PANGAEA

The Dalhousie Undergraduate History Journal

2013

Pangaea

Editor
Kate Park

Assistant Editors
Daisy Ramsden
Lindsay Oliver

Cover Design
Jeremy Bridge

Editorial Board
Conner Coles
Rebecca Riordon
Stephanie Conrod
Alex Sisley
Sarah Kasupski
Shoshana Deutsh

Faculty Advisors
Dr. Justin Roberts
Dr. Michael Ramsay
Dr. Jack Mitchell
Dr. Krista Kesselring
Dr. Cynthia Neville
Dr. Denis Kozlov
Dr. Shirley Tillotson
Dr. Roger Marsters

Special Thanks
The Dalhousie History Department
The Dalhousie Undergraduate History Society
Tina Jones
Dr. Ruth Bleasdale

Editor's Note

"To me, history ought to be a source of pleasure. It isn't just part of our civic responsibility. To me, it's an enlargement of the experience of being alive, just the way literature or art or music is."
— David McCullough

For us, history is a source of pleasure; it is the reason we came to school, and it is the reason for this journal. Pangaea 2013 is a result of much hard work and dedication, from our contributors, editors, faculty members, and staff.

Each contributor was able to bring a fresh perspective to the topics they covered in their respective fields, thus creating a diverse and engrossing read. Many hours of research and writing have brought us the thorough and thought provoking papers within these pages.

Papers in this journal come from a variety of historical backgrounds and cover diverse topics, from Ancient Rome to an English prison to Soviet Russia. While these papers were written for a variety of classes each and every paper reflects the individual style of its author and their personal interests.

Each editor was also able to bring their solid and differing opinions to the table giving way to many hours of discourse and many more emails. Through the selection process we were able to uncover the talents of each and every contributor and select papers that would best highlight these qualities.

I would like to extend my greatest thanks and congratulations to everyone involved in making Pangaea 2013 a great success.

Your partner in time,

Kate

Contributor Biographies

William Coney is a second year student of the History and Religious studies program at Dalhousie University. His paper, "Creating the Model of the Big Mac in Ancient Rome", was written for Death, Sex, and Gold in Ancient Rome, taught by Dr. Jack Mitchell in the Fall of 2012. In it, it touches upon areas of academic research which he is interested in, Ancient Agriculture, Environmental History, and the "Average" or "Daily" life of individuals throughout the Antique and Medieval Periods.

Connor Coles is a fourth year Honours History student at the University of King's College. He is originally from Quispamsis, New Brunswick and has recently been accepted to do a Master's in History at Dalhousie University, which he will be pursuing in the upcoming fall semester. He enjoy soccer, pickles, and eats too much Subway.

Craig Hyatt is a fourth-year student doing a Major in History, with an unofficial focus on medieval and early modern British history. He's been interested in history (and particularly military history) since reading several books by Pierre Burton about the War of 1812 when he was about ten years old. After graduation, he hope to get a job teaching history to the public at a museum or a national historic site.

Tamar Wolofsky is currently in the third year of her Contemporary Studies and History degree. This summer she will be in Berlin attending the Leo Baeck Summer University for Holocaust studies. In Halifax, she performs with Uncles Improv and tries to grow tomato plants on her balcony.

Genny Plumptre is a third-year student of Contemporary Studies and History. Her paper "Everything in its Right Place" arose out of a fascination with how people interact with their surroundings, constructing an environment that at once expresses and shapes human behaviour. Genny has an affinity for quiet musings, creative writing, found objects, and people watching which she hopes to one day develop into a workable career path.

Nicole Drover is a fourth year double major in political science and history. Her academic interest is specifically in Soviet cultural history. She is originally form Calgary, and is graduating in May.

Brenna Santacroce is a 3rd year student at the University of King's College. She is pursuing a Combined Honours degree in Contemporary Studies and History.

Hillary MacKinley is a third year student at the University of King's College. She will be entering the Honours program in history this coming fall as well as completing a minor in Law and Society. Her favourite areas of study are the Atlantic world and early modern England.

Lindsay Oliver is graduating in May with a BA in History and Social Anthropology. She has focused on Canadian history and issues of social inequality. After graduation she will be spending some time volunteering around Nova Scotia and Guatemala, then would like to purse a second degree in either Social Work or Therapeutic Recreation. She has been involved in the Dalhousie Undergraduate History Society for three years, and in the Dalhousie Arts and Social Sciences Society for two years. When not in school she enjoys tea, getting her Jeep dirty, listening to country music, cuddling with her cat, ballet, yoga, reading, traveling, and trying her hand at new things.

Table of Contents

William Coney

"Optāsne Frixa cum eā?";
Creating a Model of the Big Mac in Ancient Rome.

"A Big Mac – the communion wafer of consumption"
John Ralston Saul[1]

   The Big Mac, to many people, serves as a symbol of the widespread influence and impact of American consumerism and capitalism. It has made its impact felt across the world, becoming available around most of the globe, and spreading to become part of a modern empire of fast food, representing McDonalds, and its country of origin, the United States of America. This can be especially seen in the creation of the Big Mac Index, a measurement of purchasing power parity which is dependent on the identical nature of the Big Mac around the world, and the differing prices, even when accounting for the differing values of currency. But how does this sandwich stack up in one of the greatest empires of the ancient world, the Roman Empire? Most everything required in a Big Mac burger, the bread, cheese, lettuce, onions, pickles, the special sauce, and the burger itself is either widely available or easily substituted in the setting of later Imperial Rome, which allows for the creation of a Big Mac. Furthermore, because of Diocletian's Edict on Maximum Prices, and other sources on the pricing of goods, this allows for the pricing of the Big Mac, and then a comparison to the modern cost of the Big Mac with the Big Mac Index. Through creating this model, one can get a new analysis[2] on the relative prosperity and worth of Rome, presented in a very modern sense.

   If the model of the Big Mac has any hope of panning out, it must begin with the bread. The bun of the Big Mac consists of three parts, the crown, the club, and the heel.[3] These buns weigh altogether an average of about 82 grams, and serve as an integral part of the sandwich.[4] However, the composition of these buns is bleached white flour[5], which presents an issue in its translation to the ancient world. While there were similar variants of bleached wheat flours in the ancient world, they would have been uncommonly used, as other grains were preferred. Other types of grains and flours were available and would be more widely commonly consumed than the monoculture of bleached wheat flour in contemporary North American culture[6]. Taste wise, it would be right to assume the use of spelt flour or similar grains, as is done with individuals who try to reenact the cuisine of Ancient Rome.[7] Robert Allen, a prominent economic historian of Rome, has placed the price of bread in ancient Rome at about .394 grams of silver per kilogram of bread, during the reign of Emperor Diocletian. Diocletian issued a Price Edict in 301, which while relatively ineffectual at acting as a stabilizing economic measure, gives one of the most complete models of Roman prices available. This Edict, as a consequence serves as the background to the costs discussed, and by extrapolating from it we can find the costs for the Roman Big

---

[1] Saul, The Doubter's Companion A Dictionary of Aggressive Common Sense, 10.

[2] The print edition, *The Big Mac Index Fast Food for Thought.*

[3] Daily Mail Reporter, Make a big mac at home! McDonald's top chef explains the secret to the chain's burger (but why doesn't it look quite like what you get at the counter?).

[4] See Figure 1. Measurements of a Contemporary Big Mac.

[5] "Big Mac Nutrition."

[6] Margaritis and Jones, "Greek and Roman Agriculture", 165169.

[7] "Neill", post on *Pass the Garum,* Cato's Roman Bread. Giacosa, Ilaria Gozzini, *A Taste of Ancient Rome,* 16.

Mac, both in terms of Denarii Communes, the notational currency used by the Edict, and United States Dollars. These values can be seen in Figure 2., a table which prices the components of a Big Mac out, and converts them to modern prices. This table presents us with a value of .0264 dollars for the 82 grams of bread which can be found in a Big Mac burger.[8]

Similarly, the cheese would also have been very different in the ancient world, especially from the cheese found in the Big Mac. This "American" cheese is soft, rubbery, and often with a peculiar colour, the result of modern preservatives, additives, and refrigeration techniques. In reading the works of the ancient gentleman farmers, Cato, Varro, and Columella, we find they all paint for us a very different image of cheese production, largely one which was not as standardized to the degree that it was today.[9] Instead of adding chemicals or ingredients to the cheese, the preservation of the cheese would have been obtained by drying, or more infrequently salting, the cheese making it similar to a Pecorino Romano[10] Another aspect to consider is the consistent production of cheese and the consistency found in all aspects of the dairy industry these days, both for reasons of economies of scale and to ensure that a standard cheese can be shipped everywhere as part of a standard Big Mac worldwide. While manufactories were used for many agricultural products, such as olive oil and wine, cheese would have been different from region to region, as the local processes and climate changed.[11] While cheese was a common enough product, its use in cooking seems to have been as a spread or topping, or in baking.[12] There is not much evidence that cheese was cooked into or onto meat, which is unfortunate for recreating the Big Mac in Rome. This said, we can now begin to explore specifics of the cheese within the Roman Big Mac. A Big Mac contains on average two slices of cheese, which weigh in at 14 grams.[13] When used with Diocletian's Price Edict, the cheese within the burger would cost 0.34 Denarii Communes, or 0.0264 United States Dollars (USD) today.

Moving ahead, the lettuce within the Big Mac today could be viewed as ostensibly healthy by some, insofar as the Big Mac as a whole could be considered healthy. This tradition is mirrored in the literary evidence which we have from Roman times, especially within the works of Pliny's Natural History, an encyclopedia of the Roman understanding of the natural world. Within this text, Pliny goes on to describe a variety of uses for the greenery;

> "Indeed [the various species of lettuce] all have a cooling quality, and consequently are acceptable in summer. They relieve the stomach of distate for food and promote appetite. At all events it is stated that the late lamented Augustus in an illness, thanks to the sagacity of his doctor, Musa, was cured by lettuce, which had been refused him by the excessive scruples of his previous doctor, Gaius Aemilius; this was such a good advertisement for lettuces that the method was then discovered of keeping them into the months when they are out of season, pickled in honey-vinegar. It is also believed that lettuces increase the blood-supply."[14]

Lettuce as a whole is not tremendously interesting, in modern times or in ancient times, and does not appear much out of the culinary tradition. In the culinary tradition

---

[8] See Figure 2. Component and Big Mac Prices in Denarii Communes, United States Dollars.

[9] Lucius Junius Moderatus Columella, *Res rustica VIX,* 284289.

[10] Dalby and Grainger, *The Classical Cookbook,* 2526.

[11] Curtis, "Food Processing and Preperation", 384385.

[12] Edwards, The Roman Cookery of Apicius, 176177. Dalby and Grainger, The Classical Cookbook, 9296.

[13] See Figure 2. Component and Big Mac Prices in Denarii Communes, United States Dollars.

[14] Pliny the Elder, *Libri XVII XIX,* 502505.

recorded, lettuce would present itself by the leaf, or in a pureed state combined with other substances.[15] As such, the shredded lettuce to be found in the 15 Big Mac, while not impossible, would have been more likely to have been the individual leafs which can be found in the more gourmet burgers. The measurements taken with the Big Mac indicates lettuce to average at 14 grams, meaning that for Ancient Rome, the lettuce would have cost .015 Denarii Communes, or 0.0132 USD.

With the previous items addressed, the next presents itself as a real pickle. Cucumbers were widely regarded and popular in Ancient Rome, seeming to have been a real favorite of Emperor Tiberius, as Columella tells us of the immense investment and resources which this emperor would spend on the plant to be supplied with the treat throughout the year. At the same time it seems that pickling of vegetables was a common practice, seen as an attractive way to preserve the vegetables for the less fertile seasons, done with parsnips and houseleeks among other vegetables.[16] But for cucumbers, we are presented with another, alternative process which seems to have been applied to these gourds. According to Pliny the Elder, "Cucumber seed should be soaked for two days in milk mixed with honey before it is sown, in order to make the cucumber sweeter."[17] The modern understanding of this is as a process which influences the amount of Cucurbitacin in the cucumber, the chemical responsible for making the cucumber and similar vegetables bitter.[18] By soaking the seeds, this would allow for them to be less stressed as they grew, and would result in a less bitter, sweeter cucumber. As such, and with no direct evidence of any production of pickled cucumbers, these sweet cucumbers will act in proxy for the cucumbers of the modern Big Mac even if they are not a perfect replica. The cucumbers in the Big Mac measure out to be about 7 grams, meaning that it would cost 0.044 Denarii Communes for them in ancient Rome, and 0.0176 USD.[19]

Saucing it up a little, we can see one of the most Roman aspects of the Big Mac, the Big Mac Sauce. While the paprika present within it would not be something found in the Roman world, the concept of sauce pervades Roman cuisine. Sauce was slathered on almost everything, used to create a sense of sweetness or saltiness which could be considered sickening from a modern point of view. Patronius, with his "Satyricon" provides quite the example of this during Trimalchio's Feast, during which Habinnas describes a prior dinner in minute detail;

> "For the first course we had a pig crowned with sausages and served with bloodpuddings and very nicely done giblets, and of course beetroot and pure wholemeal bread which I prefer to white myself: it's very strengthening and I don't regret it when I do my business. The next course was cold tart and a concoction of first class Spanish wine poured over hot honey. I didn't eat anything at all of the actual tart, but I got stuck in the honey. Scattered round was chickpeas, lupines, a choice of nuts and an apple apiece though I took two."[20]

This love of sauces can be seen further in the Apician cooking tradition, which gives us an entire book of sauces, "De Condituris" (On Condiments), a useful reference when trying to find an analogue to replace the Big Mac sauce.[21] By listening to the description of McDonalds Executive Chef Dan Coudreaut, who describes the Big Mac sauce as one filled

---

[15] Edwards, *The Roman Cookery of Apicius,* 5052.

[16] Lucius Junius Moderatus Columella, *Res rustica XXII,* 158163.

[17] Pliny the Elder, *Libri XVII XIX,* 463.

[18] 18 University of Nebraska-Lincoln, *Bitterness in Cucumbers and Zucchini.* 5.

[19] See Figure 2. Component and Big Mac Prices in Denarii Communes, United States Dollars.

[20] Petronius, *The Satyricon,* 53.

[21] Giacosa, Ilaria Gozzini, *A Taste of Ancient Rome,* 26.

with "contrasting flavour", the qualities desired within the sauce become visible.[22] The recipe that makes the most sense would be "Ius in Venationibus Elixis et Assis" (Sauce for all boiled and roasted game).[23] This sauce contains a mixture of pepper, rue, lovage, celery seeds, thyme, mint, and pennyroyal, alongside juniper berries, honey, and Oxygarum, a vinegar based fish sauce. Such a sauce seems to have been inexpensive and widely available in the ancient world, and while Diocletian's Price Edict does not go to a level of detail which allows us to really find the cost of the materials in the sauce itself, with most minor spices simply listed as "Condimens", it does let us approximate the cost of the sauce as a whole with a simple "Liquamen" sauce. As such, the price of the sauce would have be estimated at .044 Denarii Communes, or 0.03872 USD for the 18 grams of Big Mac sauce to found in a Big Mac.[24]

    As we quickly approach the final layers of the Roman Big Mac, it feels only right to stop a moment and shed a tear for our good friend, the Onion. But the onion, besides acting in the medicinal usages which Pliny the Elder gives, was also known for other, more mystical connotations.[25] An example of this can be found in Plutarch in his "De Iside et Osiride" (On the Worship of Isis and Osiris), a part of his "Moralia", one of the best records we have to this day on Roman Egyptology. While as a whole the Ancient Egyptian tradition would not have been widespread throughout the empire, it would be tolerated amidst the diverse array of religious customs and practices in the empire. In this work, Plutarch describes how "Dictys, the nurseling of Isis" died when he fell into a river, grasping for clump of onions.[26] As such, within this faith, "... the priests keep themselves clear of the onion and detest it and are careful to avoid it." He further casts it into an inauspicious light, noting that it thrives in the waning moon, and that "It is suitable for neither tasting nor festival because in the one case it causes thirst and in the other tears for those who partake in it." Interestingly, another prominent Roman writer, Ovid, would cast the onion in a much different light. In Ovid's "Ars Armatoria" (The Art of Love) and his "Remedia Amoris" (The Cure for Love), he identifies the onion as an aphrodisiac to assist in the courtship process of a young Roman male.[27] In Ars Armatoria interestingly, the onion is presented as one of the better tasting aphrodisiacs;

> "Some counsel the taking of savoury, noxious herb; it is poison, in my judgement; or they mingle pepper with the seed of biting nettle, and yellow camomile ground up in old wine; but the goddess whom lofty Eryx holds upon his shady hill will not thus be driven to her joys. Let white onions sent from the Pelasagian city of Alcathous, be eaten, and the salacious plant which comes from the garden, eggs too and Hymettian honey, and the nuts that the sharpleaved pine tree bears."

    Inversely, in his Remedia Amoris, Ovid records this last advice to help a young man through the emotional difficulties of break up:

> "And then there is diet too; that I may perform all a physician's task, I will tell you what to take and what to shun. Onions, be they Daunian or sent from Libyan shores or come from Megara all are harmful. Nor less should you avoid salacious rocket, and whatever sets our bodies in trim for Venus. More usefully may you rue that sharpens the eyesight, and whatever sets our bodies out of trim for Venus."

---

[22] Daily Mail Reporter, Make a big mac at home! McDonald's top chef explains the secret to the chain's burger (but why doesn't it look quite like what you get at the counter?).

[23] Edwards, *The Roman Cookery of Apicius,* 202.

[24] See Figure 2. Component and Big Mac Prices in Denarii Communes, United States Dollars.

[25] Pliny the Elder, *Libri XX XXIII,* 2427.

[26] Plutarch, *Libri V,* 21.

[27] Ovid, *The Art of Love and Other Poems,* 95, 233.

Overall, the onion seems to have taken on a wide and varied role within Roman society, but one which shows its widespread usage and acceptance in Roman cuisine. With this said, the price of onions in Rome was 0.09 Denarii Comunes for the 15 grams needed, for a USD price of 0.0792.[28]

At this point the meat of the problem in creating a model of the Roman Big Mac, the Beef Patty, remains. Described as a "100% Pure USDA Inspected Beef; No Fillers, No Extenders.", the modern Big Mac has used this as a major selling point, with the all too familiar jingle *"Two allbeef patties, special sauce, lettuce, cheese, pickles, onions – all on a sesame seed bun."[29]* This said though, Beef was not an especially popular meat in Ancient Rome, and had nowhere the same level of popular acceptance or widespread consumption which we find today. This can be explained in a few ways. Part of this can be attributable to the climate of the Mediterranean, which is very much defined in the terms of a dry summer and a wet winter. This varies from the environments of Northern Europe and the United States, where a temperate and more consistent rainfall allows for cattle to be raised more easily. This is also seen with the technology employed by the Romans for farming, namely basic plows.[30] These ploughs, harnessed to work cattle without significant mechanical advantage, stressed the cow and made their meat stringy and tough. Such a meat would be undesirable, and only eaten at the end of the cow's natural life. To find a meat as ubiquitous as beef in the ancient world, we must go the whole hog and embrace the pig. Pig was the go to meat in ancient Rome, used for both oblations and consumption. Archaeological evidence provides us with traces of manufactories devoted to raising swine, something which evokes images of the factory farming of the present era.[31] The role of the pig in Roman society was seen as so central that it would become used a symbol of Roman rule in the polemic between Romans and Jews in Roman Palestine, where each side would define itself and the other by their consumption of pork.[32] For these reasons and more, it would be entirely reasonable for the role of beef in the Big Mac to be substituted by pork, as Robert Allen does in his writings on Roman economic history.[33] But even with the meat replaced, a burger made up of only ground meat with black pepper and salt would likely have been found to be bland in Rome. In Apicius, we are provided with the dish "Esicia omentata."[34] In this recipe, the meat would have been ground with winesoaked bread, grain, myrtle berries and pine nuts, resulting in a flavourful meatloaf of sorts. While it seems that patties could have been made out of a variety of meats, Apicius states "The ground meat patties of peacock have first place if they are fried … and those of suckling pig, fifth", reinforcing the decision to use pork in the model of a Roman Big Mac.[35] All this said, the sauce which was made earlier should render Esicia Omentata unnecessary, and allow one to simply use the ground meat. According to the Price Edict, the 66 grams of beef would have cost 0.03 Denarii Communes, making the whole add

---

[28] See Figure 2. Component and Big Mac Prices in Denarii Communes, United States Dollars

[29] Gallagher, "Beefedup old jingle pays off for big mac."

[30] Margaritis and Jones, "Greek and Roman Agriculture"*,* 165 169.

[31] Kron, "Animal Husbandry, Hunting, Fishing, and Fish Production", 183.

[32] Rosenblum,"'Why Do You Refuse to Eat Pork?' Jews, Food, and Identity in Roman Palestine."

[33] Allen, "How Prosperous were the Romans? Evidence from Diocletian's Price Edict (301 AD)", 45.

[34] Giacosa, Ilaria Gozzini, *A Taste of Ancient Rome,* 8990.

[35] The Economist online, *Daily Chart the Big Mac Index.* A similar decision was made in relation to the Maharaja Mac, a Big Mac proxy made out of chicken produced in India, done for mostly religious reasons. The Economist recognizes that this good is not strictly equivalent, but chooses to compare it for the purposes of the Big Mac Index anyways.

up to 1.408 USD.[36]

      With laborious effort a model of the Roman Big Mac has been constructed, allowing for the product to be sold. But the issue remains of the nonfood costs associated, mainly that of the workforce. Within the Roman world, slave labour was widely employed as a cheap, reliable means to get tasks done. This applied for both those slaves who were skilled labourers, acting as assistants to freedmen or working with fragile crops like grapes, and to the unskilled labour force which would be those employed at a McDonalds, both in the past and the present. The Diocletian Price Reforms give us the cost of a day's worth of labour from such an individual at about 3.625 Denarii Communes.[37] When split among an estimated 940 burgers a day, this would make it so that each burger cost about .001 Denarii worth of labour, which is about 0.00088 USD.[38] With these final costs, the value of the Big Mac in Roman times can now be established. Assuming that the a ten percent markup for profit is in effect, this would make the retail value of the Roman Burger 2.16 Denarii Communes or 1.8832 USD.[39] This price, while very low, is not completely unthinkable. With more specific details and costs factored in, it would make sense that this price would become similar to that of the Ukraine or Hong Kong.[40] With this, we can now compare the price to that of a modern Big Mac in the US.

      When this value is then subsequently placed onto the Big Mac Index, we get a Big Mac Index Value of 44.838, indicating a 44% undervaluation of the product compared to the US Dollar. This could be for any number of reasons, from the relative cheapness of goods and especially meat in the modern period, to simply many of any parts which are part of the modern McDonalds operation, such as the Franchise system and the use of centrally grown and distributed ingredients, or most basically to a misvaluation of the Roman denarius in itself. Another interesting question which can be explored with this concept is the affordability of the Big Mac to the average citizen. We can see that for the average unskilled labourer it would have made 36.1 nummi a day, which means that it would take 1.48 days worth of labour to afford a Big Mac, a huge amount of time and labour.[41] While this value needs to be taken with a grain of salt, it makes sense with the highly disparate wages and salaries which Romans earned.[42] All of these remain areas of potential future research, alongside some very basic questions which could very well open up new interest in this topic, such as "Would the Romans have a concept of a sandwich?". This question remains troubling to us in the modern day, as we still have issues in defining the sandwich itself in the modern period, with some choosing to define it as a "protein encased in bread product", a definition which applies to many ancient foods, such as the "Patina Apiciana".[43] Others reject this proposal, and choose to define the sandwich in relation to sliced bread, and the products wrapped within it.[44] This subject is at present the source of much discourse, both academically, and in an informal, public sense.[45] Despite these disputes, by analyzing the

---

[36] See Figure 2. Component and Big Mac Prices in Denarii Communes, United States Dollars.

[37] Allen, "How Prosperous were the Romans? Evidence from Diocletian's Price Edict (301 AD)", 3.

[38] Gibbers, comment on "Rachel", "How many burgers on average does a McDonald's restaurant sell each day?"

[39] "McDonald's Corp. Profitability Analysis."

[40] The Economist online, Daily Chart the Big Mac Index.

[41] Allen, "How Prosperous were the Romans? Evidence from Diocletian's Price Edict (301 AD)", 3.

[42] Mitchell, "Rome on a denarius a day"

[43] Chillag, post on *Wait Wait... Don't Tell Me blog,* Sandwich Monday: 'Defining Sandwich'. Dalby and Grainger, The Classical Cookbook, 136137.

[44] White City Shopping Center v. PR Restaurants.

[45] Florestal, "Is a Burrito a Sandwich? Exploring Race, Class and Culture in Contracts", 159.

nature and value of a Big Mac in the Roman era, a new and unique perspective emerges on the times of the Romans in comparison to the present.

Figure 1. Measurements

Component	Big Mac 1 – Mass (Grams)	Big Mac 2 – Mass (Grams)	Big Mac 3 – Mass (Grams)	Big Mac – Avg Mass (Grams)
Buns	86	80	81	82
Lettuce	16	13	14	14
Beef	66	66	66	66
Sauce	18	18	18	18
Onions	13	17	14	15
Cheese	14	13	14	14
Pickles	6	7	7	7
Total	219	214	214	216

Figure 2. Component and Big Mac Prices in Denarii Communes, United States Dollars

Component[46]	Amount (Grams)[47]	Amount (Number of Units)[48]	Price in Denarii Communes[49]	Price in Nummus in 301 CE[50]	Value in Silver (Grams)[51]	Price in USD[52]
Bread	82	--	.03	.75	.024	.0264
Cheese	14	--	.34	8.5	.272	.2992
Lettuce	14	.03 heads (out of a 524g head of lettuce	.015	.375	.012	.0132
Pickles (Cucumber)	7	.05 Pickles (out of a 150g Pickle)	.02	.5	.016	.0176
Sauce (lus in Venationibus Elixis et Assis)	18	1.5 Tbsp (with a weight approx. that of	.044	1.1	.0352	.03872

Higgins, post on *parker higgins dot net,* on burritos, sandwiches, and the law.
[46]   Components change from the contemporary Big Mac to the Roman model, but quantity stays the same.
[47]   Data taken from Figure 1. – Measurements of a Contemporary Big Mac.
[48]   Allen, "How Prosperous were the Romans? Evidence from Diocletian's Price Edict (301 AD)." Some values, Bread Cheese, and Beef (Pork) are based of values generated by Allen. Others are based of contemporary vegetable sizes.
[49]   Jack Mitchell, e-mail message to author, November 24, 2012. Allen, "How Prosperous were the Romans? Evidence from Diocletian's Price Edict (301 AD)." Scheidel, "Real waged in Early Economies: Evidence for Living Standards from 1800 BCE to 1300 CE."
[50]   Jack Mitchell, e-mail message to author, November 24, 2012
[51]   Allen, "How Prosperous were the Romans? Evidence from Diocletian's Price Edict (301 AD)." Approximately .032 grams of silver per Nummus
[52]   "24hgold" Based off the price of Silver in US Dollars, $1.10 USD per gram on November 29th 2012

		mayonnaise)				
Onions	15	.15 Onions (our of a 100g onion)	.09	2.25	.072	.0792
Beef (Pork)	66	--	1.6	40	1.28	1.408
Labour	--	.001 burgers worth of labour (out of 940 burgurs)	.001	.025	.0008	.00088
Total	216	--	2.16	53.5	1.712	1.8832

Results were measured from local, contemporary Big Macs procured at the Quinpool Road McDonald's of Halifax on November 27th 2012. These are assumed to be representative of Big Mac Burgers from the United States and elsewhere.[53] I would like to acknowledge James Kho and Graham Jolliffe of Dalhousie University for assisting me in the measurement and disposal of these burgers.

---

[53]   The print edition, *The Big Mac Index Fast Food for Thought.*

Craig Hyatt

From Archers to Arquebusiers: The Replacement of the Longbow by Firearms in the English Army

       Throughout a large part of the later Middle Ages, the longbow played a significant role in English military and civilian life. Archery was practiced in most towns and villages by the majority of the English populace; on several occasions, archery practice was even mandated by royal decree. This constant practice meant that, in times of war, the English army was always able to draw upon a large reserve of highly skilled archers equipped with longbows. In the late medieval period, longbowmen became an increasingly important element of English armies, and played significant roles in many important English victories such as those at Crécy and Agincourt. By the end of the Middle Ages, English archers had established the longbow as the premier missile weapon in Europe, with capabilities clearly superior to those of both the standard bow and the crossbow. However, during the end of the Middle Ages and the beginning of the early modern period, the first firearms were introduced onto the battlefields of Europe. These weapons were generally crude and unreliable, in some cases even presenting a danger to their own users. Despite this, by the seventeenth century early firearms – specifically the arquebus and the musket – had replaced the longbow as the primary missile weapons of the English army. This paper investigates the reasons behind the longbow's decline and ultimate replacement. It examines the relative tactical capabilities of the longbow and early firearms, the differences in the training and practice required to effectively fire both weapons, and the quality and expense of early modern longbows. Ultimately, this paper concludes that the longbow was not replaced by firearms due to the latter's tactical capabilities; rather, the longbow was eventually supplanted largely because of the significant difficulties involved in training and supporting English longbowmen.

       Although the longbow was ultimately replaced by firearms during the early modern period, this phenomenon was almost certainly not caused by the superior capabilities of firearms: in fact, throughout the early modern period, the longbow was the better weapon in many regards. In terms of both its maximum and effective range, as well as rate of fire that it could maintain, the longbow was clearly superior to the weapons which replaced it. Though partially dependent upon the strength and skill of the archer, the longbow's maximum range was approximately 400 yards.[1] More important, however, was the distance at which a longbowman might expect to effectively hit a target, and Donald Featherstone estimates that the longbow's effective range was approximately 200-240 yards.[2] In contrast, early firearms were not nearly as effective. Although the arquebus possessed a maximum range of somewhere between 200-300 yards, Tom Wintringham suggests that it could only fire accurately at a range of about twenty yards.[3] However, Sir John Smythe, writing about arquebusiers in 1590, suggested that the arquebus had an even shorter effective range: "they [arquebusiers] must take heede that they doo not giue their volee ... till they [the enemy] come within eight, tenne, or twelue paces."[4] In short, the longbow's range far outstripped that of early modern firearms. The longbow's rate of fire was also superior to that of early

----

[1]   Bert S. Hall, <u>Weapons and Warfare in Renaissance Europe: Gunpowder, Technology, and Tactics</u> (Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 1997), 19.

[2]   Donald Featherstone, <u>The Bowmen of England: The Story of the English Longbow</u> (Clarkson N. Potter, Inc.: New York, 1967), 60.

[3]   Tom Wintringham and J. N. Blashford-Snell, <u>Weapons and Tactics</u> (Baltimore: Penguin Books Ltd, 1973), 105.

[4]   Sir John Smythe, <u>Certain Discourses</u> (London: Richard Johnes, 1590), 17.

firearms. Bert S. Hall estimates that English longbowmen would likely have been able to loose as many as ten arrows a minute.[5] When compared to an early musket, Thomas Esper notes that the longbow was able to maintain a rate of fire roughly five times greater.[6] Longbowmen could also maintain this rate of fire for longer than arquebusiers or musketeers. At the Battle of Crécy in 1346, English longbowmen fired an average of about ninety arrows each.[7] However, Sir John Smythe recorded that early firearms could only fire seven or eight shots at once before they became too hot to use safely.[8] In short, the longbow significantly outperformed early modern firearms in terms of both range and rate of fire.

Longbowmen were also less vulnerable on the battlefield than soldiers armed with either arquebuses or muskets. Due partly to their high rate of fire, longbowmen were nearly able to defend themselves in battle. Tom Wintringham writes that "[d]efence by longbow could almost be defence by fire alone."[9] However, the much slower rate of fire of early firearms meant that the soldiers carrying them were constantly in need of protection by shock troops, usually pikemen.[10] This need was so great that, when firearms were introduced onto the battlefield, "the proportion between men armed with projectile weapons and men armed with these shock weapons altered. The firearms were at first few; the pikes were many."[11] Bert S. Hall reaches a similar conclusion, writing that "the longbow ... required some form of protection for the archer ... firearms demanded even sounder protection."[12] Thus, the longbow's capabilities meant that English archers were less in need of battlefield protection than their counterparts carrying firearms.

Although the longbow was overall a better weapon than either the arquebus or the musket, early firearms did present certain advantages over their predecessor. Foremost among these was penetrating power, particularly when applied to armoured targets. Gervase Phillips argues that "[t]he superior performance of small arms in terms of armour penetration would seem to provide a compelling logic for their adoption in place of the bow."[13] However, longbows were able to pierce armour: Bert S. Hall suggests that, from a range of about 60-120 yards, the longbow's arrows retained enough force to penetrate leather, mail, and even some plate armour.[14] In a recent article, Steven Gunn proposes that, although the longbow could penetrate armour in some cases, in this area firearms were nevertheless superior:

> Guns' superiority lay in their penetration. Recent work has argued that while longbows were very effective against unarmoured men or even those wearing thin mild-steel plate armour, they stood little chance against the quenched high-carbon steel armour developed from the later fifteenth century. Here guns, with their vastly greater penetrative power, had a clear advantage.[15]

Yet although firearms were almost certainly better at penetrating armour than longbows, it must also be noted that at the same time firearms were being introduced into warfare in

---

[5]   Hall, Weapons and Warfare, 20.

[6]   Thomas Esper, "The Replacement of the Longbow by Firearms in the English Army," Technology and Culture 6 (1965): 383.

[7]   Hall, Weapons and Warfare. 20.

[8]   Smythe, Discourses. 18.

[9]   Wintringham and Blashford-Snell, Weapons and Tactics, 103.

[10]   Ibid., 108.

[11]   Ibid., 103.

[12]   Hall, Weapons and Warfare. 111-112

[13]   Gervase Phillips, "Longbow and Hackbutt: Weapons Technology and Technology Transfer in Early Modern England," Technology and Culture 40 (1999): 580.

[14]   Hall, Weapons and Warfare. 19.

[15]   Steven Gunn, "Archery Practice in Early Tudor England," Past and Present 209 (2010): 74.

Europe, the use of armour in warfare was declining.[16] In short, although the longbow did have the ability to penetrate armour under some conditions, firearms offered a greater ability to do so.

Firearms were, in some respects, also better suited to siege warfare than longbows. Donald Featherstone notes that longbowmen needed a significant amount of space around them in order to properly draw and fire their bows.[17] Thus, it was sometimes difficult to use longbows while standing in entrenchments or behind parapets during a siege; in these situations, longbowmen often simply did not have enough space to be able to use their weapons properly.[18] Steven Gunn and Gervase Phillips both note that, in the 1540's and 1550's, the English army was undertaking an increasing number of sieges, for which early firearms were in some respects better adapted than longbows.[19] Phillips even concludes that "[w]ith increasing involvement in prolonged siege warfare between 1544 and 1550, the arquebus became increasingly commonplace among English soldiers."[20] Thus, early firearms were still able to function in confined spaces where English archers simply did not have the room they required to properly draw their bows.

Ultimately, the longbow retained its tactical superiority over firearms throughout the early modern period. There were undoubtedly specific situations, most notably when engaging heavily armoured targets and operating during prolonged sieges, in which early firearms possessed certain advantages over their predecessor. However, in terms of basic tactical capabilities, longbows were unquestionably superior: they had a much longer range and faster rate of fire than early firearms. In addition, longbowmen were less vulnerable on the battlefield than soldiers armed with either the arquebus or the musket. Examining the relative capabilities of the longbow and firearms, Thomas Esper concludes that "the replacement of the longbow by firearms occurred at a time when the former was still a superior weapon."[21] Donald Featherstone even suggests that the longbow maintained this superiority at least until the time of the Battle of Waterloo in 1815.[22] Thus, although the superior penetrating power of early firearms and their usefulness in siege warfare might have contributed to the partial decline of the longbow, the longbow's overall superiority means that it could not have been completely supplanted due to the tactical capabilities of the firearm. Therefore, the true causes of the longbow's replacement must be sought elsewhere.

Although it was a very simple weapon, the longbow was also unquestionably a tremendously powerful one. Longbows measured roughly two metres in length, and were usually made of either elm or yew, which were both extremely stiff varieties of wood.[23] The arrows which these longbows propelled were larger than those of almost any other bow.[24] However, this immense power came at a significant cost: drawing and firing a longbow was physically very strenuous. Modern historians have calculated that fully drawing a longbow required a force of about 40-50 newtons.[25] Bert S. Hall characterizes the physical demands placed upon English archers by the longbow as "extreme."[26] Unsurprisingly, a significant amount of training was necessary in order to use such a powerful weapon effectively. Thomas Esper writes that "years of regular practice were necessary for the development of

16   Wintringham and Blashford-Snell, <u>Weapons and Tactics</u>, 103.
17   Featherstone, <u>Bowmen</u>, 186.
18   Phillips, "Longbow and Hackbutt," 587.
19   Gunn, "Archery Practice," 76.
      Phillips, "Longbow and Hackbutt," 587.
20   Phillips, "Longbow and Hackbutt," 587.
21   Esper, "Replacement of the Longbow," 393
22   Featherstone, <u>Bowmen</u>, 185.
23   Hall, <u>Weapons and Warfare</u>, 19.
24   <u>Ibid</u>.
25   <u>Ibid</u>.
26   Hall, <u>Weapons and Warfare</u>, 20.

good bowmen."[27] Without such training, the longbow would have been nearly useless as a weapon.[28] Both contemporaries of the longbow and modern historians are in agreement that this training would have been almost a lifelong endeavour. Roger Ascham, one of the foremost proponents of the longbow in early modern England, noted that archery could not be done properly as an adult, unless it had first been learned as a child.[29] Gervase Phillips agrees with Ascham's assessment, writing that "[e]ffective use of the bow depended on regular practice, beginning in childhood and maintained into manhood."[30] Thus, the skill and effectiveness of English longbowmen depended heavily upon the training which they received, both during their childhood and as an adult.

In late medieval England, such archery training and practice was commonplace across virtually the whole of the country. This constant practice of archery was so crucial to the maintenance of an effective reserve of longbowmen that it was legally required on two occasions, by Edward III in 1365 and by Elizabeth in 1591.[31] However, in the early modern period, archery practice in England was in a state of decline. Ascham admitted in his *Toxophilus* of 1545 that, although men kept longbows as required by law, they did not actually practice with them.[32] While discussing the role of archery practice in England, Steven Gunn writes that "by the [sixteenth] century's end there had clearly been decline."[33] In order to illustrate his point, Gunn uses records from musters of longbowmen in the sixteenth century. According to these documents, in 1522 about one in three longbowmen who attended the muster were classified as "competent."[34] However, by 1557, the percentage of competent archers had shrunk to only one man in four.[35] Other scholars have also noted that there was a significant decline in the practice of archery in sixteenth-century England. Thomas Esper writes that longbowmen "as a whole were more poorly trained in the sixteenth century, and especially at the end of it, than they were in preceding centuries; consequently the efficiency of an army of bowmen was reduced."[36] Thus, archery training and practice were both declining in England during the sixteenth century, resulting in the creation of less capable archers.

This decline in the practice of archery in England contributed in no small part to the decline and ultimate replacement of the longbow in the English army, and its replacement by early firearms. The longbow's immense power served to make it the preeminent missile weapon in Europe by the end of the medieval period, but it also contributed significantly to its ultimate downfall. Bert S. Hall writes that "the extreme demands longbow archery placed on its practitioners help to explain why, despite its success on the battlefield ... it was bound to decline and wither away even in the land of its birth."[37] As many scholars have noted, longbowmen needed to begin training at a young age and continue practising regularly in their adult life in order to use effectively what was unquestionably a highly demanding weapon. As archery practice decline in England, so did the longbowman's physical ability to use his weapon to its full potential. Illustrating this point, Thomas Esper writes that in the late sixteenth century Sir Roger Williams, an English army officer who fought extensively in Europe, observed "that, of five thousand archers, only one thousand could shoot with sufficient force to be effective."[38] In contrast to the physical demands placed upon archers by

---

27   Esper, "Replacement of the Longbow," 391.
28   Featherstone, <u>Bowmen</u>, 61.
29   Gunn, "Archery Practice," 61.
30   Phillips, "Longbow and Hackbutt," 584.
31   Esper, "Replacement of the Longbow," 392.
32   <u>Ibid</u>., 391.
33   Gunn, "Archery Practice," 68.
34   <u>Ibid</u>., 66.
35   <u>Ibid</u>.
36   Esper, "Replacement of the Longbow," 390.
37   Hall, <u>Weapons and Warfare</u>, 20.
38   Esper, "Replacement of the Longbow," 385.

the longbow, however, early firearms were comparatively easy to load and fire. Crucially, they did not require anywhere near the same amount of training as did the longbow. Bert S. Hall writes that,

> One could learn to use a crossbow, as one could learn to use later firearms, in a matter of weeks or at most months; and the rather low level of proficiency that was required could be kept up with a minimum of practice. Archers, at least those good enough to be useful for military purposes, have to train from childhood, and they frequently perform near the limits of human capabilities.[39]

In the end, the strenuous demands of drawing and firing a longbow contributed significantly to its decline in English army service, particularly once early firearms – which did not place anywhere near the same physical demands upon their operators – were introduced onto the battlefield.

Though the declining ability of English archers played a significant role in the longbow's decline and ultimate replacement, the longbow itself may have played a role in its own demise. During the early modern period, longbows were made mainly of yew, which had to be imported from Spain.[40] However, supply problems and commercial interests meant that the prices of high-quality bows increased to the point where it became difficult for ordinary subjects to purchase well-made bows of yew.[41] Steven Gunn suggests that, particularly in the sixteenth century, "many of those who bought them opted for cheap and inferior items."[42] The result of the increasing expense of bows, according to Gunn, was that "the quality of archery suffered."[43] Gervase Phillips also notes that the issues involved in supplying high-quality yew in the sixteenth century almost certainly made the increasing use of firearms an attractive option.[44] Thus, a decline in the quality of longbows themselves during the sixteenth century, caused by problems with the supply and importation of quality yew, also likely played a role in the longbow's replacement by firearms in the English army.

Ultimately, multiple factors had varying degrees of influence upon the longbow's replacement by firearms in the early modern English army. By and large, tactical considerations did not cause the longbow's replacement. In fact, in almost all respects the longbow was superior to firearms throughout the early modern period. In terms of its range and rate of fire, the longbow was clearly a far more effective weapon than either the arquebus or the musket. Longbowmen were also less vulnerable on the battlefield than their counterparts armed with firearms, and consequently required less protection by soldiers armed with shock weapons. However, firearms did possess two small advantages over the longbow: the bullets which they fired possessed a much greater ability to penetrate high-quality armour than a longbow's arrows, and less space was required by soldiers to fire a musket or arquebus than to properly draw and fire a longbow. Though these abilities could have given early firearms an advantage over the longbow in certain situations, the longbow still remained the superior weapon in most circumstances. Thus, the firearm's advantages – and particularly its better penetrating power – could have played a role in the longbow's partial decline. Despite this, as the longbow was a better overall weapon than the firearm, it could not have been completely replaced due to the latter's tactical capabilities on the battlefield. However, it is likely that the problems experienced in the early modern period with supplying sufficient quantities of high-quality yew for longbows did have an effect upon the longbow's ultimate replacement by firearms: the high price of yew meant that many English commoners bought inexpensive and thus inferior products, leading to an ultimate decline in the quality of archery. By far the most significant factor in the longbow's decline

---

[39]   Hall, Weapons and Warfare, 20.
[40]   Hall, Weapons and Warfare, 19.
[41]   Phillips, "Longbow and Hackbutt," 590.
[42]   Gunn, "Archery Practice," 71.
[43]   Ibid.
[44]   Phillips, "Longbow and Hackbutt," 593.

and ultimate replacement, however, was the massive physical demand which it placed upon the archer. The sheer physical strength required to properly draw a longbow meant that archers had to train regularly from childhood in order to maintain their effectiveness. Once the practice of archery in England started to decline in the early modern period, and particularly in the sixteenth century, archers were largely not able to receive the training needed to enable them to deal with the longbow's physical demands, and were therefore not able to retain their effectiveness on the battlefield. Ultimately, it was not tactical considerations which contributed to the longbow's decline: rather, it was largely the difficulty of training archers so as to give them the strength necessary to draw a longbow, when combined with the decline of this training in England, that led to the eventual and inevitable replacement of the longbow by firearms in the English army.

Hillary MacKinley

'The Unnatural Mother' and the Statute of 1624: Infanticide at the Old Bailey, 1674-

1704

Prior to 1624, infanticide had no formal standing within English secular law. Despite being dealt with by the King's courts on an increasing basis (under the indictment of murder), infanticide—and the pre-marital sex that so often led to it— remained the Church's responsibility until regulation became so insufficient that the Crown had to take over. The 1624 Statute, *An Acte to prevent the murthering of Bastard Children*, was intended to discourage women from having pre-marital relationships that would end with an illegitimate child being a financial burden on the parish. Controlling infanticide through the Common Law had proved problematic and legislators felt a law dealing specifically with this crime was necessary to ensure those who broke the law were brought to justice. The arguments of this paper will be based primarily on the indictments for infanticide found in the Old Bailey Proceedings of London between 1674 and 1704, of which there were sixty-nine. The start date for this study was chosen for pragmatic reasons: the Old Bailey records begin in this year. The end date of 1704 was selected because, after Jane Lyne was indicted in 1704,[1] there were no infanticide cases brought forward at the Old Bailey until January 1708. Concentrating on the seventeenth century was intentional, as scholarship on infanticide after the 1624 statute tends to focus on the eighteenth century, a period during which resistance to the particularity of infanticide regulations was becoming more pronounced.

The Accounts of the Ordinary of Newgate, chaplain of that notorious prison who heard the confessions of condemned criminals, will also be reviewed, where they are available. Pamphlets published during the same period, which describe the crime of infanticide, have also been examined as an indicator of public opinion about the crime. Three key questions will be asked of these sources: (1) Why did these women commit infanticide? (2) How were their crimes presented to and perceived by the public? (3) Why were so many women acquitted of a crime for which there was virtually no defence? Scholars have debated the specifics of the Statute and its practical implications, but this paper will argue that the Statute of 1624 *did* create a presumption of guilt where women kept their pregnancies a secret and hid the bodies of their dead children. It will also be put forward that the Statute was not enforced to its full extent and that some women at the end of the seventeenth century were still willing to risk censure under the Statute over the shame of an illegitimate child. Additionally, public opinion of infanticide will be shown to be more compassionate towards the both the victims and perpetrators of this crime than the calculated economic repugnance of the state to bastardy indicated. It will also be argued that by the close of the seventeenth century there was already evidence of resistance to the Statute's presumption of guilt, which contradicted the presumption of innocence, established in Common Law for all other cases of homicide.

I

Infanticide has a long history in England, but it was only at the end of the medieval period, or the first half of the sixteenth century, that secular courts recognized it as a

---

[1] *Old Bailey Proceedings Online* [hereafter OBP] (http://www.oldbaileyonline.org), March 1704, Jane Lyne (t17040308-35).

distinct crime. Prior to this, infanticide could only be charged as homicide under common law, which posed problems for prosecutors. As a result, infanticide was usually brought before the ecclesiastical courts. The most common method used to kill children during the medieval period—or the one most concerning the authorities—was *overlaying*.[2] Overlaying occurred when a mother took her young child to bed with her and smothered it with her body during the night.[3] This method was common because it was difficult to discern if the mother's intentions were homicidal. Prior to 1624, overlaying was treated as a sin, not a crime and defined in broader terms. Mothers, fathers, and often the two in conjunction were brought before the courts on these charges.[4] Additionally, under cannon law, "infanticide by overlaying contained no allegation of intent to kill," though intent might lead to a more severe punishment.[5] During the 13th century, the penance for this crime was "one year on bread and water and two additional years without flesh or wine."[6] The most severe punishment for an infanticide offence was public whipping, the same chastisement meted out for other sexual offenses.[7] The punishment of infanticide during this period was that of a moral offence, and its treatment suggests that it was considered a less serious offence than homicide.[8]

While infanticide was not necessarily socially acceptable, it was often— quietly— acknowledged to be a necessity of survival for the poor.[9] In the absence of birth control, families unable to support another child would relieve themselves of the new financial burden. Some scholars suggest that during the sixteenth century the Reformation undermined the authority of the ecclesiastical courts and broke down the moral standards imposed by the Church.[10] As the Church became increasingly unable to deal with these crimes, they gradually came under the jurisdiction of secular courts.[11] This shift was formalized with the passing of *An Acte to prevent the murthering of Bastard Children* in 1624. This shift in jurisdiction also resulted in a redefinition of the crime. After 1624, infanticide became a crime committed exclusively by single mothers and intent was not only implied, but assumed.

While the statute of 1624 constituted a major shift in the legal definition of infanticide, these shifts were in keeping with the traditional treatment of bastardy. Bastardy was a crime with moral implications very similar to those of infanticide following 1624, as both were the result of extra--marital sexual intercourse. What is striking about bastardy, however, is that it was an offence primarily concerned with economic implications. The sin of the parents was decried, but punishment of the crime was determined by economic factors. The statute of 1610, which condemned female bastard bearers to the house of correction only applied if their bastard was "chargeable to the Parish."[12] If paternity could be established, and the father was capable of providing for the child, the offence was not brought before the courts at all.[13] Concern with the financial burden on the community when providing for a

---

2   Catherine Damme, "Infanticide: the worth of an infant under law," *Medical History* 22.1 (1978): 3.

3   *Ibid*.

4   R. H. Helmholz, "Infanticide in the Province of Canterbury During the Fifteenth Century," *History of Childhood Quarterly* 2.3 (1975): 385.

5   *Ibid*., 381.

6   Damme, "Infanticide," 3.

7   Helmholz, "Infanticide in the Province of Canterbury," 384.

8   *Ibid*.,

9   Damme, "Infanticide," 5--6.

10   *Ibid*., 10.

11   *Ibid*., 10.

12   *Statutes of the Realm* Vol. 4 Part 2 (facsimile) (Buffalo: William S. Hein & Co., 1993), 1161.

13   Alan Macfarlane, "Illegitimacy and illegitimates in English history," In *Bastardy and its*

bastard actually led to a form of torture carried out on women in labour by their midwives. The latter were directed to refuse the former aid until they had revealed the child's paternity.[14] More interestingly, if the parents of a bastard were married—regardless of when —the effect was retroactive and the child was automatically considered legitimate.[15] The latter measure, particularly, expresses the monetary concerns involved in punishing crimes involving illegitimate children.

Finally, infanticide during this period must also be understood within the context of high infant mortality. During the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, over one-half of the children born died before the age of three.[16] There were risks for older children as well: between 1500 and 1800, 25 to 30 per cent of recorded births resulted in mortality before the age of fifteen.[17] Even children who were well provided for were vulnerable to the conditions of the time, such as raw sewage flowing through the streets and frequent epidemics.[18] These factors contributed to a general lack of concern for infants reminiscent of the crime's original status as an ecclesiastical, rather than secular, offence—a situation that subjected perpetrators to the church's milder capacity for punishment. While these conditions were crucial to the social context of infanticide, it will also be shown below that it is important not to overstate the apathy of the community when the corpse of a brutalized infant was discovered.

<p style="text-align:center">II</p>

The 1624 infanticide statute was an attempt to prevent women from dodging the consequences of pre-marital sex and bearing a bastard. It was the natural progression from an act passed in 1610 whereby all women who gave birth to "chargeable" bastards—or bastards who would be the financial responsibility of the parish—would be committed to the House of Corrections for a period of at least one year.[19] During the period 1675 to 1704, the bastardy rate averaged 1.612 per cent, or 16 bastards per 1000 births per year in England at large.[20] Within the City of London, the rate was much lower, at only 0.233 per cent, or 2

Comparative History, edited by Peter Laslett, Karla Oosterveen and Richard M. Smith (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1980), 73.

[14] *Ibid*., 74.

[15] *Ibid*., 73.

[16] Larry S. Milner, *HARDNESS OF HEAR/HARNESS OF LIFE: The Stain of Human Infanticide* (Lanham: University Press of America, 2000), 97.

[17] *Ibid*.

[18] *Ibid*.

[19] *Statutes of the Realm* 4.2, 1161.

[20] Laslett, Peter, "Introduction: comparing illegitimacy over time and between cultures," In *Bastardy and its Comparative History*, edited by Peter Laslett, Karla Oosterveen and Richard M. Smith (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1980), 14.
These statistics were drawn from baptismal entries in the parish registers of 98 parishes of the Anglican Church. For the preceding 30 years (1645-74) there was an average bastardy rate of 1.299 (or 13 bastards per 1000 births) though the annual percentage of illegitimate births was on more or less on par throughout the years 1645-1704.
For the following 30 years (1704-1734) there was an average bastardy rate of 2.203 (or 22 bastards per birth) and the annual percentage of illegitimate births consistently began to rise above 2%.
In fact, the second half of the 17th century seems to represent a slump in illegitimacy rates. From 1580-1634 it was not uncommon for illegitimate births to compose 2-3% of the total. Indeed, after 1710, the illegitimacy rate began to rise steadily and by the late 18th century were never less than 4%. Between 1635 and 1709, however, the rate remained below 2%, with only one exception (1695-99). (Laslett 1980, 14-15)

illegitimacies per 1000 births between 1671 and 1700.[21] This number is, of course, problematic for the study of infanticide because the number of illegitimate births that were concealed, or simply not recorded by the church, is unknowable. It does, however, indicate the prevalence of this illegitimacy in English society: it was common enough, but hardly epidemic.[22] The 1624 act was born out of the frustration with the large portion of these unwed mothers who were avoiding the penalties of the 1610 act, and the social consequences of bastardy, by concealing their condition.

The state wanted women who participated in extra‑marital sex to be held accountable for their moral transgressions—and to discourage others from following their example. The Statute of 1624 opens by declaring that "many lewd Women that have been delivered of Bastard Children, to avoyd their shame and to escape Punihsment, doe secretlie bury, or conceale the Death, of their Children."[23] If women continued to avoid the consequences of their sexual transgressions in such a manner, there was no deterrent for illicit sex or bearing bastards.

This concern explains why infanticide came to be so narrowly defined in the 1624 statute:

> That if any Woman...be delivered of any Issue of her Body Male or Female, which being born alive, should by the Lawes of this Realm be a *Bastard*, and that she endeavor privatelie either by drowning or secret burying thereof, as that it may not come to light, *whether it were born alive or not, but be conceled*, in every such Case the Mother soe offending shall suffer Death as in case of Murther.[24]

The Statute, which superficially governed infanticide, was exclusively concerned with

---

[21] Richard Adair, *Courtship, illegitimacy and marriage in early modern England* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1996), 204.
When the prevalence of foundlings is taken into consider, the percentage is much higher.

[22] Illegitimacy ratios in England: (Laslett 1980, 14)

5 year periodsParishes includedIllegitimacy ratio%1675‑‑7998116/94051.2331680‑‑8498148/97161.5231685‑‑8998147/97441.5091690‑‑9498152/93381.6281695‑‑9998198/98972.0011700‑‑170498196/109621.779London illegitimacy (%): (Adair 1996, 204)

PeriodIllegitimacies AloneIllegitimacies Plus Foundlings1671 - 16800.25.01681 - 16900.24.51691 - 17000.35.7

[23] *Statutes of the Realm* 4.2, 1234‑‑35.

[24] *Ibid.* (emphasis added)
An Acte to prevent the murthering of Bastard Children (21 Jac. I. c. 27) in full:
"Whereas many lewd Women that have been delivered of Bastard Children, to avoyd their shame and to escape Punihsment, doe secretlie bury, or conceale teh Death, of their Children, & after if the Child be found dead the said Women doe alleadge that the said Childe was borne dead; whereas it falleth out sometymes (although hardlie it is to be proved) that the said Child or Children were murthered by the said Women their lewd Mothers, or by their assent or procurement: For the preventing therefore of this great Mischeife, be it enacted by the Authoritie of this present Parliament, That if any Woman after one Moneth next ensuing the end of this Session of Parliament, be delivered of any Issue of her Body Male or Female, which being born alive, should by the Lawes of this Realme be a Bastard, and that she endeavor privatelie either by drowning or secret burying thereof, as that it may not come to light, whether it were born alive or not, but be conceled, in every such Case the Mother soe offending shall suffer Death as in case of Murther, except such Mother can make pass by one Witnesse at the least, that the Child (whose Death was by her soe intended to be concealed) was borne dead."

unmarried mothers and their offspring. It did not make infanticide itself a capital offence: it already was. Rather, the *concealment* of the birth of a *bastard*, which was later found dead, became punishable by death. The Statute also excludes those indicted for infanticide from the presumption of innocence granted to those prosecuted under the Common Law for homicide. Prior to the passing of this Statute, infanticide had simply been tried as murder under the Common Law. The habitual absence of witnesses to the crime, however, made convicting indicted women practically impossible.[25] Once the obstacle of proving a child was born alive—rather than stillborn—was removed, the courts were much more successful in obtaining convictions for this crime.[26] The 1624 statute was not without precedents and was in many ways the last resort of legislators who felt their previous attempts to control sexual activity had been unsuccessful.

In his book, *New Born Child Murder*, Mark Jackson speaks about the social context of the Statute. He asserts that it was not contrived for the protection of bastards, but draws attention to the economic factors at play in instances of bastard bearing.[27] Under the Poor Laws, it was the financial responsibility of the parish to maintain many of the children born out of wedlock because their disgraced mothers would be reduced to poverty.[28] These are valid assertions, but Jackson errs when he moves on to discussing the Statute itself and how it was to be interpreted. He claims that:

> The statute simply created a legal presumption whereby a woman who had concealed the death of her illegitimate child was presumed to have murdered it. No longer burdened by the problems of proving live‑birth, the prosecution nevertheless had to establish that the child's death had been concealed.[29]

In simpler terms, Jackson is saying that while proving concealment removed the burden of proving murder, the courts did still have to find positive evidence that the crime had been concealed.[30] In practice, this was certainly not the case. It was the responsibility of the defendant to produce witnesses to the birth. This was the case for Mary Clark in 1680 when she "alleged [the infant] was still born; but having no witness therof, as the Statute required, she was found guilty."[31] Ann Price found herself in a similar predicament in 1681 when:

> She finding her pains come fast upon her: knocked with her shoo, as loud as possible, but could make none hear her, by reason she lay up three pair of stairs; but the concealing of the Child, begin a material Point of evidence against her upon the reciting of the Statute, she was found guilty of Murther.[32]

As these two cases clearly indicate, it was the burden of the defendant, not the prosecution, to provide witnesses of the birth. The courts did not concern themselves with seeking out possible witnesses and the absence thereof was often damnation for the woman on trial. If the courts played a role in establishing that the child's death had been concealed, it was a passive one.

Of the trials examined for the present study, there were thirteen instances where the accused was found guilty in part because of her inability to provide a witness. There were also eleven cases where the accused was found guilty of concealment on the grounds of witness

---

[25] Mark Jackson, *NEW‑BORN CHILD MURDER: Women, illegitimacy and the courts in eighteenth‑century England* (New York: Manchester University Press, 1996), 31‑32.

[26] *Ibid*.

[27] *Ibid*., 35.

[28] *Ibid*.

[29] *Ibid*., 33.

[30] *Ibid*., 33. Jackson also mentions Edward Umfreville, writing in 1751

[31] *OBP*, July 1680, Mary Clark (t16800707‑3).

[32] *OBP,* April 1681, Ann Price (t16810413‑1).

testimony.[33] It was the sole responsibility of these women to provide witnesses who could attest to their bastards having been born dead. Indeed, the witnesses attesting to concealment were generally persons with close relationships to the accused, such as employers or bed mates. They were also generally the ones to have discovered the crime, rather than an additional witness called to testify. A woman condemned in 1678, for instance, was found guilty because "*she* was not able to produce any of those women" which she claimed were present when she gave birth.[34] There was obviously an expectation in court that women would be responsible for providing witnesses to testify in their favour.

Jackson also tries to establish a distinction between concealing the death of a child and concealing the pregnancy, the birth and the dead body of a bastard.[35] He claims that keeping the latter three a secret created suspicion of infanticide if a dead child was discovered, but that they did not automatically bring a woman under the Statute of 1624.[36] Here Jackson references Zachary Babington, an associate clerk of the assize on the Oxford Circuit, writing in 1677:

> It is not the burying of the Child, or hiding of it, that makes it Murther upon the Statute (as some have conceived) for if the Child be found dead in Bed by her side, or in her bosome, yet it is Murther; for the word [*conceal*] in the Statute, relates not to the Body of the Infant, but the death of it...[37]

Babington's primary point seems to be that the Statute was not contingent on a woman hiding the body of her child and that even if the dead child was brought forward a witness was still required to prove the mother's innocence. This was certainly the case for Mary Baker who, in 1693, was found "in the Kitchen with the Child lying upon the ground dead beside her;" Mary was found guilty because she could produce no witnesses to the birth.[38] Mark Jackson, however, uses Babington's statement to reassert his own point that concealment of pregnancy, of birth and of the dead body were not sufficient to indict a woman for infanticide.

In practice, however, the concealment of these three things did bring a woman under the Statute. The courts assumed that a woman who had concealed the dead body of a child was guilty of murdering it; this was probably the result of those women who concealed their infant's bodies almost exclusively giving birth privately. As a result, the two became tantamount. Such was the case for an unnamed servant who was "caught carrying [her dead infant] in a Hand--basket to bury it."[39] In the records available from the Old Baily Proceedings between 1674 and 1704 Jackson's assertion is false. The "concealment of pregnancy, of birth and of the dead body of a bastard" does seem to have been roughly equivalent to concealing the birth itself.[40] Jackson not only misinterprets his source, but makes the mistake of assuming that Babington, simply by virtue of writing during the time while the Statute was enforced, both accurately represents it and embodies the prevalent societal attitudes and opinions toward it.

While Mark Jackson deals with the broad period during which the Statute

---

[33] **Relationship of witnesses to concealmentNumber of cases with guilty verdicts**Accused could not provide a witness to the birth13Witnesses attested to the concealment of the accused11Accused called a witness who denied having observed the birth1Accused claimed witnesses had been present at the birth but was unable to produce them2Witnesses were not mentioned in relation to concealment11

[34] *OBP*, January 1678, unknown (t16780116--1).

[35] Jackson, *NEW--BORN CHILD MURDER*, 33.

[36] *Ibid*.

[37] *Ibid*. (additions made by Jackson)

[38] *OBP*, October 1693, Mary Baker (t16931012--32).

[39] *OBP*, April 1679, Anonymous (t16790430--6).

[40] Jackson, *NEW--BORN CHILD MURDER*, 33.

was enforced, in the article "Monstrous Mothers, Monstrous Societies: Infanticide and the Rule of Law in Restoration and Eighteenth--Century England," Marilyn Francus deals specifically with the period between 1715 and 1750 in the Old Bailey Court Proceedings. She asserts that the application of the Statute of 1624—and discretion therein—was a mechanism of female oppression. Francus does, however, acknowledge this as an eighteenth--century development and maintains that the primary concern of the Statute in the seventeenth century was concealment.[41] To develop her own argument of change over time, she also surveys the period immediately proceeding her own, which overlaps with the period considered in this study. As a result, Francus makes several points that are relevant to infanticide and its regulation during the period 1674 to 1704. Firstly, women carrying illegitimate foetuses were often ostracized by respectable society and either dismissed from their service or simply unable to find one.[42] Secondly, almost every woman accused of infanticide should have been found guilty on the basis of concealment alone—and yet many were not.[43] Thirdly, "marks of violence" on the dead body were generally assumed to have been inflicted by the mother while more commonplace injuries— such as bruises—were more easily dismissed.[44] Lastly, that infanticidal mothers "avoided breeding poverty through a self-regulated (if belated) sense of economy."[45] This is a notion that expresses the continuity of attitudes toward infanticide from the medieval period to the eighteenth century. It is also an opinion that should be tempered by the notion of *shame* associated with illegitimate children; however, this was also a shame that could produce economic hardship. Francus raises important points about the social implications of bastardy and her findings are largely consistent with the records of the late seventeenth century.

While Francus's assessment provides valuable insight into the practical application of the Statute, she makes several erroneous claims about both the state's motivation for creating the Statute and a woman's motivation for committing infanticide. Francus claims that:

> If anything, the infanticide of lower--class and illegitimate children was not entirely unwelcome, for no one wanted more children begging on the streets or being abandoned to the care of the parish.[46]

This statement must be qualified, but not entirely discarded. The Crown did not make infanticide a capital offence because they wanted to encourage it. Francus is correct to claim that the state aimed to reduce the number of paupers relying on the parish, but she fails to see how the Statute was supposed to achieve that end. The state sought to prevent the acts of sexual congress that resulted in illegitimate children, not to encourage the extermination of bastards. Francus raises some interesting points about the nature of the statute's implementation and the social implications of bearing a child outside of marriage, but she also fundamentally misinterprets the Statute's ultimate intent.

---

[41] Marilyn Francus, "Monstrous Mothers, Monstrous Societies: Infanticide and the Rule of Law in Restoration and Eighteenth--Century England," *Eighteenth--Century Life* 21.2 (1997): 3.

[42] *Ibid*., 5.

[43] *Ibid*., 10.

[44] *Ibid*., 13.
One woman in September 1677 claimed that her child was stillborn, a statement corroborated by a midwife's testimony that "upon view of the Body there did not appear the least mark of wound, bruise, or other violence used. (*OBP*, September 1677, Anonymous (t16770906--1).)
In December 1689, Mary Campion's acquittal was based partially on the fact that "no appearance of hurt was seen on the Child." (*OBP*, December 1689, Mary Campion (t16891211-	26)).)

[45] *Ibid*., 16.

[46] *Ibid*., 2.

The issues raised by Jackson and Francus are important to keep in mind while interpreting the infanticide cases brought to trial at the Old Bailey at the turn of the seventeenth century. In the thirty--year period between 1674 and 1704, sixty-- nine cases of infanticide were brought before the court. Of the sixty--seven cases where a verdict can be determined, thirty--eight women were found guilty and sentenced to death. The most common reasons for acquittal during this period were proving marriage and presenting evidence of making provision for the birth, such as hiring a midwife.[47] But neither of these defences were representative of a majority of the cases and women were acquitted for a wide variety of reasons. Of the twenty-nine acquittals, five cases relied to one degree or another on a lack of evidence—a peculiarity discussed below. During this period only one man was charged under the Statute, and then only in conjunction with a woman—the pair managed to prove that they were married.[4]8 When a defendant's occupation is described, it is almost exclusively as a servant. This suggests that while these women occupied the lower ranks of society, they were part of the respectable working--class.

The conviction rate observed here is still much higher than that observed by Marilyn Francus just a decade later. Whereas Francus determined a 20 per cent conviction rate, the present data set indicates a rate of 56.7 per cent. [49] But according to the Statute, women charged with infanticide should have been found guilty in even greater numbers. The case of an unnamed lodger near the Thames should have been archetypal. The young woman was put out by her landlady—who feared the repercussions of having housed the 'loose' woman— and was unceremoniously dumped in the neighbouring parish:

> In this sad condition in the street, and without any help was this poor Creature
> delivered, and being found lying as one half dead by the watch, and her condition
> perceived; a midwife was called, who found the Child dead, but
> not separated from her Body, when she came to her; who asking her if it
> were still--born, the Prisoner both then and now said, it was not, for she heard it,
> cry, but denied that she intended or used any wilful means to make away the Life...
> however being a Bastard Child, and the law making it death in that case for any
> woman to be delivered alone without calling help, she was thereupon found Guilty.[50]

That her landlady left her in another parish speaks to the unwillingness of the community to provide for these women and their offspring. That this young woman was condemned despite having revealed her pregnancy in an apparent effort to provide a witness to her labour, and despite having been found "half dead" herself, indicates how strictly the Statute of 1624 could be applied. While this woman's tale is absurd to the point of outrage, legally speaking it is not exceptional. According to the letter of the law, more cases should have proceeded this way— with women being convicted despite extenuating circumstances—when they could not produce a witness. It is informative that this case is *not* indicative of the whole of the sample.

IV

---

[47]

Primary Reason for AcquittalNumber of CasesNon compos mentis/melancholy2Miscarriage2Accused was determined not to be the mother of the dead child2No marks of violence2Proved marriage5Character witness2Lived beyond the "violent" act that had made others suspect infanticide3Stillbirth2Provision6Insufficient evidence1No explanation given1

[48] *OBP*, February 1683, Margaret Benson and Joseph Axly (t16830223--9).

[49] Francus, "Monstrous Mothers, Monstrous Societies," 1.
1715--1750: 70 cases, 14 convictions, 56 acquittals

[50] *OBP*, October 1679, Anonymous (t16791015--2).

The simplest way for a woman to evade an infanticide charge was to prove that she was married. Between 1674 and 1704 only one woman initially described as married in the court records was tried under the Statute.[51] Unsurprisingly, she was found not guilty—albeit *non compos mentis*.[52] This verdict represents a trend of popular thought whereby married women had no motivation for killing their offspring and therefore had to have been outside of their reason to commit such a heinous act.[53] This woman should never have been tried for infanticide in the first place, but for murder, because the Statute of 1624 applied specifically to bastards.

An additional five women were able to prove that they were married, and that their dead children were not bastards, through the course of their trials. All of these women were acquitted. Interestingly, once these women had proved marriage, the question of what fate befell the dead child was moot.[54] Marriage nullified both the application of the Statute and any perceived motivation for the crime. This speaks very strongly to what the Statute was truly trying to regulate: not the murder of small children but the production of bastards through pre-marital intercourse and the economic burdens they presented. Married women were not under the jurisdiction of the Statute and proving marriage was a woman's best defense at a trial for infanticide.

The acquittal of married women was in keeping with the Statute, but the five women who were acquitted during this period for varying degrees of insufficient evidence were not. The most extraordinary of these trials was that of Mary Maye, indicted for strangling her child about the neck, in 1694.[55] This account of her trial survives:

> [the] Child was found dead in a Kennel of dirty water, and she owned the Child to be hers; but said it was a Miscarriage... There was abundance of concurring Evidence to corroborate the Fact, *but there was no positive Evidence that she was guilty of murthering the Child* so she was acquitted.[56]

In this case, the courts could prove that Mary had concealed the birth as well as the death of her child and under the Statute she should have been condemned for that simple fact. She was ultimately found innocent because they could not definitively prove that the child was born alive. This case, unique during the period under review, would tentatively seem to suggest a shift towards treating infanticide as a typical homicide by assuming the defendant was innocent rather than guilty. Four other women were acquitted based partially on insufficient evidence, though it did not play as central a role in their relief as it did in the case of Mary Maye.[57] Despite having the ability to convict her under the Statute, the court refrained. Garthine Walker has argued that "as early as the mid-seventeenth century, the terms of the 1624 statute were apparently ignored by jurors and judges."[58] While this trend was clearly developing during the period discussed, a *wholesale* dismissal of the statute's particularities is not evident. Attitudes about infanticide and its special status were clearly

---

51   OBP, January 1675, Anonymous (t16750115-1).

52   *Ibid.*

53   Damme, "Infanticide," 13.

54   *OBP*, February 1681, Mary Naples (t16810228-5); *OBP*, February 1683, Margaret Benson (t16830223-9); *OBP*, February 1684, Elizabeth Stafford (t16840227-18); *OBP*, April 1693, A. M. (16930426-46); *OBP*, July 1693, Alice Sawbridge (t16930713-11).

55   *OBP*, July 1694, Mary Maye (t16940711-23).

56   *Ibid.* (emphasis added)

57   During the trial of Sarah Rhoades in June 1690, "the Evidence was somewhat circumstantial, and the prisoner declared her Innocency at the Tryal, so she was acquitted." (*OBP*, June 1690, Sarah Rhoades, (t16900605-7).); *OBP*, December 1689, Mary Campion (t16891211-26); *OBP*, July 1691, Anonymous (t16910708-15); *OBP*, December 1691, B. G. (t16911209-3).

58   Walker, *Crime, Gender and Social Order*, 153.

being challenged even at this early date, though the Statute would not be repealed until 1803.[59]

Men do not figure significantly in the court records for infanticide. Only one man was indicted under the Statute between 1674 and 1704. In this instance, Joseph Axly is mentioned in conjunction with one Margaret Benson: the two eventually proved that they were married and were acquitted accordingly.[60] Rob Foulks, the notorious minister--turned---murderer, was indicted for murder, not infanticide.[61] Men are frequently mentioned in the court records, mainly by women using marriage as a defence—often unsuccessfully—but these men usually fail to materialize.[62] Men were also commonly mentioned as having promised the defendant marriage if she would surrender herself to him but having forgotten his promise after the fact.[63] Despite their cursory appearances in the records, infanticide was an essentially female crime.

The bulk of infanticide trials not only saw women on the defensive, but women performing the duties of witness and accuser as well. Evidence at infanticide trials was typically given by women, particularly midwives, who would testify about the condition of the body. In 1690 Martha Nook was acquitted after a midwife declared that the dead child had been stillborn.[64] In 1696, M. S. was brought to trial after her female peers discovered her condition:

> It appeared that she was brought to bed on a Sunday morning and complained that she was very ill, and her Mistress and some women more came to her, and charged her with it, which she denied at first, but finding Milk in her Breast...confessed at last where it was.[65]

The evidence provided by these women was crucial to the case against the accused. Despite the cursory role played by women in most serious crimes during this period, the regulation of infanticide was a distinctly female domain.

The cases where child murderers were indicted for murder instead of infanticide during this period at the Old Bailey tell a very different story than the cases presented above. In 1697, when Jane Watson was indicted for murdering her female bastard, she was indicted for murder, not infanticide.[66] This case, similar in many other ways to an infanticide trial, took a different course primarily because she had in no way attempted to conceal her condition.[67] The story of Rob Foulks, indicted for murdering his illegitimate newborn, was qualitatively similar to instances of infanticide. Mr. Foulks was charged with seducing a young woman in his charge, then bringing her to London where she was delivered of a child, which he immediately "cruelly cram'd...down a house of Office."[68] Even this method of disposing of the child is reminiscent of an infanticide indictment, wherein a large portion of mothers threw their babies into latrines in the hopes that they would avoid discovery. The critical difference between Rob Foulks and the many young women indicted for infanticide was their sex. The presumption of guilt imposed by the Statute was also not necessary to convict Foulks: "[it] was absolutely prov'd against him by several witnesses, nor was it deny'd

[59]   Damme, "Infanticide," 13.
[60]   *OBP*, February 1683, Margaret Benson and Joseph Axly (t16830223--9).
[61]   *OBP*, January 1679, Rob Foulks (t16790131--2).
[62]   *OBP*, December 1683, Elenor Adams (t16831212--2). (describe)
[63]   *OBP*, May 1681, Elizabeth Messenger (t16810520--3). (describe)
[64]   *OBP*, September 1690, Martha Nook (t16900903--4).
[65]   *OBP*, February 1696, M. S. (t16960227--18).
[66]   *OBP*, December 1697, Jane Watson (t16971208--2).
[67]   *Ibid*.
[68]   *OBP*, January 1679, Rob Foulks (t16790131--2).

by the miserable Gentlewoman."[69] These cases serve to reassert the particular importance of concealment and femininity, respectively, to the jurisdiction and enforcement of the Statute.

<div align="center">

V

</div>

The limited detail of the Old Bailey Proceedings for this era leads to an impersonal assessment of the crime of infanticide. It is only through the Ordinary's Accounts that one can get a much better sense of who these women were and why they committed the crime of infanticide. Women like Margaret Spicer, who maintained her innocence until her death, were rare.[70] Women found guilty of infanticide were more typically presented as creatures of pity and implored to repent their sins that God might take mercy on them. The account of Elizabeth Dale, who claimed she was "Educated by Religious Parents, but walkt not according to their good Counsel and Example," was typical.[71] Still others confessed, as Elizabeth Moulton did, that "That she had been guilty of Swearing, Lying, and Uncleanness. So the Devil led her from one Sin to another, till she Murtherd her Child."[72] These women told the tale of a woman gone astray finally forced to face the consequences of her actions. This moralization of an infanticidal woman's story was also necessary to justify the retelling of a sensational and violent crime.[73] These accounts were, after all, published for mass consumption.[74] The stories of infanticidal women mirrored those of other criminals condemned to death, and they were generally portrayed as having a long history of sin that led them to their damnation.

The accounts written by the Ordinary of Newgate, like the trials themselves, were intended to deter other young women from committing the same folly. The account taken of Katharine Brown in 1685 described how the Devil took control of a criminal's soul:

> Satan prevails upon Sinners by degrees: first he Tempts them to Immodesty, and Laciviousness in Conversation, by not setting a Watch over their Hearts, to prevent inward Lusting in the first Motions and Ebullitions of it; they by unwary Converse with prophane Persons, Temps them from Chambering and Wantonness, to comply with flagitious desires of gratifying sensual brutish Commixtures; to cover and conceal the turpitude and shave of which, he draws them to Murder their Illegitimate Off-springs; which is a most unnatural Crime, in as much as the very Sea Monsters Suckle and Preserve their Young.[75]

This tale promoted the idea that infanticide was the end result of a long process of sin. One had to beware the small transgression or risk falling into serious transgression. This account also suggests that these women were easily led astray and the metaphor of the Devil compelling them to commit their crimes is typical. Another common factor in these accounts was a warning from the woman herself to other women. In January 1691, Anne Stephens "warn[ed] all persons to preserve their Chastity" lest they meet her end.[76] These accounts must, however, be viewed with a measure of skepticism: they were written by the Ordinary as public deterrents, not by the prisoners themselves. They are also reminiscent of infanticide during the medieval period, when it was still considered a church crime, and

---

[69]   *Ibid*.

[70]   *OBP*, May 1677, Ordinary's Account: Margaret Spicer (OA16770504).

[71]   *OBP*, May 1691, Ordinary's Account: Elizabeth Dale (OA16910501).

[72]   *OBP*, July 1689, Ordinary's Account: Elizabeth Moulton (OA16890715).

[73]   Francus, "Monstrous Mothers, Monstrous Societies," 8.

[74]   *OBP*, "Ordinary of Newgate's Accounts," http://www.oldbaileyonline.org/static/Ordinarys-accounts.jsp (accessed October 25, 2012)

[75]   *OBP*, October 1685, Katharine Brown (OA16851023).

[76]   *OBP*, January 1691, Anne Stephens (OA16910126).

indicate that the secularization of the laws governing infanticide did not necessarily lead to shift away from Christian notions of sin surrounding it.

Moral proselytizing aside, the Ordinary's Accounts present the clearest picture of motive for infanticide. The primary motivation for many of these women was, as Anne Stephens claimed, to "avoid the shame of bastardy."[77] This sentiment was echoed by Elizabeth Moulton, Margaret Deane, Mary Baker and Christian Russel.[78] Mary Mott, as well as Mary Baker, both despaired of providing for the child.[79] These women were clearly willing to go to extreme lengths, and risk condemnation under the Statute of 1624, to avoid the social and economic burdens of raising a bastard. These records also confirm that the stigma against an unwed mother was severe and are indicative of why the state wanted to prevent women from concealing infanticide. The state felt that if a woman were going to behave in such a loose way as to occasion an illegitimate pregnancy, that she should in the end be punished. If women were allowed to dodge this punishment, either through concealing their child's body or by the inefficiency of prosecution under the Common Law, then bearing bastards would become more commonplace.

VI

While the Ordinary's Accounts provide insight into how infanticidal mothers perceived themselves, pamphlets describing their crimes are indicative of popular attitudes about their crimes. Pamphlets detailing infanticide cases were multi-purpose: they both informed the public of the consequences of the crime itself while also warning against the sexual transgressions that led to it. Once again, this relates to the necessity of attaching moral guidance to these accounts before they were disseminated to the public.[80] *Fair Warning to the Murderers of Infants*, a pamphlet published in London in 1692, recounts the sordid tale of the impoverished Mary Goodenough who committed adultery with a baker in return for her maintenance.[81]

A letter to her children follows this account, wherein she repents her sins and bemoaned "I had never fallen into those Depths of Sin, which have brought me into the Depths of Misery."[82] Infanticide pamphlets were sometimes an attempt to regulate social activity, but the morality tales incorporated into them were just as often the means of justifying the publication of these gruesome stories.

It cannot be argued that contemporaries were unaware of the consequences of infanticide or concealment. The tale of the presumably fictitious 'Mary Butcher' told in the poem *The Lamentation of Mary Butcher*, published in 1700, is about a young woman seduced by a deceitful man who attempted to hide her shame by murdering her child:

---

[77] *Ibid*.

[78] *OBP*, July 1689, Elizabeth Moulton (OA16890715); *OBP*, June 1691, Margaret Deane (OA16910603); *OBP*, October 1693, Mary Baker (OA16931023); *OBP*, January 1702, Christian Russel (OA17020128).

[79] *OBP*, December 1691, Mary Mott (OA16911218); *OBP*, October 1693, Mary Baker (OA16931023).

[80] Francus, "Monstrous Mothers, Monstrous Societies," 8.

[81] *Fair Warning to the Murderers of Infants: being and account of the Tryal, Condemnation and Execution of Mary Goodenough at the Assizes held in Oxon, in February, 1691/2* (London: 1692). In Early English Books Online [hereafter EEBO], http://eebo.chadwyck.com.ezproxy.library.dal.ca/search/full_rec?SOURCE=pgthumbs.cfg&_ACTION=ByID&ID=99889734&FILE=../session/1351228989_27627&SEARCHSCREEN=CIT ATIONS&SEARCHCONFIG=var_spell.cfg&DISPLAY=AUTHOR (accessed October 20, 2012).

[82] *Ibid*.

My new‑‑born Infant I did destroy,
In Grief I'm now surrounded...

...So now observe, my pretty Maids,
and Mind the Application,
And shun the base deceitful Man,
Let what will be his Station, Some
only court their Will to gain, Which of
times prove our Ruin...

Poor Wretch! I thought to hide by Shame For
fear my Friends should know it, But by the
Murder now you see
To Multitudes I show it.[83]

The traditional morality narrative is herein turned to poetry. There can be no clearer indication than this poem, which contains eight full verses of jaunty rhymes about the serious subject of infanticide, that this crime had become an underlying current in English society. Even if a citizen of London could not read, in 1680 the City of London decreed that *An Acte to prevent the murthering of Bastard Children* should be read out by the minister of every parish church four times each year.[8]4 It is difficult to imagine that women were not aware of the Statute and its consequences at the end of the seventeenth century. Infanticide was a well‑ advertised crime and yet many women were willing to risk conviction for this crime over the shame of raising a bastard.

It is in these pamphlets about infanticide that a concern for the well being of the murdered children finally becomes apparent. One pamphlet described the crimes of Mary Compton, a midwife convicted of murdering five young children by starvation that had been placed in her care by the parish.[85] A child still young enough to lie in a cradle was found by a neighbour to be rotting alive:

When she had it first, it was in a manner dead; and when she had it to her
House, she first gave it some Milk, and then opened the Head of it, and the Head‑
cloaths were perished close to the Skull, and stuck in the Flesh; and the Ears of it
were as it were rotten, and ready to drop off, and stunk most loathsomly for want of
looking after; and the very Skin upon the Back, and
the Lips and Breech of the poor Child came off with the Clouts; and there
were perfect holes to be seen in the Hips of it.[86]

---

[83]   *The Lamentation of Mary Butcher* (London: 1700). In EEBO,
http://eebo.chadwyck.com.ezproxy.library.dal.ca/search/full_rec?SOURCE=pgthumbs.cfg&
ACTION=ByID&ID=99893689&FILE=../session/1351230368_28795&SEARCHSCREEN=CI
T ATIONS&SEARCHCONFIG=var_spell.cfg&DISPLAY=AUTHOR (accessed October 20,
2012).

[84]   City of London, *Anno vicesimo primo Jacobi Regis, &c An Act to prevent the Destroying and Murthering of Bastard Children* (London: 1680). In EEBO,
http://eebo.chadwyck.com.ezproxy.library.dal.ca/search/full_rec?
SOURCE=pgthumbs.cfg&ACTION=ByID&ID=24038244&FILE=../session/1351232228_2991
9&SEARCHSCREEN=CIT ATIONS&SEARCHCONFIG=var_spell.cfg&DISPLAY=AUTHOR
(accessed October 20, 2012).

[85] *A particular and exact account of the trial of Mary Compton, the bloody and cruel midwife of Poplar* (London: 1693). In EEBO,
http://eebo.chadwyck.com.ezproxy.library.dal.ca/search/full_rec?SOURCE=pgthumbs.cfg&
ACTION=ByID&ID=43078109&FILE=../session/1351232893_643&SEARCHSCREEN=CITA
T IONS&SEARCHCONFIG=var_spell.cfg&DISPLAY=AUTHOR (accessed October 20,
2012).

[86]   *Ibid*.

The horrific death of this child precipitated a search of Mary Compton's cellar by her neighbours. This search produced two more dead children. Mary Compton maintained her innocence of these crimes throughout the trial and beyond, not even repenting in the face of death.[87] Compton's neighbours did not display indifference towards the suffering of these children, but took decisive action to resolve the situation. They were accordingly outraged by the midwife's crimes and Daniel Parnel, Overseer of the Poor of Poplar, decried her crimes: "Lord! What Woman would be so Bloody, so Monstrous, so Cruel, so much bereft of all humanity, all natural Affections."[88] The statute was not designed to protect bastards, but this does not necessarily imply that society was impervious to the suffering of defenceless children. True, Mary Compton's crimes fell within the legal definition of murder, not infanticide, and on a large scale at that. Nonetheless, the victims of her crime were chargeable to the parish—given to her as foundlings for a stipend from the community.[89] The reaction of Compton's neighbours to her atrocities serves, at least, to indicate that people in early modern England were not so concerned with the cost of raising these 'chargeable' children that they approved of their destruction.

The case of a woman who confessed to murdering her infant child in 1675—thirty‑three years after committing her crime—bears somewhat more similarities to the cases of unwed mothers. This woman, who remains anonymous, was widowed and left with a (legitimate) child less than a year old.[90] She is described as having "worked her fingers to the bone" to provide for this child, an indicator of the economic hardship faced by a single mother.[91] The narrative then describes how the Devil planted evil thoughts in her mind:

> As long as it lives you will never enjoy a good day: and besides it hinders your preferment; you are young and handsome, and might have a husband or two more if this childs head was but laid, but who do you think will come to wooe you as long as this froward Child is with you…[92]

There must have been some validity to the fear that finding a husband would be difficult considering her attachment to a child in need of constant care and funds for its maintenance. These difficulties could only have been multiplied where an illegitimate child was concerned. Having finally murdered her child, the woman claims the death was accidental and her story is believed.[93] Relieved of her burden, the woman remarries.[94] It is only on her deathbed, in 1675, that the woman finally confesses her crime. Although she was "in a very weak condition," she was transported to prison and "told that she cannot nor shall not dye till she be hanged."[95] Her crime was clearly thought to be a serious one considering, even after so much time had passed, the woman was put in prison despite being sick and fragile. The tone and manner in which this woman and her crime were described, however, differentiate her situation from that of women supported by their husbands. Her actions are shown to derive

---

[87] *OBP*, October 1693, Ordinary's Account: Mary Compton (OA16931023).

[88] *A particular and exact account of the trial of Mary Compton*, in EEBO.

[89] *Ibid*.

[90] *Murther will out* (London: 1675), 2. In EBBO,

http://eebo.chadwyck.com.ezproxy.library.dal.ca/search/full_rec?SOURCE=pgthumbs.cfg&_ACTION=ByID&ID=51784588&FILE=../session/1353643951_16443&SEARCHSCREEN=CIT ATIONS&SEARCHCONFIG=var_spell.cfg&DISPLAY=AUTHOR (accessed October 20, 2012).

[91] *Ibid*.

[92] *Ibid*., 3‑4.

[93] *Ibid*., 5.

[94] *Ibid*.

[95] *Ibid*., 6.

from desperation rather than anger or insanity. The public feeling towards a perpetrator of infanticide must have closely resembled this attitude. There was a tension between the harsh measures of the Statute and the more sympathetic popular understanding of the crime.[9]6 Infanticide, narrowly defined as it may have been legally, still carried a broader social meaning.

Using pamphlets to assess the immediate attitudes of the community to women who fell under the infanticide statutes is problematic. Publications describing these crimes often focus more on the woman's confession and repentance in prison than on the details of her offence. These pamphlets tend to depict their subjects as contrite and somewhat pathetic—the case of Mary Goodenough, above, taken as an example of this trend. This inclination to describe the perpetrators of infanticide—as it was defined *by law*—as pitiable, and to depict married mothers who murdered their children as violent to the point of insanity may have been the result of social perceptions of what motivated these two groups of women.[97] The impetus for an unwed mother to kill her new--borne child was easier to understand: she wished both to avoid the stigma of having borne a bastard and to relieve herself of the economic burden raising such a child entailed. It was also understood by contemporaries that while these motives were present for unwed mothers, they did not lead inevitably to "inclination, intent or guilt."[98] The motivations of married women were less clear. This second category had no easily explained reason for killing their children, and as a result their transgressions were represented more harshly.

VII

When *An Acte to prevent the murthering of Bastard Children* was passed in 1624, it was in the hope that it would force lewd women to face the consequences of their immoral actions. By ensuring that these effects were felt more often, the state hoped more women would be discouraged from participating in sexual activities that would result in a financial burden on the parish. Despite what some scholars have concluded, the Statute sought to achieve higher conviction rates through an almost complete presumption of guilt on behalf of a mother if her child was a bastard and any matter concerning its death was concealed. Women were acquitted of infanticide for a wide variety of reasons between 1674 and 1704, but that some women were relieved by a lack of evidence suggests a practical regression of attitudes toward the crime and rediscovered belief that infanticide should be tried according to the rules of other homicides. It must also be noted, however, that attitudes toward this crime were never as singular as the 1624 statute would seem to imply—this is supported by the piteous image of infanticidal mothers in print culture. The acquittal of these women, then, might also be seen as part of a wider conflict between the views dictated by the state and the opinions held by the people.

That infanticide was a crime committed almost exclusively by women—or at least prosecuted against them more commonly than men—does make it a vehicle for female oppression, though not in the same sense put forward by Marilyn Francus. This oppression was not manifested in how the Statute was applied in court, but in the Statute's very existence. The crime of infanticide, whose defendants were overwhelmingly women, was a crime with a presumption of guilt. Yet murder, more often committed by men than by

---

[96] Garthine Walker, *Crime, Gender and Social Order in Early Modern England* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 149.

[97] For an example of how the crimes of married women were depicted, see *A True and Perfect Relation Of a most Horrid and Bloody Murther Committed by One Philmore's Wife* (London: 1686). In EBBO, http://eebo.chadwyck.com.ezproxy.library.dal.ca/search/full_rec? SOURCE=pgthumbs.cfg& ACTION=ByID&ID=36273562&FILE=../session/1353642705_15520&SEARCHSCREEN=CIT ATIONS&SEARCHCONFIG=var_spell.cfg&DISPLAY=AUTHOR(accessed October 20, 2012).

[98]   Walker, *Crime, Gender and Social Order*, 150.

women, carried a presumption of innocence. Despite the odds against them, many women escaped the gallows. It is the accounts of those who did not that offer us the greatest insight into the motivations for infanticide.

   Infanticide was a crime committed for practical reasons. Women were unwilling to accept the burden of shame and economic hardship associated with bastardy. This was especially true because many of these women had been promised marriage and maintenance by their child's father and yet had received none. Society pitied these women for their misfortunes, yet despised them for begetting bastards the rest of the community would have been financially responsible for. Worse still, they had attempted to hide their shame by the more hideous crime of murder. Despite the disdain that tinged public opinion of unwed mothers, there was still a degree of pity for their innocent victims. The neighbours of Mary Compton can hardly be said to have been immune to the suffering of that woman's unfortunate wards.

Craig Hyatt

Templars, Trials, and Torture: The Factors Behind the Suppression of the Knights

Templar

During the Middle Ages, virtually all of western Europe was a profoundly religious place. Although its power declined throughout the medieval period in the face of increasingly powerful secular rulers, the Roman Catholic Church was the single most influential institution in western Europe and quite possibly the most powerful establishment in the entire world. The increasing popularity of the Christian religion led to the creation of multiple religious orders that worked with the Church to ensure the spread of Christianity throughout Europe. With the beginning of the crusades to the Holy Land during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, an entirely new type of organization began to emerge. Several military orders combining the traditional values of the monastic life with those of secular knighthood were formed, composed of warrior monks who dedicated themselves to a life of service to Christianity through the military defence of the Holy Land and the protection of the European pilgrims who came to visit it. By far the most famous of these military orders were the Knights Templar.

Founded in the early twelfth century, the Templars evolved from humble beginnings to become one of the largest of the military orders, and the Order played a significant role in the defence of the Holy Land against various non-Christian attackers for over a hundred years. By 1291, however, the Christian armies, including the Knights Templar, had been thrown out of the Holy Land by Muslim forces, and the Templars were forced to retreat to their new headquarters on the island of Cyprus. This defeat was not without consequence: the military orders, and particularly the Knights Templar, were blamed for the loss of the Holy Land.[1] Once one of the most respected institutions in Europe, the Knights Templar were increasingly subjected to criticism and animosity. This culminated in 1307, when King Philip IV of France arrested virtually all the members of the Knights Templar living under his jurisdiction. The arrests of these Templars in France marked the beginning of the suppression of the Order.

To justify the arrests, Philip accused the Templars, a religious order responsible only to the pope himself, of a variety of heretical crimes against the Church and God. On Philip's urging, Pope Clement V also ordered the arrest of all other members of the Order of the Temple living in Christian Europe, and virtually the entire order was imprisoned and forced to face the accusations. In 1310 fifty-four Templars were burned as relapsed heretics near Paris, and in 1312 a papal bull officially disbanded the Knights Templar.[2] Two years later, the remaining senior leaders of the Order – including the Grand Master, Jacques de Molay – were executed. Though the official charges of heresy and crimes against Christianity were given by Philip IV and Clement V as the justification for the suppression of the Order, the great majority of the accusations levied against the Templars by Philip IV were almost certainly false.[3] In reality, a significant number of other factors, combined together, were the true cause of the ultimate suppression of the Templars. This paper will examine the reasons for the suppression of the Templars. It will discuss the falsity of the official accusations

---

[1]   Malcolm Barber, <u>The New Knighthood: A History of the Order of the Temple</u> (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 295.

[2]   Evelyn Lord, <u>The Templar's Curse</u> (Harlow: Pearson Education Limited, 2008), 89.
      Edith Simon, <u>The Piebald Standard: A biography of the Knights Templars</u> (London: Cassell & Company Ltd., 1959), 281.

[3]   Alan Forey, <u>The Military Orders: From the Twelfth to the Early Fourteenth Centuries</u> (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1992), 231.

against the Templars, examine King Philip IV's motivations for suppressing the Templars, and examine other factors contributing to the suppression of the Knights Templar. Ultimately, this paper will conclude that it was underlying factors, particularly the advantages which Philip IV saw for himself in the elimination of the Templars, and not the official charges, which were the true reasons for the suppression of the Knights Templar.

The suppression of the Knights Templar began on 13 October 1307, when by order of King Philip IV of France, officials arrested virtually all the members of the Order living in France. Philip presented the justification for these arrests in a secret order sent to French officials nearly a month before the actual arrests, on 14 September 1307. In this order, he wrote that "brothers of the Order of the knights of the Temple, wolves in sheep's clothing, in the habit of a religious order vilely insulting our religious faith, are again crucifying our Lord Jesus Christ ... they are causing Him greater injuries than those he received on the Cross."[4] He categorized the collective charges against the Order as "a heinous crime, an execrable evil, an abominable deed, a hateful disgrace, a completely inhuman thing, indeed remote from all humanity."[5] Philip accused the Knights Templar of three main crimes: they denied the existence of Christ and spat on a crucifix or an image of Christ; they participated in rituals which included obscene kissing and even homosexuality; and they worshipped various sorts of idols.[6] In July 1308, the list of official charges was expanded to incorporate a full 127 articles which fell under seven main categories: the spitting on images of, and the denial of, Christ; worship of idols; misconduct of Templar priests during mass; belief that the Templar leadership could hear confession and absolve from sin; charges of inappropriate kissing and homosexuality; Templars' greed and their tendency to seek gain for the Order through illegal means; and the enforced secrecy of Templar meetings.[7] These accusations constituted the official charges levied against the Knights Templar, charges which were quickly made against not only Templars living in France, but against virtually every member of the Order living in Europe.

It appears as though these accusations against the Templars were first made not by Philip IV, but rather by an exiled Templar by the name of Esquiu de Florian.[8] This alone makes the allegations against the Templars somewhat suspect, for de Florian, having been forcibly removed against his will from the Order, cannot be considered a reliable or a non-biased source. In fact, de Florian actually appears to have benefited financially from the suppression of the Templars: among other things, he came to possess some land previously owned by the Templars as well as a monetary reward.[9] It is also significant that de Florian first went not to Philip IV with his allegations, but rather to King James II of Aragon, for it appears as though the Aragonese monarch simply did not believe de Florian's allegations against the Templars: in a letter to James II written early in 1308, de Florian wrote that "I am he who exposed the actions of the Templars to my lord king of France, and may you acknowledge that you were the first prince in the whole world to whom I exposed their actions ... you were unwilling, lord, to give full credence to my words at the time."[10] It is significant, perhaps, that James II (who had nothing to gain from the suppression of the Templars) did not believe these accusations, whereas Philip IV (for whom the destruction of the Order could have been advantageous) not only believed but also acted upon de Florian's

---

4 King Philip IV, "Order for the arrests to John of Tourville," in <u>The Templars: Selected sources translated and annotated</u>, ed. M. Barber and K. Bate (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002), 245.

5 *Ibid.*, 244.

6 Malcolm Barber, <u>The Trial of the Templars</u> (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 202.

7 *Ibid.*, 202-203.

