

LEGACY

A Journal of Student Scholarship

Volume 4

2004



A Publication of the Sigma Kappa Chapter of Phi Alpha Theta
& the Southern Illinois University Carbondale History Department

LEGACY

Volume 4

2004

A Journal of Student Scholarship

Editorial Staff

Natasha Zaretsky
Kimberly Dowd
Tyler Crogg
Gretchen M. Madsen
Dana L. Prusacki
Michael Tow

Faculty Editors

Kay J. Carr
Marji Morgan

Graduate Student Editor

Denise R. Johnson

The Editorial Staff would like to thank all those who supported this issue of *Legacy*, especially the Undergraduate Student Government, Phi Alpha Theta (Drs. Holly Hurlburt and Natasha Zaretsky, faculty advisors), our History Alumni, the SIUC History Department, the students who submitted papers and the Faculty mentors, Drs. Jo Ann Argersinger, Jonathan Bean, Holly Hurlburt, Marji Morgan, and John Y. Simon.

A Publication of the Sigma Kappa Chapter of Phi Alpha
Theta & the History Department
Southern Illinois University Carbondale
<http://www.siu.edu/~histsiu>

LEGACY

A Journal of Student Scholarship

Volume 4

2004

Table of Contents

“May God Return You to Me Again”: The Civil War Letters of John Preston Mann Jessica L. Benton	1
Federal Government to the Rescue: Government Response to the Needs of College Students During the Great Depression Dustin Brown	19
Lord Protector, or Usurper and Tyrant? Contemporary Views on the Legitimacy of the Cromwellian Protectorate Joshua William Gaeth	31
Pathway to the Stars: The Pioneer Women of NASA Amber Jerals	43
An Alternative Oppression: John Humphrey Noyes and the Women of the Oneida Community Karen Mylan	57
The Crusade Against Comics Christopher Rhymer	75
Adolph Engelmann: Immigrant Soldier, American Hero Ryan F. Warner	87
The Cherokee Triangle Association: A History of Affluence and Segregation Corey B. White	109
Contributors	125

Jessica L. Benton

“May God Return You to Me Again”:
The Civil War Letters of John Preston Mann

John Preston Mann sat in his crudely erected tent, amongst his fellow soldiers in Camp Butler, Illinois. In this dimly lit shelter, by the glow of a kerosene lamp, he penned a letter to his wife Nancy. As he wrote, he heard the dull roar of camp life. The horses neighed and shuffled, the crickets serenaded, and the soldiers began to wind down for the night. It was around eight o'clock in the evening and many of the older men were retiring. Some of the younger men were still awake, sitting around the campfire discussing the war. Preston was tired of talking about the war. With a heartfelt sigh he wrote, “There is no place so dear to me on Earth as my own sweet home.”¹ His day was filled with thoughts of his four little girls, growing up so fast, without their daddy at home to kiss them goodnight. Emily, his oldest, was learning to write beautifully. Her last letter began, “I am getting ready to go to school the first bell has rung but I will stay a minute to write to you.”² Preston was so proud when he received her letters. But letters did not come often enough. Home seemed so far away and those letters were his connection to Liberty, Illinois and his family, especially his wife Nancy. Oh how he missed Nancy. She was always in his thoughts. Is she safe, happy, comfortable, content, he wondered. He hoped she missed him as much as he missed her. His mind screamed, “Write, write and relieve an anxious husband.”³ Preston was afraid that she did not miss him enough because her letters were few and far between. He needed her to write more. The letters kept him sane during this uncertain time.

This picture is a common one during war time, whether it is the Civil War or the present day conflict in Iraq. The picture is one of a married couple separated, not only by miles, but by a devastating war that takes lives and tears families apart.

Historians have studied the Civil War and its battles from social or economic perspectives, usually focusing on war heroes and some women, who had played roles in the war experience. However, the lives of everyday common people are often overlooked for the story of a hero who died for the cause or fought bravely. The ordinary soldiers and their families suffered tremendously during this violent time in American history.

John Preston Mann and his wife Nancy were no exception. They were apart for the majority of the war, yet they became stronger for it. Preston's war service was not eventful. He was an officer in a regiment that never saw battle and, although the budget was tight, his family never starved. They were people like the everyday, average people of today, yet their lives during the Civil War were recorded in their correspondence. These letters give the reader a glimpse into the lives and struggles of a nineteenth-century couple separated by necessity. The letters between Preston and Nancy Mann provide readers with a thread that helps connect the present with the past.

Randolph County, nestled next to the Mississippi River in central Illinois, is a land rich in history. By studying this county's history, one can trace a panoramic view of the Mississippi Valley's history, including the arrival of the French explorers, transactions with the local Native American tribes, river piracy, the prosperous period of Southern Illinois and the subsequent decline in the economy. Within the present day county one can find many towns and villages, such as Rockwood, once known as Liberty, and Chester, both of which are rich in local history. This local history is full of everyday life—houses built and destroyed, farm land cleared, businesses that prospered and failed. People were born, raised, and died. They experienced joy, despair, hardships, and love, the same way the citizens of these two towns do today. Chester and Rockwood were the setting of a love story that survived a momentous struggle on both the home front and the battlefield.

Rockwood, Illinois is now a small village comprised of forty-five people, belonging to twenty-one families. The village lies on the Mississippi River, eight miles southeast of Chester.⁴

There is only one church, the Christ Lutheran Church, and there are none of the usual small community services like banks or grocers. This village is not the same village in which Nancy and Preston Mann lived. Rockwood did not even exist to them, as the name of their village then was "Liberty." During the Manns' residence in the village the Mississippi river flowed next to Liberty, and the community served as a busy river port and prospered by selling firewood to steamboats.⁵ Mercantile stores sprang up in Liberty as a result. In the store of John O'Neil, John Preston Mann earned his living before enlisting in the war.

John Mann, Preston's father, was born on 1 February 1796, in Abbeyville, South Carolina. John Mann had a long history of military service, including serving in the War of 1812, the Kentucky militia, and the Battle of New Orleans. He was discharged at Rushville, Logan County, Kentucky on 20 May 1815, and married Albina Balch on 4 July 1815 in Rushville, Kentucky. John and his family, consisting of eleven children, lived in Indiana on Little Rock Creek on bounty land he received for his military service. In 1827, the family relocated to Southern Illinois, Randolph County. It was here, near Kaskaskia, that John was able to practice his blacksmith skills and provide for his family. In 1830 he was elected as the Elder in the Kaskaskia Presbyterian Church where he remained a participating member until his death in 1881. John and Albina raised their children in the church and instilled in them the values of religion, which had a major effect on their children, especially Preston.⁶

John Preston Mann was the fourth son of twelve children born to John and Albina on 6 February 1829. His family resided near Kaskaskia, next door to the Clendenin family. Harvey Clendenin held the office of County Commissioner and owned a large flour mill near Liberty. Preston married Nancy Clendenin in 1853; their first home was a rented home belonging to Dr. Hall. Preston kept a diary entitled *Chester Diary* that provides insight into the economic situation of O'Neil's store. In an entry dated 13 April 1850, he recalled a fire and made mention of "good(s) lost to O'Neil \$1,624, amount on hand \$9,922. Crittenden and Wright to rebuild by October 1, 1850."⁷ Other entries, such as the ones from

1852, mention the Palo Alto Mill and six families leaving to head west to the gold rush in California.⁸

Preston gained occupational experience as a clerk working in the O'Neil store. The store supplied the local citizens with everyday goods, such as dry foods, material, and wagon supplies. When O' Neil was out of town on trips, Preston was left in charge of the store and was in charge of store upkeep and collection of bills. In a letter to Preston from O'Neil when he was in Cincinnati on a business trip in February of 1852, Preston was told to "collect all notes from customers."⁹ After the original O'Neil store burned in April 1850, a new store was built on the Mississippi riverfront in October 1850. They named the new store "The Phoenix".¹⁰ At the time of his marriage Preston was employed at "The Phoenix," but in 1853, he quit and attempted to operate a store on the levee. His friend Albert Taylor wished him "much success in [his] business".¹¹ His endeavor was short lived and Preston jumped at the chance to join the war effort.

Preston and Nancy had six children. At the time that the correspondence between them took place, roughly from 1861 to 1864, they had buried one of their children and the youngest, Samuel, their only son, was not yet born. Emily was their oldest and frequently wrote letters to her father when he served in the war. Their daughter, Kittie, was the second born, but died as an infant. In Preston's absence, the three remaining children, Nancy (Nannie), Alice, and Sadie (Baby), required their mother's constant attention, first while their father was working, and later while he was away serving the Union.

What would prompt a man to leave his wife and four young girls at home and enlist to serve in a war, knowing he might not return home? There was a considerable probability that he might not return and his children would grow up fatherless. Abraham Lincoln noted that patriotism and political bias (political or ideological convictions), among other motives, were the reasons behind many soldiers enlisting.¹² Preston exemplified these motives. He was politically active and believed in the Union's cause. Because of these things, he was prompted to enlist in the Union's cause.

Preston was a well-educated man who “practiced Christian virtues with a clean head and pure heart”.¹³ Preston was also an active contributor to the local papers. These articles demonstrated his belief that the Union must be preserved. Before enlisting, Preston kept a journal and often wrote editorials for the Chester newspaper. When he served during the war he was a “correspondent of two papers” in which he wrote short letters to them bi-weekly and kept a diary of his war experiences. He wrote comments about the “Southern Traitors” that must pay for breaking with the Union. In one letter he wrote, “Some of those traitors [will] stretch hemp if I have to come back to find them out, some of them will suffer for their treason.”¹⁴ Preston had a strong desire not only to preserve the Union, but also to crush the rebellion. He wrote strong words about the Confederate sympathizers in Southern Illinois, such as the members of the Knights of the Golden Circle, who he perceived to be even more traitorous because they did not reside in the South.

He possessed such a desire to fight for and support the Union that he wrote an eloquent poem in support of President Lincoln that shows his belief that the Civil War was necessary to preserve the Union.

The Union Army, gallant band,
As E'er raised sword or spear,
Look to thee now, and in thy hand
Puts all their hopes and fears.

Gird thine armour firmly round thee,
Higher raise freedom's sword,
And with the “pledge” thy sins bound thee,
Strike down the traitorous horde.

In Preston's Civil War diary he noted that this poem was written expressly for Abraham Lincoln, while he was at Camp Clear Creek, Mississippi, on 4 November 1863. This poem was penned just two weeks before Lincoln gave his famous Gettysburg Address. Those two hundred words gave meaning to

the Civil War, showing that all the men died for a cause. In Preston's poem, the simple words express the same idea. He sent it to Lincoln with the hope that Lincoln would in turn send him his autograph for his little girls. Lincoln did send the desired autograph, which was later stolen from the Mann home by an antique hunter.

Preston was a politically motivated person. Much of his writing before the Civil War was about the political happenings in Southern Illinois. In the Chester paper he wrote about local speakers, including Stephen A. Douglas, and about local legislation. Preston immersed himself in politics because "state policy is becoming more popular with the people of the state everyday."¹⁵

From the editorials in the paper to his personal writings, politics played a vital part in his life and he actively participated in the political scene. Part of his activity in the war was to serve the Union when duty called, especially when he closely followed Lincoln and the Republican Party. Preston described Lincoln as the "brave-hearted chief," and wrote that Lincoln's heart was "thus moved by good intent" in following the "noble work" of the restoration of the Union.¹⁶ Later in his life he was more engaged in politics than before the war. Preston read for the law and began to practice in 1870. He also continued writing with many of his articles focused on women's rights. He believed in this cause because he raised four girls and was extremely close to his family. Much of Preston's beliefs, such as his political views and religious values, were established through his affiliation with the church.

John and Albina Mann were strong Christians who raised their children in the Presbyterian Church. From an early age the church influenced Preston's thoughts and actions. Many letters make references to God and the "all wise providence."¹⁷ He urged his children to read the Bible to become good children, and firmly believed that when life is hard, "We are chastised for our hardness of heart to make us humble and obedient to his will." Clearly, he was a man who dedicated his life to following the will of God and abiding by the law of the Almighty. One can imagine that Preston would view slavery as a cruel institution and believe

that God would be on their side in the fight against the practice of slavery. It is not surprising that he argued in reference to the practice of slavery that the Union must “work then bravely in Freedom’s cause, with tru (sic) and steady aim.”¹⁸

Preston clearly believed that it was his duty to enlist because of his political and religious beliefs. Why did Nancy support her husband’s decision to leave her alone to care for their family? Nancy supported her husband because she believed God was on the Union’s side; she had to support her husband and the rest of the men in their struggle. She wrote to Preston soon after he arrived at Camp Butler, “I know that we have right on our side ... but we are a proud people and may have to be chastised severely before we are humbled sufficiently to feel our need of God’s help.”¹⁹ Nancy, who was as religious as her husband, believed that God would aid the Union in battle. She also believed that God would help her through the hard times she would experience without another adult around to raise the children and work the farm. In a reflective state Nancy wrote to Preston, “I see many ways in which I have been blessed and have also had many sorrows which may yet prove to be blessings may the Lord point out the path of duty to me and not only point it out but incline me to follow it.”²⁰ She viewed her ability to support her husband’s duty to leave for an indefinite period of time, maybe even forever, to fight in the Civil War as her duty to God and to the country.

Preston enlisted in the Fifth Illinois Volunteer Cavalry. The Fifth Cavalry was comprised of twelve companies, consisting of 1,981 men. Preston was part of Company K, which was mainly made up of 183 men from small towns in Southern Illinois, including Sparta, Kaskaskia, Chester and Liberty. In all, fifty-nine men enlisted in Company K from Chester or Liberty, thirty-two percent of the entire company. So roughly one-third of the men Preston served with were men he knew from home. He used camp contacts to draw a better picture of the situation in Chester throughout the war and Nancy used correspondence from her neighbors to make sure Preston was really as comfortable as he said he was.

When Preston had arrived at Camp Butler in October 1861 he and his compatriots did not know what the future might bring. The Fifth Illinois Volunteer Cavalry was organized at Camp Butler, located in Springfield, Illinois in November 1861, where soldiers were issued a uniform consisting of "1 blouse, 1 pr of boots, 1 pr pants, 2 pr wool drawers, 2 flannel shirts, 1 cap."²¹ Preston had taken clothes from home to wear but found that he had too many articles of clothing and had to send some home. He also had to adjust to the meal and cooking situation early into the war effort. For a short time Camp Butler had hired cooks to feed the soldiers, but they had trouble preparing the right amount of food. Sometimes there was too much, other times there was too little prepared to feed all the men. In October 1861, the men of the Fifth Illinois Cavalry returning to the mess system had to learn how to fix their own meals. "I am cooking occasionally," Preston wrote, "and get along far better than I expected."²² Young men who had always relied on their mothers and married men who relied on their wives for breakfast, lunch, and dinner now prepared meals for themselves and each other. Preston adapted to "circumstances without any great inconvenience" and felt "quite at home" in camp.²³ During the course of the war his attitude would change as much as he moved across the South.

On 20 February 1862, the Fifth Cavalry moved from Camp Butler to Benton Barracks in St. Louis, Missouri. In less than a week they moved on to Pilot Knob, Tennessee then on to Doniphan, Georgia by 27 March 1862. In May 1863, they moved on to Vicksburg, Mississippi and on 6 July 1863 the Fifth Cavalry joined General William T. Sherman's army. After joining Sherman, the Fifth went on two notable expeditions where they destroyed bridges, public work shops, railways and homes. The Fifth traveled to the Black River where they camped until May 1864, then the remaining regiment returned to Vicksburg. In January 1864 many of the regiment reenlisted as veterans, including Preston. On 3 February 1864 they moved with Sherman's Army in the Meridian Raid. On 20 November 1864 they successfully participated in a raid to destroy the Mississippi Central Railroad. Before the Fifth disbanded in October 1865, the

men traveled as far as Hempstead, Texas before the final departure for Springfield, Illinois.²⁴ Preston had traveled the distance of the Mississippi River, from Southern Illinois deep into the heart of the Confederacy. By the end of the war his attitude had changed and his thoughts were never far from his home and family.

By 5 January 1862, after four months apart, Preston wrote to Nancy in the quiet of the night as he usually did, about missing home, which began to show his shifting attitudes about camp life. He wrote, "Tonight when all is still and quiet I thought of you, home, and our little ones" and further in the letter, "I do not love the life of a soldier, I prefer to be at my own sweet home."²⁵ He found that Nancy's letters provided him a tie to his life that he missed. They were his link to the pre-war life and gave him reason to continue on the path he chose. He constantly complained about her failure to write continually to him. His demanding requests for correspondence were constant, almost as if her letters provided reassurance that his old life would still be there when he returned. In his early letters home he wrote, "I have waited 6 days and no letter from you yet." He also kept count of how many letters he sent home to her in comparison to the frequency of her letters to him by 4 July 1864. He commented that he "hardly think[s] any of [their] letters are lost in the mail."²⁶ He also used the girls to pressure Nancy into writing. Preston was fully aware that she read aloud the letters to the girls so he mentioned, "Have Ma write to me because it pleases me to get letters (Ma writes such pretty letters)."²⁷ Clearly, it was very important for Preston to feel he was missed at home. He had a connection to his home that he missed dearly.

The idea of home is a reoccurring theme in Preston's correspondence and writing. At the beginning of his service he attempted to convince himself that camp could be like home. In 1861 he wrote, "True, the camp is not "Home" but it can be made quite comfortable."²⁸ Those thoughts gradually turned into an intense desire to return home to his wife and children, a desire shared by the other soldiers with families. A short excerpt from a

poem to Nancy dated 7 November 1863, demonstrated homesickness combined with his desire to endure his service:

O haste sweet peace and drive away
This cruel and bloody strife
And bring once more that happy day
A day hope, joy, and life

The three long years will soon be gone
And there to thee I'll fly
And there I'll stay with thee at home
And live and love and die²⁹

Preston missed his family deeply, but realized that he had a duty to the Union to fulfill his three years of service. Consequently, he reenlisted after his first three years of service to finish the job he began. He did not participate in any actual battles, which virtually eliminated the possibility that he may perish in the fields of battle. Statistically, out of the entire Fifth Illinois Volunteer Cavalry (1,981), twenty-eight men were killed or mortally wounded, and 414 died of disease (441 total). Preston was lucky to survive the war and returned to his home at the end of the war. While Preston fought to preserve the Union, Nancy had her own battles on the home front.

When Preston enlisted and left for camp Nancy had to fill a void left by her husband. She had the sole responsibility of raising young children, running a farm, and feeding her family. Her plight was much like the many Union and Confederate women, whose fathers, sons and husbands left to fight. When Preston left, they had four young children, the youngest, Grace, or Baby, was an infant. Emily, the oldest, was able to attend school and help with the chores. Nannie and Alice were the middle children. Nancy attempted to keep Preston's image fresh in their minds so the little ones would not forget their father. When Preston departed Nancy bought a bowl that the children termed "Pa's bowl." She wrote that "they (the children) talk a great deal about you, every night when they go to bed, they bid you good

night just as they did when you was here.”³⁰ Many families followed similar practices. An example is a story surrounding the song and poem, *The Vacant Chair*, written to tell the story of an empty chair that remained at the table so the family would never forget their absent family member. Lines such as,

We shall meet but we shall miss him.
There will be one vacant chair.
We shall linger to caress him
While we breathe our ev'ning prayer³¹

portrayed the emptiness that the families of the three million soldiers who fought in the Civil War experienced while their sons, brothers, fathers, and husbands were fighting, whether for the duration of the war or indefinitely. In Preston’s case, he survived the war and returned to once again sit in his vacant chair and eat from Pa’s bowl. The letters were his way of filling the emptiness while he could not be home physically.

Nancy also kept open channels of communication for the children and Preston. She wrote on behalf of the girls and read them what Preston wrote in return. She was the primary caregiver and provider, caring for everyone when they contracted illnesses, such as the measles or a “bilious attack.” She wrote that when “Nannie came home from school with a severe headache and vomiting, which continued all night and the next day and night, by the time she had a high fever.”³²

Nancy had to be especially careful to not hurt herself and stay healthy because the entire burden of support lay on her shoulders. In the winter of 1861 she fell ill, with “a chill in the morning then feaver (sic) the rest of the day” and “could not keep from crying like a baby to think that you was not at home.”³³ The implications of her illness were far reaching. There was no parent to care for the children and no one to run the farm, collect eggs, feed the livestock, and make repairs. She could not rely on her family because her mother was “weak and not able to turn herself in the bed,” and her father had to care for her ailing mother.³⁴ So the many repairs and tasks that required great strength to

accomplish were tackled by Nancy alone. One time she lifted the plank (that they hung meat on) herself. She said to Preston, "If you had been here, it would have taken you and I both."³⁵ Although she found life without Preston difficult, she never gave up the belief that she and the family would endure until he returned from the war. While he was absent the family had their own war on the home front.

Although the Manns were Unionists, many of their neighbors sympathized with the Confederacy. The Knights of the Golden Circle were a constant threat to the unity of the citizens of Randolph County. In her letters Nancy mentioned the meeting of the Knights of the Golden Circle and Preston responded, "It is outrageous that while so many of us are off preparing to fight for our homes and loved ones that such a set of villains should be plotting treason while we are absent and pitting the community with discord."³⁶

Preston's view of Southern sympathizers was harsh, but his reaction shows the division of opinions. The danger of Southern sympathizers on Northern soil was perceived to be far worse than it actually was, but sometimes the danger became very real. The Manns's neighbor, William Roger, had his barn, along with three horses, twenty sheep, and his farming equipment destroyed by an arsonist who was "a man from Alabama who was staying in that vicinity since last summer."³⁷ The constant division between the North and the South on such an intimate scale served to reinforce to Nancy that her sacrifices were worthwhile. She witnessed everyday how divisions between Union and Confederacy jeopardized lives both on the home front and the battlefield.

How did Preston and Nancy survive their four-year separation during such a turbulent and stressful time and, more importantly, how did the separation affect their marriage? Their shared belief that God was in control of the situation gave them confidence. Preston believed that "with God's blessing we will be united more closely and with our loved ones around us."³⁸ The faith with which Preston was raised was the same faith that enabled him to leave his home and family and fight on behalf of

the Union, for a war that many thought was unnecessary. Nancy shared his religious sentiments. Although she worried for Preston, she knew that “the same God is watching over you there that has protected you through life. He is able to keep you in safety and return you to me again.”³⁹ Shared beliefs and values strengthened the Mann marriage. They provided the couple a common ground on which to build a relationship and a way for them to unite when they experienced stressful times.

Another coping mechanism the Manns practiced was the use of humor and flirting. In a letter home, Preston mentioned he shaved off his beard to which Nancy replied, “You say that you have shaved the beard of your mouth, I should think it quite a treat to get to kiss you now.”⁴⁰ They continued this dialogue throughout the war to relieve the pressures of everyday life. As the war outside raged, they could tease one another and make light of their serious situation. Preston asked his wife to send him a picture of herself, but she had no money so she jokingly replied, “As these are war times and money is scarce I will not agree to your terms, but I will give you fifty kisses payable on sight.”⁴¹ On the surface the joke is light-hearted, but the underlying tone shows her fear that he will not return home. The couple teases one another to conceal the apprehension surrounding their situation.

The Civil War was not the first time that the Manns’ marriage bond had been tested. Before the nation was entrenched in the battle, Preston and Nancy experienced the loss of a child. Their deceased daughter, Kittie, was sporadically brought up in their letters. Nancy wrote in one such letter after she visited “our Kittie’s” grave, “All was so quiet and peaceful there. Dear little one. She has gone to Heaven. ... [S]he will not have the long rugged road to travel as you and I have done. It would be too selfish to wish her here with us again.”⁴² Such religious sentiments were common in the nineteenth century, though no less painful. The death of their daughter could have torn the couple apart, but because of their faith in God, they accepted the premature death as His will.

Preston's wartime experience combined with a strengthened marriage, after his return from the war, presented a new direction in life. Before the war Preston operated his own store, but during the war Preston realized that he possessed the desire to strive for more in life and craved for the means to provide his family with more. During encampments Preston read or wrote all the time in the hope of bettering himself with a "first class knowledge." By 6 July 1864, Preston wrote of an "inward principle or motive that is continually urging me to acquire all the useful information I can."⁴³ He realized that his "primary affairs" would not allow him to work a job where "capital is necessary", so he toyed with the thought of practicing law even though he believed he was "too far advanced in life to enter the field."⁴⁴ Preston believed there was "not a lawyer in Randolph county [and] that [he] could excel at the bar in six months."⁴⁵ From these wartime thoughts sprang Preston's desire for a new career, which is why he obtained a law license when he returned.

Preston's longing for a new career was a product of his realization that the life of a soldier was not for him. He was torn between a small risk for a large reward in the profession of law (he was older than most men beginning that career), and the glory of fame in the army at the cost of his values. He wrote to Nancy, "Perhaps you wish your husband to climb higher in the scale of fame and honor in the army."⁴⁶ He realized that the field of war provided glory but it "offer[ed] little in the way of permanent employment or usefulness."⁴⁷ Instead he viewed it as a place where men got promoted by "deception, fraud, and chicanery" in the "act of destroying his fellow man."⁴⁸ The battlefield was not a place to seek honor and glory. The Civil War created circumstances that enabled Preston to find what he truly desired in life.

He realized that the place for him was his home and family, in Liberty. While the Civil War separated the Manns, it also provided Preston with the chance to reflect on his previous course in life and the opportunity to find a new career. Above all, the war and the distance that separated Preston and Nancy

physically did not drive a wedge between them emotionally or psychologically. Many times, crisis or problems became turning points because they strengthened psychological intimacy.⁴⁹ For the Manns, the Civil War reinforced their ability to withstand adverse circumstances and ultimately strengthened the marriage. The field of battle proved that Preston “loved his home and the peaceful pursuits of Civil life.”⁵⁰ While they were apart Preston’s and Nancy’s letters served as a lifeline until they were united once again.

As Preston rested in his tent and longed for the comforts of home, Nancy sat at the kitchen table in Liberty. She hoped to steal enough time away from the children and her duties to write a short letter to tell her husband how much she missed him. She thought of him all the time, and wondered what he was doing, asking did he have a lot of free time, was he eating well? She said, “Let me know where you are, and how you fare. I am afraid that you will not be comfortable.”⁵¹ Life was more difficult without him. She knew she would have to be both parents while he was away, but she did not worry about the separation. The gardening, feeding, and budget now rested on her shoulders. Things would be so much easier if he were there. Oh well, no use in wishing her life away. She prayed for her husband, “May God watch over you and hasten the time when we will be a united family,” because she had faith that God worked his will through Preston and the rest of the Union men.⁵² She knew it was her duty to trust God. She sighed and resumed her writing, hoping the mail carrier would come the next day and carry her letter a hundred miles northeast to Camp Butler.

Notes

- 1 Letter, Preston Mann to Nancy Mann, 17 November 1861, Mann Collection, Special Collections, Morris Library, Southern Illinois University Carbondale.
- 2 Letter, Emily Mann to Preston Mann, 14 April 1862, Mann Collection.

- 3 Letter, Preston Mann to Nancy Mann, 6 December 1861, Mann Collection.
- 4 <www.lupinfo.com/gazetter/R/RO3846-rockwood.html> 16 October 2003.
- 5 John W. Allen, *Randolph County Notes* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois Normal University, 1944), 13.
- 6 *A History of Chester, Illinois: 1829-1974*, sesquicentennial book, 1979, s.v. "John Mann."
- 7 Ibid.
- 8 Ibid.
- 9 Letter, J. O'Neil to Preston Mann, 25 February 1852, Mann Collection
- 10 *History of Chester*, s.v. "John Mann."
- 11 Letter, Albert Taylor to Preston Mann, 5 March 1853, Mann Collection
- 12 James M. McPherson, *For Cause & Comrades* (New York: Oxford University Press 1997), 6.
- 13 Letter, R.B. Servant Reference for Preston Mann, 18 April 1849, Mann Collection.
- 14 Letter, Preston Mann to Nancy Mann, 17 November 1861, Mann Collection.
- 15 Ibid.
- 16 Poem, Preston Mann for Abraham Lincoln, 4 November 1863, Mann Collection.
- 17 Letter, Preston Mann to Nancy Mann, 12 January 1862, Mann Collection.
- 18 Poem, Preston Mann for Abraham Lincoln, 4 November 1863, Mann Collection.
- 19 Letter, Nancy Mann to Preston Mann, 26 November 186?, Mann Collection.
- 20 Letter, Nancy Mann to Preston Mann, 31 December 1861, Mann Collection.
- 21 Letter, Preston Mann to Nancy Mann, 6 November 1861, Mann Collection.
- 22 Letter, Preston to Nancy, 7 October 1861, Mann Collection.
- 23 Ibid.
- 24 Pat Hageman, transcriber, *5th Illinois Cavalry Regiment History*, Adjutant General's Report.

- 25 Letter, Preston to Nancy, 5 January 1862, Mann Collection.
- 26 Letter, Preston to Nancy, 4 July 1864, Mann Collection.
- 27 Letter, Preston to his children, 5 January 1862, Mann Collection.
- 28 Letter, Preston to Nancy, 7 October 1861, Mann Collection.
- 29 Poem, written for Nancy by Preston, 7 November 1863, Mann Collection.
- 30 Letter, Nancy to Preston, 27 November 1861, Mann Collection.
- 31 H. S. Washburn, *The Vacant Chair*, 1862.
- 32 Letter, Nancy to Preston, 15 July 1864, Mann Collection.
- 33 Letter, Nancy to Preston, 3 December 1861, Mann Collection.
- 34 Letter, Nancy to Preston, 2 December 1861, Mann Collection.
- 35 Letter, Nancy to Preston, 18 December 1861, Mann Collection.
- 36 Letter, Preston to Nancy, 3 November 1861, Mann Collection.
- 37 Letter, Nancy to Preston, 25 January 1864, Mann Collection.
- 38 Letter, Preston to Nancy, 17 November 1861, Mann Collection.
- 39 Letter, Nancy to Preston, 16 April 1862, Mann Collection.
- 40 Letter, Nancy to Preston, 30 March 1862, Mann Collection.
- 41 Letter, Nancy to Preston, 25 January 1864, Mann Collection.
- 42 Letter, Nancy to Preston, 14 April 1862, Mann Collection.
- 43 Letter, Preston to Nancy, 6 July 1864, Mann Collection.
- 44 Ibid.
- 45 Ibid.
- 46 Ibid.
- 47 Ibid.
- 48 Ibid.
- 49 Richard A. Mackey and Bernard O'Brien, *Lasting Marriages: Men and Women Growing Together* (Westport, Connecticut: Praeger, 1995), 78.
- 50 Letter, Preston to Nancy, 6 July 1864, Mann Collection.
- 51 Letter, Nancy to Preston, 17 March 1862, Mann Collection.
- 52 Letter, Nancy to Preston, 25 January 1864, Mann Collection.

Dustin Brown

Federal Government to the Rescue: Government Response to the Needs of College Students During the Great Depression

The Great Depression was a time of economic hardship and despair. By 1930, the effects of the stock market crash during the preceding October were felt by the people of the United States. Unemployment rose dramatically and more college students were seeking assistance from loan funds, which were insufficient even during normal times. Decreasing student enrollments were one reflection of the problems that youth experienced during the depression. Jobless and without the financial resources to continue in school, these youth lacked the experience and training necessary to compete in an overcrowded labor market.

During the depression, hardships existed alongside the vital enthusiasm of social experimentation. The dynamics of federal activity during the 1930s affected virtually every aspect of American life, including higher education. Because of the Great Depression, the federal government established unprecedented relief programs to assist unemployed men and to provide youths with resources necessary to continue in college. Millions of dollars were spent to provide immediate employment for men by constructing physical facilities of permanent public value. Construction projects for the unemployed were only one aspect of government aid. These relief programs also provided the first aid for needy college students. The value of this relief measure is obvious, as it still continues today, while all other relief programs dissolved in the decade after the Great Depression.

This paper focuses on one aspect of the federal government's response to the needs of persons during the depression, that being the college student aid programs of the Federal Emergency Relief Administration (FERA) and the

National Youth Administration (NYA), with a view toward explaining the reasons for the establishment of the programs, how the aid was distributed, and how it affected higher education. Research for this paper was done at Southern Illinois University Carbondale (SIUC), and thus the activities at that institution will provide unique illustrations about program operations.

Even before the depression, the financial assistance available to students in colleges and universities was inadequate.¹ The colleges and universities attempted to assist students through employment, loans, and scholarships. When these funds were exhausted, many institutions began to defer fees. After the depression hit, the economic impossibility of deferring fees quickly became obvious. The universities, as well as the students, were experiencing a lack of funding and income. In 1931, the biennial appropriation for Southern Illinois Normal University (SINU) was 10% less than the previous appropriation.² By 1932, the impact of the depression on the income of colleges and universities was severe, especially in tax-supported institutions, most of which lacked the reserve funds of some private institutions.

Throughout the 1930s, all institutions confronted the question of how to economize without sacrificing essential services. In 1933, President Henry Shryock of SINU wrote a letter to the State Normal School president summarizing the pay cuts put forth by the state of Illinois. In his own words, "The faculties and employees of the five state teachers colleges and in the state university along with all of the code officials and employees will take the following pay cuts: salaries up to \$1000-exempt; salaries above \$1000 to \$2400-10%; salaries above \$2400-15%."³

Early in the 1930s colleges and universities began to manifest a willingness to seek federal assistance. Franklin Delano Roosevelt's election to the presidency in 1933 brought a marked change in the attitude of the federal government toward the problems of the Great Depression. The Federal Emergency Relief Administration was created under the Emergency Relief Act of May 1933. Five hundred million dollars in relief funds were allocated to and administered by the states.⁴ Initially a large

portion of the funds was used for direct relief, and then the concept of work relief began to be increasingly emphasized. The efforts of the federal government to provide jobs for the unemployed through work relief resulted in the establishment of the Civil Works Administration (CWA) by an Executive Order of the President on 9 November 1933.⁵ CWA projects emphasized work that would provide immediate employment for the jobless. During the winter of 1933-34, CWA workers repaired and constructed highways, parks, and public buildings. Approximately \$19.5 million was spent for school construction.⁶

When the CWA was terminated in March of 1934, its functions were absorbed into the FERA, which also expanded its work relief program.⁷ Public colleges and universities as well as elementary and secondary schools had benefited from the CWA and FERA projects. The success of the CWA and FERA programs led to further innovations in federal work relief. The scope of the construction programs affecting college campuses was enlarged considerably by the Public Works Administration (PWA), which was established in the summer of 1933 with purposes different from those of the FERA and the CWA.⁸ In addition to providing immediate employment, the PWA was designed to stimulate heavy industry and create public works of permanent value. Public colleges and universities were eligible for PWA funds. Those institutions of higher education that were eligible to receive PWA funds profited in large measure from the numerous projects that were undertaken. PWA projects were larger in scale than CWA projects and required lengthier planning. In March of 1939, the PWA reported that six hundred and sixty-two building projects were constructed on college campuses using PWA funds.⁹ Projects at colleges and universities included libraries, classroom buildings, laboratories, residence halls and many other additions to physical buildings. At SINU, PWA funds made possible the construction of a six-thousand capacity football stadium and renovations to the library, auditorium, and science buildings. As a general rule, the schools supplied the materials for projects and the government paid the workers. This enabled SINU to construct

a stadium worth seventy-seven thousand dollars for an expenditure of only a few thousand dollars from school funds.¹⁰

The work relief projects of the CWA and later the PWA provided college campuses with valuable buildings; however, these programs were under direct control of the federal government. There was one relief measure for which colleges and universities assumed primary administrative responsibility – college student aid. On 15 August 1933, several months before the inauguration of the college student aid program of the FERA, *The New York Times* reported that President Roosevelt was considering financial assistance for college students. The same article indicated that Robert M. Hutchins, President of the University of Chicago, was sponsoring a campaign for college student aid “in the interest of taking youths out of competition with married men for jobs.”¹¹ A pilot project for college student aid was established at the University of Minnesota through a special allotment from the FERA. The federal student aid program, which was endorsed by the United States Office of Education, operated exclusively in Minnesota during December of 1933 and January of 1934. In January of 1934, approximately one thousand college and university students in Minnesota were employed on work projects and earned an average wage of fifteen dollars each month.¹²

The experimental project in Minnesota was successful. On 2 February 1934, the FERA announced the establishment of a nationwide program of part-time employment for college students.¹³ The regulations issued to guide the colleges and universities through the initial phases of the program were limited. Employment was to be made available until the end of the 1933-34 school year, except for the summer session. All non-profit making institutions of a collegiate or university character were eligible. Institutions that were exempt from state or local property taxes were classified as non-profit making. An institution was considered to be of collegiate or university character if it admitted only students who had earned high school diplomas or the equivalent. In a questionable case, the state department of education would evaluate the institution’s eligibility. The president of each institution that wished to

participate was required to submit an affidavit to the state emergency relief administration certifying the eligibility of the institution, listing its enrollment and agreeing to adhere to FERA regulations in the selection and supervision of students and work projects.

Every participating college and university was granted a monthly allotment of fifteen dollars for each student in its quota. The quota for each institution was ten percent of its full-time enrollment as of 15 October 1933. Full-time students were defined as those carrying at least three-fourths of the normal course load. Students were to be selected on the basis of need, character, and ability to do college work. No student was to be granted assistance unless his/her financial status was such "as to make impossible his attendance at college without this aid." At least one-fourth of each institution's funds were to be used for students who were not regularly enrolled in college during January of 1934. Jobs were to be proportionately allocated between men and women according to the enrollment of each sex in the institutions. Hourly rates of pay were to be those commonly paid by the institution for the type of service rendered, but not less than thirty cents an hour. Each student was limited to thirty hours of work per week and eight hours per day. The institutions were required to waive all registration, tuition, and laboratory fees for students working on FERA projects.¹⁴

The reactions of colleges and universities to the new FERA program were overwhelmingly favorable. Nonetheless, two of the regulations posed immediate problems for some institutions. Many institutions argued it would be impossible to adhere to the requirement that at least twenty-five per cent of the college aid funds be paid to students who were not regularly enrolled in college in January of 1934, since the program began in the winter and new students could not enroll until the following semester. However, that regulation remained. Administrators also brought to the FERA's attention the economic wisdom and legality of waiving registration, laboratory, and tuition fees. The FERA agreed and rescinded the requirement of waivers.¹⁵

President Shryock was quick to submit an affidavit to the emergency relief administration and was rewarded on 1 March 1934 when the FERA authorized the employment of one hundred forty-nine SINU students. Students were to be paid on average a wage not to exceed fifteen dollars per month, and employed in jobs described as clerical, library and research assistants, work on buildings, grounds, and dormitories.¹⁶ At the conclusion of the 1933-34 school year, the popularity of the student aid program was obvious. There was widespread hope that the program would be extended.

The FERA announced in July of 1934 that the student aid program would be continued, and they outlined the conditions under which it would operate. The instructions were similar to those issued by the FERA in February. There were some significant changes, however. The earlier instructions specified that, in questionable cases, the state departments would determine whether or not institutions were eligible. The new instructions added the proviso that the FERA might review those decisions.¹⁷ The requirement that participating students earn at least ten dollars per month was eliminated, as was the stipulation that the number of students employed monthly could not exceed the quota at any institutions. The monthly fund allotments, however, would continue to be based on fifteen dollars for each student in the quota. Student quotas were increased from ten to twelve percent of each institution's enrollment as of 15 October 1933. The portion of the funds that each institution was required to pay to students who were not regularly enrolled in college in January of 1934 was raised from twenty-five to fifty percent. Finally, while the February instructions had stipulated that the colleges and universities would be the final judge of the acceptability of work projects, the new regulations stated that the institutions would pass on the decision of acceptable work projects to the FERA.¹⁸ Perhaps most important, the new FERA regulations reemphasized the basic purpose of the college student aid program. The federal funds were to be used to assist students rather than institutions. The intent of the program was to increase the number of students going to college, not to enable the

institutions to use their existing student aid funds for other purposes.

The process of selecting students was a difficult one for many institutions. Far more students applied for the aid program than the institutional allotments allowed. Selection committees were established and many weeks were needed for these committees to examine the applications. The responsibility for student certification and work assignments on the SINU campus rested with the Student Employment Committee. The Committee chairman in 1934-35 was athletics coach William McAndrew. In a statement made to the Normal School Board on 7 October 1935, McAndrew summed up the selection process: "Under the FERA we were allowed 169 federal student aid positions at an average of \$15.00 a month. 592 applications were on file in our office by September 1. In order to select the students for these positions, it was necessary for us to take into consideration the need, character, scholarship, and general ability of the applicant."¹⁹ In a personal interview with one such applicant, Mr. Thomas North, who attended the university from 1934-38 and was co-captain of football team, he revealed the importance of his student aid job as a laboratory assistant stating, "It was very doubtful I would have been able to attend the university without this assistance."²⁰

During the 1934-35 school year, the college student aid program operated in all forty-eight states and in Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico.²¹ During that year a total of \$11,559,486 was distributed to students under the aid programs. The chart on the following page shows the earnings of FERA college students and the number employed, 1934-35.²²

At the conclusion of the 1934-35 school year, the continuing financial need of college students was evident. The President announced the creation of the NYA on 26 June 1935 under the authority of the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935, and the formal transfer of the student aid program from the FERA to the NYA was accomplished through Executive Order No. 7164 on 29 August 1935.²³

<u>Month</u>	<u>Number Employed</u>			<u>Earnings</u>
	<u>Total</u>	<u>Men</u>	<u>Women</u>	
September	68,943	41,784	27,159	\$547,098
October	96,375	60,749	35,626	1,267,592
November	99,734	62,692	37,042	1,340,194
December	100,095	62,814	37,281	1,267,732
January	102,296	64,157	38,139	1,345,567
February	103,254	64,535	38,719	1,346,573
March	104,740	65,251	39,489	1,378,264
April	104,445	65,160	39,285	1,384,995
May	100,013	61,809	38,204	1,297,419
June	52,191	32,579	19,612	<u>384,052</u>
TOTAL				\$11,559,486

The transfer of the college student aid program from the FERA to the NYA entailed few changes in the organizational structure that had been set up in the colleges and universities to administer the FERA program. The student aid program of the FERA had been restricted to college students. Under the NYA, President Roosevelt stipulated that aid would be granted to high school, college, and graduate students "in exchange for part-time work upon useful projects."²⁴ Payments to high school students could not exceed six dollars per month. Graduate students could earn a maximum of forty dollars per month while undergraduate students were limited to twenty dollars. Average monthly payments to graduate students and undergraduate students were to be thirty and fifteen dollars respectively.²⁵

The NYA issued its first regulations concerning institutional eligibility for participation in the college student program on 15 August 1935.²⁶ The regulations were similar to those that had been formulated by the FERA. A major administrative problem for the participating institutions continued to be the selection of students. Many participating institutions favored greater flexibility in the NYA's definition of need. On 10 August 1936, the NYA modified the student selection regulations. Students could qualify if "in need of such assistance in order to enter or remain in school properly." The insertion of

“properly” broadened the original definition of financial need.²⁷ In addition, the earlier regulation relating to academic ability was expanded. Originally the regulation specified that students receiving NYA aid should “possess such ability as to give assurance that they will do high grade work in college.” The new regulation added the proviso that NYA students “must continue to do good scholastic work while receiving aid.”²⁸ There were no other major changes in the institutional eligibility requirements during the remainder of the 1930s. NYA was transferred from relief authority to the Federal Security Agency on 1 July 1939.²⁹ The NYA operated for three years under the Federal Security Agency. On 17 September 1942, the NYA was transferred to the War Manpower Commission, and at the end of 1943, the NYA was dissolved.³⁰

Financial assistance to needy college students was inadequate even before the depression. The problem was compounded by the economic collapse of 1929. Tentative efforts toward a solution took the form of an experimental student aid program in Minnesota during December of 1933 and January of 1934. On 2 February 1934, the FERA expanded college student aid to include all non-profit making institutions of higher education. In the summer of 1935, the program was transferred from the FERA to the NYA. During its early stages, the college student aid program was regarded primarily as a relief measure. In July of 1934, the FERA reminded the participating institutions of the basic purpose of the program. The assistance was intended to make it possible for more students to attend college through part-time work relief on socially desirable projects, and colleges and universities were not to regard the program as simply a means by which institutional funds normally used for student aid could be diverted to other areas. Students such as Tom North can testify to the success of this assistance.

By the end of the depression, the college student aid program had developed from a relief measure into a means of improving the educational opportunities of the nation’s youth. Along with a realization of the importance of higher education to the security and effective development of the nation came a

growing awareness of the needs of disadvantaged youth. During a time of insufficient funds in the United States, the development of the student aid program was tax dollars well spent.

Notes

- 1 Palmer O. Johnson and Oswald L. Harvey, *The Natinal Youth Administration* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1938), 5.
- 2 *Proceedings of the Board of Trustees of the Illinois Teachers College Board*, 12 December 1931, University Archives, Special Collections, Morris Library, Southern Illinois University Carbondale (SIUC).
- 3 Henry Shryock, *Correspondence of the President*, 9 February 1933: University Archives, Special Collections, SIUC.
- 4 U.S. Works Projects Administration, *Final Statistical Reports of the Federal Emergency Relief Administration* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1942), 7.
- 5 *Ibid.*, 8.
- 6 Charles A. Quattlebaum, *Federal Aid to School Construction* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1954), 14.
- 7 U.S. Federal Emergency Relief Administration, Work Division, *The Emergency Work Relief Program of the FERA* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1935), 32.
- 8 U.S. Works Projects Administration, 7.
- 9 Quattlebaum, *Federal Aid*, 42.
- 10 *Proceedings*, 25 October 1937.
- 11 "Crisis in Higher Education," *The New York Times*, 15 August 1933.
- 12 Dorothy G. Johnson and Malcolm M. Willey, "Backgrounds of College NYA Students," *School and Society*, vol. 50, No. 1286 (19 August 1939), 252.
- 13 U.S. Works Projects Administration, 16.
- 14 *Ibid.*, 17-9.
- 15 *Ibid.*, 21.
- 16 *Proceedings*, 15 May 1934.
- 17 U.S. Works Projects Administration, 29.
- 18 *Ibid.*, 31.
- 19 *Proceedings*, 7 October 1934.
- 20 Thomas North, Interviewed by Dustin Brown, 17 October 2003.

- 21 U.S. Works Projects Administration, 66.
- 22 Ibid., 65.
- 23 Betty and Earnest K. Lindley, *A New Deal for Youth: The Story of the National Youth Administration* (New York: The Viking Press, 1938), 13.
- 24 Quoted in Betty and Ernest K. Lindley, *A New Deal for Youth: The Story of the NYA* (New York: The Viking Press, 1938), 15.
- 25 Ibid., 15.
- 26 Johnson and Harvey, *National Youth*, 33.
- 27 Lindley, *New Deal for Youth*, 17.
- 28 Johnson and Harvey, 48.
- 29 U.S. Federal Security Agency, War Manpower Commission, *Final Report of the National Youth Administration: Fiscal Years 1936-1943* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1944), 43.
- 30 Ibid., 49.

Joshua William Gaeth

Lord Protector, or Usurper and Tyrant? Contemporary Views on the Legitimacy of the Cromwellian Protectorate

On 30 January 1661, Oliver Cromwell was exhumed and hanged at Tyburn, then drawn and quartered, a fitting end for a traitor, and yet his name still graces many of the streets throughout England and his statue stands in front of Parliament. How could the person who evoked such strong feelings of hatred even after his own death for what Charles II and others saw as a horrible murder become such an important and iconic figure to the English people that they would do him the great honor of naming streets after him in the present? This is the great problem of Oliver Cromwell in British history. Was he the hero of the Civil Wars of the 1640s who won victory on the battlefield and brought peace and stability to the government? Was he a traitor to his own cause who turned on the republican ideals of the Parliament at the end of those Wars, and then used his military might to impose a dictatorship upon the people? Was he a traitor to the crown who waged war against true government and then murdered the king, all so he could usurp the royal authority for himself? These questions divided the English people during his rule, and after his death on 3 September 1658.

The key issue upon which Oliver Cromwell's legacy rests is whether or not he had the right to take the actions he took in acquiring the power to govern England under the title of Lord Protector. During his personal rule his enemies, at home and abroad, assaulted him for his illegitimacy, and he faced two major plots against his rule, both of which he put down. After his death and the failure of the second protector, Richard Cromwell, both Oliver's supporters and his opponents began not only seeking power for themselves, but also launching a conscious effort to

shape the way in which posterity would see the Lord Protector and his government. Books and pamphlets were written by both sides to attempt either to justify and legitimize his rule, or to cast him as a tyrant and usurper. The three major groups that constitute this debate are Cromwell's supporters, the royalists and the republicans. Both the royalists and the republicans demonized Cromwell and attempted to destroy his reputation with posterity, just as the new King Charles II tore apart Cromwell's corpse. Meanwhile, his supporters attempted to justify and explain the legitimacy of his actions as lawful and to counter the claims of his opponents.

Much has been written about the Protectorate and Oliver Cromwell, and many of these writers add their own opinion of the man and his government. Yet in all these writings not many of these historians have examined the writings about Cromwell immediately after his death and the fall of his government. Those historians that do touch on this topic fail to examine it in its entirety. Robert Paul in *The Lord Protector* briefly mentioned the prejudice against the Protectorate that ensued in England during the restoration, acknowledging the hypocrisies in his government brought up by the royalists, but he failed to examine many of the other writings from this period, specifically those of Cromwell's supporters.¹ Roger Howell also indicted the royalists for quickly skewing history's view of the Protectorate, adding that the radical left had its own role in casting Cromwell as an ambitious hypocrite.² Although some historians have dealt with Cromwell's detractors, none seem to be interested in his supporters, and only Christopher Hill recognized the importance of Edward Sexby's pamphlet in inciting the revolt of 1657.³ This paper seeks to fill this hole in these histories of the Lord Protector and his government by examining writings that both support and attack Cromwell's government, taking into consideration the time they were published and the authors' identities to gain a better perspective on the turmoil in England after the fall of the Protectorate. In attaining a better understanding of the debate about the legitimacy of Cromwell's government, we can better understand how the British people made sense of the upheaval

they had gone through in the years of Civil War and military government.

The earliest writings attacking the Protectorate were published during its own time, taking the form of anonymous pamphlets speaking out against the evils of this new government that had replaced the Rump Parliament. One of the earliest such pamphlets to be produced was printed in London during the revolt of 1655. This pamphlet was written by a former officer of the Parliamentary army who now felt disenchanted by his old commander's seeming disregard for the cause and principles he fought for.⁴ In his writings against Cromwell's newly installed Protectorate, he focused on the evils of Cromwell's destruction of the old government, claiming that he dismissed the Parliament because "they agreed not to gratifie him in his lust."⁵ He felt that Cromwell had removed Parliament because it stood as a barrier to his policies, as well as his own personal powers. This pamphlet goes on to claim that Cromwell retained such a great support of the people, not because his was a good and just government, but because men would rather condemn themselves than to suspect Oliver Cromwell, who had won such great victories for them during the Civil War.⁶ This author wrote out against Cromwell because he felt that the new government trampled on the rights that he and the other members of the army and country had fought for during the Civil Wars.

A second pamphlet written during the years of the Protectorate also had for its author a former officer of the Parliamentary Army. The author, Edward Sexby, was an officer in Cromwell's regiment of horse during the early phases of the Civil war, rose through the ranks and raised a regiment of foot soldiers for service in Ireland. He rebelled against the government in 1655 and fled to Holland where he published the pamphlet in 1657.⁷ Writing under a pseudonym to protect himself from the regime he hated, he wrote about most of the same concerns raised in the *Hypocrisie Discovered* in 1655, namely the fact that Cromwell had taken hold of the reins of government without the consent of either the people or their organs of government. Accusing Cromwell of dissolving the

representatives of the people by force, he deplored the title of Lord Protector as a title of force and fraud.⁸ He asked his readers to identify how they turned over their power to Cromwell, who their representatives were, where they met, and, “to whom deputed we our Authority?”⁹ Sexby implored the people to act against this tyrannical government established by Oliver Cromwell because it had no justification through the representatives of the people. He felt that the Civil Wars had been fought to right the wrongs of monarchy and to ensure the people a voice in government. In his view, Cromwell stepped in and destroyed those lofty ideals.

In both of these pamphlets, there is an emphasis on the unlawful dissolution of the Rump Parliament that had existed throughout the entire Civil War and into the conquest of Scotland and Ireland. Both of these writings attack Cromwell for overthrowing the people’s representatives, and both share similar rhetoric in claiming that Cromwell was a thief who stole power away from the people.¹⁰ It is even possible that Edward Sexby had a hand in writing both of these documents, although there is no conclusive proof of this. Both of these represent the republicans’ view of the Protectorate. They speak highly of the representation in Parliament. In each of these two cases the writer felt strongly enough about his cause to risk the wrath of a government not willing to tolerate such dissenting views. Edward Sexby experienced this wrath for his pamphlet when he died in the tower in 1658 after being captured while distributing it in England.¹¹

The death of Oliver Cromwell sparked the publication of many works about the life of the late Lord Protector. His supporters now strove to justify his actions of the past years, while returning royalists and other groups of the anti-Cromwell party attempted to destroy the validity of his government to better re-establish the king in the minds of the people of England. The biographies of Cromwell by his supporters tend to focus on the justifications for his actions in dealing with the various Parliaments during his rule, and sought to preserve for posterity the righteousness of his actions. His opponents, now with

renewed royalist influence due to the reinstatement of the King, questioned not only his dealings with Parliament, but also tended to paint Cromwell as a devil that unlawfully killed their beloved King to usurp his power.

Historians who sought to write biographies of Oliver Cromwell that helped to legitimize his government during the Protectorate had several major points to deal with. First, they had to address the question raised by those former parliamentarians who questioned his right to dismiss the Rump parliament in 1653. This was the key point of protest of many supporters of Parliament during the war, as well as of royalists who pointed out the hypocrisy of the revolution that ended in the tyranny of the Protectorate. When Oliver Cromwell walked into that meeting and dispersed the people's representatives who had sat for so many years, he moved into a shady realm of political rights. Under whose authority did Cromwell act? In whose interests did he act? Two authors who tried to address this issue were Samuel Carrington writing in 1659 and Henry Fletcher writing in 1660.

Samuel Carrington published his history of the life of Oliver Cromwell in 1659 and attempted to address this issue on the basis that Oliver Cromwell had the strength to dissolve the Parliament and, therefore, the duty to dissolve it for the good of the English people. He admitted, as well, that the power of government was transferred "by the points of their swords," but added that it was transferred to those who better deserved it.¹² Although Carrington admitted that the only power Cromwell was endowed with was that of the sword, he continued to argue that Cromwell turned that sword upon those very people who entrusted him with it. However, he argued that this was done not for his own personal gain. Rather, Cromwell did it for the good of the institution of Parliament and the country as a whole. Carrington went on and added that "being unwilling to deprive England of her ancient liberties and privileges [Oliver Cromwell] resolved...to assemble a Parliament."¹³ Carrington tried to argue that even though he took an unprecedented step in the dissolution of Parliament, this was a necessary step for the good of the people of England. Furthermore, in taking this step, he sought to pass

the power to a new set of better individuals that would be able to continue the government of England. He made it evident that although Cromwell interfered in the government, he did not want a role in it at that time.

Henry Fletcher also justified Cromwell's action in the dissolution of the Rump Parliament as an act necessary for the people's government to continue to represent the people, and to prevent it from becoming a tyrannical institution. Fletcher wrote about this long sitting Parliament "that as standing water would breed corruption and grow offensive if it were not sometimes changed: So Parliaments perpetual were offensive to the peoples priviledges."¹⁴ Fletcher felt that Cromwell was justified in dissolving the Parliament because it would not dissolve itself, and call new representatives. Fletcher claimed that Cromwell saw that it was his duty to force this Parliament to dissolve and call new representatives. He attempted to draw the picture of a man who had crusaded against a tyrannical King, and then also against a Parliament that he saw beginning to take on those same traits. So Cromwell stepped in and righted the ship, because he was the only person in the nation with the strength to do so. Fletcher also explained how the dissolution was not enough to ensure a good government and that the new Parliament to be called should be made up "of known persons, and of approved integrity" whom Cromwell approved of.¹⁵ This was necessary to ensure the effectiveness of the new government and to prevent the radicals from taking hold of the government and abusing the people. During this time Cromwell also took on sole control of the government of England, because of the imminent danger that the war with the Dutch presented. But he had no intention of remaining in the government after the convening of the new Parliament.¹⁶ Again, one of Cromwell's biographers looked to cast Cromwell as the good leader who acted in the interest of the country as a whole, and although he might have overstepped his powers as a general in the army to dissolve the Parliament, he did it because it was necessary. Cromwell acted for the good of the country; he alone had the might to do what had to be done, and so took responsibility to take that action for the country.

The other major problem that the historians who sought to uplift Cromwell and his government had to address was the question of where the Protectorate itself gained its legitimacy. Although created when the packed Parliament summoned by Cromwell decided to dissolve itself and deliver up its powers into the hands of one man, Oliver Cromwell, it still seemed to lack the legitimacy necessary to win over many former parliamentarians. Cromwell was conscious of this fact, as in both of the Parliaments he called during the Protectorate he was forced to press an Oath of "a person and parliament," upon his Parliament to stop the debate over the legitimacy of the government, and their own sitting in Parliament.¹⁷ Carrington felt that these members of Parliament who were dismissed, for not taking the oath, were an "evil" who spread into the countryside, inspiring conspiracies resulting in the revolts of 1655.¹⁸ Both of these writers felt that the members of Parliament who were kicked out by Cromwell were of the lowest sorts and had to be removed for the government to run.

These authors both seem to agree on the importance of Cromwell's government to England. Carrington wrote that Cromwell "protected [England] from ripping up its entrails and bowels by its own hands."¹⁹ This quote effectively sums up the position of Cromwell's supporters in justifying his rule after his death. They felt that, although Cromwell had several times stepped beyond the bounds of the power that his positions conferred upon him, it was a necessity for the good of England. When he dissolved the Rump Parliament and installed military rule in the countryside under the Major Generals, it was all for the good of England, in that it kept the country together. For these actions Oliver Cromwell was justified in creating and running the Protectorate.

Where the supporters of Cromwell saw a man being forced into the government by the necessities of the situation, his opponents, by this time almost all men who expressed royalist tendencies, saw a man driven by a lust for power who sought the supreme authority of the nation for himself. This opinion is typified in a cartoon opening the work of the Reverend John

Gauden, future chaplain to Charles II. In this cartoon Cromwell is lifting the crown off of the dead king's head saying, "Lets kill and take possession," while in the background a helpless Englishman decries this act as "a horrible murder."²⁰ This was the basis of the royalist opinion of the Protectorate. The royalists saw it as the end result of one man's drive for personal power and glory, and in their examinations of the history of the Protectorate, they repeatedly saw Cromwell making decisions that would ensure his advancement to the supreme authority in the kingdom.

One of these royalists was the esteemed political philosopher Thomas Hobbes. While in exile in Holland during the Civil Wars, Hobbes sought to examine the wars and determine the causes of the various events that occurred from 1640-1650, writing of these causes in his book *Behemoth*. In his examination of Cromwell's actions in creating the Protectorate, one does not come away with the same feeling, as after reading the accounts written by Cromwell's supporters. Instead, Hobbes made the argument that there was something far more sinister in Cromwell's actions. Hobbes, like Gauden, saw a man bent on becoming the ruler of England. In describing the dissolution of the Rump Parliament, Hobbes wrote that Cromwell was within one step of realizing his goals, a step, "on the neck of this Long Parliament."²¹ This presents a very different image from the one of Cromwell disposing of the Rump Parliament for the public good. In discussing the situation after the dissolution of Parliament, Hobbes wrote that although no one had the right to govern, Oliver Cromwell was the only one with the strength to govern, so the power fell into his hands.²² Hobbes also drew a parallel between the problems Cromwell had with his Parliaments, and those King Charles I had with his. Hobbes found that the cause of Cromwell's establishment of the Major Generals was a direct result of his inability to get taxes passed in Parliament.²³ Hobbes saw in the figure of Cromwell a tyrant who had fought against the lawful ruler, the King, and who sought to take power for himself. Like Gauden, Hobbes felt that from the beginning, Cromwell's involvement in the government was simply an effort to install himself in the seat of power.

Abraham Cowley, a royalist in exile in France who returned with the new King, also saw the seeds of Cromwell's advancement in his dissolution of the Rump Parliament. Cowley, like Hobbes, felt that the dissolution of that Parliament was the key to Cromwell's advancement into the supreme authority. Cowley compared this act to Nero's burning of Rome, although unlike Nero, who wished to rebuild a better Rome, Cowley saw Cromwell's motivation as being, "to better loot in the flames."²⁴ This analogy illustrates Cowley's idea that Cromwell destroyed the government, only to be the one to rebuild it to prevent anarchy.²⁵ Cowley cited this rebuilding of the state as well as the military conquest as the only justifications for Cromwell's government, and he claimed, "It is upon these principles that all great crimes of the world have been committed."²⁶ Cowley saw the danger that Cromwell's government posed to the country, and that danger was the substitution of stability for liberty. This opinion was shared by another Royalist, James Heath, who looked at the Protectorate's role in handling the revolts of 1655. Heath found that the first conspiracy was not some great uprising against the government, but rather a "horrible practice of machiavellian policy" used by Cromwell to eliminate his political opposition.²⁷ Both of these writers viewed Cromwell's policies as merely political moves to take and secure his position of power in England.

The royalists writing after the death of Cromwell often went well beyond Gauden's condemnation of Cromwell as a Usurper and a Murderer. Many of these authors also examined the policies of the Protectorate, and examined how these policies abused the power of the government, and abused the trust of the people. They attempted to discredit Cromwell's government, not only through his murder of the rightful King, but also through his betrayal of the revolution for which he initially fought.

From the moment Cromwell stepped into the House of Commons with the intent to force it to disperse to call new representatives in 1653, he pursued a path that would result in controversy. He dissolved the last bit of legitimate government following a gruesome Civil War. At the same time, he restored

order to the government and peace to the country. In evaluating Cromwell and his government, the writers discussed above tried to further their own ends. His supporters attempted to justify his actions, republicans sought to denounce his actions as contrary to their revolution, and the royalists sought to denounce the grounds on which his government stood, while affirming their right to reinstall the monarchy in England. It is important to understand these different opinions of Cromwell, as they give insight into the problems faced in revolutions throughout the world. The great problem of many revolutions is that they often succeed without the instruments necessary to run the country. This often results in the elevation of military and political leaders like Cromwell, who rise to power and install a dictatorship loosely based on the ideals of the revolution. In the end, these men, like Cromwell, are neither entirely tyrants and usurpers, nor righteous leaders seeking to save the country, but rather something in between.

Notes

- 1 Robert S. Paul, *The Lord Protector: Religion and Politics in the Life of Oliver Cromwell* (London: Lutterworth Press, 1955), 391-2.
- 2 Roger Howell, *Cromwell* (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1977), 249-50.
- 3 Christopher Hill, *God's Englishman: Oliver Cromwell and the English Revolution* (New York: The Dial Press, 1970.), 153.
- 4 *Hypocrisy Discovered*, (London: 1655), 7.
- 5 *Ibid.*, 5.
- 6 *Ibid.*, 12.
- 7 *The Dictionary of National Biography*, ed. Sir Leslie Stephan and Sir Sidney Lee (London: Oxford University Press, 1967), 17:1230.
- 8 Edward Sexby, *Killing No Murder* (London: 1689), 5.
- 9 *Ibid.*, 4-5.
- 10 *Ibid.*, 12.
- 11 *The Dictionary of National Biography*, 17:1230.
- 12 Samuel Carrington, *The History of the Life and Death of His Most Serene Highness Oliver Late Lord Protector* (London: Nathaniel Brook, 1659), 140.

- 13 Ibid., 149.
- 14 Henry Fletcher, *The Perfect Politician* (London: F. Cottrel, 1660), 219.
- 15 Ibid., 225.
- 16 Ibid., 227.
- 17 Ibid., 272-3.
- 18 Carrington, *The History of the Life and Death*, 177.
- 19 Ibid., 167.
- 20 John Gauden, *Cromwell's Bloody Slaughter House* (London: James Davis, 1660), 1.
- 21 Thomas Hobbes, *Behemoth: The History of the Causes of the Civil Wars of England*, ed. William Molesworth (New York: Burt Franklin, 1962), 226.
- 22 Ibid., 227.
- 23 Ibid., 234.
- 24 Abraham Cowley, *A Vision Concerning His Late Pretended Highness Cromwell* (London: Henry Herrington, 1661), 39-40.
- 25 Ibid., 38-9.
- 26 Ibid., 30-2.
- 27 James Heath, *Flagellum: Or the Life and Death of O. Cromwell the Late Usurper* (London: L.R., 1663), 161.

Amber Jeralds

Pathway to the Stars: The Pioneer Women of NASA

On 18 June 1983 Sally Ride exited Earth's atmosphere and became the first American woman in space. Her journey began almost twenty years after the first woman entered space. In the middle of the sixties and at the height of the Cold War, the Soviet space-program beat the Americans once again by sending twenty-six year-old Valentina Tereshkova into space. The United States, on the other hand, did not allow women into their space program, and it would be another twenty years before an American woman would see the stars. Why did it take so long for American women to be allowed to answer the call to space? While Tereshkova entered the history books, there were thirteen American women waiting for that call. They had fought their way through government channels, passed every test the men had passed, survived criticism and heartache, but in the end were denied entrance into the National Aeronautics and Space Agency (NASA). Those eager to join NASA were denied the chance to make history because they were women and traditional concepts of gender excluded women's participation as astronauts.

In October of 1957, the Soviet Union launched the satellite Sputnik and started the Space Race between the United States and the Soviet Union. As Americans walked out onto their porches and looked into the sky at night, they could see the tiny object that dominated the night sky and the minds of many politicians.¹ According to Gene Kranz, author and employee at NASA for over thirty years, the launching of the first satellite into space by the Soviets "gave Americans both an inferiority complex and a heightened sense of vulnerability in what was then the most intense phase of the Cold War."² The space race had begun and America was already far behind.

The government quickly moved toward launching its “man in space program.” In 1958, a Space Task Group was established to determine what types of people would be considered as astronauts.³ President Eisenhower personally decided that astronauts should only come from a select pool of military test pilots already equipped with the expertise the government felt was necessary to pilot a space capsule. Due to time constraints, they wanted to go with a group of men who already had the proper backgrounds, but in doing so they ignored many other qualified civilian pilots, some of whom were women.⁴ The task group also set other requirements for future astronauts. Test pilots had to be under the age of 39, below the height of five foot eleven inches, and they had to have at least fifteen hundred clocked flying hours. They had to have a knowledge of engineering, science, and aircrafts. Plus they had to be able to work well with others, make rapid decisions, and be disease free.⁵ With these requirements in mind, the hunt began for America’s first astronauts.

By April of 1959, the Mercury Astronauts (as they would be called) were chosen. Seven young pilots, representing the white, Protestant, middle class were chosen after passing a series of grueling physical tests at the government funded research clinic, the Lovelace Foundation in Albuquerque, New Mexico. The foundation had been formed by Randolph Lovelace II and Brigadier General Donald Flickinger.⁶ Lovelace, a member of the committee on human factors in space flight, headed the diagnostic clinic that ran the tests.⁷ Seven men, including John Glenn, Alan Shepard, and Gus Grissom, passed all of the Lovelace tests and entered the space program. America had its first astronauts.

While Americans celebrated their newfound heroes, Lovelace and Flickinger began to debate the idea of testing others for the space program. The capsule that would be flown into space was extremely small. It was only nine and a half feet high and seventy-four inches across. The total weight for the capsule to lift off had to be less than 2700 pounds. With the newly chosen astronauts weighing between 168 to 180 pounds plus the added weight of the heat shield, oxygen tanks, bulkheads, and radio,

electrical, and hydraulic systems, they were pushing their weight limit. Lovelace and Flickinger began considering finding smaller pilots for the capsule.⁸

Lovelace and Flickinger found their perfect pilot after a visit to Russia. While in the Soviet Union, both men realized that the Russians were testing women as pilots for the space program. Unlike in the United States, the Russians did not have gender bias in their space program. Soviet women were in many fields that were dominated by men in the United States. In fact, during this time period, one half of the doctors in Russia were women.⁹ Seeing the Russian women in action, Lovelace, in particular, realized that women were the perfect subjects to test for space flight. Military tests during World War II had shown that women were less prone to loneliness, cold, heat, and the pain of space travel.¹⁰ They also weighed less than their male counterparts, which would prove useful with such a strict weight limit.¹¹ Also, according to Haynsworth and Toomey, NASA "was in desperate need of a first" after losing every space advancement thus far and women seemed to be the perfect candidates.¹² Lovelace returned from his trip with a plan to test women as astronauts, and he began to search for his first test subject.

The problem with testing women, as Lovelace would soon realize, was that there were no previous test results to guide them. Although there had been some testing done during World War II, scientists were not completely satisfied with known data of how women's bodies would respond to space. Men had been the subject of scientific testing for nearly two decades and it would possibly take two more years to study women. There was a great ignorance when it came to knowledge of the female body. Many doctors still held onto old myths of the menstrual cycle and its effect on the brain. Doctors believed that the female cycle affected the brain in such a way that it made it hard for women to concentrate, which would not bode well for women striving to become astronauts. Air Force doctors knew nothing about women's bodies and they did not want to learn more about them for fear that the knowledge would prove women superior to men. They were content to hold on to old beliefs that women were only

80 percent as effective as men and that they needed to be protected from harsh conditions.¹³ There was no data that reflected women's true abilities. If women were going to have any chance at all of being astronauts, "scientific data that refuted prevailing social attitudes had to be acknowledged."¹⁴ Lovelace set out to obtain this scientific data.

Lovelace soon found his first candidate in pilot Jerrie Cobb. Jerrie Cobb was born 5 March 1931 near the town of Norman, Oklahoma and by the age of twelve she was already in an airplane. She learned to fly and received her pilots license by age seventeen. Forgoing college, she joined a woman's softball team, the Sooner Queens, and used her earnings to buy her first airplane. She worked her way through several jobs, first as an oil pipeline patroller and then as a flight instructor.¹⁵ She entered several races and by the time the Soviets launched Sputnik, she had beat three of the world flying records held by the Russians.¹⁶ Cobb had established herself as a world class pilot.

It was Jerrie Cobb that Lovelace had in mind when he traveled back from his Russian expedition. He asked Cobb to come and test under the same conditions that he had used in testing the Mercury astronauts. Cobb agreed and she was soon on her way to Albuquerque. When Cobb stepped through the doors of the Lovelace Foundation, she realized that women's future in the space program rested on her shoulders. If male candidates failed the tests, another replacement would be brought in, but if Cobb failed that would be the end for women.¹⁷ They would most likely never get another chance to test as astronauts. As Cobb readied herself for the next week of tests, she prepared herself for battle, yet as Ackman stated, "No battle was more formidable than the one she faced outside the Lovelace doors ... the battle against sexism."¹⁸ Cobb had to prove that women were just as capable as men to fly in space and she had to overcome the gender stereotypes that kept women from entering male-dominated fields like NASA. Cobb was up for the challenge.

Cobb was put through the same grueling tests that the original Mercury astronauts had endured just three years before. The examinations at the Lovelace Foundation were some of the

most extensive testing done at the time. The extensive process included seventeen tests on the eyes, one on motion sickness, one on speech, and one that required an electrode in the hand.¹⁹ One test called for the injection of water into a subject's ear to test to destroy their sense of balance and produce a state of vertigo.²⁰ In the electrode test, a needle was injected into the subject's hand and hooked up to a machine. When the button on the machine was pushed, the subject's hand would open and close into a fist at an inhumanly rapid pace. Like all tests at the Foundation, the subjects were never told why they were being tested or what the tests measured.²¹

Not only were the tests difficult and painful, they were also extremely humiliating. Subjects had to collect their own stool samples and give themselves daily enemas. One of the most humiliating was the lower gastro intestinal examination. During the test, barium was inserted into a test subject's bowels followed by a tube with a balloon on the end that inflated to hold the barium in place. After the test, the subject marched down two public floors full of people to the nearest bathroom with the tube and balloon still in place. One Mercury astronaut described the test as utter agony "to try to walk, with this explosive load sloshing about in your pelvic saddle."²² Yet, everyday, potential astronauts endured these tests with little complaint.

Jerrie Cobb passed all of these tests with flying colors. She left the Lovelace Foundation and headed to phase two of the testing at a veterans hospital in Oklahoma City. There she was tested by psychologists on her ability to endure the isolation of space. Astronauts were originally tested by being isolated in the middle of a dark room for seven days. Psychologists feared that this did not accurately portray the isolation of space, so they designed a new test that was in place by the time Cobb arrived in Oklahoma. Cobb was placed inside a tank of water at skin temperature in a room that was sound proof, vibration proof, and without lights. Most men that had been tested had been pulled out after a few hours, claiming they heard voices inside the silent room. Unlike the others, Cobb lasted nine hours before the doctors pulled her out. Only one candidate had remained in the

tank longer than Cobb.²³ From there, Cobb moved on to the U.S. Naval School of Aviation Medicine in Pensacola where she was tested in endurance. Test after test Cobb passed. Cobb knew that she had to do her absolute best because “she thought the doctors ... were looking for an excuse to fail her. She knew she had to get past all the tests without flinching.”²⁴ Cobb passed all her tests and Lovelace hoped that her passing would open an official testing ground for potential women astronauts. She was labeled as having “exceptional, if not unique, qualities and capabilities for serving on special missions in Astronautics.”²⁵ Although Cobb displayed great ability as a potential astronaut, NASA claimed that her testing was invalid. The testing had not been sanctioned by NASA; it had been a private project funded by Lovelace himself, therefore the testing was of no value to NASA.²⁶ Lovelace’s superiors denied Cobb access to the space program.

NASA did offer Jerrie Cobb a job as a consultant, which she graciously took. It is curious that Cobb was not considered qualified enough to be an astronaut, yet NASA felt she was qualified enough to be a consultant. There is very little evidence that shows why NASA decided to offer Cobb this position. It is known that at the time, there was much discussion in Washington regarding the participation of minorities in government programs. Racial issues in the South were becoming increasingly heated with the Freedom Rides and outbursts of violence. Vice President Johnson believed that minorities should be represented in NASA and Director of U.S. Information Agency Edward Murrow suggested to NASA administrator James Webb that he consider putting a minority male in space. Webb had not received any resumes from any minorities, but he had received plenty from women. A few months later, Webb offered the consultant job to Cobb. It is possible that Webb offered the job as a way of proving to Washington that NASA was on the path to allowing women and minorities into the program, although no direct evidence points to this conclusion.²⁷ Upon her hiring, NASA officials informed Cobb that more research had to be done before they would consider sending a woman into space. She made it her mission to gather data for sending women to space, educate

young people about space exploration, and lobby for women astronauts. Along with the help of Lovelace, Cobb began recruiting women for testing at the Lovelace Foundation and by the end of 1961, twenty-six women had been tested and thirteen had passed the first phase. Using her ties at NASA, Cobb set up testing to begin at Pensacola, but two days before the tests were to begin they were called off. NASA refused to authorize or pay for the tests, so the Navy called them off.²⁸ The testing came to a stand still.

Fed up with government policy, Jerrie Cobb petitioned Congress in 1962.²⁹ In July of that year, Cobb went before a House Subcommittee to determine the specific qualification for astronauts.³⁰ Cobb argued in front of an eleven member committee that women only sought to be judged by NASA without discrimination. She then went on to list the medical advantages that women held in space flight. Cobb believed that it was the requirements set up by NASA that barred women from even being considered for the space program. NASA required that all applicants be military test pilots and at that time, women were not allowed in that position, so they could not be astronauts.³¹ She ended her speech with the claim that the women were asking "for the opportunity to bring glory to our Nation by an American woman becoming the first in all the world to make a space flight."³² The Committee also heard from Jane Hart, another of Lovelace's test subjects, and Jackie Cochran, a former member of the Womens Airforce Service Pilots (WASP). Cochran dealt a blow to the women when she expressed her belief that women would prove just as capable as men in space flight, but more testing still needed to be conducted. This shocked Cobb and Hart, who believed that such testing would take several more years.³³ The next day, the committee heard from Mercury astronauts John Glenn and Scott Carpenter. Glenn joked about women being more capable than men and on the idea of accepting women as astronauts. His comments often filled the room with laughter.³⁴ Glenn claimed that any possible discrimination was "a fact of our social order."³⁵ Glenn's comments set back the program of the Mercury women and his words rang true in the hearts of many

Americans.

John Glenn's statement about the social order of America reflected many Americans' beliefs about women at the time. Women, during the time, were expected to maintain a certain quality of womanhood in the public eye. As a pilot Jerrie Cobb had to make sure that she maintained some sort of feminine quality even when she was trying to break a world record. When Cobb tried to break the highest altitude record, she had to wear a dress and high heels under her flight suit even though the temperature she would endure would be below freezing. Because she was in the media spotlight, she had to be lady-like in her appearances before the public.³⁶ When the Mercury astronauts were displayed to the public, they were pictured with their wives. The interviews and pictures portrayed an image "that women always watched, waited, helped, and learned from men," but did not actively participate.³⁷ Even as the women began their tests at Lovelace, they did not receive a warm reception from the American public. They actually received hate mail from many people condemning them for wanting to be astronauts. Letter writers criticized them for leaving their homes and their duties as wives and mothers, but in reality the women were no different than the male astronauts. Most of the Mercury astronauts left behind families to go into space, but they were never criticized. It was only the women who were condemned for abandoning their traditional roles.³⁸ Critics argued that a woman's place was at home and this idea echoed throughout America and in the words of John Glenn.

Glenn's statements were damaging to the Mercury 13, but it was NASA's testimony that drove the nail into the coffin. Although Glenn dealt with the social aspects of astronaut qualifications, NASA was more practical about the matter. They tended to look at the financial aspect. Americans wanted to win the space race. In fact, Kennedy had offered NASA the funding to put a man on the moon before the Russians. Along with Congress, he had basically informed NASA to come up with the amount that it would take to accomplish this goal and the government would foot the bill.³⁹ Director of Spacecraft and

Flight Missions George Low believed that in order to train women for space flight, a separate program would have to be established. To allow for a new program, funds would have to be diverted which he stated "would slow down our national goal of landing a man on the moon before the end of this decade."⁴⁰ This was asking too much. The government could not afford to sacrifice the moon landing for women astronauts. The hearing ended with a general directive to look into a parallel training program, but that would be years down the road, as NASA had no plans for starting a parallel program.⁴¹ The women lost their plea to Congress and for many the fight was over.

With American women barred from the space program, a new woman entered the public eye. On 16 June 1963, Valentina Tereshkova made history by becoming the first woman in space. Her flight lasted seventy hours and thirty minutes.⁴² The daughter of a tractor driver, twenty-six-year-old Tereshkova began parachuting for fun and organized a parachuting club at the textile mill where she worked. She had no prior flight training, but she was extremely athletic, practicing rowing, skiing, and bicycling. Many of her male colleagues were envious of her physical abilities.⁴³ Unlike the United States, the Soviet Union claimed that they did not harbor the same gender prejudices that the United States held toward women. Since the Revolution of 1917, the Soviet Union had tried to provide equality of the sexes, with women holding a large percentage of the jobs. In 1961, fifty-three percent of all professionals in the Soviet Union were women. Seventy-four percent of all doctors were women and thirty-one percent of all engineers were women. The United States could not even compare to these numbers; there were only fourteen thousand female doctors in the US in the same year.⁴⁴ Unlike in the United States, when Nikita Khrushchev went looking for a woman astronaut his only stipulation was that she be a Communist and a worker. He wanted to show the world that Soviet "society [treated] all of its people as equal."⁴⁵ Tereshkova's success met with much celebration in Moscow. Women danced in the street while men kissed them.⁴⁶ Tereshkova's flight proved that women could be just as successful as men in space and it put

the Russians on top both in the Space Race and women's rights.

Tereshkova's flight hit the American people hard. Not only had they lost another stage of the space race to the Russians, but the flight had succeeded in embarrassing the American leaders who refused to allow women into NASA.⁴⁷ The men made every excuse for the Soviets reasoning for sending a woman into space. They claimed that the Soviets had used Tereshkova as a female guinea pig and any results from their tests would be useless. Lt. General Leighton Davis, a commander at Cape Canaveral, believed the flight was "merely a publicity stunt."⁴⁸ The flight itself and the success of the Russian society were merely propaganda. According to Clare Luce, many women, on the other hand, supported Tereshkova claiming "Hurrah for us gals" and "It beats doing the dishes."⁴⁹ Some women, though, still believed that a woman should not be sent up into space unless she had a man by her side.⁵⁰ Public opinion was torn.

Government reaction was divided over the Russian flight. NASA refused to comment on the flight and still held on to their claim that women would not be allowed into the space program anytime in the near future.⁵¹ Senators displayed varying opinions. Senator Ernest Gruening believed that the Soviet Union had showed its belief in equality when it launched what he described as "a 26-year-old girl" into space.⁵² Some officials believed that the time had come to allow women into the space program, but others were more reserved. Many believed that women would eventually be allowed into the program, but now was not necessarily the time. Chairman of the House George P. Miller was not surprised by the Russians beating the Americans in putting a woman in space, but he did not believe that the United States should focus on putting women in space.⁵³ The government was still nowhere near making any decisions on women astronauts.

As for the women of the Mercury 13, the Soviet success came as no surprise. Jerrie Cobb had been warning NASA for a year that the Russians were on the verge of sending a woman in space, but she was, as she described, "the most unconsulted consultant in any government agency."⁵⁴ Jerrie Cobb only hoped that the Russian exploit would help push the American

government into giving women their fair chance.⁵⁵ Many of the other Mercury 13 women also were not surprised by Tereshkova's flight and expressed regret that they could not have been among the first women in space.⁵⁶ For them, it was a great tragedy that a Soviet woman had beat them into space when they had tried so hard for years.

For many of the Mercury 13 women, Tereshkova's flight signaled the end of their battle with the government. Many went back to their daily lives and jobs and left the dreams of space behind. Cobb finished her career with NASA and in 1965 became a pilot for humanitarian aid in the Amazon.⁵⁷ It would be another twenty years before the first American woman entered the space program and another thirteen before a woman pilot would be allowed into NASA. For the Mercury 13, however, that dream never came. Though they passed every test and proved themselves capable of space flight, it was not enough. Everywhere they turned, they faced discrimination from NASA, the government, and their fellow citizens. They fought a bitter battle to win the approval of the American people, but in the end they could not overcome the long held prejudices that dominated American society. They were women and, according to social norms of the day, they had no business in space. Instead, they had to idly stand by as a Soviet woman stole their glory. Some of the women, however, continue to have hope that women will get their chance at becoming astronauts. Although the Mercury 13 women lost their battle, to this day they continue to wait for the chance to prove themselves capable of space flight.

Notes

- 1 Gene Kranz, *Failure is Not an Option: Mission Control from Mercury to Apollo 13 and Beyond* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 2000), 15.
- 2 *Ibid.*, 15.
- 3 Alcestis Oberg, *Spacefarers of the '80s and '90s* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1985), 18.

- 4 Martha Ackmann, **The Mercury 13** (New York: Random House, 2003), 9.
- 5 NASA, *Mercury Project Summary Including Results of the Fourth Manned Orbital Flight May 15 and 16, 1963* (Washington, D.C.: US Government Printing Office, 1964), 173.
- 6 Ackmann, *Mercury 13*, 10.
- 7 Tom Wolfe, *The Right Stuff* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1979), 88.
- 8 Leslie Haynsworth and David Toomey, *Amelia Earhart's Daughters* (New York: William Morrow and Company, 1998), 195-6.
- 9 Ackmann, *Mercury 13*, 36.
- 10 Haynsworth and Toomey, *Amelia Earhart*, 199.
- 11 Ackmann, *Mercury 13*, 11.
- 12 Haynsworth and Toomey, *Amelia Earhart*, 198.
- 13 Ackmann, *Mercury 13*, 38-47.
- 14 *Ibid.*, 38.
- 15 Rosanne Welch, *Encyclopedia of Women in Aviation and Space* (Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO, 1998), 41-2.
- 16 Ackmann, *Mercury 13*, 6-8.
- 17 *Ibid.*, 11-61.
- 18 *Ibid.*, 61-2.
- 19 *Ibid.*, 54-5.
- 20 Haynsworth and Toomey, *Amelia Earhart*, 221.
- 21 Wolfe, *Right Stuff*, 89-90.
- 22 *Ibid.*, 91-3.
- 23 Haynsworth and Toomey, *Amelia Earhart*, 205-7.
- 24 *Ibid.*, 221.
- 25 *Ibid.*, 207.
- 26 Ackmann, *Mercury 13*, 66.
- 27 Haynsworth and Toomey, *Amelia Earhart*, 230-1.
- 28 *Ibid.*, 230-40.
- 29 Welch, *Encyclopedia of Women*, 43.
- 30 Haynsworth and Toomey, *Amelia Earhart*, 260-1.
- 31 House Committee on Science and Astronautics, *Qualifications for Astronauts*, 87th Cong., 2d sess., 1962, 3-13.
- 32 House Committee on Science and Astronautics, *Qualifications*, 3-13.
- 33 Haynsworth and Toomey, *Amelia Earhart*, 269-270.
- 34 House Committee on Science and Astronautics, *Qualifications*, 24-60.
- 35 *Ibid.*, 67.

-
- 36 Ackmann, *Mercury* 13, 4.
 - 37 Ibid., 12.
 - 38 Haynsworth and Toomey, *Amelia Earhart*, 246-7.
 - 39 Ibid., 223-8.
 - 40 House Committee on Science and Astronautics, *Qualifications*, 62.
 - 41 Haynsworth and Toomey, *Amelia Earhart*, 277.
 - 42 NASA, *Astronautics and Aeronautics 1963: Chronology on Science, Technology, and Policy* (Washington, D.C.: US Government Printing Office, 1964), 244.
 - 43 "First Woman in Space," *The New York Times*, 17 June 1963, 24.
 - 44 Clare Boothe Luce, "A Blue-Eyes Blonde in Orbit," *Life*, 28 June 1963, 31.
 - 45 Haynsworth and Toomey, *Amelia Earhart*, 287.
 - 46 Luce, "Blue-Eyes Blonde," 31.
 - 47 Colin Burgess, *Teacher in Space: Christa McAuliffe and the Challenger Legacy* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2000), 47.
 - 48 Luce, "Blue-Eyes Blonde," 31.
 - 49 Ibid.
 - 50 Ibid.
 - 51 "U.S. Not Planning Orbit by Woman," *The New York Times*, 17 June 1963, 24.
 - 52 NASA, *Astronautics*, 256.
 - 53 Ibid., 245.
 - 54 Luce, "Blue-Eyes Blonde," 31.
 - 55 Ibid., 32.
 - 56 Haynsworth and Toomey, *Amelia Earhart*, 294.
 - 57 Ibid., 298-9.

Karen Mylan

An Alternative Oppression: John Humphrey Noyes and the Women of the Oneida Community

Women in nineteenth-century America had little control over their own lives. Single women were in the control of their fathers, and when they married, their husbands exerted a similar control over their lives. Women were expected to marry and have numerous children, while having little or no sexual desire. It was rare for a married woman to work outside the home, although some single women were trained for respectable occupations such as teaching. Middle-class women in particular had few career choices outside of the domestic sphere. Society expected these women to create a warm, loving, and peaceful atmosphere to which their husbands could escape after a competitive day at work. For their children, women were to provide a loving home and moral training. These women lived within a distinct world, which consisted of activities focusing on their husbands, children, and homes, but not themselves.¹

Scholars have shown that not all middle-class women were satisfied with living under these restrictions.² Some women sought ways to broaden their lives. They formed intimate and long lasting relationships with one another. They were active in reform movements such as the temperance and abolitionist movements. Involvement in voluntary religious and charitable organizations was a popular outlet for women. The importance of education for women increased, and women such as Catherine Beecher, Emma Willard, and Mary Lyon established “academies and seminaries for girls.”³ Women began to seek work outside the home to attain financial independence and for “the sake of self-expression.”⁴ There were also women in this century who had substantially different views toward marriage and sexuality.

One alternative lifestyle, which appears to have been liberating for women, was within the Oneida Community.

Women of the Oneida Community had opportunities and advantages beyond other women of the nineteenth century. Life for these women was considerably different from that of ordinary women. The Oneidans had different standards for women, especially regarding marriage and sex, and to some degree regarding acceptable occupations and childcare. Women held positions of power within this community. Ultimately, however, supreme power was in the hands of John Humphrey Noyes, and his followers were constantly subject to his whims and peculiarities. By taking a close look at the lives of some Oneida women, it appears that they were as oppressed as ordinary women, especially under the leadership of John Humphrey Noyes.

Much historical research has been done regarding both women's roles in the nineteenth century and the utopian societies of the era, including the Oneida Community.⁵ The majority of scholarship on the Oneida Community focuses on the leadership, doctrines, and breakup of the community. Little has been said about the role of Oneidan women, except to portray them as liberated compared to their counterparts in mainstream society. Lawrence Foster, who has done extensive research on the Oneida Community, has examined the duplicity of Noyes's treatment of women in his book, *Women, Family, and Utopia*.⁶ The aim of this paper is to better understand the role of Oneidan women and their relationship to the community's leader, John Humphrey Noyes. Such an understanding will reveal the oppressive nature of even the most seemingly liberating nineteenth-century communities, such as Oneida.

Because America underwent significant economic and social changes in the nineteenth century, tensions were formed that found relief in religious revivals. Out of these revivals a number of utopian societies were established. These utopian societies held a wide variety of views pertaining to nearly all aspects of life.⁷ One such society was the Oneida Community of Western New York. The origins of the Oneida Community lie in the Burned-Over District of Western New York. John Humphrey Noyes was the founder and leader of the Oneida Community. In

1831 Noyes attended a four-day revival in Putney, Vermont where he accepted God and rejected his career in law. He received his license to preach in 1834 from Yale Theological Seminary. He converted to Perfectionism, which was an offshoot of Wesleyan Methodism commonly preached by revivalists in the Burned-Over District. Perfectionism offered its followers a path to "perfect holiness," while not expecting them to be free from sin.⁸ Noyes made substantial changes to this doctrine and proclaimed himself to be free from sin. He was promptly relieved of his license to preach.⁹

In 1836, Noyes appointed himself the leader of a small group of family and friends in his hometown of Putney, Vermont. Influential Putney townspeople would later force the group out of town because of its socially unacceptable sexual habits and other alleged transgressions.¹⁰ By early 1848 they had resettled in Oneida, New York where they would remain until the community's break up in 1880.

At Oneida, the group continued to live communally as they had done at Putney.¹¹ As Communists, Oneidans relinquished "individual proprietorship of either person or things" in favor of "absolute community of interests."¹² Members of the community, on joining, turned over all money and assets. They also gave up exclusive rights to their spouses and entered into a communal marriage. The distinct Oneidan idea of marriage separated this community from other utopian societies and, presumably, was advantageous to the women of the community. Their idea of marriage was incorporated into the Oneidan practice of Bible Communism. The Oneidans called it complex marriage; their opponents referred to it as "Free Love."¹³ Two basic principles of Bible Communism were complex marriage and male continence.

Complex marriage evolved from Noyes's interpretation of the Bible. Noyes proposed that "in the Kingdom of Heaven, the institution of marriage, which assigns the exclusive possession of one woman to one man, does not exist."¹⁴ Instead, at Oneida, all men and women were considered to be married to each other.¹⁵ They were free to engage in sexual relations with each other as

they wished, and they were also responsible for each other's well-being. The Oneidans considered this communal management to be favorable for the women, because they would not be the slaves of their husbands, prisoners of loveless marriages, or nonentities.¹⁶

Complex marriage was not uncontrolled lechery. With Noyes's strong need for control, free and random sex was unacceptable. Thus, complex marriage was subject to strict rules and procedures. Noyes was very often personally in control of the sexual relationships of the community members. He also used a system that involved using a third person, usually himself or an older woman of the community, who would act as an agent of those who wished to partner.¹⁷ The diary of Victor Hawley and the journal of Tirzah Miller contain examples of the use of this system. Noyes had denied Hawley's request to have a child with Mary Jones. Hawley then expressed his interest to community elder Mrs. Dunn in having a baby with a young woman named Ida Loveland. She responded the following day that "Ida is 19 yrs & to young" and this request was also denied.¹⁸ Throughout Tirzah Miller's journal, there are references to Noyes having served as the third person in her case. Noyes had personal interests in Miller and more often than not denied her permission to have contact with other men of her choosing, selecting men for her instead.¹⁹ The community presented this system as an advantage to women because it eliminated any potential embarrassment caused by rejection, enabled women to be the sexual instigator, and gave the third person knowledge of who was partnering with whom. The third person passed this information on to Noyes who discouraged and occasionally prohibited repeated and exclusive relationships. In reality, the third person system was simply another way for Noyes to be in control.

Another method of control used in partnering community members was ascending fellowship. This was the practice of having as a partner someone much older or younger. The purpose of this was to match spiritually mature members with those less spiritually mature. Noyes, being the supreme spiritual leader, often initiated young girls as they reached puberty. As a

result of these initiations, which sometimes lasted several months, many of the girls developed strong attachments to Noyes. They considered him to be a "lover, surrogate father, teacher, and spiritual guide."²⁰ Ascending fellowship was also an integral function of male continence, the form of birth control used by Oneidans. Young boys were customarily paired with post-menopausal women for their early sexual experiences until they had mastered self-control.²¹

Ascending fellowship and male continence gave the Oneidans liberty to embrace a substantially different attitude toward sex than that held by mainstream society. For the first twenty years of its existence, members of the community were encouraged to have sex solely for the purposes of pleasure. This gave the women at Oneida some advantages over their counterparts in ordinary American society. Procreation was not the desired end for a number of years, owing to the community's lack of funds.²² The Oneida women were not expected to remain in a perpetual state of pregnancy. Theoretically, they could choose when and by whom they would become pregnant. The women were encouraged to enjoy sexual relations, rather than depending solely on their maternal instincts to drive their sexuality. Women were not held responsible for birth control at Oneida, as has been stated. Men were required to practice a form of birth control called male continence or "*coitus reservatus*."²³ Euphemistically, male continence was compared to rowing a boat close to a waterfall while knowing exactly when to stop without going over the rapids.²⁴ Male continence was quite successful, and there were few unplanned pregnancies. According to Noyes's granddaughter, Constance Noyes Robertson, during the years between 1848 and 1869, "only thirty-one children were born to a community population of upwards of three hundred persons."²⁵

While the women of Oneida were allowed a degree of sexual freedom, they were not allowed to base their relationships with men on affection or love. Sustained relationships were not only frowned upon, they were strictly prohibited. The control that Noyes wielded over the community is apparent in the journal of Tirzah Miller, a prominent member of the community and a

niece of John Humphrey Noyes. The journal reveals much of Miller's life within the community, especially the turmoil she experienced in her relationships with several men, including Noyes. Several men of the community apparently found Tirzah Miller extremely attractive. Her entry for 22 August 1868 describes what Noyes had said to her about women and sex. Miller recalled Noyes as having said, "There is as much difference between women in respect to ability to make social music as there is between a grand piano and a ten penny whistle" and "I always expect something sublime with you."²⁶ Her journal entries from September 1867 to March 1869 contain references to "sleeping with John" and mention that she and Uncle George (John Noyes's younger brother) were "no longer lovers."²⁷ In her 27 March 1869 entry she stated, "Last night J.H.N. talked with me about having sexual intercourse performed on the stage. 'We never shall have heaven till we can conquer shame, and make beautiful exhibition on the stage.'"²⁸ In the following entry, Miller wrote of not wishing to sleep with Noyes again because of her lack of interest and her fear that he will be aware of this. She had been sleeping with other men to whom she admitted not being attracted. From these journal entries, it seems that Tirzah Miller was feeling pressured to succumb to the desires of several community men.

Miller's journal reveals John H. Noyes's authoritarian tendencies when she began to write of her feelings toward other men. For example, she wrote of a relationship with Homer Barron, a man who developed strong feelings for Miller, and of falling in love with a man named Edward Inslee. Noyes sent Miller to a sister community to curtail this relationship. Likewise, in Victor Hawley's diary, he wrote of his special love for Mary Jones, the consequence of which was her removal to the sister community at Wallingford.²⁹ The Oneida Community and John H. Noyes relied heavily on the concept of complex marriage and credited it with their success as a commune. It was strictly unacceptable for Tirzah Miller to have strong feelings for Inslee, for Barron to fall in love with Miller, and for Hawley and Jones to repeatedly attempt to carry on an exclusive relationship. Exclusive or idolatrous love was considered to be immoral based on Noyes's

biblical interpretation, which was that “the new commandment is, that we love one another and that, not by pairs, as in the world, but *en masse*.”³⁰ Noyes believed that exclusive love was detrimental to the community as a whole and, by sending Miller and Jones away, he demonstrated his power over the lives of his followers.

Despite his own social theory of complex marriage and its importance to the survival of the community, Noyes often acted selfishly and hypocritically where Miller was concerned. For example, one of Miller’s journal entries noted, “Three weeks ago Father Noyes had some talk with me in which he said that he had sworn in his heart that he would have the use of me, and he was not going to have his plans about me frustrated any longer by ... special lovers.”³¹ Later in the same entry, Miller described an encounter between herself, Noyes, and Edward Inslee. Noyes had entered Miller’s room as she and Inslee embraced. According to Miller:

J.H.N. was very much in earnest, and after making some remarks showing how serious would have been the consequences of that Newark visit, he told Edward that he must not come to my room or see me anymore. ... ‘All right,’ said E., looking as white as a sheet. In the afternoon J.H.N. and I had a very animated, magnetic talk - ‘fiery’ he called it. ‘How do you know but I shall have a baby by you myself?’ said he.³²

At this time, Tirzah Miller was pregnant with Edward Inslee’s child. Noyes kept them separated until 12 April 1874, eight days before their child was born, despite repeated pleas from Miller and Inslee that they should be allowed at least to speak to one another. Another example of Noyes’s particular interest in and control over Miller is a journal entry in which she indicated that he said to her, “I guess I can’t let you have a baby for some time yet.”³³ Noyes preferred that Miller work on her writing and study of literature. It also seems that she had not

specifically requested that he be the father of her second child and that she was struggling in her relationships with Homer Barron and Edward Inslee at this time. In a further attempt to control reproduction amongst all members and to increase the Oneida Community's population, John Humphrey Noyes developed what he termed "stirpiculture."

The community newspaper, *The Circular*, described stirpiculture as "scientific combination of the sexes, for the sake of progeny, [which] take the place of the crude and mainly instinctive unions of the past."³⁴ In the early years of the stirpiculture experiment, couples applied to a group of central members who would decide if the couple possessed the desired traits. Later the community formed a committee for this purpose. After April 1876 the responsibility fell again to the central members. Regardless of who had the responsibility of deciding which men could impregnate which women, the decision ultimately was made by Noyes.³⁵ All Oneidan women of childbearing age signed a resolution that stated that they did not belong to themselves but "first to God, and second to Mr. Noyes as God's true representative."³⁶ The resolution also declared that the women had no rights about producing children that might be in opposition to Noyes's choice of "scientific combinations," and that they would follow Noyes's decision of who would be chosen as appropriate candidates to produce children, with no negative feelings whatsoever.³⁷ A number of Oneidan men signed a similar resolution stating their agreement with and planned participation in the program of eugenics.³⁸

The experiment began with the intention of creating future generations who were spiritually superior and would be successful in continuing this kingdom of heaven. Ultimately, it resulted in resentment and internal conflict. The case of Mary Jones and Victor Hawley, who had applied for the privilege of having a child together, is an example of this and of the control held by Noyes. Hawley wrote to Noyes and expressed their desire, their history, and his repentance for having special love for Mary.³⁹ Another community leader denied the request because of the "inordinate and unsanctified desire especially on Mary's

particular.”⁴⁰ Mary’s desire to have a child with Hawley was too much for the community to accept because members believed she was putting her interests above those of the community. Within the month, Noyes sent Mary to a sister community where she was to become pregnant by his son, Theodore Noyes.⁴¹ Hawley revealed his emotional reaction to this news in his diary when he wondered, “My God My God what has she been through as well as I. Will they tear the hearts out of both of us. When shall we ever be happy together again?”⁴² Jones returned to Oneida where she suffered a difficult pregnancy, with Hawley by her side to comfort her. Noyes and other community leaders now accepted their special love. Perhaps this acceptance was an effort to keep the couple in the community or perhaps the forced separation had been a matter of preventing the pair from producing what they would have considered an inferior child. The leaders had considered Hawley and Jones to be a poor match and thought that the genes of Theodore Noyes would produce a superior baby. Mary Jones delivered a stillborn baby girl on 23 June 1877. By November, