries between coca chewing and crack smoking saw major advances in coca cultivation, cocaine refining, and methods of self-administration. Each of these technical advances increased the drug supply or allowed higher concentrations of cocaine to enter the user's blood stream at one time, intensifying the drug's effects. Coca leaves have very low concentrations of actual cocaine, and these cocaine levels dropped even lower as the leaves decayed on the long voyage to Europe. The relatively low potency of the leaves limited European interest in the drug and protected coca chewers from its deleterious health effects. However, all that would change in 1860, when German scientist Alfred Neimann isolated cocaine alkaloid ($C_{17}H_{21}NO_4$), the active ingredient in the leaves, from a batch of leaves that had been shipped to Göttingen University, where he worked. In his book, *On a New Organic Base in the Coca Leaves*, published in 1860, Neimann named this newfound alkaloid "cocaine."[7] Using the new technical methodology of isolation, the German pharmaceutical firm, Merck KGaA, which later moved to the U.S. and was renamed as Merck & Co. and then Merck Sharpe and Dohme,

began producing small amounts of cocaine in the 1860s. Cocaine was marketed as part of their comprehensive line of alkaloid products, despite the paucity of evidence suggesting that it had any medical benefits.[8]

In the following decades, three major events propelled cocaine, at least for a short period, into the medical domain and the public spotlight in Europe and North America. The first of these transformative events was Sigmund Freud's 1884 publication of *Über Coca*, in which he praised cocaine as a "wonder drug" and panacea for a wide array of ailments, ranging from morphine and alcohol addiction to asthma.[9] The second important development was Austrian ophthalmologist Carl Koller's discovery of cocaine's novel and unique effectiveness as a local anaesthetic for eye surgery. Koller's discovery was later popularized in the United States by American physician William Halsted, the "father of modern surgery," leading to a huge increase in the county's supply of and demand for cocaine.[10] This is evident from the increase in production at Merck's factory in Darmstadt from less than three-quarters of a pound in 1883 to 3179 pounds in 1884.[11]

The availability of cocaine was further amplified by a technical advancement made in 1885 by Parke-Davis chemist Henry Rusby that allowed on-site production of semi-refined, crude cocaine. Rusby developed an inexpensive and simple technique to obtain cocaine by soaking pulverized coca leaves in a solution of alcohol and benzol. The addition of sulphuric acid and sodium carbonate leads to the production of a precipitate known as "coca paste," which contains 60-90% cocaine. Even after the paste is filtered and dried into cocaine powder, the cocaine content (40-60%) is still significantly greater than that of the coca leaves (0.5-1%).[12] Equipped with this new technology, pharmaceutical companies were able to simplify and improve the shipping and storage of cocaine, which reduced costs and increased output.[13]

Following these technical developments in production, and the parallel rise in public demand, Merck's cocaine output significantly

increased again in 1886 to 158,352 pounds.[14] In addition, the increased availability and reduced cost of cocaine and coca leaves allowed for their use as ingredients in a multitude of tonics and nostrums created by 'patented' pharmaceutical companies. The most popular of these products included Vin Mariani's Coca Wine, which was purported to cure influenza, and the familiar American beverage Coca-Cola, to which coca leaves were added for flavour.[15] In addition to being used in a variety of these patented products, cocaine became very popular in Europe and the United States for recreational purposes because of its euphoric, energizing, and sexually arousing effects. Initially, there were no regulations placed on cocaine production or use, as there was little or no knowledge of its addictive potential, in which dependence develops without typical symptoms of withdrawal. As a result, cocaine became widely abused throughout European and North American society, including by such prominent figures as Freud, Halsted, and even by the fictional Sherlock Holmes.[16]

The end of the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth century was marked by this brief peak in popular cocaine use and the perceived medical benefits of cocaine products. However, this was followed shortly thereafter by the growing recognition of cocaine's harmful and addictive nature. The U.S. federal government began introducing drug regulations and prohibitions, starting with the Pure Food and Drug Act in 1906, which required manufacturers to correctly list all product ingredients on their labels in order to inform consumers of any addictive or potentially harmful contents. This was followed by the passage of the Harrison Narcotics Act in 1914, in which cocaine was (mis)classified as a narcotic and its use and distribution was criminalized (except for a few registered companies and individuals, for whom it technically remained legal).[17]

The legislative interventions at the turn of century transformed cocaine into an illicit drug, culminating with international efforts at the 1911 Hague Conference to stop its production and distribution. These efforts, as well as disruptions in transportation and smuggling routes during World War II, led to the gradual disappearance of cocaine from the

global drug scene during the 1930s and 1940s.[18] As a result, cocaine never became meaningfully integrated into mainstream medicine, especially once less addictive derivatives such as novocaine, became available as anaesthetic substitutes. Over the next few decades, cocaine use was marginal, taking a back seat to such drugs as marijuana, LSD, and heroin, until its strong comeback in the second half of the twentieth century.

Prelude to Cocaine: The Rise of Recreational Drugs, 1960-1970

The huge rise in usage and the glamorization of cocaine in the 1970s and 1980s was related to both a new recreational drug culture and resulting legislative efforts to control such drug use at that time. The preceding decade had seen many revolutionary changes in America, as a massive generation of baby boomers reached young adulthood, the prime "drug-using age."[19] The most pertinent of these changes was the 'drug revolution' of the 1960s, in which drug use moved out of the marginal and underground parts of society into the mainstream community of middle- and upper-class adolescents and young adults. Meanwhile, the arrival of commercial airplane travel facilitated the transport of illicit drugs, rendering them readily available for mass consumption.

The movement of recreational drug use from inner-city criminals and jazz-musicians to urban and suburban affluent youth, normalized this type of drug use, particularly with drugs such as marijuana and LSD, within middle and upper class society. In fact, drug use of this kind was so widespread that it motivated commentators of the era to claim that America was an "addicted society," seeking enlightenment through drugs.[20] American society, particularly the affluent middle and upper classes, collectively witnessed the popularization and glamorization of illicit drugs, such as marijuana and LSD, which the media and the public often positively associated with social rebellion, popular music, and intellectual enlightenment. Therefore, by the time

cocaine started making a visible comeback, mainstream American society was already familiar with widespread recreational drug use.

Marijuana and LSD were the most socially tolerated illicit recreational drugs of the 1960s, although others, such as heroin, morphine, barbiturates, and amphetamines, were also increasingly used and abused throughout the decade. The increased use of these drugs attracted various kinds of negative attention, including legislative prohibition and punishment, social criticism, and demonization. This backlash against these illicit narcotics effectively cleared the way for a resurgence of cocaine by diverting most negative drug-related attention to other substances. Commenting on the changing drug scene at the time and incorrectly downplaying the dangers of cocaine, the Deputy Director of Chicago's Bureau of Narcotics, Irvine Swank, stated: "so much publicity has gone out on heroin that people don't want to get started on it. But with coke you get a good high and you don't get hooked."[21] As another example, the public awareness campaign in the late 1960s concerning the dangers of amphetamines, which used the slogan, "speed kills," actually sparked interest in cocaine. Cocaine seemed a comparable and safe substitute for fearful speed addicts, with the added allure of sexual prowess.[22] Indeed, a 1971 *Newsweek* article, entitled "It's the Real Thing," quoted a student from the University of Tennessee as saying: "Speed kills, but coke heightens all your senses [...] and goes better with orgasms."[23]

In 1968, Richard Nixon approved "Operation Intercept" to curb rising marijuana abuse by stopping the huge influx of marijuana from Mexico, the main supplier at that time. This plan now seems both ambitious and naïve. Nixon instructed every customs agents at the U.S.-Mexico border to stop and search every vehicle attempting to cross into the United States. This attempt to cut off smuggling and trafficking of marijuana was largely unsuccessful, although it did put pressure on the Mexican government to restrict its black-market marijuana trade.[24] Nixon's initiative also had the unintended effect of displacing the Mexican marijuana industry to Colombia, where a booming illicit drug industry developed, first with

marijuana and soon after with cocaine. Furthermore, the initial lack of available marijuana caused by these efforts added an impetus for some thrill-seekers to look elsewhere for their 'high.' This search ended with the arrival of cocaine, a drug perceived as "a harmless, soft or gourmet drug, non-addicting like marijuana [that] was easy to sell, especially in a climate where few believed the dire warnings of government drug propaganda anymore because of its dishonest approach to cannabis."[25]

All of these and other socio-political strategies unintentionally fuelled the spread and acceptance of cocaine use in the 1970s and early 1980s, even though they may have also helped curb rates of other illicit drug use. The public was primed to view cocaine as a safe and non-addictive drug, which developed an allure for being associated with intense sexuality, psychic energy, and self-confidence. By the 1970s, Americans were ready for an explosion of cocaine, which was finally set in motion by certain technical and organizational foreign advances.

The American 'Snowstorm': Cocaine's Fifteen Years of Fame, 1971-1985

The first noticeable resurgence of cocaine use began in 1971 and became increasingly visible over the next fifteen years. The precise date of this re-emergence has been contested by various authors, but unfortunately, there are few accurate statistics or reports on such illegal activity. Some cocaine scholars have designated 1969 as the first "real year" of cocaine, when the influential movie *Easy Rider* opened, generating an astonishing $20 million at the box office.[26] The film's initial sequence depicts Peter Fonda, Dennis Hopper, and Jack Nicholson delivering a package to Phil Spector containing cocaine, or 'Pura vida' (Pure Life), as their Mexican connection calls it. However, 1971 may in fact mark the true beginning of the cocaine re-emergence, as suggested by a *New York Times* article of that year which covered a press conference of the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs. The *New York Times* reported: "Government officials

and others say the re-emergence of cocaine is one of the few clear trends in the shifting and often murky picture of drug use in the United States."[27]

As the decade progressed, cocaine's persona became increasingly prominent in and glorified by popular culture and music. In both 1970 and 1975, *Rolling Stone* magazine dubbed cocaine the "drug of the year."[28] Gradually, cocaine developed a certain cultural cachet, which made other products 'cool by association' and, in turn, reinforced its idealized image. Products on the cocaine-bandwagon included *The Gourmet Cokebook*, an American instructional manual related to snorting cocaine, the book *Dealer*, depicting the life of a cocaine dealer, and popular T-shirts with the word 'cocaine' inscribed as part of the Coca-Cola logo.[29] Famous artists, such as the Rolling Stones, the Grateful Dead, Eric Clapton, and the Eagles, further enhanced this glamorized image of cocaine by referencing to the drug in their hit songs of the decade. The amalgamation of these various cultural portrayals of cocaine transformed it into a symbol of fame, sex, and glamour, and made it popular among a wide range of affluent Americans, including both counterculture and "straight" circles.[30]

Although selling-prices of cocaine in the United States dropped significantly throughout the 1970s and 1980s in accordance with its greater availability, the cost of cocaine in the first ten to fifteen years of its re-emergence remained relatively high compared to other illicit drugs. In 1975, for example, cocaine was at least twelve times more expensive than heroin on a cost-effectiveness scale. Heroin cost approximately $2.75 per gram (with one-third of one gram producing a high lasting about four to six hours), whereas cocaine cost roughly $4.00 per gram (with one-third of one gram producing a high of about thirty minutes).[31] As an 'expensive drug,' the relatively high price of cocaine, at approximately $1500-$2000 per ounce, limited its use for most of the decade to affluent Americans.[32] This exclusivity added to cocaine's allure, leading *Time* magazine to dub it "a drug with status." The 1981 cover of the magazine featured a picture of a martini glass filled with what looked like cocaine, topped with a green olive.[33] This cover story described cocaine

as the "All-American drug," detailing it as relatively safe and highly appealing to the fast-paced metropolitan society in the United States.[34]

Mass Cocaine Production and Distribution: The South American Connection

Cocaine's widespread social acceptance and popular association, in the United States, with sexual prowess, fame, and a fast-paced lifestyle was partly the result of cocaine use and promotion by trendsetters, such as The Rolling Stones. However, such a widespread re-emergence of the drug could not have occurred without certain technical advances that enabled its large-scale manufacturing and distribution. These technical advances were accomplished in South America, the primary source of coca plants, coca paste, and cocaine in the United States and worldwide. These advances included the development of transportation and smuggling routes, and improvement in the organization and efficiency of production and distribution of cocaine. This fuelled the massive influx of cocaine into the United States during the late 1970s and 1980s, and contributed to the subsequent creation and rise in the use of crack cocaine in 1985.

The massive influx of cocaine, and subsequently of crack cocaine, in the United States in the 1970s and 1980s was directly linked to the World Bank's funding of the Pan American Highway, connecting the United States to South America through Amazonia and the Peruvian Huallaga River Valley. The construction of this massive thoroughfare provided a direct transportation route for smugglers into the United States. This drug trafficking was accomplished with relative ease and safety, since the jungles and dense wildlife concealed the smugglers and made the area difficult for authorities to regulate and control.[35] Thus, the Pan American Highway quite literally paved the way for cocaine's emergence in the United States on a large scale. This flow of cocaine into the United States was further aided by organized criminal groups, known as drug cartels, who took advantage of these new transport systems, using their sophisticated methods of drug trafficking and smuggling.[36] These drug cartels, which primarily

operated in Colombia, were largely responsible for the huge amounts of cocaine that were available United States in the 1970s and 1980s, accounting for approximately 80% of all global cocaine production.[37]

From Powder to Rock: Crack Cocaine

The continual rise in the cocaine drug supply eventually democratized its consumption by lowering costs, making it more widely accessible to the American public.[38] Expanded supplies helped reduce the price by one third between 1980 and 1985 and again by one half between 1985 and 1987. However, cocaine still often remained too expensive for the poor.[39] Drug dealers in the United States had long been interested in manufacturing smokeable, 'freebase' forms of cocaine from the hydrochloride powder because their high potency and low cost could expand the cocaine market to inner-city populations. Although the technical knowledge for such manufacturing was available in the early twentieth century, it was not until the 1980s that any significant production of these smokeable cocaine-base pellets – known as 'rock' or 'crack' – actually occurred.[40] The massive and relatively cheap supply of cocaine HCl that became available the United States in the 1980s made such crack production a cost-effective endeavour.[41]

Crack is manufactured by dissolving cocaine HCl and baking soda (sodium bicarbonate) into water, which is then heated and dried into hard, smokeable cocaine pellets or rocks.[42] Although these crack pellets are adulterated by the chemicals used in its manufacture, such as hydrochloric acid and baking soda, they produce relatively pure cocaine vapours that can be inhaled.[43] This method of self-administration is the major aesthetic difference between cocaine HCl, which is most commonly snorted, and crack cocaine, which is inhaled. Such differences result in variable pharmacological and physical effects in the human body, which accounts for part of the reason why cocaine HCl and crack have been regarded in radically different ways despite their common active ingredient. However, this physical or 'objective'

difference in administration method alone does not, explain why crack has been demonized while cocaine has been glamorized and, mistakenly, regarded as non-addictive. The following sections provides material, scientific, and sociological explanations for the condemnation of crack as the deadliest and "most addictive drug known to man."[44]

Chemical and Pharmacological Differences between Crack and Cocaine: Addiction

Like any medicinal or recreational drug, the physiological effects of cocaine are determined by the rate of absorption and concentrations of its active ingredients in the bloodstream. These properties, termed pharmacokinetics, are greatly impacted by the method of administration. Human studies show that, compared with intranasal cocaine use, smoking crack results in more rapid absorption of cocaine into the bloodstream and higher peak cocaine concentrations, but a shorter duration of action at high levels.[45] These findings explain the subjective observation that crack use is associated with a more intense, yet brief, euphoric experience. Distinctly different from intranasal cocaine use, this effect pattern is an important contribution to the reinforcing effects of crack on the brain's reward system.[46] Thus, the evolution from cocaine to crack, while only a minor change in chemical composition, dramatically increased the potential for addiction and abuse.

The model of cocaine addiction as a 'chemical reward' in the brain's 'pleasure system' has been effectively substantiated in various animal studies. In the case of crack cocaine inhalation, some of the most striking demonstrations of its highly addictive potential were demonstrated in studies of self-administration among primates, who have a natural aversion to smoke inhalation of any kind. Since the 1970s, numerous studies have shown that animals voluntarily administer continual doses of crack cocaine smoke even if this results in a lethal dose.[47] Many of these studies also note that crack's immediate and intense euphoric effects, combined with its short duration, produce stronger urges for

'binging' than is produced by cocaine sniffing.[48] Therefore, the crack innovation transformed the already addictive cocaine powder into an even more dangerous substance with a higher risk of abuse and addiction.

Crack's Target Market: The Role of 'Set and Setting' in Drug Use

The high potency of cocaine rocks mea that smaller amounts of cocaine can be used to produce the desired effect, resulting in a more intense 'high' than did sniffing cocaine. As a result, the price of crack was significantly less than that of cocaine, with crack rocks sold in vials costing only a few dollars, thereby making it affordable for the inner-city poor in the United States.[49] The drug dealers' targeted marketing of crack to impoverished African-American and Latino communities, particularly in New York, Los Angeles, and Miami, generated a new class of consumers for whom powder cocaine was less affordable and less available.[50]

The low cost of crack, and its association with poor, crime-ridden, urban neighbourhoods, led to its name as "the poor man's cocaine."[51] The large segment of young, unemployed people in these areas composed both the user base for consumption and the workforce for crack preparation, distribution, and sales. The intense intoxication produced by smoking crack offered individuals with limited access to education, employment opportunities, and social support the opportunity of an immediate escape from their surroundings.[52] Once addicted, this group had few resources for breaking their habit, including access to psychiatrists or community-based programs. These circumstances stand in stark contrast to those of the affluent cocaine sniffers, prominent in the preceding decades, who had what sociologist Marsha Rosenbaum terms "life options," or "a stake in conventional life," which gave them a competitive advantage in controlling their drug abuse.[53]

The Reagan Era and the War on Drugs

The negative consequences associated with crack use were

exaggerated and brought into sharper focus by the particular policies and legislation of President Ronald Reagan's 'War on Drugs' and the anti-crack media frenzy he inspired. Reagan viewed crack cocaine as the cause of many social problems plaguing American society, such as high unemployment, poverty, and a collapsing education system, rather than as a consequence of the social context from which crack emerged. As a result, the use of crack by lower-class members of society was not viewed not as a product of poor social conditions and limited life prospects. Instead, it was regarded by the federal administration and by much of middle and upper-class society as a weakness of character and lack of moral judgement.[54] This position was reflected in Reagan's support of punitive approaches to fight crack use and addiction, rather than policies of social welfare and addiction treatment and prevention. His policies and rhetoric and the corresponding media hype depicted crack cocaine as an inherently evil drug and the cause of many social ills and much suffering in America.[55]

By establishing a mandatory minimum sentencing for drug possession and distribution, the passage of the Anti Drug Abuse Act in 1986 strengthened the support and funding for prisons and police to fight crack addiction. This law established a 100:1 disparity between crack and powder cocaine, such that crack possession of even five grams was more often and more severely punished than cocaine possession. As crack was the only affordable cocaine product for the members of the marginalized inner-city, these 'undesirable' populations were disproportionately punished with prison sentences.[56] The high proportion of people arrested and sentenced for crack-related crimes then served as a post-hoc justification for the demonization of crack and crack users in the following years. The lack of punitive parity between crack and cocaine also reinforced the perception of cocaine as a less dangerous and less addictive substance, which could be largely tolerated in society.

Conclusion

The active compound in cocaine and crack shares the same chemical formulation, but the difference in drug delivery combined with a multitude of historical, cultural, and political factors resulted in the creation of two very different social identities. The analysis of crack's demonization and cocaine's glamorization should not be mistaken for a denial of the addictive potential of either substance, as there is much about crack that deserves condemnation and much about cocaine that is not at all glamorous. However, representations of these drugs within political discourse and the media have often underestimated the risks of cocaine and added to the misery of crack cocaine users. This raises questions about whether social policies, more so than punitive reforms, can do more to help those who are addicted to drugs and to prevent or minimize the scourge of drug addiction in the population. But such considerations warrant further investigation and merit their own separate analysis.

Notes

1. "Kids Getting Hooked on Cocaine," *Newsweek*, March 17 1986, 58-59.
2. Craig Reinarman and Harry Levine, "The Crack Attack: Politics and Media in the Crack Scare," in *Crack in America: Demon Drugs and Social Justice*, ed. Craig Reinarman and Harry Levine (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1997), 18-48.
3. "Kids Getting Hooked on Cocaine," 58.
4. Note: For convenience, I will use the term 'America' throughout this paper to refer to The United States of America.
5. Richard Ashley, *Cocaine: Its History, Uses and Effects* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1975), 18-19.
6. James Inciardi, *The War on Drugs IV: The Continuing Saga of the Mysteries and Miseries of Intoxication, Addiction, Crime, and Public Policy* (Boston: Pearson Education, 2008), 117-118.
7. George Gay et al., " "An' Ho, Ho, Baby, Take a Whiff on Me:" La Dama Blanca

Cocaine in Current Perspective," *Anesthesia and Analgesia*, Vol. 55, No. 4 (July 1976): 583.

8. Steven Karch, "Cocaine: History, Use, Abuse," *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine*, Vol. 92, No. 8 (August 1999): 394.

9. Howard Markel, *An Anatomy of Addiction: Sigmund Freud, William Halsted and the Miracle Drug, Cocaine* (New York: Pantheon Books, 2011), 48-49.

10. Ibid., 144.

11. Karch, "Cocaine: History, Use, Abuse," 394. At this time, Germany dominated the chemical production industry and it was not until the late 1880s and early 1890s that American pharmaceutical firms, such as Parke-Davis & Company, gained a meaningful foothold in the pharmaceutical industry. Therefore, the cocaine output at Merck KGaA, the leading drug manufacturer in Germany at that time, most accurately represents the supply of and demand for cocaine in Europe and North America.

12. Inciardi, *The War on Drugs IV*, 118.

13. Joseph Spillane, *Cocaine: From Medical Marvel to Modern Menace in the United States, 1884-1920* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2000), 51.

14. Karch, "Cocaine: History, Use, Abuse," 394.

15. David Courtwright, *Forces of Habit: Drugs and the Making of the Modern World* (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 2001), 25-26.

16. John Flynn, *Cocaine: An In-Depth Look at the Facts, Science, History and Future of the World's Most Addictive Drug* (New York: Carol Publishing Group, 1991), 28-31. It is difficult to obtain any accurate estimates or figures of drug consumption rates at this time because no drug regulations had yet been passed, which would have provided a systematic method for tracking legal cocaine use (i.e., using prescription rates or cocaine product taxation). The first drug regulation in the United States was not passed until 1906, as the Pure Food and Drug Act, which merely required the correct labelling of products' ingredients. At this time, cocaine was widely available and could be easily purchased without a prescription. The best indicators of widespread cocaine use are the quantity of cocaine produced by pharmaceutical companies and the incorporation of cocaine in a large number and wide range of products. Since an accurate record of individual usage is limited in this way, the accounts of cocaine use/abuse of such prominent figures as Freud and Halsted and in popular fiction (i.e., Sherlock Holmes) are among the best indicators of the extent of cocaine use. The difficulty of finding accurate information on cocaine use persisted, or even intensified, once cocaine was transformed into an illicit substance by the passage of the Harrison Act in 1914. These difficulties are faced by nearly all those doing any historical research into illegal substances and activities of this kind.

17. Courtwright, *Forces of Habit*, 33-35.

18. Paul Gootenberg, *Andean Cocaine: The Making of Global Drug* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2008), 190.

19. David Smith and Donald Wesson, "Drugs of Abuse 1973: Trends and Developments," *Annual Review of Pharmacology*, Vol. 14 (April 1974): 513.

20. Leslie Farber, "Ours is the Addicted Society," *New York Times Magazine*, December 11, 1996, 4; J. Simmons and B. Winograd, *It's Happening: A Portrait of the Youth Scene Today* (Santa Barbara, CA: Marc-Laired, 1966), 16.

21. "It's the Real Thing," *Newsweek*, September 27, 1971, 4.

22. Gootenberg, *Andean Cocaine*, 308.

23. "It's the Real Thing," 4.

24. Inciardi, *The War on Drugs IV*, 50.

25. Dominic Streatfeild, *Cocaine: An Unauthorized Biography* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2001), 200; Gootenberg, *Andean Cocaine*, 308.

26. Streatfeild, *Cocaine*, 207-8.

27. "Cocaine is Re-Emerging as a Major Problem, While Marijuana Remains Popular," *The New York Times*, November 15, 1971.

28. Gay et al., " "An' Ho, Ho, Baby, Take a Whiff on Me:" " 586.

29. David Musto, "Opium, Cocaine, and Marijuana in American History," *Scientific American* (July 1991): 25.

30. Ashley, *Cocaine: Its History, Uses and Effects*, 206

31. Ibid., 141-2.

32. Craig Reinarman and Harry Levine, "Crack in Context: America's Latest Demon Drug," in *Crack in America: Demon Drugs and Social Justice*, ed. Craig Reinarman and Harry Levine (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1997), 3.

33. Musto, "Opium, Cocaine, and Marijuana," 27.

34. Streatfeild, *Cocaine*, 239.

35. James Inciardi, "Beyond Cocaine: Basuco, Crack, and Other Coca Products," *Contemporary Drug Problems* (1987): 465.

36. Gootenberg, *Andean Cocaine*, 222.

37. Inciardi, *The War on Drugs IV*, 128.

38. John P. Morgan and Lynn Zimmer, "The Social Pharmacology of Smokeable Cocaine: Not All It's Cracked Up To Be," in *Crack in America: Demon Drugs and Social Justice*, ed. Craig Reinarman and Harry Levine (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1997), 135.

39. David Courtwright, *Dark Paradise: A History of Opiate Addiction in Americ*a

(Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1982), 176.

40. Our knowledge in the twentieth century regarding manufacturing is based on the practice known as 'freebasing.'

41. Morgan and Zimmer, "Social Pharmacology of Smokeable Cocaine," 127-134.

42. Inciardi, *The War on Drugs IV*, 144.

43. Ibid., 147. Street samples of crack pellets ranged from 10-40% cocaine purity by weight.

44. "Kids Getting Hooked on Cocaine," 1.

45. E. J. Cone, "Pharmacokinetics and Pharmacodynamics of Cocaine," *Journal of Analytical Toxicology*, Vol. 19, No. 6 (Oct 1995): 459-78; Dorothy K. Hatsukami and Marian W. Fischman, "Crack Cocaine and Cocaine Hydrochloride: Are the Differences Myth or Reality?" *Journal of the American Medical Association*, Vol. 276, No. 19 (Nov 1996): 1580-88.

46. Hatsukami and Fischman, "Crack Cocaine and Cocaine Hydrochloride," 1580-88.

47. For example, see M. Bozart, "New Perspectives on Cocaine Addiction: Recent Findings from Animal Research," *Canadian Journal of Physiology and Pharmacology* 67, (1988): 1158-67; C. Johanson, R. Balster, and K. Bonese, "Self-administration of psychomotor stimulant drugs: The Effects of Unlimited Access," *Pharmacology Biochemistry and Behaviour* 4 (1976): 45-51.

48. "New Perspectives on Cocaine Addiction: Recent Findings from Animal Research," *Canadian Journal of Physiology and Pharmacology*, Vol. 67, No. 9 (1988): 1158-67.

49. Courtwright, *Dark Paradise*, 176.

50. Reinarman and Levine, "Crack in Context," 2.

51. Lucig Danielian and Stephen Reese, "A Closer Look at Intermedia Influences on Agenda Setting: The Cocaine Issue of 1986," in *Communication Campaigns About Drugs: Government, Media, and the Public*, ed. Pamela Shoemaker (New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1989), 56.

52. Reinarman and Levine, "Crack in Context," 2.

53. Marsha Rosenbaum, *Women on Heroin* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1981); Dan Waldorf, Craig Reinarman, and Sheigla Murphy, *Cocaine Changes: The Experience of Using and Quitting* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1991), 14.

54. Inciardi, *The War on Drugs IV*, 242.

55. Ethan Nadelmann, "Drug Prohibition in the U.S.: Costs, Consequences, and Alternatives," in *Crack in America: Demon Drugs and Social Justice*, ed. Craig Reinarman and Harry Levine (Los Angeles, University of California Press, 1997), 287-293.

56. Inciardi, *The War on Drugs IV*, 292-210.

Works Cited

Ashley, Richard. *Cocaine: Its History, Uses and Effects*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1975.

Bozarth, Michael A. "New Perspectives on Cocaine Addiction: Recent Findings from Animal Research." *Canadian Journal of Physiology and Pharmacology* 67 (August 1988): 1158-1167.

Cone, E. J. "Pharmacokinetics and Pharmacodynamics of Cocaine." *Journal of Analytic Toxicology* 19, no. 6 (Oct 1995): 459-78.

Courtwright, David. *Dark Paradise: A History of Opiate Addiction in America*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1982.

Courtwright, David. *Forces of Habit: Drugs and the Making of the Modern World*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2001.

Danielian, Lucig, and Stephen Reese. "A Closer Look at Intermedia Influences on Agenda Setting: The Cocaine Issue of 1986." In *Communication Campaigns About Drugs: Government, Media, and the Public*, edited by Pamela Shoemaker, 47-63 [?]. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1989.

Farber, Leslie. "Ours is the Addicted Society." *New York Times Magazine,* 11 December 1966.

Flynn, John. *Cocaine: An In-Depth Look at the Facts, Science, History and Future of the World's Most Addictive Drug*. New York: Carol Publishing Group, 1991.

Gay, George R., Darryl S. Inaba, Richard T. Rappolt Sr., George F. Gushue Jr., and John J. Perkner. ""An' Ho, HO, Baby, Take a Whiff on Me:" La Dama Blanca Cocaine in Current Perspective." Anesthesia and Analgesia 55, no. 4 (July 1976): 582-7.

Gootenberg, Paul. *Andean Cocaine*: *The Making of Global Drug*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2008.

Hatsukami, Dorothy K. and Marian W. Fischman. "Crack Cocaine and Cocaine Hydrochloride: Are the Differences Myth or Reality?" *JAMA* 276, no. 19 (Nov 1996): 1580-88.

Inciardi, James. "Beyond Cocaine: Basuco, Crack, and Other Coca Products." *Contemporary Drug Problems* 14 (1987): 461-492.

Inciardi, James. *The War on Drugs IV: The Continuing Saga of the Mysteries and Miseries of Intoxication, Addiction, Crime, and Public Policy.* Boston: Pearson Education, 2008.

"It's the Real Thing." *Newsweek*, 27 September 1971.

Karch, Steven. "Cocaine: History, Use, Abuse." *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine* 92 (August 1999): 393-7.

"Kids Getting Hooked on Cocaine." *Newsweek*, 17 March 1986.

Markel, Howard. *An Anatomy of Addiction: Sigmund Freud, William Halsted and the Miracle Drug, Cocaine*. New York: Pantheon Books, 2011.

Morgan, John P., and Lynn Zimmer. "The Social Pharmacology of Smokeable Cocaine: Not All It's Cracked Up To Be." In *Crack in America: Demon Drugs and Social Justice,* edited by Craig Reinarman and Harry Levine, 131-170. Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1997.

Musto, David. "Opium, Cocaine, and Marijuana in American History," *Scientific American* 265 no. 1 (July 1991): 20-27.

Nadelmann, Ethan A. "Drug Prohibition in the U.S.: Costs, Consequences, and Alternatives." In *Crack in America: Demon Drugs and Social Justice,* edited by Craig Reinarman and Harry Levine, 288-316. Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1997.

Reinarman, Craig, and Harry Levine. "Crack in Context: America's Latest Demon Drug." In *Crack in America: Demon Drugs and Social Justice,* edited by Craig Reinarman and Harry Levine, 1-17. Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1997.

"The Crack Attack: Politics and Media in the Crack Scare." In *Crack in America: Demon Drugs and Social Justice,* edited by Craig Reinarman and Harry Levine, 18-52. Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1997.

Rosenbaum, Marsha. *Women on Heroin.* New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1981.

Simmons, J. L., and Barry Winograd. *It's Happening: A Portrait of the Youth Scene Today*. Santa Barbara, CA: Marc-Laired, 1966.

Smith, David, and Donald Wesson. "Drugs of Abuse 1973: Trends and Developments." *Annual Review of Pharmacology* 14 (April 1974): 513-520.

Spillane, Joseph. *Cocaine: From Medical Marvel to Modern Menace in the United States, 1884-1920.* Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2000.

Streatfeild, Dominic. *Cocaine: An Unauthorized Biography*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 2001.

Waldorf, Dan, Craig Reinarman, and Sheigla Murphy. *Cocaine Changes: The Experience of Using and Quitting.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1991.

A Surgeon's Apprehensions Using Anesthesia and the Changing Surgeon-Patient Relationship

Arielle Shiller

Anesthesia presents modern surgeons with the ability to eliminate pain for patients during surgeries. It is easy to assume that, once the benefits of anesthesia were clear, its use would spread quickly and would be used in all formerly painful procedures. The surgeon who completed the first surgery with anesthesia said, "never again shall we witness the heart-rendering cries of agony from our victims."[1] Nevertheless, this was not the case. While people in the twenty-first century would be horrified to see surgeries performed without anesthesia, in the mid-nineteenth century, this was in fact the norm. Many surgeons were apprehensive to use anesthesia in their procedures soon after its invention, and its use was only for selected cases. There was a delay between the invention of ether, a chemical used for anesthesia, by Boston Dentist William Morton in 1846 and its widespread use which came later in the century. How can this delay be explained in consideration of today's sentiment that anesthesia is a vitally important part of surgery?

I aim to answer this question by examining the fears that surgeons had about the use of anesthesia and how it might affect the patient's healing process. How did their understanding of pain in the healing process affect the incidence at which anesthesia was accepted? Also, what fear did surgeons and patients have with respect to the issues of power and control within surgery and how anesthesia might alter this relationship? Why did surgeons feel that some patients required anesthesia while others did not and how did this play a role in the perception people had of anesthesia in the mid-nineteenth century?

Answering these questions will involve a brief history of the discovery of anesthesia and what this meant during the mid-nineteenth century. The discovery of anesthesia is largely credited to one man, William T. G. Morton, but there were other figures that were important as well and who helped pave the way for its discovery. Primary accounts, which discuss the perceived faults of anesthesia and the negative public opinion it received, give insight into the fear it caused as well as a possible answer for the delay in its acceptance. The works that physicians wrote at the time about anesthesia capture the sense of criticism it received by professionals in the field. This essay will focus much attention on the discovery of ether as an anesthetic by Morton, as is suggested by historian Martin Pernick, which led to the widespread use of anesthesia in surgery later in the century.[2] It was really Morton's discovery, which spread to Europe and throughout America, that would change the face of surgery– and ether would be the first of a growing list of compounds known as anesthetics.[3]

While historians today largely agree that Morton invented modern anesthesia, more specifically the use of ether, in 1846, this was seen as a controversial claim. There seems to be many cases of physicians developing something very much like anesthesia at around the same time but in isolation from one another. Written sources from the mid-nineteenth century, regarding the discovery of this particular use for ether, corroborate the understanding that Morton was the true discoverer of anesthesia. An example of this is Henry Bigelow, a prominent Boston physician and a professor at the Medical School of Harvard College, who wrote to *The Lancet* on November 28, 1846, stating that the inventor of inhaling ether as a means of lessening a patient's pain was indeed Dr. Morton.[4]

Even though we now credit Morton with the discovery of anesthesia, by no means can it be said that he was the first person to suggest that pain could be lessened in surgery with the use of a substance. George Bankoff wrote in 1946 that, even as far back as the Neolithic period, men searched for ways to lessen their pain.[5] James Moore wrote in 1784 that the first surgeons searched for "plants of all kinds […] and the whole vegetable

kingdom [was ransacked] for external applications that would ease pain, and heal wounds."[6] Moore described several instances in which techniques were used to rid the pain from surgery in the century before Morton developed his anesthesia. One example of this was the widespread used of opium by the medical community as a painkiller in the time before anesthesia. The downfalls of using opium during surgery are described in Moore's 1784 book *A Method of Preventing or Diminishing Pain in Several Operations of Surgery*. He describes how opium was useful after an operation to help relieve the pain experienced during recovery but that the amount which would be required to help the patient's suffering during the procedure would be too much to prescribe.[7] Moore continues by expressing his wish for something to come along, which could decrease the pain for the patient without increasing the danger of the surgery. In fact, he writes that he had tried but failed to find something that could lessen the pain of surgery. Moore proposes that by cutting the nerve to a limb, he could eliminate the pain from surgery, but found that this created more problems than it solved.[8] The methods used to diminish pain from surgeries before anesthesia never succeeded in eliminating the pain entirely, but were able to lessen it somewhat.[9] Furthermore, the shock of surgery could kill, and therefore surgeries needed to be performed with speed.[10]

There are several reasons why it was Morton, in particular, who was successful in his attempt at removing pain from surgery while other physicians failed. Medical historian Stephanie Snow suggests that Morton was successful because he was motivated by an entrepreneurial ambition rather than a will to help ease the suffering of his patients. Morton wanted to be able to improve his practice by performing more extractions.[11] His discovery came at a time when Morton had developed a new and better looking design for his artificial teeth but the problem with this new technique was that it involved removing the roots of the old teeth, which was an undertaking too excruciating for most to consider.[12] This is a proposed reason why Morton saw a need for anesthesia at this time as opposed to earlier, regardless of the fact that was always present in surgery.

Furthermore, Snow suggests that anesthesia was in truth only invented in the 1840s because, at this time, the issue of pain in surgery was coming into view and the use of opiates was growing as people's tolerance for pain was lessening.[13] Snow does not believe that the reason it was invented at this time was because the elimination of pain was not an objective sought out before the mid-nineteenth century. What she does suggest however, is that the need for anesthesia increased as the development of new and more painful surgeries began.[14] Only four years before Morton discovered anesthesia, prominent Scottish surgeon Charles Bell wrote, "when pain will be taken out of surgery, the earth and the lives of all who dwell on it will have changed."[15] Historian Thomas Dormandy remarks that Bell wrote "when" and not "if" pain will be removed from surgery. This demonstrates how great the need and want for this discovery was and how there was faith in its existence. With such high demand for pain elimination from surgery, it would seem that surgeons and patients would jump at the chance to use anesthesia in every case possible. However there were many fears associated with this new discovery, which would first need to be overcome.

There was such a great demand for anesthesia because pain during surgery before its discovery could be described as torturous. The pain was so horrible that patients needed to be held and tied down. They were also completely conscious and watched as the intimidating instruments were used on them, further increasing their anxiety.[16] Prior to anesthesia, "operations were dreaded more than hell."[17] In fact, teeth extraction was so painful that it was often used a torture technique. King John of England extracted teeth as a means of extortion and there are documented cases of teeth extraction as a means used for religious conversion.[18] The great pain associated with dentistry helps explain why it was a dentist who discovered anesthesia. Furthermore, the sheer risk and fear of the surgery made people weary of having them performed at all. Some patients took time before their operations to prepare for death and the next life. A young doctor wrote, "[b]efore the days of anesthetics a patient preparing for an operation was like a condemned criminal

preparing for execution."[19] Dormandy writes that the fact that there are few records from patients who underwent surgery without anesthesia is actually a blessing to the historian, as it saves him from having to recount the horror.[20] However, his book does include a case recounted by a woman who underwent a mastectomy without any anesthesia and the pain she describes is almost too much for the modern reader to imagine.

The personality of the pre-anesthesia surgeon was an important and often talked about concern, which was a factor in the consideration of adopting the use of anesthesia. Being callous was the first necessary characteristic of the surgeon, and those who lacked this quality often failed at the trade.[21] Young Henry Hickman was motivated to help people by relieving their suffering and he thought the best way to do this was to be a surgeon. However, after witnessing several operations in the years before anesthesia, it became clear to him that it took a certain type of individual to bear inflicting pain on others. He did finally become a surgeon but he always believed that pain was not a necessary condition of surgery and he hoped for its elimination.[22] A surgeon performing operations without anesthesia "must ignore cries and pleadings, and do his work regardless of complaints."[23] William Hunter, a famous surgeon in the mid-eighteenth century, said that a surgeon was "a savage armed with a knife."[24] While this was a true portrayal of the surgeon, they were also often known to try to comfort their patients during the ordeal, and were known to address the patient with confidence throughout their procedure.[25] Surgeons understood how greatly their demeanors could influence the way the patient dealt with a painful operation. The fear and anxiety felt by the patient was in some ways shared by the surgeon, who was known to smell of alcohol before performing operations, and who would shout at the attendants to relieve their own anxiety. [26] There is no doubt that the elimination of the screaming patient from surgery greatly relieved the surgeon and changed the character of the profession.

There were many attempts to eliminate pain from surgery prior to the nineteenth century, but there were still those who saw pain as a necessary

tool for the healing process. Medical historian Thomas Schlich writes, "[s]ome doctors feared that anaesthesia might impair wound-healing, an idea based on the observation that painless wounds often did not heal well."[27] It was often seen as an important warning sign for the body even before symptoms became visible.[28] Furthermore, surgeons noticed that, time and again, the most painful procedures led to the greatest chance of recovery, and for this reasons surgeons and patients both tolerated them.[29] This correlation between pain and healing led many to see the importance of pain in surgery. According to Fülöp-Miller, "[p]hysicians are ready to declare that pain is essential to the preservation of life and health, since it is a 'danger signal' to the body when danger threatens."[30] In fact, it was understood that pain was needed in order to guide the physician to make a correct diagnosis.[31] Modern physicians, however, do not believe that pain is vital to diagnosis and it is not seen as a trustworthy warning sign.[32] It was not until the "the 1830s [that] the radical view that pain was purposeless began to emerge."[33] It fact, Doctor James MacCartney from Dublin proposed that pain was not necessary for the healing process in 1838.[34] This would prove to be an important factor for the discovery as anesthesia.

While Morton's discovery had the possibility of greatly changing the field of surgery, anesthesia did not change the way surgery was performed instantly. This is an interesting phenomenon, since it has been shown that the demand and need to eliminate pain from surgery was great. Dormany puts it succinctly: "[a]nesthesia did not abolish the pain of operations; it only made the pain of operations optional. To some and for some time the preferred option remained in doubt."[35] Therefore, while Morton's discovery was available, there was great debate on how, when and if it should be used. Historian Martin Pernick stipulates that the use of anesthesia spread at an impressive rate compared to other innovations such as the smallpox vaccine.[36] Still, it took months before his discovery spread to the most important places of surgery and look even longer before it convinced even the most adamant skeptics that anesthesia was a viable surgical instrument.[37] However, Pernick did find

that while the use of anesthesia spread quickly to some hospitals, within those hospitals it was not being used on everyone. Still in 1847, one year after Morton's discovery, one third of painful operations performed at the Massachusetts General Hospital were executed without anesthesia.[38] Even Morton himself was faced with patients who feared anesthesia. He said to a patient in 1846: "I will give you five dollars if you will let me pull out one of your teeth. There will be no pain I guarantee that. Do you agree?"[39] The patient in this case did not agree, providing an a good example of the fear associated the new technique of inhaling ether and its unknown attributes, which proved too much for many patients to risk. Therefore fear was largely attributed to the delay in acceptance of anesthesia.

Surgeons, almost as much as patients, greatly benefited from the coming of anesthesia and the profession grew in scale as a result. To perform a painful surgery without anesthesia was, of course, frightening to the patient, but it also disturbed the surgeons since they were the ones inflicting the. There have been documented cases where surgeons felt as though they were "going to a hanging," and some were known to vomit after especially gruesome procedures.[40] The great desire by many surgeons to find a way to lessen their own apprehensions of inflicting pain undoubtedly helped the use of anesthesia spread in the mid nineteenth century.

Anesthesia, while promising to eliminate the pain from surgery, still created countless fears among patients and surgeons regarding its use. This was probably the largest contributing factor to the delays in its use. One of the fears, which anesthesia produced soon after its discovery, was its ability to blur the line between the dead and the living. Some surgeons felt that while looking at a patient under ether, it could be difficult to tell if they were still alive because they looked so pale.[41] Also, to be unconscious in this way just a few years prior would have signaled great blood loss and trauma in the body, which signaled danger, therefore, for many surgeons, these visual cues were hard to ignore. Others fears stemmed from the evidence that suggested that ether worsened respiratory problems, worsened bleeding and slowed healing.[42]

Army surgeon John Porter wrote in 1852 regarding his fears that ether poisoned the blood and would greatly impede the healing process.[43] Some of these fears regarding anesthesia live on in the twentieth-first century, where general anesthesia is still regarded as one of the most dangerous parts of any surgical operation.[44] Another common fear, at the time, was felt among women of high society. They thought that ether might make them lose their self-control and they might embarrass themselves.[45]

Still one of the greatest fears spurred on by anesthesia was that it would lead to the performing of unnecessary operations. While the numbers before and after the advent of anesthesia doubled in Boston and in London, this did not mean that those surgeries performed were as such unnecessary or experimental.[46] Perhaps one of the explanations was that people who were fearful of the pain before the use of anesthesia were now persuaded to have operations performed. As was the case of a man in London in 1847 with a compound fracture, "[t]he patient refused to consent to an operation, said the surgeon, until he was promised it could be done without pain, using ether."[47] It seems likely that many people were willing to have more minor surgeries performed, which they might not have allowed prior to anesthesia. With the elimination of pain now a possibility, an increased number of people actively sought out medical attention. This is exemplified through the, one-third increase in the demand for surgery that was observed in the year following Morton's discovery at the Massachusetts General Hospital.[48] Pernick adamantly believes that anesthesia did not increase the rates of unnecessary or experimental surgeries and that the rates of these operations were actually higher prior to the use of anesthesia.[49] While anesthesia was only used to perform unnecessary or experimental surgery in extreme cases, this does give insight into how the power relationship between doctor and patient changed as a result.

One of the statistics that fueled the fear of using anesthesia was that it might lead to higher death rates. In fact, "mid nineteenth century American physicians thought anesthetic surgery did kill about five percent more patients than non-anesthetic operations did."[50] This observation,

however, was not true. The fear of death from anesthesia was so great that the Pennsylvania Hospital banned all forms of its use for seven years after its discovery.[51] There was great fear that when ether was used at such high doses, as to make the patient unconscious, that it could in fact poison the patient.[52] Reports in newspapers brought the case to the public that anesthesia could lead to death. No doubt these accounts only fueled the fire of the negative perception of anesthesia, leaving some people's fear of death by anesthesia greater than the fear of pain from the surgery itself.[53]

The idea that some patients were more able to cope with pain while others were more sensitive to it was an idea that predated anesthesia but would later impact its widespread use. Before anesthesia, it was not uncommon for some people to run away from surgeries while others were able to bear the same procedure in relative silence.[54] It was believed nineteenth-century women, biologically, were more sensitive than men and this theory was used to explain the social subordination of women.[55] The fact that anesthesia was used more often on women gave it a negative association of being used only on the weak, and that it was not something tough men required. This is a possible explanation for the delayed use of anesthesia on the male sector of society. Pernick writes, "women and children supposedly required painkillers more often than did men; the rich and educated more often than the poor and ignorant."[56] In fact, the rates at which surgeries were performed on women after the advent of anesthesia more than tripled, while for men it only doubled.[57] This evidence suggests that prior to anesthesia, surgeries were most likely performed on those patients who were deemed tough enough to bear the pain, while women and children may have been less likely to be operated on.[58] Anesthesia greatly changed the rate at which surgeries were performed on the more 'sensitive' in society.[59]

Social conditions also played into the understanding of sensitivity, Penick writes, "[a]nd if poverty and degradation produced numbness, the combination of wealth, status, femininity could breed a truly exquisite sensitivity."[60] These theories of sensitivity to pain greatly played into

the selective use of anesthesia. Pernick asserts that the end of the era of selective anesthetization came as a result of new anesthetic techniques and an overall revival in the field of medical interventionism.[61] This means that, for nearly forty years, anesthesia was not as widely used as it is today, on both minor and major surgeries and on all gender, ages and races.

Even by the time the use of anesthesia was more widespread in the medical field, it was not used on every patient or for every condition. Its use was favored far more for those cases deemed to be 'major'. In fact, "[t]he operations considered too 'minor' for anesthesia included many procedures that today are considered quite painful."[62] This limitation of anesthetization was one of the ways in which the risks associate with its use were decreased.[63] This demonstrates the great fear of overusing anesthesia. A fitting example of the selective use of anesthesia was the procedure of lithotomy.[64] It was believed that this procedure was not major enough to require anesthesia in adults. However, when this procedure was performed on children, it was almost always done with anesthesia and this was interpreted as relief for the patient as well as the surgeon.[65] The benefits of using anesthesia on children are largely described in terms of its benefit for the surgeon and his or her need for more control over their patient. "For children too little to be restrained by reason yet too big to be restrained easily by force, anesthesia was especially valuable."[66] It is interesting to note that there is no mention of the benefit of the use of anesthesia as eliminating pain for the child, but rather only that it facilitated the procedure for the surgeon. This meant that surgeons had the tendency to anesthetize children for even the most minor procedures as means of increasing their control.

The use of anesthesia greatly altered the doctor-patient relationship. For one, there are recorded cases of nineteenth-century doctors performing procedures on anesthetized patients who had not consented to the surgery.[67] This case is very different from the surgeries performed prior to anesthesia, where pain was the greatest factor. According to Peter Stanley, before anesthesia, many surgeons felt the decision-making process prior to the surgery was important for their patients to be a part of.[68] This

shared relationship between doctor and patient, whereby there was some common ground between the two, would be greatly threatened when the surgeon gained the upper-hand by virtue of anesthesia. Prior to anesthesia, "in the heightened emotion attending the event, surgeons and patients could build a bond of trust which might carry both through the ordeal before them," but without the emotional ordeal the bond was threatened.[69]

Some surgeons also felt free to perform unwanted surgeries on anyone they deemed incompetent to make rational decisions. Those deemed unable to make these decisions included children, the mentally ill and even women.[70] Some surgeons felt that they were in the best condition to decide what cases warranted surgery and so they justified the unwanted surgeries by explaining that they were only doing what they felt was best for the patient. Amazingly, if these cases went to court, the actions of the physician were seen as sound and not negligent.[71] It is clear that the threat of unwanted surgeries could lead to a fear that anesthesia gave the physician too much power over their patient. So while anesthesia should have actually lessened the fear of the patient, they now felt as if they had lost some of the power in their relationship with the physician. However, the rate of surgeries performed against the will of the patient did remain low and there were noted cases where the opposition of the patient to the surgery was respected by the surgeon.[72]

Patients also lost their ability to share their concerns and wishes during surgery, even if without anesthesia their wishes were most often ignored. On the changing relationship between surgeon and patient, it can be said that "doctors remained convinced that anesthesia removed the subtle barrier between civilization and bestiality– between proper and improper behavior."[73] The use of anesthesia gave more power to the surgeon, in that they were now dealing with a patient who was not present during the surgery in the same way they were before. The rise in the power of the surgeon can be seen especially in the cases of children, where surgeons used anesthesia in certain cases where it may have been unnecessary in order to gain control over the patient.[74] The

end of selective anesthetization came in the 1880s, when the amount of anesthetics became so great that they were used more widely.[75]

The development of anesthesia changed the way surgeries needed to be performed entirely. Ghislaine Lawrence points out that speed was the most important characteristic of pre-anesthetic surgery.[76] One of the delays with accepting the use of anesthesia was seen in the case of Liston, a pioneering Scottish surgeon, who performed an amputation in record time even though the patient was anesthetized. This demonstrates the fear to which the surgeon had regarding the new technique; perhaps he did not trust that the patient was really without pain.[77] This case also reveals that there is usually some delay in adapting to the use of new techniques. It took time for surgeons to relearn how to perform surgeries without speed as a primary goal. After anesthesia entered the operating room it allowed for other developments to follow. Schlich explains the degree to which anesthesia allowed for the use of antisepsis in the operating room, which hitherto would have been impossible with a struggling patient held down by assistants in addition to the chaos that it created.[78]

With the desire to eliminate the pain from surgery growing in the mid-nineteenth century, it seems an obvious conclusion that, once a remedy became available, it would be widely and quickly adopted by the medical community. However, the newfound technique of anesthesia suffered its share of criticisms, from surgeons and patients alike. The theory of anesthesia could not have been developed without first breaking down the way pain was understood within medicine. It needed to be redefined as something that was an unnecessary part of the healing process before society agreed to rid it from surgical procedures. Once the need for anesthesia became clearer in the 1830s, people still needed to be convinced that the risk of its use was worth the reward. The fact that it was developed by a relatively unknown dentist with little prior acclaim may have also gave rise to some of the criticisms anesthesia received. It was also developed as a way to bolster business for the dental profession; therefore perhaps the understanding of its great value in surgery was still

underappreciated in the 1840s. It seems that the benefit to the surgeon and the patient was not enough to convince both parties that anesthesia was worth the risk and the fear of relying on something relatively unknown. The answer to the question of why there was a delay in accepting the use of anesthesia is a complex one with many explanations. But perhaps the most important one is the way it changed the entire experience of surgery itself, from an experience which was shared between the surgeon and the patient to one which gave the surgeon increased power. The increased fear felt by the patient that they might die due to anesthesia was something that would take a long time to overcome. This, compounded with the fears of unnecessary surgeries as well as the perception of anesthesia being only for women or the poor, made people apprehensive of accepting its use. A lot of the fear surrounding anesthetization was felt by the surgeon, who was not sure if the patient was fully anesthetized and was left wondering if they were still alive. The great successes of anesthesia in that it eliminated pain ultimately outshone the risks it presented. Its ability to relieve the surgeon's stress and anxieties associated with inflicting pain helped it gain acceptance among professionals. Although anesthesia is still something that instills fear among those who must use it in surgery, the pain from surgery is still something that is greatly feared.

Notes

1. George Bankoff, *The Conquest of Pain: The Story of Anaesthesia* (London: Macdonald & Co, 1946), 142.

2. Martin S. Pernick, *A Calculus of Suffering: Pain, Professionalism and Anesthesia in Nineteenth-Century America* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1985), 3.

3. Ibid.

4. Peter Kandela, "Pain-Free Surgery," *The Lancet*, Vol. 352, No. 9134 (1998): 1159.

5. Bankoff, *The Conquest of Pain*, 14.

6. James Carrick Moore, *A Method of Preventing or Diminishing Pain in Several Operations of Surgery* (London, 1784), 9.

7. Ibid., 13.

8. Ibid., 22.

9. Thomas Dormandy, *The Worst of Evils: The Fight Against Pain* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006), 169.

10. Ibid.

11. Stephanie J. Snow, *Blessed Days of Anaesthesia: How Anaesthetics Changed the World* (Oxford: Oxford University, 2008), 23.

12. Dormandy, *The Worst of Evils*, 213.

13. Snow, *Operations Without Pain*, 11.

14. Ibid., 19.

15. Ibid., 201.

16. René Fülöp-Miller, *Triumph Over Pain*, trans by Eden Paul and Cedar Paul (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1938), 7.

17. Ibid.

18. Ibid.

19. Ibid., 90.

20. Dormandy, *The Worst of Evils*, 171.

21. Ibid., 82.

22. Ibid., 83.

23. Fülöp-Miller, *Triumph Over Pain*, 6.

24. Ibid, 82.

25. Dormandy, *The Worst of Evils*, 174.

26. Peter Stanley, *For Fear of Pain: British Surgery, 1790-1850* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2003), 201.

27. Thomas Schlich, "The Emergence of Modern Surgery," in *Medicine Transformed: Health, Disease and Society in Europe, 1800-1930*, ed. Deborah Brunton (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004), 76.

28. Snow, *Operations Without Pain*, 20.

29. Ibid., 21.

30. Fülöp-Miller, *Triumph Over Pain*, 398.

31. John Hilton, *On Rest and Pain: A Course of Lectures on the Influence of Mechanical and Physiological Rest in the Treatment of Accidents and Surgical Diseases, and the Diagnostic Value of Pain* (New York: William Wood & Company, 1879), 41.
32. Fülöp-Miller, *Triumph Over Pain*, 398.
33. Snow, *Operations Without Pain*, 21.
34. Ibid.
35. Dormandy, *The Worst of Evils*, 276.
36. Pernick, *A Calculus of Suffering*, 4.
37. Ibid.
38. Ibid.
39. Fülöp-Miller, *Triumph Over Pain*, 123.
40. Snow, *Blessed Days of Anaesthesia*, 4.
41. Ibid., 55.
42. Ibid.
43. Pernick, *A Calculus of Suffering*, 36.
44. Ibid., 37.
45. Ibid., 58.
46. Ibid.
47. Ibid.
48. Ibid., 221.
49. Ibid., 220.
50. Ibid.
51. Ibid., 36.
52. Ibid.
53. Ibid., 37.
54. Snow, *Blessed Days of Anaesthesia*, 63.
55. Ibid.
56. Pernick, *A Calculus of Suffering*, 6.
57. Ibid., 211.
58. Ibid., 220.
59. Ibid.
60. Ibid.,151.
61. Ibid., 7.
62. Pernick, *A Calculus of Suffering*, 6.

63. Snow, *Blessed Days of Anaesthesia*, 61.
64. Pernick, *A Calculus of Suffering*,172.
65. Ibid.
66. Ibid.
67. Ibid., 228.
68. Stanley, *For Fear of Pain*, 192.
69. Pernick, *A Calculus of Suffering*, 202.
70. Ibid., 229.
71. Ibid., 230-231.
72. Ibid., 232.
73. Snow, *Blessed Days of Anesthesia*, 57.
74. Pernick, *A Calculus of Suffering*, 173.
75. Ibid., 237.
76. Ghislaine Lawrence, "Surgery Traditional," *Companion Encyclopedia of the History of Medicine*, Vol. 2, ed. W. F. Bynum and Roy Porter (London and New York: Routledge, 1993), 980.
77. Schlich, "The Emergence of Modern Surgery," 79.
78. Ibid., 80.

Works Cited

Bankoff, George. *The Conquest of Pain: The Story of Anaesthesia*. London: Macdonald & Co, 1946.

Dormandy, Thomas. *The Worst of Evils: The Fight Against Pain*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006.

Fülöp-Miller, René. *Triumph Over Pain*. Translated by Eden Paul and Cedar Paul. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1938.

Hilton, John. *On Rest and Pain: A Course of Lectures on the Influence of Mechanical and Physiological Rest in the Treatment of Accidents and Surgical Diseases, and the Diagnostic Value of Pain*. New York: William Wood & Company, 1879.

Kandela, Peter. "Pain-Free Surgery." *The Lancet* Vol. 352, No. 9134 (1998): 1159.

Lawrence, Ghislaine. "Surgery Traditional." In *Companion Enyclopedia of the History of Medicine* Vol. 2, edited by W. F. Bynum and Roy Porter, 961-983.

London and New York: Routledge, 1993.

Moore, James Carrick. *A Method of Preventing or Diminishing Pain in Several Operations of Surgery*. London, 1784.

Pernick, Martin S. *A Calculus of Suffering: Pain, Professionalism and Anesthesia in Nineteenth-Century America*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1985.

Schlich, Thomas. "The Emergence of Modern Surgery." In *Medicine Transformed: Health, Disease and Society in Europe, 1800-1930*, edited by Deborah Brunton, 61-91. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004.

Snow, Stephanie J. *Blessed Days of Anaesthesia: How Anaesthetics Changed the World*. Oxford: Oxford University, 2008.

Snow, Stephanie J. *Operations Without Pain: The Practice and Science of Anaesthesia in Victorian Britain*. Houndsmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006.

Stanley, Peter. *For Fear of Pain : British Surgery, 1790-1850*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2003.