8 Piers Paul Read, <u>The Templars</u> (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2000), 263-264.

9 Edward Burman, <u>The Templars: Knights of God</u> (Great Britain: Crucible Publishing, 1986), 161.

10 Esquiu de Florian, "Letter of Esquin of Floyran to King James II of Aragon," in <u>The Templars: Selected sources translated and annotated</u>, ed. M. Barber and K. Bate (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002), 256.

accusations.[11] James II of Aragon was not the only secular ruler to view the charges with scepticism, as King Edward II of England was also doubtful of the validity of the charges: "King Edward II of England had received a letter from King Philip the Fair in mid-October, 1307, describing how he had uncovered the cesspit of corruption in the Temple ... Like King James of Aragon, King Edward was at first incredulous."[12] This initial refusal of two prominent European monarchs to believe the charges against the Templars is significant, and seems to cast doubt on the validity of the numerous accusations against the Order. If even a fraction of the accusations were true, it seems likely that the two monarchs would not have been so incredulous towards the charges.

The actual evidence against the Templars, and its thinness, also casts some measure of doubt upon the validity of the accusations. There was virtually no physical evidence against the Templars, and much of the testimony against them was relatively unreliable. Concerning the trial of the Templars in England, Clarence Perkins writes that

> The evidence was almost entirely hearsay. Very few could name even one living man from whom the story had come, and in most cases the persons named had heard the tale from some one else not named. The stories themselves were extremely fantastic and improbable in character, remarkable productions of overheated imaginations, based largely on the secrecy of the Templar ceremonies.[13]

This lack of proper evidence against the Templars has also been acknowledged by other historians. Edith Simon notes simply that "No documentary proof of the charges was ever found. In spite of the surprise effect of the arrests in 1307 and in spite of exhaustive research, the idol which thousands of prisoners confessed to having worshipped ... no such idol was unearthed."[14] Simon also writes that "The prosecution [at the Templars' trial in France] was not doing very well, even though the defence had no right to cross-examine witnesses. A lot of hearsay was produced and much that was inconclusive, even manifestly dubious."[15] Perhaps the most damaging argument, however, was a simple logical one. Piers Paul Read writes that

> all the evidence against the Order was tainted and, moreover, defied common sense ... Surely knights of this calibre, if they had discovered such iniquities in the Temple, in particular the blasphemies against Jesus Christ, 'would have all shouted out, and have divulged all these matters to the whole world'?[16]

It is indeed hard to believe that knights willing to sacrifice their lives for the Christian religion would have put up with even a fraction of the accusations against the Templars. Significantly, Alan Forey has noted that although many Templars confessed to priests who were not members of the Order, no priests ever came forward with allegations similar to those made by Esquiu de Florian and Philip IV. In fact, Forey writes that "All the non-Templar priests who testified during the trial and who had heard Templar confessions stated that these had been orthodox."[17] Thus, the trials of the Templars in various countries produced only unreliable and questionable evidence, a lack of evidence which seems to suggest that the great majority of the official charges against the Templars were almost certainly false.[18]

Throughout the course of the investigations into the accusations against the Order, a significant number of Templars confessed, either in full or in part, to the charges against

---

[11]   Simon, <u>Piebald Standard</u>, 241-242.
[12]   Read, <u>Templars</u>, 288.
[13]   Clarence Perkins, "The Trial of the Knights Templar in England," <u>The English Historical Review</u> Vol. 24, No. 95 (1909): 440.
[14]   Simon, <u>Piebald Standard</u>, 288.
[15]   *Ibid.*, 267.
[16]   Read, <u>Templars</u>, 280.
[17]   Forey, <u>Military Orders</u>, 234.
[18]   Simon, <u>Piebald Standard</u>, 288.

them. Despite a lack of proper physical evidence, and the questionable quality of testimony from witnesses, the confessions of the Templars themselves were by far the most significant proof against the Order. However, it seems probable that in many cases the confessions of the Templars were not freely given but were rather extracted through the use of torture. In France, particularly, both actual torture as well as the threat of such, was often used in order to gain confessions.[19] Edward Burman notes that the original order commanding the arrest of the Templars, sent by Philip IV to his officers, authorized the use of torture in the investigation into the Templar charges, even before the arrested Templars were presented to the formal inquisition.[20] The order mandates that officers of the French government will "investigate them [the Templars'] first before calling the commissioners of the enquiry, and will determine the truth carefully, with the aid of torture if necessary."[21] Burman even suggests that the arrest order's authorization of torture before the Templars had even been imprisoned amounts to "arrangements to obtain confessions of the initial charges ... even before the arrests were carried out."[22] It is beyond question that an extensive amount of torture was used during the Templars' trial in France. Peter de Boulogne, a Templar priest who had been chosen to act as the principal defender of the Templars during the trial in France, was actually able to conclusively prove that the Templars had been submitted to torture during their trial in France:

> He [Peter de Boulogne] had offered to prove the use of torture, bribery, and forged letters by the prosecution, and was able to make good at least a part of his promise – that pertaining to torture. Witness after witness gave the most frightful details, and the visible evidence of their bodies was not lacking.[23]

Another historian, Piers Paul Read, suggests that "given that a large number of those arrested were not battle-hardened warriors ... the shock and disorientation, combined with the mere threat of torture, quickly led many to admit whatever the King's officers and the Inquisitors suggested."[24] In other countries where torture was not used, however, the situation was very much different. In England, for example, the general conditions of the Templars' imprisonment were much less severe, and English law did not permit the use of torture in order to gain confessions.[25] Although papal inquisitors questioned forty-three members of the Order for nearly a month, between 20 October and 18 November 1309, every single Templar maintained the innocence of the Order.[26] Although some Templars eventually confessed when the use of torture was temporarily permitted in England, Clarence Perkins has noted "that the full confessions of crime were extorted by the inquisitorial procedure with torture temporarily established in England, and that the guilt of the Templars was not proved."[27] Many scholars have noted this apparent link between the use of torture and the obtainment of confessions. Edith Simon writes that "it is suggestive that nowhere but in France or under immediate French influence were the wholesale confessions obtained."[28] Piers Paul Read observes that "Only those from France contained credible confessions; those from outside France, in particular from England, Aragon, and Cyprus, could only come up with hearsay evidence from non-Templars to give substance to the accusations."[29] Most explicitly, Herbert Wood writes that "In England and France [where torture was used] the

---

19   Lord, <u>Templars' Curse</u>, 71.
      Read, <u>Templars</u>, 265.
20   Burman, <u>Knights of God</u>, 162.
21   King Philip IV, "Order for the arrests," 247-248.
22   Burman, <u>Knights of God</u>, 162.
23   Simon, <u>Piebald Standard</u>, 267.
24   Read, <u>Templars</u>, 266.
25   Perkins, "Trial," 432-435.
26   *Ibid.*, 434.
27   *Ibid.,* 447.
28   Simon, <u>Piebald Standard</u>, 289.
29   Read, <u>Templars</u>, 293.

result [of the trials] was unfavourable to the Templars; but in Aragon, Castile, Portugal, and the archbishopric of Mayence the inquiries resulted in an acquittal."[30] It seems clear, then, that a definite correlation existed between the use of torture and the confessions of the Templars. This connection can only serve to further weaken the legitimacy and truthfulness of the official accusations made against the Templars.

Despite the existence of serious and extensive doubts concerning the accusations against the Templars, it is still possible that some of the charges were in fact true. In particular, it appears as though the Templars may have been to some extent guilty of the charge of sodomy, and of the accusation that senior Templar leaders could hear confessions and absolve sins. During the Templars' trial in England, for example,

> Two Templars asserted that the pope had granted their chaplains greater
> power of absolution than other priests, and several more made damaging
> admissions regarding absolution from sin by the visitor or the grand master.
> Three of these said that the master or grand preceptor could absolve from sin,
> though they had not seen it done.[31]

This same belief seems to have existed in both Scotland and Ireland. In Scotland only two Templars were arrested, and they denied all the charges against the Order, with the exception of the accusation concerning the ability of senior Templars to absolve members of the Order from their sins.[32] In Ireland, six of fourteen Templars questioned confessed that Templar preceptors did absolve members of the Order from sin.[33] Clarence Perkins suggests that these confessions regarding the absolution of sins could have originated quite simply from confusion about the rules of the Knights Templar concerning the matter.[34] It appears, as well, as though this was not a phenomenon limited to the British Isles. Evelyn Lord has noted that the Templars imprisoned in Aragon had a similar confusion: "like the English Templars, they [the Aragonese Templars] seemed to have misunderstood the rule about absolution and thought that the master could absolve sins."[35] It is certainly possible that, as Perkins suggested, the Templars could have simple been confused about the rules concerning absolution; it is also possible that the Templars could have been guilty of this particular charge.

It has also been suggested that the Templars could have, to some extent, been guilty of the crime of sodomy and homosexuality. Many Templars did confess to the existence of homosexuality and sodomy within the Order, though these confessions all came from areas in which torture was used by the inquisitors.[36] Despite this questionable testimony, however, Anne Gilmour-Bryson concludes by stating that "I remain convinced that some homosexual acts were practiced in the Templar order, as they were in all other institutes of religion, [and] that the frequency of such behaviour was not particularly high."[37] Though perhaps less likely than the accusations concerning the absolution of sins, it is nevertheless possible that the Knights Templar were guilty, to a relatively minor degree, of the crimes of sodomy and homosexuality. However, though it is very much possible that these two accusations were true, they represent but a small amount of the total charges against the Templars.

Even so, it is nonetheless important to consider that many of the accusations made against the Templars by Philip IV were not unique to the trial of the Order. In fact, multiple scholars have noted that a considerable number of charges bear a startling resemblance to

---

[30]   Herbert Wood, "The Templars in Ireland," Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy. Section C: Archaeology, Celtic Studies, History, Linguistics, Literature 26 (1907): 355.

[31]   Perkins, "Trial," 436.

[32]   *Ibid.*, 443-444.

[33]   *Ibid.*, 444.

[34]   *Ibid.*, 447.

[35]   Lord, Templar's Curse, 116.

[36]   Anne Gilmour-Bryson, "Sodomy and the Knights Templar," Journal of the History of Sexuality, Vol. 7, No. 2 (1996), 157.

[37]   *Ibid.*, 183.

other trials of the time. Edward Burman writes that "what is most striking is the fact that in the context of contemporary witchcraft trials all these charges are quite familiar."[38] Alan Forey goes even farther in *The Military Orders*, and suggests that "the charges levelled against the Templars were not very original. Precedents can be found for almost all of them in earlier accusations against alleged heretics ... some of the same offences had even been imputed to Pope Boniface VIII only a few years before the Templars' arrest."[39] Yet another scholar, Ian Mortimer, has also noted this trend; he suggests that the same similarities seen in the charges against the Templars and Boniface VIII may also be observed in the accusations made against King Edward II of England in the early fourteenth century.[40] Perhaps most significant, however, is the fact that the charges made against Pope Boniface VIII were levied by none other than Philip IV, who was also the principal accuser of the Templars. Thus, the accusations against the Templars were not an isolated occurrence; rather, they must be seen in the context of similar charges being laid throughout Europe at the beginning of the fourteenth century.

It seems almost certain, then, that the great majority of the charges against the Templars were almost certainly false. The falsity of the charges may even have been evident at the time, and several European monarchs including James II of Aragon and Edward II of England initially refused to believe the validity of the charges. It is also significant that none of the contemporary critics of the Templars, such as Walter Map and Matthew Paris, made any suggestions concerning alleged wrongdoings and religious crimes among the Knights Templar. Had they known about such wrongdoings they almost certainly would have mentioned them.[41] Religious chroniclers of the early fourteenth century also seem to have had a hard time believing in the Order's guilt. Pierre de la Palud, a Dominican friar, presented evidence in favour of the Templars; Jacques de Thérines, a Cistercian theologian, noted the many contradictions in the evidence against the Templars and seems to have been unable to determine the Templars' guilt or innocence; and perhaps most significantly, the Dominican Bernard Gui, an experienced member of the inquisition, appears to have been unable to interpret the evidence against the Templars.[42] Thus, none of the Templars' contemporaries (including several already well known for their criticisms of the Order) appear to have believed in the truth of the charges made against the Templars. In this context, it also seems difficult to believe that Philip IV of France, the main persecutor of the Templars, could have possibly believed the charges against the Templars. Instead, it seems far more likely, as Malcolm Barber suggests, that he only used the charges to justify his actions against the Templars, which were in fact motivated by other, less straightforward purposes.[43]

Philip IV certainly had several reasons to persecute and suppress the Knights Templar, and he was undoubtedly in a position to benefit from the potential disbanding of the Order.[44] Foremost among these reasons were financial ones: Philip was deeply in debt due to wars against Flanders and England, and much of this money was owed to the Templars themselves: by 1307, Philip owed no less than 260,000 *livres parisi* to the Order.[45] Malcolm Barber notes that there were "obvious financial reasons for the sudden arrest of the Templars in France, for as bankers they possessed considerable liquid wealth and negotiable assets, and as landowners, fixed and moveable properties in every region of France from

---

[38] Burman, Knights of God, 167.
[39] Forey, Military Orders, 234.
[40] Ian Mortimer, "A Reconsideration of Edward II's Sodomitical Reputation," in The Reign of Edward II: New Perspectives, ed. G. Dodd and A. Musson (Rochester: York Medieval Press, 2006), 51-52.
[41] Helen Nicholson, Templars, Hospitallers and Teutonic Knights: Images of the Military Orders, 1128-1291 (London: Leicester University Press, 1995), 133.
[42] Burman, Knights of God, 169-170.
[43] Barber, Trial, 202.
[44] Lord, Templar's Curse, 70.
[45] *Ibid.*, 67.

Normandy to Provence."[46] Clarence Perkins, in an article on the wealth of the Knights Templar in England, even goes so far as to explicitly characterize the overall wealth of the order as "the immediate cause of the attack on them by Philip IV."[47] It seems clear, then, that the considerable wealth possessed by the Templars was a significant factor the decision of Philip IV of France to suppress their order.

This motivation can even be seen in Philip's own writings. In early 1308, Philip IV wrote to the masters of theology at the University of Paris, posing seven questions on the subject of his persecution of the Templars. In his sixth, he inquires as to whether "the goods which the said Templars possessed in common as their own property, in a case of this type should be confiscated for the profit of the prince in whose jurisdiction they are situated, or should rather be used for that of the Church."[48] In the case that the confiscated goods of the Templars were ordered to be used for the benefit of the Holy Land, Philip asks in his seventh question "to whom should their [the confiscated goods'] distribution, regulation and administration belong? Is it to the Church, or [to] the princes, particularly in the kingdom of France."[49] In this letter, Philip is essentially asking whether he must surrender the wealth and possessions of the Templars to the possession of the Church or other military orders, or whether he may retain it himself. Even in the event that the Templars' wealth must be used in the Holy Land, Philip seems eager to retain control over the distribution of the Order's money and possessions. Thus, it seems entirely possible that this letter can be seen as evidence of Philip's desire to acquire the wealth and property of the Templars; undoubtedly, the Templars' wealth played a significant role in their suppression at the hands of Philip IV.[50] It is perhaps also interesting to note that in a letter sent to Philip in 1313, the Knights Hospitaller (who had received a good deal of the Templars' assets from the pope) renewed a promise to pay Philip a sum of 200,000 *livres tournois*, taken mainly from the inheritance from the Templars: "we have promised and promise by the present document that we will release and repay to the aforesaid lord king [Philip IV] or his representative 200,000 *livres tournois* from the assets of the Temple and of our Order."[51] It seems clear, when considering both the context of the suppression of the Templars as well as Philip's own writings, that financial motivations played a significant part in Philip's suppression of the Knights Templars.

It is also possible that Philip IV had personal reasons to suppress the Knights Templar[52]: along with several other European leaders Philip had advocated for the unification of the military orders prior to a new crusade, and had seen himself as the grand master of this new, united order. Piers Paul Read has noted that "in Philip's mind, a prerequisite to a successful crusade was the merger of the military orders. He would command the united order and be succeeded by one of his sons."[53] Certainly, this position would have given Philip a considerable degree of power. However, this unification of the military orders, popular among the leaders of secular Europe, was far less so among the military orders themselves. Evelyn Lord has described the possible unification of the military orders as "a merger which [Templar Grand Master] Jacques de Molay refused to

---

46   Barber, <u>New Knighthood</u>, 298.

47   Clarence Perkins, "The Wealth of the Knights Templars in England and the Disposition of it after their Dissolution," <u>The American Historical Review</u> Vol. 15, No. 2 (1910): 252.

48   King Philip IV, "Questions of King Philip IV to the masters of theology at the University of Paris and their reply," in <u>The Templars: Selected sources translated and annotated</u>, ed. M. Barber and K. Bate (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002), 259.

49   *Ibid*., 259-260

50   Perkins, "Wealth of the Knights Templars," 252.

51   Knights Hospitaller, "Letter of the Hospitallers to King Philip IV," in <u>The Templars: Selected sources translated and annotated</u>, ed. M. Barber and K. Bate (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002), 323.

52   Lord, <u>Templar's Curse</u>, 70.

53   Read, <u>Templars</u>, 261.

countenance."[54] De Molay was so opposed to the potential unification of the military orders that in 1306 he wrote a letter to Pope Clement V containing no fewer than fifteen separate arguments against a potential unification, acknowledging only two possible benefits for the Templars.[55] It is certainly possible, then, that the refusal of Jacques de Molay to permit the merger of the military orders into a single, unified order under the grand mastership of Philip IV could have manifested itself as a personal reason for Philip to suppress the Templars in 1307.

It is also highly possible that Philip IV chose to suppress the Knights Templar in order to remove a potential challenge to his own position as King of France. The Templars were, without question, the most militarized of the military orders: James Brodman has noted that "within the Templar Rule, the rhetoric is military: the brethren are knights ... The terminology in the Hospitaller Rule, by contrast, is one of service."[56] In fact, the Templars had become so militarized even by the middle of the twelfth century that an additional set of regulations, known commonly as the "French Rule," was created mainly to guide and regulate the conduct of the Templars' military affairs. Among its articles are four documents clearly relating to a military life: "How the Brothers Should Make Camp," "How the Brothers Form the Line of March," "How the Brothers should go in a Squadron," and "When the Marshal takes up the Banner to Charge."[57] The contents of this additional rule, as well as the necessity for the creation of the document, both demonstrate the unprecedented extent to which the Templars had become a primarily military organization, even at this early point in the Order's history. However, with the fall of Acre in 1291 the Templars no longer had an immediately clear military purpose, and it seems entirely possible that this could have made Philip IV uneasy about his position on the throne. Moreover, the Knights Templar, and Jacques de Molay in particular, had a recent history of intervening in the affairs of secular government. In 1306, King Henry II of Cyprus was forced to abdicate in favour of his brother, and several historians have suggested that the Templars were implicated in this plot. Malcolm Barber, for example, has suggested that "while not the instigator of the move against Henry II, he [Jacques de Molay] was certainly heavily involved."[58] This incident, concerned with Philip's recent troubles with the Church (in particular with Pope Boniface VIII), could easily have made the French king apprehensive about his position on the throne of France.[59] Indeed, Clarence Perkins notes that "It has been asserted, too, that the great military strength of the Order made it a menace even to the crown."[60] Thus, the considerable military strength of the Templars, and the consequent threat that they could potentially pose to the French crown, could easily have contributed to their suppression and ultimate disbandment at the hands of Philip IV.

In addition to the factors which directly contributed to Philip's suppression of the Templars, two long-term factors also contributed indirectly to the suppression of the Order: the loss of the Holy Land, and general dissatisfaction throughout Europe with the Knights Templar. As the most militant of the military orders, the Knights Templar took a considerable amount of blame for the loss of the Holy Land.[61] Piers Paul Read writes that

---

[54]   Lord, Templar's Curse, 70.

[55]   Jacques de Molay, "The reply of James of Molay to Pope Clement V concerning the proposal to unite the Orders of the Temple and the Hospital," in The Templars: Selected sources translated and annotated, ed. M. Barber and K. Bate (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002), 234-238.

[56]   James W. Brodman, "Rule and Identity: The Case of the Military Orders," The Catholic Historical Review Vol. 87, No. 3 (2001): 386.

[57]   Knights Templar, "French Rule," in The Templars: Selected sources translated and annotated, ed. M. Barber and K. Bate (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002), 67-73.

[58]   Barber, New Knighthood, 290.

[59]   Lord, Templar's Curse, 66-70.

[60]   Clarence Perkins, "The Knights Templars in the British Isles," The English Historical Review Vol. 25, No. 98 (1910): 209.

[61]   Read, Templars, 248.

"the defence of the Holy Land had been their [the military orders'] *raison d'être* ... the surrender of Sidon and Castle Pilgrim without a fight, while undoubtedly justified by strategic considerations, had not added to their prestige."[62] Malcolm Barber seems to agree with this:

> More than any of the other military orders the Temple was associated with the defense of the crusader states and the holy places. The decision to abandon first 'Atlīt and then, in August 1291, Tortosa as well ... was a portentous step, the repercussions of which were certain to be profound both inside and outside the order.[63]

Edward Burman also argues that the loss of the Holy Land had a significant impact upon the ultimate suppression of the Templars. He suggests that "It is possible to interpret their decline in the closing years of the thirteenth century as an inevitable consequence of the fading of the crusading ideal."[64] According to Burman, it was the Templars' reliance on the Holy Land and the crusading ideal for their *raison d'être*, as well as the inability of the Order to adapt to the new circumstances after the loss of the Holy Land (a difficulty not seen among the leadership of other orders such as the Hospitallers), that ultimately sealed the fate of the Templars.[65] Thus, due to their preeminent position in its failed defence, and because of the Order's failure to adapt to a world without a strong crusading ideal, the fall of the Holy Land had a significant – and negative – impact upon the perception and reputation of the Knights Templar in Europe.

Throughout the existence of the Knights Templar, there was an increasing amount of general discontent with the Order, due both to the Templars' inability to live up to the extremely high standards originally laid out for their order, as well as the privileges and exemptions afforded the order by the Pope. In his *De laude novae militiae*, written in the early twelfth century around the date of the Templars' founding, Bernard of Clairvaux highly praised this new order of religious knights. Among other things, he claimed that "truly the knight is without fear and totally without worries when he has clothed his body with the breastplate of iron and his mind with the breastplate of the faith. Indeed, endowed with both sorts of arms he fears neither demon nor man."[66] Despite the elaborate praises of Bernard of Clairvaux, however, it is clear that the Templars were not able to achieve this almost inhuman standard. Around the same time that *De laude novae militiae* was written, Guigo, the Prior of La Grande Chartreuse, wrote a letter to the Templar Grand Master Hugh of Payns, in which he observed that "it is pointless to wage war against external enemies without first overcoming internal ones. If we are unable first to subject our own bodies to our wills, then it is extremely shameful and unworthy to wish to put under our control any sort of military force."[67] It appears, then, as though the Templars were unable to live up to the standards laid out for them, and this likely contributed to the increasing discontentment directed towards them from several parts of European society. In fact, Burman has argued that the trials were the direct result of the criticisms made against the Templars. He writes that "The history of the Templars can be viewed in terms of the mounting vehemence and authority of these criticisms, culminating in the series of trials which led to their

Brodman, "Rule and Identity," 386.

[62] Read, Templars, 249.

[63] Barber, New Knighthood, 283.

[64] Burman, Knights of God, 145.

[65] *Ibid*.

[66] Bernard of Clairvaux, "In Praise of the New Knighthood," in The Templars: Selected sources translated and annotated, ed. M. Barber and K. Bate (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002), 217.

[67] Guigo du Pin, "Letter of Guigo, Prior of La Grande Chartreuse, to Hugh of Payns," in The Templars: Selected sources translated and annotated, ed. M. Barber and K. Bate (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002), 213.

suppression. The trials were by no means a bolt from the blue, but an inevitable consequence of two centuries of criticism."[68] Even in the early thirteenth century, nearly a century before the suppression of the Templars by Philip IV, the Order was subjected to a considerable amount of criticism. Appreciating the seriousness of the criticisms against the Templars, in 1218 Pope Honorius III wrote a letter to members of the clergy in Sicily, urging them to protect the Templars. He wrote that

> some people returning from Outremer have so blackened their [the Templars'] reputation, that if their innocence had not shone forth in the furnace like gold in time of need we ourselves would have been forced by the rumours and the calumnies of their detractors to suspect that they had occasionally committed crimes.[69]

Without a doubt, the criticisms of the Templars, even in the early thirteenth century, must have been considerable to have required the intervention and support of the pope himself. Therefore, the criticisms of the Templars were increasingly serious and numerous, and had a significantly negative effect upon the Order as a whole.

Even more than the Templars' own failures, however, the special privileges and exemptions granted to them by the pope had an increasingly negative effect on their popularity.

In 1139, not long after the foundation of the Order, Pope Innocent II issued the bill *Omne Datum Optimum*. In this bill, Innocent laid out the fundamental papal privileges afforded to the Templars. He wrote that "Those things that you take from their spoils you may in all confidence convert for your own uses, and we forbid that you should be forced to give a part of them to anyone against your will."[70] Thus, the Templars were permitted to keep all spoils of war and use them for their own purposes in the Holy Land, and were exempt by papal decree from paying any sort of taxes on these spoils to secular rulers. Innocent also wrote that "We establish that the house or Temple, in which you have assembled for the praise and glory of God, with all its possessions and goods ... will be under the protection and tutelage of the Holy See for all time to come," effectively giving the Templars and their property direct papal protection.[71] However, this widespread papal support negatively impacted the Templars' popularity, especially in the eyes of many secular rulers. Malcolm Barber notes this problem, writing that "the papacy's enthusiastic patronage created an organization whose position and activities increasingly came to chafe upon the society within which it needed to function."[72] Piers Paul Read also notes this, writing simply that "the Templars were resented for their privileges and exemptions."[73] There was, therefore, a considerable and increasing amount of discontentment with the Knights Templar throughout Europe, due partially to their own failures and partially to the exemptions and privileges that the pope granted to the Order. Though none of these factors contributed directly to the persecution and suppression of the Knights Templar, they did contribute to an environment in which the suppression of the Order by Philip IV was made possible.[75]

The causes of the suppression of the Knights Templar are both many and complex. The great majority of the official accusations made against the Templars by King Philip IV of France were almost certainly false. The biased nature of the origins of the charges, the quantitative lack and questionable nature of the evidence against the Templars, and most

---

[68] Burman, Knights of God, 138.

[69] Pope Honorius III, "Pope Honorius III orders the prelates of Sicily to protect the Hospitallers and Templars," in The Templars: Selected sources translated and annotated, ed. M. Barber and K. Bate (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002), 231.

[70] Pope Innocent II, "Omne Datum Optimum," in The Templars: Selected sources translated and annotated, ed. M. Barber and K. Bate (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002), 60.

[71] *Ibid*., 60-61.

[72] Barber, New Knighthood, 282.

[73] Read, Templars, 250.

[75] Barber, New Knighthood, 295.

seriously the correlation between confessions and the use of torture during the investigations, all cast a serious amount of doubt on the accusations against the Templars. That King James II of Aragon and King Edward II of England did not initially believe the charges, and that contemporary Templar critics make no mention of the charges in their writings, suggest that Philip IV of France simply used the charges as a means to achieve his own personal goals. A closer examination of Philip's situation reveals compelling evidence that this may have been the case. Philip's dire financial situation, combined with the relative wealth of the Templars, would have made suppressing the Order a potentially profitable exercise for the French King. The refusal of Jacques de Molay to accept a unification of the military orders, combined with Philip's desire to personally head a united military order, point to personal motivations on Philip's part in favour of the suppression of the Knights Templar. It is also very much possible that, given the recent events in Cyprus and the military power of the Templars, Philip might have suppressed the Templars in order to remove a potential threat to his position on the throne. Although the loss of the Holy Land, and the increasing discontentment with the Templars in Europe, were not direct causes of the suppression of the Order, as Malcolm Barber suggests these factors did certainly contribute to a climate in which the suppression of the Templars by a secular king was possible. In the end, it was both these long-term factors, as well as the benefits of the suppression of the Order for Philip IV, which were the true causes of the suppression of the Knights Templar.

Connor Coles

Giggles, Snickers, and Young Ladies' Knickers: Humour and the Body in the

British Atlantic

People have always found something to laugh at. While the nature of humour has changed over the centuries, it is a certainty that people will laugh at anything from the most elaborate politically charged pun to the simplest fart joke. Humour is not only important as a source of study for academics, but also as a source for historians to use a means to look at the past. It provides historians "access [to peoples'] innermost assumptions, providing a guide to social tensions and anxieties"[1]. Humour can provide a wealth of information about the early modern period specifically. As the Enlightenment gave way to new ideas of thinking, particularly about gender relations, health, medicine, and the body, humour and jokes evolved to reflect these new ideas about men's and women's bodies. With the Scientific Revolution beginning in the late 1500s and early 1600s, ideas about health and the body expanded with new theories replacing old ones. Certain aspects of early modern culture (like any culture), are not influenced totally by professionals. Jokes, especially ones dealing with sex, have revealed that it was not simply physicians who developed theories about medicine and thoughts about the body, but there was also "lower" cultural impact on the field of medicine and concepts surrounding gender relations. Jokes about the body influenced not only the most modern medical theories, but also how males came of age in the period. They also revealed a definite fear in the growing autonomy of women throughout the period as an openness about sexuality grew. Jokes, particularly about intercourse with women, reveal social norms about attaining manhood, and reinforced already embedded gender roles with women. This is also shown in certain areas of medical journals; this will be explained further in this paper.

Jokes in the early modern period were focused mainly around relishing in someone else's misfortune. Jokes played on the unfortunate position of second class citizens, such as the crippled, elderly, and especially women. Old women were the worst off, and many jokes had young gentlemen put gunpowder in their handbags to blow them up and things of that sort as the punch-line; early modern peoples would roar at "human suffering . . . [there was] unquestioned pleasure at the sight of deformity or misery"[2]. If we can accept that there is an element of truth to every humorous situation, then these jokes are capable of showing us the fears and desires of men in the seventeenth and eighteenth century. By providing us with material with which gentlemen laughed at, understanding the innermost feelings of early modern English (and later British) society; their deepest social assumptions are clearer. The jokes being circulated amongst the English (and later British) people were "continually 'fed back' to the orally transmitting audience" of this jests and humorous stories[3]. These jokes were even available in polite society "because of their verbal framing . . . [it was] possible to discuss base or repugnant things without violating linguistic decorum", showing that jokes, even the basest jokes about bodily humour were being discussed by all classes[4]. Jokes, for the upper classes, were a means by which one could prove their wit; they "taught their readers to

---

[1] Tim Reinke-Williams. "Misogyny, Jest-Books and Male Youth Culture in Seventeenth Century England", <u>Gender and History</u> 21 (2009) 325

[2] Simon Dickie. "Hilarity and Pitilessness in the Mid-Eighteenth Century: English Jestbook Humour", <u>Eighteenth Century Studies</u> 37 (2003) 2

[3] G. Legman. "Towards a Motif: Index of Erotic Humour", <u>The Journal of American Folklore</u> 75 (1962) 230

[4] Ibid. 12

be witty in an original way"[5].

      William Byrd II, an elite Virginia planter, had written in his commonplace book several jokes concerning sex and sexuality. Entry 485 describes practices in Sparta where "old Bachelors above the age of 24 to be whipt publickly by the women upon a certain Festival, for shewing so great a disregard to their charming Sex"[6]. Other jokes were not as kind to females; the more "charming" sex. Many jokes revolved around a woman's inability to be a normal person (i.e. a man). In a jest-book by Archie Armstrong, the punch-line to why women were so crooked was "inspired by the Bible, being 'because the first Woman was made of a crooked thing', namely Adam's rib"[7]. Women were often the butt-end of jokes, unsurprising given the status of women at the time. In the medical profession, women were predominately seen as simply underdeveloped men until the end of the early modern period. Because of this model, and the biblical history of women (having cast out both Adam and Eve from the Garden of Eden), medical designs often showed the female uterus as a monstrous place, and the female body was a horrible entity. The uterus was often displayed with horns, signifying the devil. In one medical text, the female "testicle" was shown to retain the body parts of undeveloped people within it upon dissection[8]. Women's bodies were truly the monsters of the early modern period.

      While this understanding of women's bodies was prevalent in both medical journals and the most humorous jokes of the day, these jokes also have a lot to say about the influence these jests had upon men of the day. While one's manhood was usually defined by one's age, other tools were used to gauge masculinity amongst peers: "marital status, age, social position and context . . . [along with] sexual prowess and drinking"[9]. These jokes about sex and denouncing women were part of male culture in the early modern period. Many of these funny tales are set in ale houses, taverns, and other drinking establishments, with the punch-lines of the jokes suggesting that males desired "to be able to seduce the opposite sex, but [there was] an unwillingness to offer any form of commitment"[10]. Many of the jokes refer to some body part as a euphemism for another, such as the nose being closely related to phallus, and the "middle of the body" often refers to the anus. Jests such as a country man telling a wench "would my flesh were in thine" to which she replies: "so would I . . . would your nose were in my, I know where" would have enthralled male youths because of the flirtatious nature of these jokes[11]. These jokes suggested not outright rejection, but rather enticing males to showcase their sexual performance in a setting around their peers.

      These sorts of jokes, however, highlight a disparity between youth culture and the prominent medical discussions of the day. Youths were ideally to engage in large amounts of intercourse as part of their coming of age, while medical journals indicate that having sex with prostitutes will almost certainly give off the "burning" (Chlamydia). In a letter written from Mr. William Beckett to his colleague in the Royal Society, Dr. James Douglass, in 1717 Beckett outlines that "no other Disease that can be communicated by carnal Conversation with Women, but that which is Venereal"[12]. It was generally accepted that having sex with a

---

[5]   Simon Dickie. "Hilarity and Pitilessness in the Mid-Eighteenth Century: English Jestbook Humour" 9

[6]   William Byrd; Kevin Berland; Jan Kirsten Gilliam; Kenneth A Lockridge. <u>The Commonplace Book of William Byrd II of Westover</u>. (Williamsburg, Virginia: University of North Carolina Press, 2001), 183

[7]   Tim Reinke-Williams. "Misogyny, Jest-Books and Male Youth Culture in Seventeenth Century England" 328

[8]   James Cleghorn." The History of an Ovarium, Wherein Were Found Teeth, Hair and Bones". <u>The Transactions of the Royal Irish Academy</u> 1 (1787) 73-89

[9]   Tim Reinke-Williams. "Misogyny, Jest-Books and Male Youth Culture in Seventeenth Century England" 326

[10]   Ibid. 329-330

[11]   Ibid. 335

[12]   William Beckett. "An Attempt to Prove the Antiquity of the Venereal Disease, Long before the

diseased woman would certainly make you diseased yourself as argued by "almost all the physical writers upon this subject"[13]. The literature in medicinal thinking held the same sexist lens which most of the jokes of the period held. It is important to note, however, that while venereal diseases could be contracted primarily by prostitutes in public bath houses, John Astruc and his treatise on the matter concludes that:

> "the Venereal Disease does never arise from the promiscuous copulation of sound Persons; and that a Woman in Health, let her lie with as many Men as she pleases, can never be infected with it, provided they are in Health too"[14].

Jokes of the period also reflect this belief that honourable women were unable to be corrupted by venereal diseases, should they be "sound persons". In a joke from William Byrd II's commonplace book, a courtier tries his luck with his landlady's daughter where the daughter is not the character of ridicule; it is the man for being dishonest and trying to impress a woman above his station while the woman remains untouched by the scathing humour[15]. This shows that while men did, indeed, hold their societal superiority to women dear, they also realized that their station could be slighted by their own illicit sexual behaviour[16].

Jokes and medical thinking had taken the idea of developing manhood into a manner by which to cement male dominance in the British Isles during the early modern period. Medical texts of the 1600s had perceived "youth as an age of spirited and courageous action . . . but also a period of potential vice and lack of self control"[17]. By issuing medical texts which tailored to the developing sexual prowess of up-and-coming gentlemen, early modern English (and later British) society had made it socially acceptable for young men to engage in vast amounts of sexual intercourse, so long as it remained within the confines of "normal" society. The outcasts of society; prostitutes, harlots and wenches were to remain untouched out of fear of contracting venereal diseases. Honourable women were exempt from this rule.

While medicinal thought changed dramatically throughout the early modern period, the manner of jokes did not vary very much. Jest-books right up until 1800 continually used the same material; some using the same jokes from as early as 1558[18]. Material from the "Old Joe Miller" jest-book written in 1800 still uses the same euphemisms which were used in the 1600s. In one jest, the nose can be used as a substitute for a penis. The joke can be understood as two people having engaged in intercourse:

> "An impudent jade was taken before a wise justice of the peace for an [illegible], who frequently made use of the following words: *Put that and that together*. At the end of the examination the justice ordered his clerk to write her mittimus, saying *Put that*

Discovery ofthe West-Indies; In a Letter from Mr. William Beckett, Surgeon, to Dr. James Douglass, M.D.and R. Soc. Soc. and by him Communicated to the Royal Society" <u>Philosophical Transactions (1683-1775) </u>30 (1717-18) 843

[13]   John Astruc. <u>A treatise of the venereal disease, in six books; containing an account of the original, propagation, and contagion of this distemper in general. As also of the Nature, Cause, and Cure of all Venereal Disorders in particular, whether Local or Universal. Together with An Abridgment of the several Discourses, which have been written upon this Subject from the first Appearance of the Venereal Disease in Europe to this Time, with critical Remarks upon them</u>. Trans: William Barrowby. (London: the Royal Exchange, 1737) 41

[14]   Ibid. 21

[15]   William Byrd; Kevin Berland; Jan Kirsten Gilliam; Kenneth A Lockridge. <u>The Commonplace Book of William Byrd II of Westover</u>. 179

[16]   Tim Reinke-Williams. "Misogyny, Jest-Books and Male Youth Culture in Seventeenth Century England" 333

[17]   Ibid. 326

[18]   Editor of New Joe Miller, or the Tickler. <u>Old Joe Miller: being a complete and correct copy from the best edition of his celebrated jests; and also including all the good things in above fifty jest-books published from the year 1558 to the present time</u>. (London: Wilson & Co. 1800) 1

44

> *and that together*: the girl, while this was doing, informed his worship that she had one particular observation to make; "What is it hussey?" said he: "Your worship has a large carbuncle on your nose:" "And what if I have?" "Why and please your worship, I have one upon my ------ *Put that and that together*."[19]

Here the joke implies that the justice of the peace has slept with this "impudent jade" and grown a large carbuncle (skin infection) upon his nose (referring to his penis). Even in 1800 with developments in medicine, jokes still circulated about those with otherwise distasteful character giving more respectable gentlemen venereal diseases. The old jokes of the period remained as testament to the theory that people of low character could only contract these diseases, despite medical texts from 1800 suggesting otherwise. In one treatise about the treatment of venereal diseases by using nitrous acid, a wife had contracted "inflammation of the labia pudenda, which gave her much pain in walking. She had probably contracted these from her husband, as he lately had, according to her account, some primary symptoms of the disease"[20]. This shows that there was a distinct change from the previous model that typically women could only contract venereal diseases by being of a more disreputable character, but by 1800 doctors had seemingly rejected this model. In William Blair's "Essays on the Venereal Disease", there is no mention of the women who he has treated having contracted the disease having had it from being of "low" character. Blair's patients remain simply patients, while jokes from the period mocked shady characters for their high probability of having an infection, and finding joy in them spreading it to characters of authority.

It is important to note, however, that sexual humour cannot simply be looked at from the typical binaries with which discussions about sex are usually held; typically within the heterosexual, procreative, male-female relationship. While we understand marriage to typically have a procreative aspect, we also know that there were many instances of rudimentary birth control and attempts at sexual play at work within the early modern period[21]. Is it appropriate to see approach humour and sexuality in a manner which focuses only on "sodomy and procreation, marital and extramarital, male and female, masculine and feminine, dominant and submissive"[22]? While these binaries help, it is important for historians to go deeper into the topic.

While it is clear that males used humour and modern medicine to reinforce their own growing sense of manhood, the issue behind the jokes told by young gentlemen of the period is more complex than wanting to express their developing sexuality through humour and having it reinforced by professional doctors. The jokes, particularly the ones issued in pamphlets featured "proverbs, drama and cheap print [often] reflected male anxieties about the instability of patriarchy [in the family] and the disorderliness of female behaviour"[23]. Going back to the medical documents listed previously, we can see that these fears did in fact exist amongst doctors. Honourable women were truly appreciated by society and were "allowed" to bed as many men as they chose, while "loose" women were prone to contracting all sorts of terrible diseases. These morally lax women were also the subjects of many jokes. One describes a wife who has been particularly disobedient with her husband:

> "A young Man married to an ill-temper'd Woman, who not contented, tho' he was very kind to her, made continual Complaints to her Father, to the great Grief of both

---

19   Ibid. 227-228
20   William Blair, Essays on the veneral disease and its concomitant affections. Part the second: Containing Additional Evidence, with critical and practical Remarks, on the new saline antisyphilitic Remedies; and an Answer to some Objections made against the former (London: H.D. Symonds, 1800) 18
21   Katherine Crawford, "Possibility and Perversion: Rethinking the Study of Early Modern Sexuality" The Journal of Early Modern Sexuality 78 (2006) 416
22   Ibid.
23   Reinke-Williams. "Misogyny, Jest-Books and Male Youth Culture in Seventeenth Century England" 324

Families; the Husband, no longer able to endure this scurvy Humour, bang'd her soundly: Hereupon she complain'd to her Father, who understanding well the Perverseness of her Humour, took her to Task, and lac'd her Sides soundly too; saying, Go, commend me to your Husband, and tell him, I am now even with him, for I have cudgell'd his Wife, as he hath beaten my Daughter"[24].

The punch-line of the joke, both men having established restorative justice upon each other at the expensive of their daughter and wife to prove a point, suggests that men were eager to laugh at the expense of women because they felt uncomfortable by the rising power women had throughout the early modern period. If we use Thomas Hobbes' definition of laughter: "the rush of glee caused 'by the apprehension of some deformed thing in another, by comparison whereof they suddenly applaud themselves'", we can see that men would see the "deformed thing" as the growing power of women in the period[25]. This is visible at all levels of society. Most jokes take place in taverns, bars, and ale houses, and as print media became more widely circulated, these jokes could have been read aloud at coffee houses and the bars where the jokes, in fact, are set. These jokes "take us strikingly close to lived experience" for many early modern people, and by examining their jokes, we can gather a wealth of knowledge about their personal lives outside of journals and commonplace books.

In conclusion, it is clear that understanding humour is important for historians to get a clearer grasp of the social and personal feelings of a society. In the early modern period, sexual humour was used to add a dimension to developing ideas about manhood and coming of age. This was often associated with excessive sex and drinking, which was reflected in the humour at the time. It is also important to note that sexual history should no longer be simply explained within the binaries of what is sexually "normal" (used here very loosely) but should be looked at from a larger context. For example, in this particular case, sexual jokes made by males about females often had a tinge of fear over the developing concept of feminism with Enlightenment thought. Jokes will, and should continue to be, a valued source for social historians to use as a passport into the minds of their subjects. It is difficult to gauge fears and personal feelings through a treatise, but through what people laugh at, there is a wealth of untapped historical research.

---

[24]   Simon Dickie. "Hilarity and Pitilessness in the Mid-Eighteenth Century: English Jestbook Humour" 2

[25]   Ibid.

Lindsay Oliver

Indigenizing the 'white man' and whitenting the 'red man'
Processes and Discourses of Canadian Interwar Racial Imaging and Nation Building

*"I am always amongst the white people and making an honest living
and I have good reputation among the white people…"[1]*

"…[he is] a better citizen than lots of white men…"[2]

During Canada's interwar period increasing numbers of First Nation individuals sought to become enfranchised- to renounce their Indian status and become fully legal Canadian citizens.[3] While the increase in numbers still amounted to a minority- the majority of Fist Nations choose to not become enfranchised, the few hundred applications that the Department of Indian Affairs received between 1918 and 1940 reveal something about Canadian national and racial imaging.[4] The main reason identified in applications usually centered on gaining access to the resources and opportunities that were denied to these individuals under Canada's "Indian" status.[5] Accordingly, applicants sought to use enfranchisement as a way to better their lives and compete more equally with the "white men."[6] In entering into this process, and ceasing to be "Indian," First Nation applicants had to demonstrate their level of assimilation and integration into white society. Essentially, they had to prove their "whiteness," and, thus, their lack of "Indianness."[7] The process of proving a certain way of life and, thus, an eligibility for citizenship, were tied to the processes of nation building and national delineations of race, ethnicity and the citizen.[8] Through legal definitions and designations, citizenship is how a nation defines what and who it is. In turn, this determines who is, and who can be, entitled to full rights and access to national legal, political, social and economic resources and opportunities.[9]

In addition to delineating citizenship, the nation-state also has the task of defining and defending itself against other nations as a way to justify its existence, and as an exercise of power. Family, commonly being the first community to which an individual belongs or develops a sense of belonging, is a widely used metaphor for nations and nation building; the nation needs to make itself seem like a "natural" domestic unit worth being part of, and worth defending.[10] This involves creating a sense of common bonds which are built on the perception of shared histories, values, characteristics and aspirations. Ultimately, this requires a common identity which allows a nation, and its nationals, to

---

[1]   Thomas L. to Charles Cooke of DIA, 16 Nov. 1925, file 8022-9, vol. 7230, series B-3, RG 10, LAC in Robin J. Brownlie, "'A Better Citizen than lots of White Men': First Nations Enfranchisement- an Ontario Case Study, 1918-1940," *The Canadian Historical Review* 87:1 (2006): 29.

[2]   Alex A. to DIA, 5 Jan. 1920, file 8019-7, vol. 7224, series B-3, RG 10, LAC in ibid.,36.

[3]   Brownlie, "'Better Citizen,'" 29-30.

[4]   Ibid., 30-31.

[5]   Ibid., 35, 37.

[6]   Ibid., 37.

[7]   Ibid., 30.

[8] Sunera Thobani, *Exalted Subjects: Studies in the Making of Race and Nation in Canada*, (Toronto: Toronto University Press, 2007), 74.

[9]   Ibid., 3, 5, 9-11.

[10] Daniel Coleman, "The National Allegory of Fraternity: Loyalist Literature and the Making of Canada's White British Origins," *Journal of Canadian Studies* 36:3, 138. (2001): 132.

differentiate and align itself with, and against, others.[11] The human body thus becomes a biopolitical identity through which a nation can employ strategic correlations and binaries, leading to a sense of collective identity, and an ability to determine which bodies can come into the country, who can represent them in wars, where one can live, or even how one can reproduce. [12]For Canada, these processes have involved the construction of a primary identity which ultimately defines and exalts "whiteness."[13] Settlers to Canada had to redefine who they were; they had to become nationals and not just settlers.[14] Stemming from its partially British roots, Canadian nation building has centered on a "whiteness," which harmonizes and differentiates "Canadiannes" with "Britishness.[15] However, in order to do this, nationals had to define what "Canadian" meant, and then justify "Canadian" access, and right to resources, land, and a state. The interwar period was a significant time for such Canadian nation building, and due to binary processes of nation building, it was also significant for First Nation racial imaging. Canada gained more independence from Britain and sought to create an image for itself, which in turn, incorporated a binary of progressivism and primitiativeism that ultimately sought to indigenize the "white man," and assimilate or eliminate the "red man," in an attempt to justify the state.

The Indian Act of 1876 defined Canada's indigenous people as "wards of the state," and implemented the reserve system, thus legislating place making and racial imaging processes as part of white Canadian nation building. Indigenism binds groups of people to the land, which implicates certain rights and access to that land.[16] Therefore, in order to justify the state and non-indigenous access to the land, white nationals not only had to gain control of the land and its resources, they also had to maintain that control.[17] Thus, the colonization of indigenous populations had to be justified, and the land made accessible and adoptable to whites. In Canada, the reserve system legislated indigenous bodies to specific and often isolated tracts of land, thereby defining physical zones of designation, access and exclusion.[18] Through this system, First Nation access to the land was restricted, and their indigenous image could be deconstructed, and then reconstructed as one separate from the land. Reservations became sites for the cultural extinction and the re-creation of a Canadian state - a common theme in other nation building projects, which focused on the centrality of the land to Canadian nation building and ultimately sought to indigenize the white presence.

During the First World War an estimated 3500-4000 Aboriginal Canadians voluntarily enlisted and fought in the Canadian Expeditionary Core.[19] For many their wartime experience was one in which they were treated as equals: brothers and full participants in Canadian nationhood. The Canadian Expeditionary Core dressed and equipped all of its soldiers the same, and, as such, military participation, especially through the uniform, created an image of equality.[20] The equalizing aspect of the visible marker of the uniform would have contrasted to that of previous experiences of racialization wherein certain physical markers of the body (such as skin colour) would have been visible marks of

---

[11]   Thobani, *Exalted Subjects*, 19.

[12] Kim S. Rasmussen, "Focault's Genealogy of Racism," Theory, Culture & Society 28:5 (2011): 36-37, 39, 40.

[13]   Thobani, *Exalted Subjects*, 3,5; Coleman, "National Allegory," page 132-138, 141, 146.

[14]   Thobani, *Exalted Subjects*, 55.

[15]   Ibid., 81.

[16] Jyotimaya Tripathy, "Towards an essential Native American Identity," *The Canadian Journal of Native Studies* XXVI 2(2006): 316.

[17]   Thobani, *Exalted Subjects*, 48.

[18]   Ibid., 12.

[19]   Robert J. Talbot, "'It Would be Best to Leave Us Alone': First Nations Responses to the Canadian War Effort, 1914-18," Journal of Canadian Studies 45:1 (Hiver 2011 Winter), 108, 109.

[20]   Fred Gaffen, *Forgotten Soldiers* (Winnipeg: Canadian Defence Academy Press, 2008), 1.

"Indianness," and, thus, markers of differentiation. One of the hopes of Aboriginal wartime experiences was that such equalization might be extended to Aboriginal peoples and communities on Canadian soil, so that the racial images and legislated discourses of racialization and restriction to land would be redefined in a way that reflected the part First Nation contributions to Canada's war effort. However, at the War's end, Canada gained new international recognition, in addition to experiencing new industrial economies and gender roles that developed from total war efforts, and, in consequence, the interwar period became a pivotal time in the development of Canadian nationalism. As in the pre-World War II period, white nationals continued to use access to land as one way to accomplish the construction of a national image of "whiteness."

While some First Nations individuals were overseas fighting for the rights and freedoms of the Canadian state, Aboriginal leaders back home were waging their own war, using the wartime experiences and discourses to defend Aboriginal access and rights to citizenship and land. Aboriginal overseas contributions were being recognized and celebrated in national newspapers as part of wartime discourses of the First World War, yet, interwar nation building discourses did not facilitate successful campaigns for these leaders. Canada had fought to defend overseas borders, and, accordingly, also partially fought to establish its relation to the British Empire and the Canadian territory itself. Land was a contentious issue, and the very lands set aside as sites of exclusion once again became battlefields over legal designation to land access. The Canadian state fought to set aside parts of certain reserve lands exclusively for white war veterans.[21] Despite celebrated contributions to the war effort, and experiencing relative equality overseas, Aboriginal veterans were not afforded the same rewards and recognition as their white brothers in arms.[22] In the overseas wartime front Canada represented itself as a racially diverse nation of relative equals. However, within Canada`s own borders and boundaries- on its "own" land- "Indians" were still "wards of the state" that had to be kept from the land. Aboriginal veterans were thus accordingly managed under the Department of Indian Affairs, and not by the federal state responsible for citizens- those white nationals of "exemplary" pioneer qualities at the core of the nation building pioneer mythology.[23]

The pioneer mythology of Canadian nation building effectively conveyed a binary between British and Indian ways of relating to the land, environment and ideas of progress. Discourses on early arctic exploration, especially the Franklin expeditions, not only serve as an example of how Canada defined itself in terms of environment and a pioneer mythology, but also the way this mythology served interwar nation building purposes. Sir John Franklin was a nineteenth century British naval officer and arctic explorer. In 1845 he set sail with the intension of sailing through the Northwest Passage. No one from his crew survived. Yet, despite the failure of the expedition, from 1900 – 1970, Franklin was seen as an ideal example of commendable Britishnness in facing the environment- an exemplar of a certain type of national character.[24]

The appeal of the Franklin expeditions lies in what could be said about land, character, and nation building.[25] In the early twentieth century, the scholar Vilhjalmur Stefansson argued that the explorers demonstrated the "stubbornness" of the "English mind… unwilling to learn from savages."[26] This became a more common view in the 1970s

---

[21] Sarah Carter, "'An Infamous Proposal': Prairie Indian Reserve Land and Soldier Settlement after World War I," *Manitoba History* 37 (Spring 1999): 9-20.

[22]   Ibid., 14-15.

[23]   Ibid., 14.

[24]   Janice Cavell, "Comparing Mythologies: Twentieth-Century Canadian Constructions of Sir John Franklin," in Norman Hillmer and Adam Chapnick, eds, *Canada's of the Mind: the Making and Unmaking of Canadian Nationalisms in the Twentieth Century* (Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2007), 15, 20-21.

[25]   Ibid., 23

[26]   Quoted in Ibid., 23.

with anti-American sentiments and a related questioning of Canada's relationship with Britain which was growing in the nation, but the pioneer discourse was popular in the interwar period.[27] These interwar discourses presented Canada's "pioneering" explorers as determined and enterprising men who worked and suffered to make a new nation[28] could be important and inspirational for a nation struggling during and after war, perhaps in need of finding pride in the sacrifices made. The Inuit, having survived in the arctic climates, were a glaring example of successful adaptation to the environment that did not lead to death. Yet, that was largely ignored in the construction of British "heroes." It was the task of the pioneer to conquer the frontier and civilize it, and Franklin was a hero because of his attempts to do so.[29] Thus, the Franklin discourses were linked to ideas of land, land use and land designation. Franklin was of a national character who endured and attempted to conquer the land. Because they did not ``conquer``, the Inuit were seen as obstacles to ``progress`` and thus removed from the pioneer discourse, and by association, the land.

   Canada has often looked to technology as a national building scheme, a way to bring a diverse and vast land together from one sea to the other, and ``conquer`` the land.[30] This began with McDonald`s National Policy and the Canadian Pacific Railroad of John A. McDonald, and continued to into the interwar years with the telephone. In 1927, historic broadcasts of Canada's Diamond Jubilee speeches were broadcast "not only from Ottawa but from across the nation," in the first ever "attempt at globe-circling broadcasting," which "united" Canadians as never before.[31] Such technologies were also used in 1939 to send messages from Canadians to the British King and Queen. In this broadcast the expanse of the land was featured between each speaker to emphasize the unifying capability of the technology which could bring messages from "the province of Nova Scotia on the shores of the Atlantic" to "800 miles westward to the province of Quebec," to "300 miles southwest to Toronto" to "600 miles westward to a farmhouse in Saskatchewan" to "500 miles northwest to Edmonton," and finally "800 miles across the Rocky Mountains to the province of British Columbia… in Vancouver on the shores of the Pacific."[32] However, this focus on technology also had a divisive impact as it contributed to a binary of white nation building and the making of primitive Aboriginals.

   By taking pride in technological advancements, nation building discourses presented whites as continuing to conquer the land, they were becoming part of it and the vastness of the Canadian territory was becoming less of a barrier national unity and identity.[33] Like Franklin, whites were presented as the inventors, movers and shakers, the progressives. The work done by those considered to be outside of the nation, like the Chinese railroad workers, or Aboriginal veterans, were ignored in the discourses by a lack of acknowledgment and/ or being physically removed from the land. Ideas of progress in relation to land also came into play in discourses of folklore, Canadian art and crafts, summer camps, and marketing. These however, were also coupled with a paradoxical nostalgia for a past "golden age," which

[27] Ibid., 15, 38-39.

[28] Ibid., 24, 35.

[29] Ibid., 23-24.

[30] MacDougall, "The All-Red Dream,`` 46.

[31] Canadian Broadcast Corporation. "CBC Digital Archives: 1927: Diamond Jubilee broadcast links Canadians." Access date: April 09, 2012. http://www.cbc.ca/archives/categories/society/celebrations/celebrations-general/diamond-jubilee-broadcast-links-canadians.html.

[32] Canadian Broadcast Corporation. "CBC Digital Archives: Canada Calling the British Empire." Access date: April 09, 2012. http://www.cbc.ca/archives/categories/society/celebrations/celebrations-general/canada-calling-the-british-empire.html

[33] MacDougall, "The All-Red Dream," 46, 51.

contributed to the process of making whites appear indigenous and First Nations primitive, part of the past, not part of the developing and unifying future.

The First World War encouraged a rapid industrialization of Canadian society, and a corresponding insecurity over the new industrial order made its way into the white Canadian psyche, thereby producing interwar nation building discourses of "folk." The ``folk`` was related to ideas of a past golden age, and of an essential cultural identity rooted in the purity of tradition.[34] The CPR publicity agent, and author of the influential *Canadian Mosaic* (1938), J. Murray Gordon, was an important proponent of this idea, which was a central reason behind his creation of the CPR Folk festivals. These festivals, which occurred between 1927-1931, celebrated the "folk" of Canada- the essential cultural expressions and identities of those (European) cultures which made up Canada. Like the telephone, folk, to Gibbon, enabled communication and was thus a unifying force. He believed that at their core, the folk of each culture was essentially the same, therefore in celebrating the different folks, the similarities of each could be recognized, and a Canadian identity based on plurality could be created.[35] John Buchan, or Lord Tweedsmuir, shared a similar opinion.

John Buchan was Canada's Governor General from 1935 to 1940, who, as argued by Peter Henshaw, was one of the earliest proponents of multiculturalism.[36] According to Buchan, the development of a Canadian folk helped maintain ties with the Empire while also creating a pluralist Canadian identity. In both Buchan's and Gibbon's folk narratives, the past was romanticised; yet, these discourses also became a way through which progress could be measured, and racial images of ``modern`` whites and ``primitive`` First Nations were reproduced. In Buchan's vision, First Nations were part of a primitive, traditional folk and they were of a past which informed the present. In Gibbon's view, First Nations were literally written off the land.[37] Folk narratives also had an industrial component in that they made culture a commodity, something that could be performed, enjoyed and bought within modern economic and capitalist structures. This paradox was present in similar anti-modern discourses, which placed the folk, and ultimately Canada's "Indians," as the nostalgic people of the past.

Partially as a result of industrial advancements which facilitated production, but also resulting from concerns over industrialism, Canadian artists adopted the pioneer mythology during the interwar years.[38] Painters like Emily Carr and the Group of Seven became prominent, well-known artists, known for their ability to paint "distinctive" Canadian art. In accordance with contemporary nation building narratives, their art focused on the landscape and relations to the land. The Canadian landscape was perceived to be unique and distinctive, and was featured prominently in Canadian art. Thus, Canadian art became another way that the land became a central part of white Canadian conceptions of self. Yet, if artists and Canadians were to take such pride in the environment around them, creating an

---

[34] Stuart Henderson, "While There is Still Time: J. Murray Gibbon and the Spectacle of Difference in Three CPR Folk Festivals, 1928-1931," *Journal of Canadian Studies* 39 (2005): 141; Coleman, "National Allegory," page

[35] Ibid., 142.

[36] Peter Henshaw, "John Buchan and the British Imperial Origins of Canadian Multiculturalism," in ," in Norman Hillmer and Adam Chapnick, eds, *Canada's of the Mind: the Making and Unmaking of Canadian Nationalisms in the Twentieth Century* (Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2007), 191-208.

[37] First nations, for example, were not featured in any of the CPR folk festivals, Henderson, "While There is Still Time," 154; Henshaw, "John Buchan," 193, 198, 203.

[38] Sandra Campbell, "The Real Discoverers and Master-Builders of This Nation": Lorne Pierce of Ryerson Press and Nationalism in Canadian Art, 1920-1950," in Norman Hillmer and Adam Chapnick, eds, *Canada's of the Mind: the Making and Unmaking of Canadian Nationalisms in the Twentieth Century* (Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2007), 177-178.

image or sense of belonging to that land was also important, and the land could not feel foreign. Claiming the land for the "white" was done partially through the work of salvage ethnographers and was based on theories of First Nation extinction.

Prior to the First World War a popular discourse that surrounded Canada's Aboriginal population was that of an unfortunate extinction due to the inevitable processes of national progress. A branch of anthropology developed, based on this belief for the need to preserve cultures, known as salvage ethnography. First Nations were made subjects to be recorded and exoticized, and the collection, and/ or painting of Aboriginal artefacts was also part of this process. In the artistic expressions of salvage ethnography, some artists focused solely on Aboriginal portraits, while those who experienced the most contemporary acclaim, including Emily Carr and the Group of Seven, made them part of the background, an impersonal, and thus inhuman part of a past land and time.[39] Carr did paint some portraits, but, interestingly, they were of women and children- the Indians who, by the Indian Act, could loose their status, and those who were being assimilated through the Residential schools.[40] Accordingly, Carr's art added to discourses of the vanishing traditional Indian by presenting the traditional as an impersonal part of a past, or by people who can, and were, being assimilated. Edmund Morris painted elders, but he focused on those individual Indians about to die, thus adding to extinction discourses.[41] Ultimately, the presence of "Indians," whether it was a portrait or as part of the landscape, in Canadian art added an allure and exoticism which helped Canada to differentiate itself from the motherland. In exoticising Canada, Canadians were, by association, exoticised, and seen as a people separate from Britain.[42] As expressed by Canadian art, Canadians were becoming increasingly indigenous to the land, set to replace the people of the past- now relics to be captured in art, but who, according to the discourses, could not, and were not, participating in modern society, unless it was in an assimilative role. An example of this process can be seen in the Jubilee celebrations of Vancouver where Vancouver's First nations and Chinese featured prominently.

In 1936 the city of Vancouver was 50 years old, and its Jubilee celebrations were a defining moment for the city to show the world who they were, both within the Empire and Canada. Songs were composed in which land, travel and technology were frequently mentioned, thus creating a sense of incorporation of land, technology and settlement into Vancouver's development, which paralleled the national discourses.[43] Pavilions were also created, one for Vancouver's Chinese population, and one for its First Nation population.[44] Showcasing Aboriginal imagery made sense as, through the works of Emily Carr, west coast native art was becoming increasingly popular and familiar in the Vancouver landscape. Ironically, however, in reality Aboriginal peoples were often in isolated reserve areas of the province, and thus, not familiar to Vancouver. Initiatives were thus made to make Aboriginal imagery more accessible for the expected visitors and tourists coming to Vancouver, with

---

[39] Daniel Francis, "Ch.2: Vanishing Canadian," in *The Imaginary Indian: The Image of the Indian in Canadian Culture* (Vancouver: Arsenal Pulp Press, 2004): 25; LiLynn Wan, "'Out of Many Kindreds and Tongues': Racial Identity and Rights
Activism in Vancouver, 1919-1939" (PhD diss., Dalhousie University, 2011) 93.

[40] See her works "Indian Baby"(n.d), "Mrs. Douse, Chieftainess of Kitwancool"(1928), "Louisa" (1928), "Old Mrs. Green, Lousia's Mother, Queen Charolette Island" (1928), and "Possibly Susan Dan" (n.d), from B.C. Archives. "Contact Sheet Two." Access date: April 09, 2012. http://bcheritage.ca/emilycarrhomework/gallery/bccon2.htm.

[41] Francis, "Imaginary Indian," 28-29.

[42] Coleman, "National Allegory, 145.

[43] See, for example, the song submission by A.G. Bowie, J. Booth, "Cockney Version" by Edith Neelands and "Vancouver's Jubilee" by Les Crane, George Rex, "British Columbia Sheet Music," Access date: April 10, 2012,
http://www.library.ubc.ca/music/bcmusic/htmpages/vancouversjubilee.html.

[44] Wan, "'Out of Many Kindreds and Tongues,'" 165-166.

such token representations of Aboriginal cultures like totems poles. The number of totem poles in Vancouver's Stanley Park increased as the days got closer to Jubilee celebrations.[45] This was a white directed initiative, as was the Aboriginal pavilion.

Unlike the Chinese who had control over how to present themselves, white Vancouver elites controlled the presentation of Vancouver's First Nations.[46] In the Jubilee exhibition, aboriginals were presented through three main events: an Indian canoe regatta, Indian Exhibit Building, and a Totem Pole exhibit, all of which featured First Nation "relics." While an active celebration of sport, the presence of a canoe contributed to discourses of primitive Aboriginals through portraying them in a historic item- the canoe had precedence as being displayed as an artefact in national and international museums.[47] The advertising of the regatta also employed exotic language which removed the Aboriginal "contestants" from the current settings, claiming they were from "many distance parts." In the Totem Pole Exhibit, the traditional totem pole artefact was on display, and in the Indian Exhibit building, both Indian arts and crafts as well as Indian themselves were on display. Here, Fist Nation artisans sold their arts and crafts, which were presented as commodities rather than artefacts.[48] However, given the discourses of nostalgia that surrounded contemporary arts and crafts, this participation was part of a process of racialization which designated Aboriginals as primitive peoples, selling things from a "golden era" of anti-modern, unindustrialized production.[49] This also presented the First Nations participants as being part of the modern economy, and two discourses were simultaneously at work. First Nations were portrayed and seen as an anti-modern, primitive and part of the past, but they were also modern, assimilated capitalists. It was a paradoxical celebration of the past and a present assimilation. It also made First Nations culture purchasable to whites, made it a commodity which whites could admire, purchase and take home. First Nations images were also more directly used to sell products, and more subversively in summer camps.

Consumer culture is a process by which nation building occurs in the home and every day life.[50] In this interwar national branding process, First Nations images conveyed various messages, including aforementioned images of anti-modernism and non-industrial purity, and invoking a sense of history. For example, the Chippewa Brand of red raspberries used the image of an Indian to convey a sense that their raspberries were "natural," untouched by the rapidly developing, and concerning, industrial world. Images of farmer were used in similar ways.[51] Like the images of a farmer, images of the French were also used to convey a sense of nationalist progress rooted in a history tied to the land.[52] The presence of these images made this nationalist discourse Canadian in a concrete way that helped to create a common sense of a shared history. These discourses contrasted the primitive with the industrial, again adding to a sense of continuity and ownership to the land, where progress reigned and traditionalism (or "Indians") were of a nostalgic past that could be consumed.

Children's summer camps were popular as a way of meditating this age of industrialization. Social movements of the time stressed the need for children to gain a sense of connection to the Canadian landscapes being ever popularized in artistic, festive and consumer images of Canada. "Indian" summer camps were a popular answer to this,

---

[45]   Vancouver Park Board. "Stanley Park: Totem Poles." Access date: April 10, 2012. http://vancouver.ca/parks/parks/stanley/landmarks.htm
[46]   Wan, "Many Kindreds," 166.
[47]   Ibid., 170.
[48]   Ibid.
[49]   Ibid., 94-96,109-110.
[50]   Paula Hastings, "Branding Canada: Consumer Culture and the Development of Popular Nationalism in the Early Twentieth Century," in Norman Hillmer and Adam Chapnick, eds, *Canada's of the Mind: the Making and Unmaking of Canadian Nationalisms in the Twentieth Century* (Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2007), 135.
[51]   Ibid., 136.
[52]   Ibid., 136-137.

especially for children in Ontario.[53] At these camps, white children not only spent time in nature, but through division into tribes, ceremonies and the receiving of "Indian" names, they adopted, for a time, an Indian image. However, the authenticity of this image was not always of primary concern. A camp in Bolton, for example, featured the tepees of the Plains Indians, next to the totem poles of the West Coast tribes.[54] This suggests that what was really important was not reality, but the perpetuation of a certain image that fit in certain stereotypes, and thus, worked in accordance with national rhetoric of nationhood and racialization. If the over arching ideas were not challenged, then the image was lent a sense of authenticity. In which case, whether whites were designing and running the Indian camps, or organizing the Jubilee presentations of First Nations, the displays of indigenous peoples were controlled in a way that they were not challenging to the popular narratives, so they seemed correct. The underlying processes of indigenism added to the authoritativeness, as did the token "real" Indian camp workers and artisans. This also shows a certain fluidity to racial designations, where whites could adopt the image of Indian, which made "Indian" more of a image than a reality.

　　　　While white children were playing Indian in summer camps, Indian children were removed from their families, communities and lands, and were sent to residential schools, places of exclusion and cultural re-appropriation. Here Indian children were taught to be white, and the residential schools had a threefold effect of dismantling Indian families, cultures and their connection (and thus right) to the land. Residential schools of the interwar period became even more potent vehicles of cultural dismantling when, in 1923, the federal government ceased to distinguish between the smaller, less ambitious, and more local boarding schools, and the larger, more pervasive, isolated industrial schools. From 1923 onward, "residential school" referred to the industrial type of school,[55] a change which had overarching impacts on the discourses and realities of nation building and racial imaging.

　　　　With First Nation children removed, and white children being taught to be connected to the land through Indian images, white children received a message about what rights they had to the land, and of "Indianness" being a temporary thing, a play thing of the past, not a real, enduring status. This made it easier, in some very tangible ways, for whites to control the land. Removing First Nation children from their families into isolated industrial residential schools, not only had the physical effects of removing them from their land and cultural teachers, but also the psychological effects of saying that the Indian family is defective.[56] This lent creditability to social purity movements focused on the creation and preservation of the western-European patriarchal, nuclear family, and made it seem necessary / possible to correct aboriginal family structures and, subsequently, to de-empower Aboriginal women.

　　　　The Indian Act made it possible for Indian women to loose their Indian Status through marriage. This was part of an overarching process to de-empower First Nation women. Matriarchies were a threat to the patriarchal family structures and gender roles desired for Canada. These family structures and gender roles granted power to men and regulated women to the home, not to the positions of power which were traditionally available to First Nation women in tribes. Moreover, women can also control the reproduction of a nation, which is one primary reason why the state thought it important to de-empower First Nation women and regulate female status.[57] If the woman ceased to be an

---

[53] Sharon, Wall, "Totem Poles, Teepees, and Token Traditions: 'Playing Indian' at Ontario Summer Camps, 1920-1955," *The Canadian Historical Review* 86:3 (2005): 513-544.

[54] Ibid., 524.

[55] J.R. Miller, "Troubled Legacy: A History of Native Residential Schools," *Saskatchewan Law Review* 66 Part 2 (2003): 363-364.

[56] Thobani, *Exalted Subjects*, 109,119-120, 124, 128.

[57] Ibid., 49, 119-120.

Indian under a white husband, then, by Anglo-Saxon approaches to family lineage, her children would legally be white and Indians could be legally bred out. It was also a process by which family structures could be corrected. Here women went from being Indian "wards of the state," under state control, to being under the control of her husband, as was "proper" according to gender purity movements. All this, however, also suggests that racial identities were fluid.[58]

Contemporary scientific discourses argued that race was a fixed identity that determined certain characteristics, yet popular and legal discourses simultaneously implied that race could change. Indian women could become legally white, Indian men could be enfranchised and become legally white, Indian children could be assimilated, and even whites kids could play Indian and become Indian. Yet, while racial identities were thus artificial, they had very real consequences. Several aspects of the "Indian" image worked within a binary of industrial, enterprising, modern white man and the backward, traditional, and primitive. Through nation making processes, aspects of this binary became a reality, which only encouraged its development and proclamation. By restricting First Nation economic activities to those available on the reserves and as traditional artisans, the Canadian state did make it so that, in terms of economic production, First Nations did have fewer opportunities to be enterprising, and modern. Franchise applications show that several First Nations sought to become legally white in order to achieve greater access to economic opportunities, suggesting that their Indian status was a very real source of limitation. Erasing First Nations from other discourses related to the land, and/or making them an adoptable character, also made indigenous rights and relations to the land seem less valid, as white discourses were beginning to claim a historic relation to the land for themselves, or if not an indigenous right, then a noble and moral justification of colonialization of the primitive, which was now being displayed, in some aspects, as modern, assimilated participants. In all this however, Fist Nations were not without agency.

As evidenced in on the ground war time experiences, First Nation leaders mobilized to agitate for greater legal recognition for indigenous rights and claims to land. Such processes of asserting rights within the context of collective indigenous rights continued and further developed in the interwar period as First nations were slowly being given a more participatory, and central role in the Canadian economy and national image processes.[59] Ironically, it was the way in which the pioneer mythology and its inherent homogenizing binaries shaped the interwar "Indian" image that facilitated a greater creation of a collective sense of indigenous rights and an ability to fight for those rights.[60] Despite their diversity, all First Nations had been colonized, displaced, dislocated and subjected to all sorts of restrictions and discriminations, common experiences which, in this period, were increasingly leading to senses of a shared experience and identity.[61] Indigenism also tied First Nations to the land, and in the interwar discourses of land and primitivism, this element of a shared experience and history was also beginning to manifest into a foundation for race based rights-activism.[62]

The master narrative of Canada has been one of an enduring, persistent pioneer who overcame obstacles, and thus, the environment and ideas of indigenism have been central to Canadian processes of nationhood, as well as the formation of what is now referred to as the "pioneer mythology" or a "national fraternity of whiteness." Conquering the harsh Canadian environment, the pioneers were seen as adventurous and enterprising. The overcoming of the environment and the climate were seen as factors that brought the nation together. Yet, having overcome the land, pioneers also had to justify their right to the land, in which case,

---

[58]   Ibid., 50

[59] Wan, "Many Kindreds," 9, 10, 23, 56-57

[60]   Ibid.

[61] Ibid.; Tripathy, "An Essential Native American Identity," 314.

[62]   Wan, "Many Kindreds," 10, 23,

Canadian nation builders had to ennoble pioneer actions and explain the indigenous populations. A binary was created between First Nations and the developing Canadians, where, as the nationals, white bodies were made the personification of a lawful, modern enterprise, where as, as the "other," and First Nations as unlawful and primitive, and thus, in need of European guidance. The Indian Act was developed to regulate Indian bodies, and First Nations were institutionalized as the opposite of the Canadian national. Going into the interwar years, Canadian nation building discourses took on several threads: anti-modernism, progressivism, social purity, autonomy from Britain as well as a connection to it, all of which sometimes occurred in the same images of white and the Indian, as the Indian was used to define whiteness. Canadian interwar nation building also built from previous discourses, especially in relation to the land and senses of indigenism, removing the "redman" in order to indigenize the "white man," creating and justifying the Canadian state.

_____

Brenna Santacroce

The "problem" of frigidity: its inconsistent treatment and consistent role in marital advice from the 1920s to the 1960s

Frigidity loomed over the first half of the twentieth century as a threat to sexual satisfaction within marriage; in an age in which marital success was increasingly linked with "good sex", frigidity became a pejorative symbol of Victorian prudishness in the emergent sexological discourse. Paradoxically, it was common in popular marriage and often aspired to by the "civilized woman". Moreover, any totalizing definition of frigidity remained elusive. Frigidity was at once customary, a sign of neurotic pathology, and impossible to define satisfactorily. For decades, it played at the fringes of psychiatric literature – discussed only in medical diagnoses of neurotics – and then appeared in traditional marital manuals by the 1960s. This essay will attempt to tease out the multiplicity of causal threads that contributed to a radically different treatment of frigidity in marriage manuals from 1920 to 1960. Using Marie Stopes's *Married Love* (1918) and Romar and Lee's *A Family Relations Guide for the Canadian Woman* (1961), it suggests that while frigidity was explicitly excluded from the first and delicately included in the second, there is common cause behind both decisions. While the definition of frigidity was altered dramatically throughout the first half of the twentieth century, its *role* in marital advice was consistent. Frigidity was used as a tool for the institutionalization of sexological knowledge (Waters 56), one meant to prescribe normative heterosexual relations through its opposition. As such, its presentation in marital advice changed to better suit that purpose. In the broader sexological context, a paucity of research and radical discrepancies in accepted belief suggest far less interest in frigidity for its own sake.

From the term's earliest beginnings to its exhaustive formulations, a universally accepted definition of frigidity remained elusive. As a term defined by its *lack*, it is necessary to regard frigidity as inextricably linked to whatever stood as the popular conception of the "correct" female orgasm in an era when orgasm became the necessary marker of "good sex". For the twentieth-century woman in a post-psychoanalytic tradition, the failure to develop and ultimately enjoy vaginal orgasm was taken as a symptom of frigidity (McLaren 160). The vaginal orgasm represented a woman's passive and submissive acceptance of male sexual authority; it was deemed the only healthy female sexual response (Lewis 42). Correspondingly, over the course of the interwar period, the failure of vaginal orgasm became the conceptual lynchpin of frigidity (Angel 536). While the psychoanalytic tradition was influential,[1] psychiatric and medical communities continued to have different views on the specifics of frigidity. At one extreme, frigidity was characterized as a complete absence of sexual sensation, be it physical, sensual, or emotional; at the other, there was a rigid view that any sexual experience, except coitus concluding with orgasm, was symptomatic of frigidity (Schaefer 165). The definition changed not just over time, but between scientific fields as well. If there was any consistency to the definition of frigidity, it was as a term used to control and categorize, rather than describe. It stood as a tool for depicting normative sexual behaviour in its opposition to normality – an unspecific descriptor intended for use *against* itself.

While issues surrounding marital sexual satisfaction and frigidity were certainly widespread across class levels, it would be almost impossible to argue contact between most of the English speaking world and sexologists. As McLaren suggests in his *History of Sexuality*, even if the reading public was more enlightened in the 1920s, one should not exaggerate the impact of feminism, psychoanalysis, or sexology on the mass of the population (69). This claim holds weight throughout the first half of the twentieth century, for although there was research published on sexuality, it often did not make it into the consciousness of the dominant culture. What were distributed quite effectively, however, were marriage manuals, which exploded in popularity in the 1920s. Marie

---

[1] Kroger and Freed assert "what is called psychosomatic medicine today is the outgrowth of the efforts of psychoanalytically oriented physicians...the psychodynamic tenets of Freud have become well established diagnostic and therapeutic tools in all phases of clinical medicine" (Kroger, Freed 570).

Stopes's *Married Love* sold more copies than many popular novels and ushered in a genre that would remain fashionable for much of the century.

Marital guides were concerned with the improvement of marriage; the method for doing so had, by the 1920s, come to mean sexual education. More specifically, marital guides prescribed "correct" sexual practice. Over the next forty years, however, what was included in these manuals changed dramatically. Published in 1918, Stopes's project excludes frigidity, while the 1961 *Family Relations Guide for the Canadian Woman* includes it. Stopes's omission of frigidity is especially indicative because it is not accidental. Like so much of Victorian literature's deletion of sexuality, the exclusion is almost more telling than any inclusion would be. For the intellectual community of the 1920s, frigidity was a pathology to be understood and studied *as such* – it had no place in a happy marriage. Moreover, love in marriage had to be protected from it. By 1961, however, *Family Relations* devotes three full pages to a discussion of frigidity within marriage. Frigidity shifted from being viewed as a neurotic pathology to be categorized by obscure medical textbooks and began to be acknowledged in texts aimed at the general public.

To understand the many, and often seemingly contradictory, threads of twentieth century discourse on marriage, it is important to remember that these shifts are often reactionary. This is especially true of Stopes's *Married Love*. Her work, both as an author and with Margaret Sanger on the birth control movement, sought to change the public perception of sex and "sexology". Their opponent: Victorian prudishness in relation to sex within heterosexual marriage. Pioneering sexologist Havelock Ellis commented in 1910 that "by many, *sexual anaesthesia* is considered natural in women", citing medical authors who claimed frigidity rates of between 66 and 75 percent for "civilized women" (Maines 61).[2] In the nineteenth century, frigidity in women was not only commonplace, it was religiously and morally preferred. Sex was inextricable from its reproductive consequences and was controlled as such.

Stopes's opposition to the Victorian public's ignorance of "good sex" did not begin with dreams of sexual liberation, however: it was a project intended to revitalize marriage. By the inter- war period, heterosexual marriage had transitioned from a purely reproductive, economic union into a companionate relationship concerned with romantic compatibility. Many intellectuals expressed concern for marriage after the First World War. As a result, there was an explosion of new marriage manuals which emphasized the need for sexual pleasure and provided necessary advice on technique (Robb 99). Stopes's *Married Love* is arguably the first of this genre, and its subtitle, 'A New Contribution to the Solution of Sex Difficulties', suggested that marriage was in trouble and that good sex was the solution (Robb 99). Victorian purity became an enemy of good marriage; as the foundation for societal stability in the post-war backlash, marriage needed rescuing from this dangerous foe. What earlier generations had seen as woman's ideal purity was now labelled "repression" or "frigidity" (Robb 99). The marital advice literature of the early twentieth century emphasized the necessity of sexual fulfilment for a happy marriage – and, by extension, a healthy society (Angel 537). Yet, perhaps more significant than the war in creating this unexpectedly "sex-positive" culture (for the heterosexually monogamous, of course), was the increasingly popular use of contraception. For the first time in the history of sexuality, marriage was confronted with sex *separate* from reproduction. Before the widespread availability and active championing by some groups of birth control, "sexual pleasure in marriage was always overshadowed by fears of pregnancy" (Robb 90). For the marriage manual of the 1920s, sex was freed from reproductive control. The result: sexual norms had to be even more carefully policed. Stopes's marriage manual is

---

[2]   It should be noted, the problem of frigidity is a primarily intellectual concern centred around the upper and middle class, due to the expensive and personal nature of psychiatric treatments. There were never any efforts made by psychiatry or psychoanalysis to combat or treat frigidity on a large scale. Even by 1963, in "The Problem of Frigidity", Bergler comments: "mass treatment is out of the question. As a mass problem, the question of frigidity is, unfortunately, not to be solved" (375).

[3]   Published in the late 1920s, the book was originally intended only for a professional

demonstrative of this trend; it was a tool for the improvement of normal, heterosexual and monogamous marriage, not a guide for dealing with abnormality.

Married Love ushered in a new era of marital advice literature that provided an educative function on correct sexual practices. The most famous is likey Theodoor vab der Velde's *Ideal Marriage,* a book concerned with the ABCs of sex – how it *should* be performed.[3] As discussed above, Stopes makes no attempt in *Married Love* to offer an explanation of frigidity; it does not belong in a discussion of a happy, 1920s marriage. She refers the "sexually anaesthetic" reader to the work of sexual pathologists like Forel, Ellis, Bloch, or Krafft-Ebing. Her usage of *sexual anaesthesia* suggests a familiarity with the sexological work on the subject, as does the pathologizing, almost taxonomical language used: she encourages the reader to discover what type of humanity they belong to (17). There is no need for such a reader to engage with her book, "for it is written about, and it is written for, ordinary men and women" (17). Once a normalized phenomenon, frigidity in the 1920s had become a danger to the romantic marriage; in a world where sex was no longer defined by reproduction, it had to be *correct*. As McLaren argues, any failure was presented as a threat to family stability and therefore to society. If pregnancy did not have to be feared, any lack of heterosexual ardour could be taken as a sign of frigidity (69). With the events of the early twentieth century, claims at a moral and religious backing for frigidity began to subside. It was now part of the taxonomy of pathological sexual dysfunction, and useful as a way of protecting and prescribing normal sexual behaviour.

Although the character of marriage may have remained static over the course of the next two decades, the heterogeneous field of sexology did not. It should be noted that while sexological works were certainly not best-sellers, Chris Waters claims that, by the 1930s, their ideas were being widely discussed, and shaped the academic sexology increasingly encountered at most levels of society (47). Sexologists' prescriptions of normal sex were passed down to the public through marital advice; as seen with Stopes, however, the public was shielded from the details of abnormal sex. Historically speaking, research into sexuality was defined by the interactions of sexologists, psychoanalysts, psychiatrists, medical doctors and researchers. While each field existed at the same time, since there were shifts in their prominence, the changing face of frigidity is most simply explained as following these paradigmatic shifts. From biological essentialism, to pathology, to behaviour that could be adjusted through counselling, even the reduction of frigidity to an artefact of male "unadroitness" (Stekel 123), the definition of frigidity changed depending on who was using the term. In the decades after Stopes, the field most inclined towards investigating frigidity was certainly psychiatry; as Angel points out, the salience of psychiatry in discussions of female sexual problems has its roots in the mutually entangled development of psychiatry, sexology, and criminology (536). Perhaps the most persistent – and paradoxical – trend throughout this dynamic period: while common, frigidity was associated with neurotic woman, and certainly something to be avoided. Throughout the first half of the twentieth century, the definition of frigidity was in crisis – shaped and reshaped by the popular paradigm of the day.

Beyond Freud's prescription of the vaginal orgasm, the most striking paradigm shift emerged with a hotly contested project of medical research: the publication of Kinsey's *Sexual Behaviour in the Human Male* in 1948 and then *Sexual Behaviour in the Human Female* in 1953. While psychiatry was still in its heyday, scholarship set out in a new direction: its declared aim was to study ordinary life and to examine society from the ground up (Cocks, Houlbrook 5). Rather than describe what ought to be normal behaviour in the top-down fashion of sexology, the Kinsey report looked into what was actually taking place in heterosexual marriage. As much as the "civilized woman" aspired to restraint, the Kinsey report provided statistical evidence showing discrepancies between the common assumptions of a moralistic public and the actual behaviour of people (Bowman 2). Moreover, its data suggested that medical professionals were out of touch with dominant sexual trends; rather than successful vaginal orgasm, sexual stimulation and climax were centred on the clitoris (Lewis 59). As a result, Kinsey argued what had been standard claims of over 50 percent frigidity in the work of Stekel, Kroger and Freed, and others, were unsubstantiated and exaggerated estimates (375). By employing empirical methods to demonstrate the shift in focus away from the vaginal to the clitoridean orgasm, Kinsey upset what had long been an accepted tenet of frigidity for many

---

audience, though it eventually became a public sensation.

sexologists. He went on to suggest, moreover, that the data confirmed that the persistent failure of the female to reach orgasm *in her marital coitus* may do considerable damage to a marriage (371). Amidst the panic around domestic and national security in the 1950s, any threat to heterosexual marriage was dangerous – Kinsey's claims caused an uproar.

By the mid-twentieth century, Edmund Bergler, W.S. Kroger and S.C. Freed stood as authorities on female sexual health, especially in sexual dysfunction: all three were staunch defenders of the primacy of the vaginal orgasm. They mirrored Wilhelm Stekel's earlier work on *anaesthesia vaginalis,* a condition he had described as "bordering closely on the realm of sexual pathology" (Stekel 117). As Bergler had articulated earlier in his hallmark essay "The Problem of Frigidity": "the formula, 'Orgasm is orgasm,' is wrong" (376). For Bergler, and Kroger and Freed, frigidity was defined by the "the incapacity of woman to have a vaginal orgasm during intercourse" (Maines 62) – in their eyes, Kinsey's efforts to validate the "clitoridean orgasm" would only serve to placate neurotics. They maintained the woman's passive acceptance of the penis was necessary – any failure at vaginal orgasm was caused by "a multiplicity of neurotic reasons" (Kroger, Freed 571). Despite maintaining statistics ranging from 75 to 90 percent frigidity in women, Bergler, Kroger and Freed continued to describe frigidity as a neurosis – and one with tragic consequences (Bergler 389). Enforcement of the vaginal orgasm, specifically passive penetration, was not mere medical prescription, however; it had real-world implications for the state of marriage, especially amidst the 1950s "conservative backlash".

Mirroring the post-war 1920s, the 1950s saw a shift in attitudes towards marital relations. Cold War anxieties and post-war tensions made the assertion of traditional gender roles within heterosexual marriage of paramount importance. The normal family unit, rooted in healthy heterosexual desires and behaviours, played an integral role in securing political, economic, and social stability (Lewis 68). Like the 1920s, contraception increasingly facilitated the separation of sex from reproduction – as did a preference for clitoral orgasm. Consequently, the medical profession tried to make motherhood the tangible expression of female psycho-sexual health, insisting that the only healthy sexual acts were those that contained the possibility for reproducing within the legal and moral sanctity of marriage (Lewis 68). As the basis of societal stability, the marriage model needed to be protected. The "traditional" role of the passive female so brilliantly contained in the vaginal orgasm helped safeguard gender roles: by maintaining it was the only correct orgasm, experts offered medical imperative to the post-war domestic ideology that valorized female domesticity and male bread-winning. In short, the vaginal orgasm became the key to ensuring domestic bliss and national security (Lewis 68). Female sexual dysfunction was dangerous not only for the family, but for society as a whole.

The Canadian Woman's Guide to Family Relations[4] emerged out of these deeply polarized attitudes toward frigidity. On the one hand, social anxieties dictated the importance of stable familial "relations" through successful vaginal orgasm; on the other, the picture of the heterosexual marriage painted by the Kinsey report in no way matched those prescriptions. Published in 1961, it appeared on the heels of the first FDA approved oral contraceptive, a marker that reaffirms the ever- broadening gap between sexuality and reproduction. The guide dismisses contraceptives on religious/moral grounds, but devotes a full chapter to the "Problem of Frigidity". It claims: frigidity in marriage is always a serious matter. It is crippling to both husband and wife...and to their marriage (66). Frigidity is presented, as always, in opposition to good marriage. In a clear link to earlier psychiatric efforts to taxonomize "different" types of frigidity,[5] *Family Relations* appeals to "some authorities who break the problem of frigidity into two categories, primary and secondary. In both, distinction is made between the completely frigid wife who never responds, and the relatively

---

[4]   Like many other marriage guides, it was available via mail-order for private, family use, and advertised in marital advice magazine and journals.

[5] For examples, see: Bergler's 8 part "general typology" (378-379), Stekel's tripartite division of the "absolutely, relatively, and passionate-frigid woman" (98), and Williams's division of the population into: "perfectly adjusted, rarely have orgasm, and absolutely frigid" (572).

frigid wife who responds to some degree" (65). To elucidate on this distinction, it articulates three different stories:

> Three widely contrasting families, yet in their hearts and minds, a great similarity. Helen, meticulous and finicky, considered her husband gross and uncouth, hating to have him touch her...Annette, driven by ambition, had to excel in a man's world...Being 'just' a woman was not enough. Lorraine was terribly tired, but also terribly afraid. Whenever Norman wanted to kiss her, one of her headaches came on...Each of these women was a frigid wife. (64)

The usual conflicts between repression, psychiatric neurosis, and even early fears around pregnancy are all found here. Yet, over the course of the chapter, the emphasis is on the *emotional* causes of frigidity: it is portrayed as a difficulty to be overcome, rather than a neurotic pathology. Regardless, in all three cases, either medical or psychiatric treatment are strongly encouraged. Recalling Stopes's work, *Family Relations* rails against Victorian prudishness, citing "Victorian upbringing" as a common cause of primary frigidity (65). In what would become a trend towards the end of the 1960s, however, it also criticizes the extremity of this backlash against Victorianism. *Family Relations* comments: "the marriage manual which was aimed at breaking down Victorian attitudes of a generation or so ago may have some repercussions today...for such a book sets unrealistically high standards, regardless of individual differences" (66). As much as Stopes's project was intended to revitalize marriage, by the 1960s, it had begun to backfire.

While seemingly contradictory positions, the confluence of societal anxieties and Kinsey's data suggests a point of access for understanding this double perspective on anti-Victorianism and inadequacy. For the post-psychoanalytic woman, vaginal orgasm was not just encouraged, it was a necessary achievement – even a test of competence (Schaefer 174). Orgasm was not an experience, it was an indicator of success. The permission to have orgasm imposed a new burden, namely "the feeling of inadequacy if [the woman] fails to achieve it" (Schaefer 179). This inadequacy had been felt within the marriage, in the psychiatric chair, and in medical literature on the subject. With the emergence of Kinsey's data, however, it became publicly apparent that the vaginal orgasm could not produce sexual satisfaction. As Kinsey summarizes: "some hundreds of the women in our own study have consequently been much disturbed by their failure to accomplish this biological impossibility" (Kinsey 584). *Family Relations* sits in the uncomfortable convergence of these two opposing viewpoints. On the one hand, it forcibly prescribes heterosexual monogamous coitus amidst a society concerned with reproductive stability. On the other, it was published for an audience not only *struggling* to make that happen, but arguably *failing*. *Family Relations* occupies the delicate position of trying to "de-pathologize" frigidity by including it, while still maintaining it must be treated. This inclusive shift in marital advice emerged, in part, as a result of a broadening acknowledgement of frigidity in the public sphere, and marriage manuals' attempts to give heterosexual partners the correct information about it.

In the midst of the cultural and intellectual climate of the 1960s, including frigidity within marriage guides was a more effective way of controlling heterosexual marriage. While Kinsey's research may have been framed as "revolutionary scholarship", the way it was used in publicly-disseminated literature continued the top-down sexological tradition found in the 1920s. The inclusion may be explained by the fact that its absence had very publicly stopped working. The Kinsey report, rather than offer the public new information, had turned to the public to provide hard data for what people already knew. As Bowman argues, the attempt to study sex in terms of biological statistics reflected a recent stage of cultural development: Kinsey was no historical accident (1). What was significant, was that its popularity meant that the data could not be ignored. The medical community had been found to be out of touch with reality: actual bedroom practice did not match what they had previously prescribed. Consigning abnormal sexual practice, like frigidity, to pathological taxonomy had failed to control heterosexual practice effectively. In a culture of anxiety, this potential instability in marriage was a very real threat. As a result, rather than ignore it, marital literature embraced and included it – frigidity could no longer be relegated to obscure medical literature. Like the revolutionary practice of including graphic details of sexual activity in early marital manuals, however, this was not done out of newfound sexual liberalism. Frigidity, as a

symbol of the failure of sexual satisfaction so necessary to marriage, needed to be controlled. Paralleling Bergler and Kroger's insistence that there was no scientific difficulty with arguing that 80 to 90 percent of all women were "abnormal" in their dissatisfaction with vaginal penetration (Maines 62), the admittance of frigidity into marital manuals articulated it in contradictory terms: while removing its pathological connotation to some degree, the treatment also reinforced it. Frigidity was never normalized, despite being objectively common. McLaren reduces Kinsey's project to the claim "what is, is right" (165). It would seem fair to say that in the case of marital advice on frigidity, the verdict remained: what is, isn't right. Frigidity, though understood in different terms than the *sexual anaesthesia* of the 1920s, continued to perform the same role in marital advice manuals: it was cast in opposition to successful marital relations, used as a tool to propagate a specific model of heterosexual marriage – a fragile ideal, once again, under threat.

While frigidity was treated differently within the marital advice manuals *Married Love* and *The Canadian Woman's Guide to Family Relations*, it nonetheless played the same role, despite upheavals in the field. The definitions of frigidity changed depending on the current sexuality paradigm, but by the 1950s, two opposing camps had emerged: one championed the validity of the vaginal orgasm while the other defended the clitoridean orgasm. Frigidity was claimed by the first to affect upwards of 50 percent of women; for the second, less than 10 percent. Amidst wildly opposing viewpoints, societal anxieties, and the emergence of the broader public into the field of sexuality, frigidity continued on as it had: for most women, it was a source of tension in their marriage, a responsibility to an achievement they continually failed to meet. Marriage guides were not interested in what frigidity could say on its own; instead, they painted the contradictory picture of a common neurosis that had to be fixed. As a mechanism of the institutionalized prescriptions founded in sexological discourse, the role of frigidity remained the same in 1960 as it had been in 1920. Frigidity was used in marital advice as a tool for describing and encouraging "correct" heterosexual relations in a marriage model no longer defined by procreative sex.

Tamar Wolofsky

The Unlikely Entente: Collaborations Between Zionism and National Socialism before the Second World War

History, for the most part, paints Jews and National Socialists as two groups completely at odds with one another. Accounts of the Second World War show that the Nazis were avowed anti-Semites, and that the Jews were helpless to the mass destruction of the Holocaust. While these statements are doubtlessly true, the years leading up to the war saw a number of collaborations between Zionist Jews and the Third Reich. As fascism swept Europe, the Zionists seized the opportunity to further their agenda of founding a Jewish homeland in the British colony of Palestine. While the left-wing Labour Zionists worked with Hitler's government to transfer Jews and funds into Palestine, the right-wing Revisionists were attracted to Mussolini's style of Italian fascism. In turn, the Nazis favoured Zionists over other Jews, citing their common nationalist ideals. While the Zionists were justified in their attempts to work with the various fascist countries in order to achieve their goals, the focus on collaboration arguably blinded Zionist leaders to the true outcome of Hitler's election. Due to the fact that Zionist leaders worked with, rather than rallied against the Axis countries, they were not able to rally against the sinister intentions of National Socialism. The failure of Zionism had many factors, including international politics, internal ideological differences, and a tragic lack of foresight. This is not to say that the Zionists were responsible for the Holocaust; on the contrary, many Jews were rescued through Zionist programs. Overall, however, the Zionists' continued attempts at collaboration with the Nazis and fascists failed in the face of the Final Solution. This paper will examine the relationship of Zionism with fascism and National Socialism during the years leading up to the Final Solution.

Zionism, at its very core, aims for "the redemption of the downtrodden Jewish people in their own land"[1]. Early Zionist leaders such as Theodore Herzl faced the reality of a world hostile to Jews and sought a state of their own, which they thought would give them the power to defend themselves[2]. Theodore Herzl, the first president of the World Zionist Organization founded in 1897, recognized the need for Zionism to be backed by a major world power, but the best offer he received was for Great Britain to offer the Jews land in Uganda. While Herzl tentatively backed this suggestion, it was officially rejected in 1905[3]. Herzl's early appeals to world leaders showed the conviction of some Jews that, "the future belonged to the Jew-haters, that anti-Semitism was inevitable, and natural"[4]. In a 1985 diary entry, Herzl wrote, "... I recognized the emptiness and futility of trying to 'combat' anti-Semitism"[5]. Rather, Herzl sought to use anti-Semitic feelings to his advantage, even telling the Sultan of Turkey that he was trying to take Jews away from the revolutionary parties[6]. Thirty years later, this promise would be all too true. Herzl, however, died in 1904 and was succeeded by Chaim Weizmann and Vladimir Jabotinsky. In 1914, Jabotinsky collaborated with the British to raise a Jewish Legion, which fought to liberate Palestine from Turkish rule. The Balfour Declaration in 1917 paved the way for the League of Nations to give Great Britain the Mandate for Palestine in 1922. The agreement recognized the Jewish historical and

---

[1]   Brenner, L. (1983). Zionism in the Age of the Dictators. Connecticut: Lawrence Hill & Company. 1.

[2]   Netanyahu, B. (2012). The Founding Fathers of Zionism. Noble, OK: Balfour Books. 8.

[3]   "Theodor (Binyamin Ze'ev) Herzl." Jewish Virtual Library. <http://www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/jsource/biography/Herzl.html>

[4]   Brenner, Zionism in the Age of the Dictators. 1.

[5]   Theodore Herzl, quoted in Brenner, Zionism in the Age of the Dictators. 1.

[6]   Brenner, Zionism in the Age of the Dictators. 5.

religious connection to Palestine, and allowed for Jewish autonomy in the state while preserving full powers of legislation and administration for the British[7].

The World Zionist Organization in its brand-new homeland was headed by Chaim Weizmann, who advocated for patience and cooperation with the British. Jabotinsky, by contrast, had become frustrated with the British, who had dissolved the Jewish Legion and separated Trans-Jordan from the Jewish territory. By 1931, Jabotinsky's right-wing Zionist-Revisionists had become the third-largest faction in the party[8]. The Revisionists, unlike the mainstream Zionists, believed that a Jewish state with a Jewish majority was the final goal of Zionism, and advocated for a strong military to support their territory. While at this point Jabotinsky denounced fascism as a political system, he was an avowed anti-Socialist and saw some good qualities in fascism, such as the outlawing of strikes[9]. Indeed, Jabotinsky established a youth movement, the Betar, whose military discipline drew constant comparison the Hitler Youth. In the early 1930s, Jabotinsky wrote several articles in support of Mussolini's brand of fascism, calling it, "an ideology of racial equality ... to hold that a regime maintaining that principle in a world turned cannibal does, partly, but considerably, atone for its other shortcomings"[10]. Having split from the WZO to form the NZO (New Zionist Organization), Jabotinsky and the Revisionists moved ever closer to Italian fascism, even establishing a Betar training camp in Italy which was visited by Mussolini himself. The Betar epitomized the Revisionist ideals: they were young, invigorated, militarized, and extremely disciplined. They embodied the virtue of hadar, meaning 'glory' or 'splendor,' which was intended as a means "to transform the Hebrew nation from a passive victim to a disciplined fighting machine"[11]. The Revisionist movement, as symbolized by the Betar, was characterized above all else by its determination to make the Jewish people, so long the underdog, into the masters of their own destinies. To many Revisionists, a fascist style of governance was the best way to accomplish this goal.

By 1936, European fascism, including Mussolini, had moved to side with Hitler. Jabotinsky severed ties with Italy and withdrew the Betar training camp. However, while Jabotinsky had been trying to work with Italy, the WZO had been busy making agreements with Hitler in Germany. A rise in German Zionism mirrored Hitler's rise to power, hinging on the Zionists' fundamental acceptance of anti-Semitism. Mainstream Zionism encouraged 'dissimilation' rather than 'assimilation' without necessarily demanding relocation to Palestine; many German Jews thought that this would be enough to justify their continued coexistence in Germany[12]. Demonstrating a renewed interest in Zionism in the first months of Hitler's regime, Hannah Arendt reported that circulation of the Zionist weekly paper Die Jüdisher Rundschau increased from five to seven thousand to nearly forty-thousand, and Zionist fund-raising operations received three times as much income in 1935-36 as they did in 1931-32[13]. At this point in time, the Nazis tolerated the Zionists and the two parties even agreed on certain points. Klaus Polkehn writes, "the fascists as well as the Zionists believed in unscientific racial theories, and both met on the same ground in their beliefs in such mystical generalizations as 'national character (*Volkstum*)' and 'race,' both were chauvinistic

---

[7]   "Text of The Palestine Mandate (July 24, 1922)." Jewish Virtual Library. <http://www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/jsource/History/Palestine_Mandate.html>

[8]   Brenner, L. (Autumn, 1983). "Zionist-Revisionism: The Years of Fascism and Terror." Journal of Palestine Studies, Vol. 13, No. 1. 67.

[9]   Brenner, "Zionist-Revisionism," 72.

[10]   Jabotinsky, V. "Jews and Fascism -- Some Remarks -- and a Warning." Quoted in Brenner, "Zionist-Revisionism," 78.

[11]   Kaplan, E. (2005). The Jewish Radical Right: Revisionist Zionism and its Ideological Legacy. Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press. 26.

[12]   Arendt, H. (1964). Eichmann in Jerusalem: A Report on the Banality of Evil. New York: Viking Press. 59.

[13]   ibid.

and inclined towards 'racial exclusiveness'"[14]. The objective of German Zionism at the time was to exploit the similarities between the National Socialist and Zionist doctrines: Zionists did not want to be assimilated, Germans did not want to associate with Jews. Zionists wanted their own land, Germans wanted their land to be free of Jews. To undermine the fact that many German Jews thought of themselves as mostly assimilated, the Nazi state encouraged the formation of a 'distinctive Jewish identity' by promoting separate Jewish schools and institutions[15]. These measures were intended to dissimilate the Jews from the German population, but also to potentially encourage Zionism. To the Nazis, the Zionists were "the 'decent' Jews since they too thought in 'national' terms"[16].

The Nazi acceptance of the Jews could also be seen in a more sinister light, and many foreign Jews saw collaboration attempts as degrading and humiliating. One such example is a clause in the anti-Semitic Nuremberg Laws of 1935 which permitted only two flags to be flown in the Reich: the swastika and the blue-and-white Zionist banner[17]. This action singled Zionism out as being akin to National Socialism. However, Jewish discomfort still did not make the Zionists act against Hitler's regime. In his book Zionism in the Age of the Dictators, Lenni Brenner bemoans this period in Zionist-Nazi relations as the fatal flaw in judgement which prevented the Jews from preparing themselves for the horrors of the war to come. Tellingly, he writes, "Dante has false diviners walking backwards, their faces reversed on their necks, tears pouring from their eyes. For ever. So it is for all who misunderstood Hitler"[18].

As Marrus and Paxton write in their examination of the three stages of Nazi policy towards the Jews, the first stage was characterized by an emigration policy: Jews were to leave the Reich and leave their property behind[19]. In the early days of the regime, sending the Jews to Palestine seemed like a reasonable solution. Arno Schickendanz, the Chief of Staff of the NSDAP foreign affairs bureau, summarized the issue in 1936:

> Palestine is not able to absorb all the Jews in the world, entirely aside from the fact of increasing Arab opposition to Jewish infiltration. The Arabs are, after all, the undisputed owners of the land. But what other territory would be appropriate? And at the instant Palestine ceased to be the goal of Jewish emigration, political Zionism would collapse, since Palestine is seen as a means for the fulfillment of prophecy. Without that, the whole enterprise would lose its point. Jewry itself would make the most passionate and bitter attacks, and before long any undertaking that ignored Palestine would be crippled by Jewry itself.[20]

At this point, both Zionists and Nazi officials were interested in finding 'mutually satisfactory' solutions to the Jewish problem. Sending the Jews to a single territory seemed to be a positive idea for the Nazis: they wouldn't have to bother with them until after they had won the war, at which point they would be surrounded on a tiny tract of land. At his trial, Adolf Eichmann presented the emigration project more charmingly, declaring that he:

> regarded the Jews as opponents with respect to whom a mutually acceptable, a mutually fair solution had to be found. ... That solution I envisaged as putting firm soil under their feet so that they would have a place of their own, soil of their own. And I was working in the direction of that solution joyfully. I cooperated in reaching such a solution, gladly and joyfully, because it was also the kind of solution that was

---

[14]   Polkehn, K. (Spring/Summer, 1976). "The Secret Contracts: Zionism and Nazi Germany, 1933-1941." Journal of Palestine Studies, Vol. 5, No. 3/4. 57.

[15]   Brenner, Zionism in the Age of the Dictators, 86.

[16]   Arendt, 60.

[17]   Brenner, Zionism in the Age of the Dictators, 85.

[18] Brenner, Zionism in the Age of the Dictators, 36.

[19]   Marrus, M. R. and Paxton, R. (Dec., 1982). "The Nazis and the Jews in Occupied Western Europe, 1940-1944". The Journal of Modern History, Vol. 54, No. 4. 692.

[20]   Schickedanz, A. (1936). "Zionism." German Propaganda Archive. ed. Randall Bytwerk, 2001. <http://www.calvin.edu/academic/cas/gpa/zionism.htm>

approved by movements among the Jewish people themselves, and I regarded this as
the most appropriate solution to this matter[21].

Thanks, in part, to collaboration with the Third Reich, 164,267 Jewish immigrants arrived in
Palestine between 1933 and 1936[22]

To support the emigration plan, the WZO collaborated with the Germans to create a
transfer scheme to move Jewish capital out of Germany and into Palestine. Chaim Arlosoroff,
the Labourite Political Secretary of the Jewish Agency, the executive arm of the WZO, went
to Berlin in 1933 to negotiate a 'liquidation bank'[23]. The resulting Ha'avara, or transfer
arrangement, was finally approved in 1935. The scheme worked by establishing a company
in Tel Aviv and a sister company in Berlin. Jewish emigrants paid their money (with a
minimum limit of a thousand pounds sterling) into the German account. Jewish importers
used this money to buy German goods for export to Palestine, paying the equivalent amount
into the Palestinian account. When the emigrants arrived in Palestine, they received from
this account the equivalent of the sum he had paid in Germany[24]. At a time when many Jews
worldwide were engaged in a boycott of German products, Hannah Arendt writes that
Palestine was being flooded with German-made goods[25]. The 139.6 million Reichmarks
transferred in the Ha'avara scheme greatly boosted the Zionist economy in Palestine[26]. The
Germans, however, were presumably not providing transfers out of genuine goodwill to the
Jews. On the contrary, Brenner believes that the Nazis gained the most from the Ha'avara,
writing, "Not only did it help them push out a few extra Jews, but it was of immense value
abroad, providing the perfect rationale for all those who still wanted to continue trading with
the Germans"[27]. Brenner quotes Oswald Mosley as having said that, "We are cutting off our
nose to spite our face and refuse to trade with Germany in order to defend the poor Jews. The
Jews ... are to continue making profitable dealings with Germany themselves. Fascists can't
better counter the malicious propaganda to destroy friendly relations with Germany than by
using this fact"[28]. Furthermore, Brenner cites the Ha'avara as having "removed the million-
strong Zionist movement from the front line of anti-Nazi resistance" and "demoralized non-
Jews to know that a world-wide Jewish movement was prepared to come to terms with its
enemy"[29]. Seen in this light, the Ha'avara was overall a negative project for the Zionists
despite its vital boosting of the Palestinian economy. The positive press it generated for
Hitler was paralleled only by the unfavourable reaction the Zionists faced.

In the Ha'avara and the emigration project lies a fundamental failure of the WZO to
recognize the true nature of National Socialism. Despite the collaborationist attitude of many
Nazi officials, Hitler's true thoughts on the subject had been spelled out in Mein Kampf for
years. He denied that the Jews had sufficient national character to create their own
sovereign state, or that the Jews would be satisfied once they had their own homeland.
Rather, he believed that the state would, "serve as a refuge for swindlers who have been
found out and at the same time a high-school for the training of other swindlers"[30]. It is
understandable that the Zionists may have naively believed that Nazis such as Eichmann
had some investment in the Jewish people or the Jewish state -- but this too constitutes a
tragic failure to apprehend Nazism's true intentions. However, historic documents and
testimony shows that, in the early years of the Third Reich, the Nazis tolerated and

---

[21]   Arendt, 56.

[22]   Brenner, "Zionist Revisionism." 80.

[23]   Brenner, "Zionist Revisionism." 73.

[24]   Polkehn, 64-65.

[25]   Arendt, 60.

[26]   Polkehn, 66.

[27]   Brenner, Zionism in the Age of the Dictators, 75.

[28]   Oswald Mosely, quoted in Brenner, Zionism in the Age of the Dictators, 75.

[29]   Brenner, Zionism in the Age of the Dictators, 76.

[30]   Hitler, A. Mein Kampf. (1939). trans. James Murphy. Project Gutenburg Australia, 2002.
       <http://gutenberg.net.au/ebooks02/0200601.txt>

supported Zionism, at least nominally. Zionism, for its part, accepted that the Jewish people constituted a 'problem' for the Germans and didn't try to fight what they saw as a historical inevitability. Rather, they tried to use the ideology of National Socialism to their advantage. Because the WZO was trying to stay on Hitler's good side, they were not able to rally their forces against him.

On the other side of the Zionist spectrum were the Revisionists and Jabotinsky. In 1932, Jabotinsky assumed full dictatorial control of the group, a move he called 'democratic' since it had been decided upon in a putsch by a majority of Revisionists[31]. According to Ezra Kaplan, "Jabotinsky regarded himself as a biblical prophet -- burdened by his knowledge of the truth, forced to proclaim God's word to the unbelieving populace"[32]. Like many fascist leaders, he believed that the individual should be subsumed by the nation, and that national culture should be determined by race. While mainstream Labour Zionism had a socialist orientation, Jabotinsky favoured free-market economics and private property[33]. Jabotinsky's associations with Mussolini ended in 1936 when Italian fascism aligned with the German racial ideology, and as such he never expressed his support for Hitler. While some of the Revisionist extremists called Nazism "a national liberation movement" through which "Hitler had saved Germany from Communism,"[34] they reversed their stance after a reprimand from Jabotinsky. Henceforth, the Revisionist newspaper attacked the collaboration attempts by the Labour Zionists, running a newspaper article entitled "The Alliance of Stalin-Ben Gurion-Hitler" (Ben Gurion being the leader of the Labour movement), accusing them of selling out the Jews to the Nazis and scheming to set up a pro-Communist Arab regime[35]. The vehemence with which the Revisionists attacked the Labourites is telling of the highly fraught relationship between the two factions. Indeed, two members of the Revisionist party were charged in Arlosoroff's murder, although they were both acquitted. Jabotinsky continued to deepen the divide between the Revisionists and the WZO and exploited his 'fascistic' image, as when he marched into a Jewish convention surrounded by a bodyguard of Betar brownshirts[36]. The split of the WZO and the Revisionists was finalized in 1935 when Jabotinsky formed the NZO, and the two factions continued in their opposite directions.

While the WZO was associating with the Nazis over the Ha'avara, the Revisionists were busily trying to support a boycott of German products. However, the party lacked the funds and manpower to support a boycott. Furthermore, there was little to no Jewish unity at the time, Jewish opinion having been shattered into disparate factions by the various attempts of Zionists to align themselves with National Socialism. While Jabotinsky's proposed boycott failed, the WZO's emigration scheme was problematized by the British White Paper of 1939, which severely cut the quota of Jewish immigration into Palestine. Citing the "bitterness between the Arab and Jewish populations" and wishing to avert a "fatal enmity between the two peoples," immigration was capped at 10,000 Jews per year for five years[37] -- a serious blow considering that over 160,000 had immigrated between 1933 and 1936. However, Dalia Ofer finds that immigration continued to illegally exceed the quotas: around 27,000 Jews emigrated to Palestine in 1939, of whom 17,000 would have been illegal[38].

During this period, Jabotinsky was attempting his own version of collaboration as he

---

31   Kaplan, 22.
32   Kaplan, 8.
33   Kaplan, 60.
34   Brenner, "Zionist Revisionism." 72.
35   Brenner, "Zionist Revisionism." 73.
36   Brenner, "Zionist Revisionism." 75
37   "British White Paper of 1939." The Avalon Project: Documents in Law, History, and Diplomacy. <http://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/brwh1939.asp>
38   Ofer, D. (May, 1984) "The Rescue of European Jewry and Illegal Immigration to Palestine in 1940: Prospects and Reality: Berthold Storfer and the Assad le'Aliyah Bet." Modern Judaism, Vol. 4, No. 2. 161.

looked to Poland for support of his army, the Haganah. The Polish government was openly anti-Semitic, but the huge Jewish population had always made Poland a focal point for Revisionist attention. Brenner writes that the agreement with Poland was "strenuously opposed by all of Polish Jewry beyond the Zionist camp. But the Revisionists, having lost Mussolini's support, were desperate for a patron"[39]. In 1939, the Revisionists asked the Polish government to take over the Mandate for Palestine from Britain, and use the new Polish colony as a dumping ground for 'unwanted Jews'[40]. Rather than asking the League of Nations for the Mandate, the Polish were set to help the Revisionists take over Palestine by force. A guerrilla training school was established in the Tatra Mountains, where the Polish Army taught Revisionists about sabotage and insurrection. Weapons were provided for 10,000 men, and the invasion was planned for April 1940[41]. While the invasion was never carried out, it was an important episode nonetheless. Through their liaison with the Revisionists, the Polish government hoped to rid themselves of their Jews; while the Revisionists hoped to overthrow the British Mandatory whose new policies did not suit their goals or ideology. But above all, the collaboration prevented the active Polish branch of the Betar from fighting against Polish anti-Semitism and pogromists. Schmuel Merlin, the then-Secretary General of the NZO, admitted that Revisionism, too, lacked foresight: "We did not consider that we had to fight in Poland. We believed the way to ease the situation was to take the Jews out of Poland. We had no spirit of animosity"[42].

The Nazis invaded Poland the night of August 31, 1939, starting a war that Jabotinsky refused to believe possible until it began. Earlier that month, he had written, "there is not the remotest chance of war"[43]. In reality, though, the Nazis' concern and tolerance for the Jews (including the Zionists) had ended with the Austrian anschluss in 1938, which brought so many Jews into the Third Reich that to continue to bother with emigration would have crippled their progress[44]. The conquest of Poland was soon followed by a ban on Jewish emigration as the Nazis moved into the second stage of their policies towards the Jews[45]. Despite the repeated efforts by Revisionist and Labour Zionists to use Nazism in their favour, the Nazis marched on towards their final solution. The Zionists as a body never organized any resistance against Hitler, and therefore any collaborations between the two groups ended up in Hitler's favour. Brenner speculates that the Nazis did not mind moving Jews to Palestine because that area would eventually fall under the jurisdiction of the Thousand-Year Reich, where, "as a Gestapo agent told a Jewish leader, 'we will catch up with you'"[46]. Hannah Arendt recounts a relevant anecdote from Zindel Grynszpan's testimony at Eichmann's trial. Grynszpan was a Polish Jew living in Germany when the Polish government decided to renounce the citizenships of all Jews living outside of the country. So that Germany wouldn't be stuck with thousands of stateless Jews, they were rounded up and deported to Poland. Grynszpan testified: "On the twenty-seventh of October, 1938 ... they took us in police trucks, in prisoners' lorries, about twenty men in each truck, and they took us to the railroad station. The streets were black with people shouting: 'Juden raus to Palestine!'"[47]. To Brenner, the single statement 'Juden raus to Palestine' summarizes the most poignant problems with the Zionist-Nazi relations. While the Zionists believed that the emigration plan provided a mutually satisfactory solution to the Jewish problem, creating a Judenfrei Reich as well as a Jewish homeland, the Nazis saw it as being only satisfactory for themselves. Sequestering the Jews in Palestine would create a Jewish enclave that would

---

[39] Brenner, "Zionist Revisionism." 85.
[40] ibid.
[41] ibid.
[42] 1982 interview with Shmuel Merlin, quoted in Brenner, "Zionist Revisionism." 86.
[43] Brenner, "Zionist Revisionism." 87.
[44] Brenner, Zionism in the Age of the Dictators, 87.
[45] Marrus and Paxton, 697.
[46] Brenner, Zionism in the Age of the Dictators, 89.
[47] Arendt, 228.

eventually be surrounded by anti-Semitic forces. The Nazis had no interest in coexisting with the Jews in their own state; rather, they were sending them to Palestine to be dealt with later.

The study of Zionist collaboration with anti-Semitic regimes during the years leading up to the Second World War is a history of failure and mistakes, of poor foresight and naïveté. The Revisionists, headed by Jabotinsky, were themselves a quasi-fascist faction aligned with Mussolini. While Jabotinsky seemed to recognize the impossibility of collaboration with Italian fascism after it joined Hitler's camp of racial ideology, he moved on to collaborate with the openly anti-Semitic Polish government. On the other side of the spectrum, the World Zionist Organization's multiple alliances with the National Socialists showed a distressing lack of foresight into the regime's true intentions. In each of these attempts at collaboration, the true winner turned out to be the Nazis, who profited immensely from the positive press the schemes generated. While multiple sources have shown that Jews affiliated with Zionism were preferred over non-affiliated Jews in the Third Reich, and that for a time some Nazis seemed genuinely interested in aiding the Jews' emigration to Palestine, their true intentions were revealed in 1938. The moment that the Germans acquired more territory, and therefore more Jews, the emigration project was abandoned and more radical solutions were undertaken -- resulting in the horrors of the Final Solution and the murder of six million Jews, as well as millions of other 'enemies' of the state. While it cannot be said that the failure of the Zionists to present a greater challenge to Nazism was the cause of such destruction, it can certainly be considered to be a factor.

Genny Plumptre

Everything in its Right Place: (Sub)urban sprawl and the Canadian segregated city

Living in the sprawl,
Dead shopping malls rise like mountains beyond mountains,
And there's no end in sight
– Arcade Fire, *Sprawl II*

The suburbs, as they are popularly understood, typify the American cultural landscape of the post-war period. But as to the place of suburbanization in Canada, there is a need for deeper analysis. As fundamentally planned spaces, the suburbs exist at the intersection between government interference and individual agency, showing how the values and beliefs we share as a society achieve material expression in the landscape. Ideals of the suburbs as a "bourgeois utopia" have largely been discredited by an awareness of the negative environmental impact of urban sprawl, and by critiques of our unsustainable levels of consumer capitalism. For the majority of Canadians, though, "suburbia" still refers back to stale notions of a culturally homogenous, middle class space. Although this image continues to bear some resemblance to the reality of suburban life, particularly in its emphases on consumer culture and the automobile, it overlooks the complexities and dynamism of the modern-day Canadian city. As more and more immigrants flock to outlying areas of the Greater Toronto Area, a landscape of surprising colour and diversity is taking root – beautifully evoked in Katharine Cizek's documentary *Highrise*. An analysis of post-war (sub)urban sprawl in Canada brings into focus some of the major themes of modernity, as what it means to live in a city and belong a community undergoes a gradual but decisive shift.

Highly rationalized and artificial, the modern (sub)urban landscape is "an expression of human will…no less than the temples of Greece or the cathedrals of medieval England, [it] informs us about prevailing standards of truth, beauty, and goodness"[1]. Packaged to maximize consumer satisfaction, efficiency, and company profits, suburban sprawl across Canada is symptomatic of a growing culture of consumer capitalism. Larry McCann has captured the phrase "suburbs of desire" to describe the sense in which the suburban landscape is intrinsically bound up in the culture of consumption as a way of life, which equates the accumulation of material possessions with personal achievement. As a consuming society that continually seeks status in possessions, "we take pleasure in the new and the modern."[2] Central to the evolving post-war consumer culture is an emphasis on the all-importance of homeownership. For newcomers to North America and lower-class citizens living in the inner-city slums, the suburban home constitutes an ideal, the apex of individuals' and families' desires. Throughout the 20th century, the average suburban house underwent a series of fluctuations in size and style, in keeping with shifting economic conditions and fashions. While their external facades are an indication of wealth and status, their interiors express attitudes toward family and privacy, making them concrete markers of cultural expression.[3]

The (sub)urban landscape of the late twentieth century is distinguished from its antecedents in being the by-product of planning: positioned at the intersection between public and private, it is the result of collaboration between corporate developers and government planners. With the end of WWII, there was an urgent need to reconstruct war-

---

[1]   Edward Relph, *The Modern Urban Landscape* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1987), 10

[2]   Larry McCann, "Suburbs of Desire: The Suburban Landscape of Canadian Cities, c. 1900–1950," In *Changing Suburbs: Foundation, Form, and Function,* ed. Richard Harris and Peter Larkham (New York: Routledge, 1999), 137

[3]   McCann, "Suburbs of Desire," 133

damaged cities in Europe, while, in North America, governments were grappling with the administrative difficulties involved in supporting a rapidly expanding population.[4] Across Europe and North America, municipal planning became "a fact of life" – due in part to a growing preference for centralized administration.[5] The resulting landscape stands out for its lines of discontinuity, where new developments confront old, historical quarters. Here the dividing line constitutes a "'time edge,' a boundary between two eras as well as between two landscapes…[These] abrupt edges…reveal profound shifts in ideology, in social values."[6] In this way, the modern landscape embodies one of the tensions of our age, in its dual impulses towards past and future; nostalgia and progress; tradition and innovation. Promoted both as "the hallmark of traditional values…[and] as the showcase of modernity," the suburban home has, from its inception, been wound up in a paradox that defines much of contemporary life.[7]

Underlying this trend toward the planned city is a concern with promoting human welfare. Suburbs were first conceived in the 19th century as "bourgeois utopias." Such a low-density environment seemed to offer refuge from the discord of city life, and a return to domestic values associated with the traditional nuclear family structure. At the same time, their idyllic, park-like setting represented a return to "unspoiled nature."[8] The introduction of zoning bylaws controlling the location of economic activities was among the most revolutionary of these changes. What had previously been dense and heterogeneous living spaces became decidedly more homogenous and middle class, devoted almost exclusively to residential activities. Indeed, developers viewed homogeneity as one of the suburbs' principal advantages: their uniformly residential appearance allowed for a strict separation between work and home life. As urban planners conceptualized a rational, efficient, and orderly landscape to draw into relief the chaos of the inner city, the urban landscape of the 19th century was transformed into a landscape of imagination – the site of promises, ambitions, and fantasies rooted in the "American Dream."[9]

'The segregated city' describes the tidy division of functions that is the defining the modern suburban landscape. One of the most obvious indications of a planned place is its rigid segregation of activities, such that there is "no overlapping or overflowing at the edges, no mixing or confusions."[10] The language of contamination seems particularly apt here, suggesting how the entire planning process consisted in a rationalist reaction against the "messiness" of city life. Plans were prepared according to standardized models of design and layout, so that post-war urban planning was reduced to little more than a system of "planning by numbers."[11] As a result, there is a quality of predictable orderliness about suburbia. In its geometrical arrangement, it epitomizes Edward Relph's claim, "There is an indication of the obsession with orderliness that grips all modern planning." For Relph, the impulse to suburbanize, to *standardize* betokens "an all too familiar sort of mind [at work] …a mind seeing only disorder where a most intricate and unique order exists."[12] In its fascination with the arranged, the segregated landscape disposes of "the idiosyncratic developments and the 'happy accidents' which make the older parts of cities so visually

---

[4]   Relph, *Landscapes*, 131
[5]   Ibid., 139
[6]   Ibid., 262
[7]   McCann, "Suburbs of Desire," 133
[8]   Dolores Hayden, "The Shapes of Suburbia," In *Building Suburbia: Green Fields and Urban Growth, 1820-2000* (New York: Pantheon Books, 2003), 8
[9]   Ibid., 5
[10]   Relph, *Landscapes,* 165
[11]   Ibid., 141
[12]   Relph, *Landscapes,* 165

interesting."[13] The city's spontaneous character, the particularities of *place*, are lost. Mass suburbia had come to reflect a weakening of the identity of places, a kind of "placelessness" where things "not only look alike but feel alike and offer the same bland possibilities for experience."[14]

By about 1975, the optimism that had characterized the early years of urban renewal gave way to doubts about the capacity of large-scale planning to respond to community needs.[15] Its drab results seemed a far cry from the original vision of the happy, egalitarian city of tomorrow: overcrowded, geometrically arranged complexes and highrises have fostered whole range of social and economic problems, from depression to vandalism and crime.[16] Major developers, in collaboration with the government, have mass-marketed ever-larger private developments without adequately addressing the need for infrastructure, or considering the environmental impact of urban sprawl. As much as they have been hyped as ideal neighbourhoods, suburbs often lack the social and economic centres necessary to foster a sense of community. For women, especially, suburbia breeds isolation. While for men the suburban home represented a retreat away from the workplace, for women, especially in the early to mid twentieth century, it was a site where gendered roles prevailed.[17] The more traditional social tenor of the landscape was such that women were usually expected to abandon the well-paying jobs they had held during the war, reassuming prescriptive gender roles relegating them to the status of "homemakers." In an era of unprecedented mass-production and electronic media, the risk of isolation only increases. As Dolores Hayden observes, "If many activities, such as paid work, exercise, shopping, seeking entertainment, and voting, are able to be done in- house through the various electronic communications systems, reasons for going outside decrease."[18] Hayden presents us with a dystopian vision of the suburban house functioning as a kind of container for mass-produced goods, cutting off residents from the external world in a landscape where any social or economic neighbourhood context has all but disintegrated.

Because, in America, suburbia has played such a key role in shaping the nation's identity, the Canadian experience of suburbanization is often overlooked. Urban theorists tend to regard the process of suburbanization as a kind of intrusion of the American cultural landscape upon the North, both in its aesthetic and ideological components. Although this view is not without cogency, it does not account for the particularities and geographical contingencies involved in the Canadian cultural landscape.[19] As Rob Fiedler and Jean-Paul Addie indicate, "political boundaries, governmental infrastructures, and urban territoriality are of fundamental importance in shaping the spatial terrains, cultural patterns, and political-economic relations of city- regions."[20] In Toronto, or what is now known as the Greater Toronto Area, urban sprawl is an issue of ongoing relevance. The creation of Metro (Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto, which included East York, Etobicoke, North York, Scarborough, and York) in 1954 was largely successful in its attempt to grapple with the city's unbridled growth. In 1998, continued expansion of the 905 area (municipalities outside Metropolitan Toronto) required new political configurations, leading to the amalgamation of

---

[13]   Ibid.*,* 143

[14] Rob Fiedler and Jean-Paul Addie, "Canadian Cities on the Edge: Reassessing the Canadian Suburb," 1:1

(2008), 23

[15]   Relph, *Landscapes*, 10

[16]   Ibid.

[17]   Fiedler and Addie, "Canadian Citites," 19

[18]   Hayden, "Nostalgia and Futurism," 225

[19]   Fiedler and Addie, "Canadian Cities," 6

[20]   Fiedler and Addie, "Canadian Cities," 7

the "old city" of Toronto with its adjacent inner suburban municipalities. The result was the creation of a "megacity" extending from the central city of Toronto to its four surrounding regional municipalities: Durham, Halton, Peel, and York.[21] Opposition to the proposed amalgamation focused around the movement Citizens for Local Democracy, which voiced fears that amalgamation would "dilute the power of downtown reformists against pro-growth suburbs" and lead to cuts in social programs as well as education.[22]

Among the communities affected by the amalgamation was Bronte, Ontario, a former fishing village located in the town of Oakville, which belongs to the Halton municipality. For Bronte residents, the expanding suburban landscape, notable for its plethora of drive-in restaurants and parking lots, jarred with their ideals of the village as a form of country living – safer, more spacious, and relatively inexpensive as compared to its urban counterpart.[23] As valued heritage properties were gradually overtaken by the post-WWII onslaught of industry and car culture, community activists in the late 1960s rallied together under the banner of WORA (West Oakville Residents'Assoviation) in an effort to curb unwanted development.[24] At issue in the controversy were two divergent definitions of "progress": one centred on a preference for the conveniences afforded by modern industry and technology, the other based on aesthetic concerns, drawing upon the rhetoric of environmentalism and urban reform. In their nostalgic yearning for a peaceful, small-town atmosphere, WORA was at odds with the forces of modern life.

The Bronte controversy underscores one of the major tensions underlying urban development during the 20th century, as increased government intervention in planning decisions was met with resistance on the part of residents who favoured a more vernacular approach to development – one directed at the grassroots level. In 1939, the War Measures Act gave the Canadian government unprecedented power over the economy and the allocation of resources, as well as the ability to legally expropriate private property. This increasingly interventionist federal government, combined with the enormous prosperity following WWII, led to an influx in centrally planned and executed programs that translated normative visions of suburban development into reality. Across all disciplines, there was during this period a growing reliance on expert analysis of both social and private problems. In some cases, notably the establishment of Africville in Halifax, uncontested authority of expertise opinion has had disastrous consequences. In terms of urban planning, 20th century experts proclaimed the spatial form of the suburb the "natural" way to order society. But it is important to remember that suburbs are more than just residential spaces; they also contain huge expanses of industrial and commercial space.[25] By facilitating urban sprawl in the GTA (Greater Toronto Area), Bronte's car culture undermines the population density that is integral to fostering a sense of community, and exacerbates the alienation of modern suburbs and apartment blocks.[26]

Although density can be effective as a way of alleviating the damaging environmental and psychological effects of urban sprawl, it also has the potential to be tremendously mismanaged. In Toronto's older, modernist inner suburbs, "child unfriendly high rise dwellings set in barren, frequently unsafe expanses of land" are often lacking in adequate

---

[21] Ibid., 9

[22] Ibid.

[23] Penfold, Steve, "'Are we to go literally to the hot dogs?' Parking lots, drive-ins, and the critique of progress
in Toronto's suburbs, 1965-1975." *Urban History Review* 33:1 (2004): 8-23.

[24] Ibid.

[25] Hayden, "Suburban Space," 8

[26] Fiedler and Addie, "Canadian Cities," 16

infrastructure and essential services.[27] The 1960s apartment boom in Canada produced "a large stock of now low rent apartment blocks…highly localized within large tracts [of land]… creating micro-geographies of acute housing need and poverty."[28] Katarina Cizek's documentary film project *Highrise* investigates the global phenomenon of the post-war suburban highrise, largely overlooked by politicians and the media, and frequently misrepresented in popular culture. A multimedia, collaborative documentary project, *Highrise* is an experiment in interventionist and participatory approaches to filmmaking. Contrary to Dolores Hayden's fears of the isolating effects of technology, the project demonstrates how technology can be used to overcome the loss of connectivity, community, and public space associated with (sub)urban sprawl. Cizek's goal, at least in part, is "to see how the documentary process can drive and participate in social innovation rather than just to document it."[29]

The first of the project's video instalments, *One Thousandth Tower* and *One Millionth Tower*, explore – and engage with – a Rexdale highrise building located on Kipling Avenue in the outskirts of Toronto. Harnessing digital storytelling as a means of actively involving the community in the changes that would affect it, Cizek teamed the Kipling tower residents up with architects to re-imagine the space in and around their building.[30]

In the process of telling this very personal, local story, *One Thousandth Tower* challenges the stereotype that suburbs are devoid of cultural interest or activity. Indeed, Cizek, along with her team of journalists and filmmakers, taps into the energy and spirit of the residents to uncover a world of surprising vitality. Toronto is growing increasingly segregated as its diversity continues to drift to the fringes. Addressing the urgent need for revitalization of the world's decrepit highrises, the film exposes the failed infrastructure of the suburbs. At the same time, it marks a new approach to urban renewal and recycling based at both local and international levels, showing how, with some modest investment, existing structures can be transformed into a hub of community growth and activity.

The Kipling tower is an example of an "in-between landscape" – one that does not conform to conventional understandings of suburbia as socially, economically, and politically uniform. In a study of the diversifying characteristics of the Canadian suburban landscape, Rob Fiedler and Jean-Paul Addie argue against a simplistic and uncritical "suburban-city dichotomy…increasingly unsuited to the complex realities of contemporary metropolitan life."[31] This outdated mode of representation still predominates in urban discourses and popular media, but the reality today is very different. Suburban sprawl has transformed the dynamic of metropolitan cityscapes. Whereas the suburbs have long been positioned on the "fringes" of society, in fact historic central cities no longer have priority over the landscape; they have gradually been subsumed by sprawling city-regions such as the GTA.[32] Meanwhile, the popular definition of suburbia falters in considering spaces on the "urban periphery" – a kind of geographical no-man's land whose image is obstructed by that of the historical city-core.[33] What is needed is a re-conceptualization of the suburbs that takes into account the presence of these in-between landscapes, "neither fully urban, nor suburban."[34] The continuing prevalence of the city-suburb dichotomy goes hand in hand with a process of de-valorization whereby the day-to-day realities of suburban spaces and lives are

---

[27]   Ibid., 15

[28] Ibid., 16

[29] Cizek, Katarina, *Highrise*, Interactive Video Project (Canada: NFB, 2010)

[30] Ibid.

[31] Fiedler and Addie, "Canadian Cities," 3

[32] Fiedler and Addie, "Canadian Cities," 2

[33] Ibid., 22

[34] Ibid., 25

overpowered by the myth of "suburbia."

Complex and multi-faceted, the cultural landscape of the suburbs cannot be fully comprehended by the popular dichotomy of city-suburb which persists in contemporary urban theory, media, and literature. The very expansiveness of suburbia, whose built form reflects the larger-scale afforded by private automobile travel, defies easy access or analysis. Katarina Cizek's *One Thousandth Tower* offers a portrait of an in-between landscape, one that has been excluded from the prevailing image of the suburbs as socially homogenous, a private bourgeois refuge from the hustle and bustle of the city. At the same time as they house ever-higher numbers of Canadians, the suburbs are diversifying across ethnic, economic, and political lines. As a cultural landscape, they are "increasingly representative of the social geography of Canadian cities."[35] But the pace of urban sprawl so far has exceeded our ability to keep up in understanding with the lived reality of suburban space.

---

[35]   Fiedler and Addie, "Canadian Cities," 21

Nicole Drover

The Thaw and Novy Mir.

       The Khrushchev era of the Soviet Union is also known as the thaw period. It was an era of relative freedom in literature and ideology, especially when compared to the preceding Stalinist period. The thaw period is generally considered to have started after Joseph Stalin's death and ended with the removal of Nikita Khrushchev from power; however, this is debatable as the thaw was a process not possessing an immediate beginning and end. The controls over literary ideology would once again tighten under Khrushchev's successor Brezhnev. *Novy Mir* is the thick literary journal, mostly under the editor Aleksandr Tvardovskii during this period, which published many of the influential works of the thaw. One important idea that Dina Spechler put forth of this period is that *Novy Mir* and its published works were a form of so called 'legitimate dissent', something that challenged the party ideology and Soviet system as a form of dissent, but did so through official publication. In this paper I will explore *Novy Mir* as the central publisher of the literature of the thaw period, and this idea of legitimate dissent. However, I will argue that despite the thaw containing many ideas and topics in literature that had previously been un-publishable in the Soviet Union, these works published in *Novy Mir* were not dissent published via legitimate means, but a reflection of the wider, if temporary, shift in values of the party and editors of the journal. The most important figures of the period were Nikita Khrushchev and Aleksandr Tvardovskii.

       The first major issue is that of publisher intent versus author intent. The author may have written their work as dissent but in order for a work to be published officially, or legitimately, the work would have to pass through the editors of a journal like *Novy Mir*, the censors, and the party. This process requires the journal editors to assess the message of the work, along with literary qualities, and decide whether it can be published. Then the journal passes through the state censors, gaining either approval to be published, or partial to complete rejection based on ideological grounds. Tvardovskii as editor of *Novy Mir* did publish increasingly ideologically varied works during his two stints as head of the journal, especially his second from 1958 to 1970. Due to personal beliefs, which will be discussed later in this paper, he did not see the works published in *Novy Mir* as dissent. Even during the peak of the thaw the state censorship and their handbook Gavlit applied to all literary works. There was a way to get around the censors by gaining permission to publish from the central committee, and we will see that Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn's novel *One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich* did follow such a path, but this was not a normal occurrence. Due to this process when a work is published legitimately, despite what the authors intentions were, it loses the possibility of being dissent as the work has gained the approval of editors like Tvardovskii, the state censors, or in the case of *One Day* party officials like Khrushchev. These decision makers in the world of publishing were loyal party members, and in being such the approval of them on ideological grounds makes a work published through such people unable to be categorized as dissent, even if it intended to be by the author. Therefore any work officially published in the Soviet Union during the thaw is not dissent, as the process of publication takes away such possibilities.

       There were literary works of dissent during the thaw period, but to maintain the status of dissent for a work of literature the author could not seek legitimacy. Many authors and poets wrote works during the thaw that criticised the regime. In not seeking publishing of these works the intent of the author is maintained, and therefore such works can be considered dissent. Some authors, especially young poets, felt the restrictions of socialist realism and the power of editors, forced authors seeking to publish to make a compromise,

and self-censor their work.[1] These authors are often the ones that maintained dissent at the expense of legitimacy. A poet or author could have works that classified as legitimate, while still having others that classified as dissent. Only the works submitted for official publishing became subject to others intents. Works circulated unofficially or kept private served the authors intent as the primary intent, instead of the authors intent becoming secondary to a publishers.

      Novy Mir was the crucial literary journal of the thaw period, publishing the majority of the official works. During the 1950's and 1960's *Novy Mir* had two editors, Konstantin Simonov was the editor from 1946 to 1950 and again from 1954 to 1958, and Aleksandr Tvardovskii was editor from 1950 to 1954 and 1958 to 1970. The journal was launched in 1925, the name *Novy Mir* meaning *New World*, but it is the general consensus that the journal reached its literary peak during the period of the thaw. [2]To quote Dina Spechler: "For more than a decade after Stalin's death that journal was the major and most steadfast source of dissent among all the legally published newspapers and magazines."[3] Although I disagree with the idea of the works published in *Novy Mir* as dissent, for the reason I argued earlier, the journal for much of the 1950's and 60's consistently published the works that most challenged the literary restrictions of the Soviet Union. The bringing back of Tvardovskii for a second stint as editor shows the shift that had occurred in the Soviet Union towards accepting a wider variety of literary opinions; as Tvardovskii was fired in 1954 for the 1953 publishing of a literary critical article that had attracted negative attention from the party.[4] Yet when Simonov was fired in 1958, the central committee brought Tvardovskii back as editor of *Novy Mir*, and on the condition Tvardovskii had set that he could handpick the editorial board. [5]Simonov had also been fired for publishing unacceptable works, predominantly *Not By Bread Alone* by Vladimir Dudinstev. Tvardovskii would be the editor for twelve years, and would be the editor responsible for the official publication of many of the major works of the thaw, such as *One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich* and *People, Years, Life*.

      Aleksandr Trifonovich Tvardovskii was born in Zagore, Smolensk in 1910; his father, Trifon, was a peasant blacksmith and small landowner.[6] Tvardovskii participated in official soviet society for much of his life; he joined the local Komsomol in 1924, and the Russian Association of Proletariat Writers in 1927. [7]This participation in official culture was not without its rough patches, for example in 1930 Tvardovskii was expelled from the Smolensk Russian Association of Proletarian Writers for six-month period, as his poetry ha failed to be proletarian enough.[8] 1931 would see his family labeled as Kulaks, and Tvardovskii was forced to renounce them by the local party secretary.[9] In June 1934 he was admitted to the Soviet Writers Union, he would leave Smolensk for Moscow during this period of his life. [10] Tvardovskii then entered the Moscow Institute of Philosophy Literature and History, and his poem *The Land of Muravia*, written between 1934 and 1936, would receive the first of the three Stalin Prizes he would be awarded in his lifetime.[11]

[1]   Emily Lygo*, Leningrad Poetry 1953-1975: The Thaw Generation* (Oxford: Peter Lang, 2010), 17-18.

[2]   Michael Glenny, ed., *Novy Mir: A Selection 1925-1967* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1972), 12

[3]   Dina Spechler, *Permitted Dissent in the USSR: Novy Mir and the Soviet Regime* (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1982), xiv.

[4]   Denis Kozlov, "The Readers of "Novy Mir," 1945--1970: Twentieth-century experience and soviet Historical Consciousness" (PhD diss., University of Toronto, 2005), 26.

[5]   Kozlov, 115.

[6]   Orlando Figes, *The Whisperers* (New York: Picador, 2007), 132.

[7]   Figes, 132.

[8]   Kozlov, 178.

[9]   Kozlov, 178.

[10]   Kozlov, 179.

[11]   Kozlov, 179.

During World War Two Tvardovskii would serve first as a war correspondent, then later an officer. [12]It is during this period that he would write and publish his most well known poem, *Vasily Tyorkin*. The poem was extremely well received, especially by soldiers at the front. To quote Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn: "Of the many things offered them, they obviously had a special preference for *War and Peace* and *Vasily Tyorkin*."[13] The success of *Vassily Tyorkin* was partly due to the high standards Tvardovskii set for himself, which would translate to high literary standards as editor of Novy Mir, and partly due to his ability to accurately describe the experience of soldiers during the war. Tvardovskii's officially published poetry was acceptable under socialist realist standards, and unlike amny socialist realist authors his literary talent was evident. To quote Tvardovskii: "Even in a socialist society, it is difficult to remove all inequalities of talent."[14] The rules that Tvardovskii so successfully navigated were developed during the Stalinist period, and are commonly known as the Zhadanov criteria. One element of these rules was Gavlit, the handbook of the censors; it was a written code by which all officially published works were judged. Gavlit placed many topics and ideas as un-publishable, including classifying detention centers and prison camps as a state secret.[15] The publishers of journals, newspapers and magazines followed Zhadanov criteria, not only during the Stalinist period, but also for months after Stalin's death, and only slowly began to challenge them.[16] The Zhadanov criteria required a clear statement of political or ideological position on all issues discussed in a work. A literary work needed to display party spirit, while portraying the party as the ultimate and infallible leader. Stories must contain educational messages, which were simple and easy to understand. Correct classes of people and class values were to be present and in proper proportions. A minimized discussions of past was preferred, and instead a literary work should show optimism and progress towards the future. Stock literary characters were to be used, portraying different stereotyped soviet people, and the good proletariat hero was to win against the class enemy.[17] These criteria said nothing about literary quality of a work, and many works were published under Stalin because they meet these criteria regardless of quality.

The thaw, or the period of Khrushchev as party secretary, represented an increase of freedom in ideas presented by officially published literary works, especially those of *Novy Mir*. During this period fiction became a way to discuss political and social issues.[18] The thaw was a process, and one major factor was the speech Khrushchev gave at the twentieth party congress in 1956. The speech denounced the '*cult of individual*', which had taken place under Stalin, while praising the earlier days of Lenin.[19] This speech set a precedent in looking to the past, and open criticism of Stalin. However, one of the first officially published works to turn to the past occurred prior to this speech, as Valentin Ovechkin's *District Routine* was published in 1952. It criticized the over centralization that occurred under Stalin, especially in regards to collective farms, instead preferring the voluntary cooperation of Soviet people. [20]The work was well received and opened the door for more works to be written about topics

---

[12] Vladimir Lakshin, *Solzhenitsyn, Tvardovsky, and Novy Mir* (Cambridge: MIT press, 1980), 93.

[13] Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn, *The Oak and the Calf: Sketches of Literary Life in the Soviet Union* (New York: Harper and Row, 1980), 15.

[14] Alexander Tvardovsky, *Tyorkin and the Stovemakers* (Great Britain: Carcanet Pres Limited, 1974), 7.

[15] Lakshin, 4.

[16] Spechler, 1.

[17] Spechler, 2-3.

[18] Miriam Dobson, "Contesting the Paradigms of De-Stalinization: Readers' Responses to 'One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich,'" *Slavic Review* 643 (2005), 581. http://www.jstor.org/stable/3650143.

[19] The Guardian. "Nikita Khrushchev: The Cult of the Individual." Last modified April 26, 2007. http://www.guardian.co.uk/theguardian/2007/apr/26/greatspeeches1. 1.

[20] Spechler, 13.

such as collective farms.

The '*Speech on the Cult of Personality*' given by Khrushchev and Valentin Ovechkin's *District Routine* were key components of the wider turn to the past in both literature and culture. One major genre that occurred in *Novy Mir* was village prose, such as *District Routine*, this genre looked at the rural life and culture of peasants. [21]Village prose had its root in 19th century literature, which held a fascination with the peasantry. This fascination with peasants and rural life had been replaced under Stalin with the proletariat as the centre of literary works, but in the rise of village prose we can see a return to the traditions of Russian literature.[22] Along with the rise of village prose, under the guide of *Novy Mir*, came a flood of camp memoirs. Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn's *One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich* was the most prolific, but far from the only. Tvardovskii, as editor of *Novy Mir*, encouraged those who had experienced the camps to write about their experiences as a form of therapy. He stored those that were not published in a special archive for the future use of historians and writers.[23] These, we can see, were direct challenges to the restrictions on literary works, especially Solzhenitsyn's *One Day* that spoke of camp life, a topic banned in the Gavlit handbook. These works were not dissent, and Tvardovskii published many after Khrushchev's speech.

Along with the twentieth party congress, the twenty-second party congress, of 1961, also contributed greatly to discussions of the terror. This congress reinforced the message of the twentieth party congress, and of the Stalinist period as having gone to far. At the same time as the twenty-second party congress, Ilya Ehrenberg's memoir *People, Years, Life* was being published in *Novy Mir*. It was published in parts over the years 1960 to 63 and 1965.[24] Ehrenberg introduced both people and events that had been eliminated from discussion in official soviet life.[25] In his memoir Ehrenberg largely left out description of the terror, despite talking of the people who were targeted by it. The leaving out of the description of the terror was somewhat due to censorship, both self and state.[26] Here we can see how not only official state censors could control what was either published or not, but also an author can leave out topics, themes, or discussions of events that they know are un-publishable in order to have their work officially published. This self-censorship takes away the ability for an author to write their honest opinion, or write dissent about the Soviet system.

Novy Mir, in publishing works like Ovechkin's and Ehrenberg's, was the major literary journal of the thaw period. The *Novy Mir* of the 1960's is widely considered to have reflected on the problems within society through literature. During this period Tvardovskii personally read all major incoming scripts and was the decisive word on what would be published.[27] As a result the journal had quickly become an extension of Tvardovskii's personal reflections on the past and the terror; which had begun much earlier.[28] These reflections included both his personal experience of life under Stalin, such as his family's exile, and the experiences of others, including friends that had been in the camps. Camp memoirs, as a major aspect of the *Novy Mir* of the 1960's, were of importance to Tvardovskii. In these he demanded an element of authenticity, desiring them to accurately portray the experience he had only heard about.[29] November 1962 would see *Novy Mir* publish *One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich*. To Tvardovskii this work would set the standard for camp

---

[21] Kozlov, 28.

[22] Geoffrey A. Hosking, "The Russian Peasant Rediscovered: 'Village Prose' of the 1960s," *Slavic Review* 324 (1973), 706. http://www.jstor.org/stable/2495492.

[23] Kozlov, 318-320.

[24]   Spechler, 13.

[25]   Kozlov, 218.

[26]   Kozlov, 228.

[27]   Kozlov, 171.

[28]   Kozlov, 171.

[29]   Kozlov, 198.

memoirs. He thought that Solzhenitsyn overcame the difficulty of official language not accurately portraying the terror.[30] Tvardovskii, himself a classic of Soviet literature, had successfully navigated official language, but had failed to find the words to describe the terror.[31] He would, as a result, consider *One Day* his greatest literary discovery.[32] *One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich* is generally considered to have violated the principles of socialist realism, by focusing on the theme of survival in the present, and not idealizing the Soviet life or state.[33] Tvardovskii, despite this, went to great lengths to get the novella published.

Tvardovskii, although a personal champion of Solzhenitsyn, held a vote of the editorial board and received a unanimous approval to pursue the publication of *One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich*.[34] He then wrote a letter to Khrushchev advocating the publishing of *One Day*, and the Presidium of the Central Committee discussed the issue twice before granting permission to publish.[35] This is important because not only was the novella granted approval by the entire editorial board, but also the party. The censors of Gavlit could not ban its publishing, even if camps were supposed to be a state secret. The characters from *One Day* were based on real life people, and Solzhenitsyn treated all prisoners equally regardless of the reason for them being in the camp.[36] This is far different from Khrushchev's opinion on the people in the camps, as is evident in the speech *On the Cult of Individuality*. Tvardovskii wrote a preface to *One Day,* which was a huge deal. The preface not only indicated that the publication of the novella was intentional, it also provided Tvardovskii's vast literary authority to a previously unpublished author who would come up against powerful critics.[37] One major impact of Solzhenitsyn's *One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich* can be contributed to the idea that it ended the silence between those that had been in camps and those that had not. This silence had lasted ten years between releases from prison camps and the novella's publication. This silence resulted from an inability to communicate between those who had experienced the camps and those who had not.[38] It was partly due to the almost indescribable experience that camps provided. We can see through Tvardovskii how the official language was not able to describe the camps. Solzhenitsyn had resorted to language outside that of official literary circles in order to write *One Day,* including swear words and language that imitated the spoken language of the illiterate lower class.

The method of getting a work published by going directly to the party was the exception to standard practice, generally literary works had to pass through the censors. As a result of the censors many works were either rejected, or editors did not attempt to publish them knowing they would be rejected. An example of a work that was denied the right to be officially published in the Soviet Union is *Cancer Ward* by Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn.[39] Tvardovskii again personally advocated this work to be published, but unlike with *One Day,* he was denied permission. Much of the time, even if Tvardovskii personally liked a work he would not try to get it published, knowing it would not pass through the censors. To quote Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn: "Whenever Tvardovsky's first (poetic) self felt strongly attracted to a manuscript, he had to test the feelings of his second (political) self before he could publish it as a work of *Soviet* literature."[40] As editor Tvardovskii was able to read many manuscripts that had literary merit, but were ideologically not permissible. In these instances he had to

---

[30]   Kozlov, 212.

[31]   Kozlov, 212.

[32]   Kozlov, 27.

[33]   Kozlov, 354.

[34]   Lakshin, 4.

[35]   Lakshin, 4.

[36]   Kozlov, 334.

[37]   Lakshin, 19.

[38] Elena Zubkova, *Russia After the War: Hopes, Illusions, and Disappointments, 1945-1957* (New York: M.E. Sharpe, 1998), 170.

[39]   Tvardovskii, 10.

[40]   Solzhenitsyn, 29-30.

differentiate between his view as a reader and his view as an editor.

Even during the relatively liberal period of the thaw a number of works were not published via official means in the Soviet Union. One example is Boris Pasternak's *Dr. Zhivago*. Pasternak had submitted the novel to a number of literary magazine's in 1956 and 57.[41] The central committee, because of the political philosophy expressed in the novel, rejected *Dr. Zhivago*.[42] However, it had been published in Italy and was nominated for a Nobel Prize, creating a controversy within the Soviet Union. *Literaturnaia Gazeta* denounced Pasternak in 1958, this denunciation included letter signed by *Novy Mir* editors. In 1958 Tvardovskii and the new editorial board publicly agreed with their predecessors that the Nobel Prize had been awarded based on political and not literary opinions.[43] Tvardovskii, however, was against the expulsion of Pasternak from the writers union, and abstained from the vote; but the other *Novy Mir* editors fully believed that persecution of Pasternak was the right thing.[44]

A second example of a work that was not published because of ideology is Vassily Grossman's *Life and Fate*. Tvardovskii read the novel and personally loved it, but he also realized he would be unable to publish it. Tvardovskii is quoted as having said *Life and Fate* "Transcends, far and decisively, the borders of literature."[45] He did not consider the novel to be without flaws, he saw the title as ridiculous and Grossman's claims of the novel as an epic to be pretentious.[46] One of the major themes of *Life and Fate* is a parallel Grossman made a between the Nazi's and Soviets. This parallel was hard to accept for Tvardovskii who had taken an us versus them mentality from the war. He did, however, think *Life and Fate* was better than the previous two most famous books of the thaw, *Dr. Zhivago* and *Not by Bread Alone*. The novel would not be published in the thaw period. Mikhail Suslov, an important party member, is rumored to have threatened *Life and Fate* would not be published for at least one hundred years.[47] The novel would not remain hidden for one hundred years, but it was confiscated by the KGB and only published in 1988, more than twenty years after the death of Grossman, who died in 1964.[48] The novel simply went farther than the thaw would permit. Leaders and elites in the Soviet Union did push for an increased critical look at the past, but were not willing to allow works drawing comparisons of the regime to the Nazi regime to be published, regardless of literary quality.

Neither Khrushchev, as party secretary, nor Tvardovskii, as editor of *Novy Mir*, was trying to make major changes to the system. Tvardovskii believed in the regime but wanted to improve it, and thought that by looking at the errors of the past improvement was possible.[49] Khrushchev looked at the Stalinist era as having gone to far, but even in the speech *'On the Cult of Personality'* he accepted the legitimate use of violence for political purposes as well as the party as the rightful rulers of the Soviet Union. Dissidents during the thaw period often felt that the new freedoms were not going far enough. Brezhnev became party secretary in 1964, and these views quickly changed.[50] Khrushchev, Tvardovskii, and others like them, were responsible for the publishing of the works that shaped the thaw. In this way those that shaped the discussion of the thaw were not dissenters, but those that thought looking at the past they could create a better socialist state. The thaw was a brief period that ended with the removal of Khrushchev as party secretary. Like the start of the

---

41   Kozlov, 119.
42   Kozlov, 121.
43   Kozlov, 120.
44   Kozlov, 121.
45   Kozlov, 213.
46   Kozlov, 213.
47   Kozlov, 215-216.
48   Kozlov, 218.
49   Tvardovskii, 11.
50   Stephen V. Bittner, *The Many Lives of Khrushchev's Thaw: Experience and Memory in Moscow's Arbat* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2008), 6-7.

thaw, the end would be a process. This period of relative liberal and free thought would not be replicated during the remaining decades of the Soviet Union.

A huge factor of the thaw is the power of both Khrushchev and Tvardovskii. These two men were far more open to challenges to their beliefs, and more adaptable, than most Soviet elites. Them simultaneously being party secretary and editor of *Novy Mir* gave a legitimate and official route for the publication of the works of the thaw. A major reassessment over this period for Tvardovskii would be his opinion of Stalin, which he reevaluated continually over the 1950's and 60's. This would not prevent him form always retaining a fascination with Stalin.[51] Tvardovskii would also find the 20th party congress influential; it officially recognized the rumors about Stalin and the camps that he had already heard.[52] Despite the revaluations and challenges to Tvardovskii's beliefs, he always maintained that communism was the answer.[53] Khrushchev also maintained not only a belief in communism, but in violence as a legitimate tool of power. As is evident in this quote from the secret speech: "Actually Lenin taught that the application of revolutionary violence is necessitated by the resistance of the exploiting classes, and this referred to the era when the exploiting classes existed and were powerful."[54] Khrushchev, although wanting an open and honest discussion of the past, maintained his belief not only in communism but also in the revolution and Lenin.

This overall commitment to the party and communism by both was crucial to the success of the thaw, and also the factor that negates the idea of legitimate dissent. These two men were liberal enough to facilitate a discussion of a controversial point in Soviet history. Many hard line communists disagreed and criticized them, especially Tvardovskii, for permitting works that were too critical or went too far. Despite this, both men being convinced communists were working towards a better communists state. In this way they may have challenged some of the events of the past, but neither represented a true challenge to the system of the state like a dissident would, and Khrushchev in particular wanted to maintain the existing order. In this same respect anything officially published during the thaw could not be dissidence, because it was facilitated and used by men like Khrushchev and Tvardovskii. An author may write a work with the intention of dissidence, but when it passes through editors, journal, publishers, censors and party members to become published via official means, a work ceases to serve only the intentions of the author; but also serves the intentions of the people who it has passed through. Any work published in *Novy Mir* served the intentions of Tvardovskii, and despite his liberal views, he would not intend it to be dissent, and neither would other editors or publishers of official literary works in this period. Because of this process to get official, or legitimate, publication the authors' intention becomes second to those granting permission for publication. Since none of these permission granters were dissenters, no officially published work could be dissent. Therefore the concept of 'legitimate dissent' in the Soviet Union is a false one, as a work could be either or but not both. The period did allow for the publication of many works that in other periods would be considered dissent, but were permissible in the thaw. This period of relative ideological freedom would soon end.

Khrushchev's removal from power in 1964 represented the biggest turning point of the end of the thaw; this persecution seemed to many to be a prelude to the persecution of *Novy Mir,* as both Tvardovskii and the journal expressed views similar to Khrushchev's. Tvardovskii initially feared such a persecution; in an attempt to save the journal he decided no longer to publish works that were sensational or challenged the existing order.[55] Another of the major events signaling and end to the thaw was the Siniavskii-Daniel affair. In September 1965 the Siniavskii-Daniel affair resulted in two academics being imprisoned for

---

[51]   Kozlov, 181.

[52]   Kozlov, 189.

[53]   Lakshin, 21.

[54]   The Guardian, 2.

[55]   Kozlov, 364.

publishing works in the west under pseudonyms. This seemed too many like a return to the Pasternak affair.[56] The similarity being the persecution of Soviet authors for publishing works outside the Soviet Union. Tvardovskii had previously published Siniavskii`s writings in *Novy Mir*. This represented a link between the journal and the persecuted writers, which had the potential to threaten the journal if wider repercussions were to occur.[57] Tvardovskii was not only concerned about the repercussions for *Novy Mir*, but also the west's reaction to the trials. He thought that social ostracism might be a better route, as the criminal persecution and imprisonment was reminiscent of the terror.[58] These two incidents, Khrushchev's removal form power and the Siniavskii-Daniel affair, lead to a rapid halt in discussions of the terror.[59] As a result the *Novy Mir* of the late 1960`s was forced to defend itself against administrative pressures, but they did not completely abandon themes of the past or shift from focusing on heroes as ordinary people.[60] We can see how the Soviet regime shifted over the late 1960's from looking at the terror through literature, to once again trying to have ideological control. This shift in policy would force *Novy Mir*, the journal that had printed many of the crucial literary works of the thaw, to change along with the regime.

In 1968 *Novy Mir* would publish *Youth in Zhelezhool`sk* by Nikolai Pavlovich Voronov. The novel was loosely based on Voronov's childhood in Magnitogorsk[61]. *Youth in Zhelezhool`sk* said little about the terror, but would still provoke a campaign against Novy Mir. The campaign would be a major turning point for *Novy Mir*. During this period Tvardovskii would personally responding to letters of support, which was an indication of the seriousness of the situation.[62] In February 1970 the central committee decided that Tvardovsky should be no longer hold the position of editor. To facilitate this they appointed four new co-editors to the board. In return Tvardovskii would resign in February 1970, and die shortly after in 1971.[63] This was a part of the central government's wider attempts in the late 1960`s to regain control over intellectual life.[64] We can see how interlinked Khrushchev, Tvardovskii and the thaw were. All three rose and fell in relatively the same fashion, and Tvardovskii, often with Khrushchev's approval, facilitated the intellectual discussions of the thaw via *Novy Mir*. *Novy Mir* would never regain the popularity or influence that it had possessed during the thaw period.

Tvardovskii was a man that during his time faced many critics, despite his wide popularity. This is especially true during his editorship; hard line party members and supporters felt he was going to far, while dissidents and authors like Solzhenitsyn felt he was to supportive of the party and did not go far enough to challenge the Soviet system. In response to criticism he had received earlier in his career Tvardovskii wrote a poem entitled to my critics:

"You ever strive to dictate me,
To give simple advice
To have me sing, not hearing, not seeing,
Only knowing: what's permitted, what's not.

But I can't but reckon
That later, after many years have passed,

---

[56]   Kozlov, 362.
[57]   Kozlov, 364.
[58]   Kozlov, 417.
[59]   Kozlov, 427.
[60]   Kozlov, 428.
[61]   Kozlov, 439.
[62]   Kozlov, 439.
[63]   Kozlov, 459.
[64]   Kozlov, 459.

<div style="text-align: center;">
It will be you again who will lecture me:
Where were you, poet? What did you see?"[65]
</div>

We can see through this poem that Tvardovskii was aware that he would never be able to please everyone, and that despite whatever role a person played in the present that same person could become a critic in the future. Tvardovskii was a fascinating and complicated man. He guided the publication of the literary works of the thaw as an extension of his own beliefs, which had been greatly challenged by the death of Stalin and Khrushchev's speech at the twentieth party congress. He tried to operate within the limits of the Soviet regime that he supported, while continually challenging his own beliefs and the past in order to improve communism. Tvardovskii faced his critics, but followed his beliefs; as he knew that there would still be critics in the future regardless of what path he choose. This also contributed to his removal as editor of *Novy Mir*, his beliefs remained those of the thaw period and did not serve the interests of the tightening of Soviet controls on literature and ideology that occurred under Brezhnev.

In conclusion the works that were published officially during the thaw were not dissent. This is due to the process required to get to get a work of literature published meant that a work began to serve the intent of those who published primarily, and serving the original intent of the author secondarily. Two men who were crucial to the thaw were party secretary Nikita Khrushchev, and *Novy Mir* editor Aleksandr Tvardovskii. Both men looked to an open and honest conversation of the past in order to improve the present and future of Communism. Neither man wanted to radically alter the state; therefore neither man was a dissenter. These two men shaped the intellectual conversation of the thaw, via Khrushchev's secret speech, and Tvardovskii publishing the major literary works. Khrushchev's removal from power signaled the end of the thaw, and in turn Tvardovskii would be removed from the position of editor, as a result of tightening control on literature and ideology. Khrushchev, Tvardovskii and the thaw are interlinked, and their commitment to communism meant that dissent was still not officially permitted during the thaw, even as a turn to history, and criticism of history, became cultural acceptable. The thaw was not a period of permitted dissent, but of relative ideological freedom, steered by two men trying to improve the Soviet system.

---

[65]   Edith Rogovin Frankel, *Novy Mir: A Case Study in the Politics of Literature 1952- 1958* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981), 119.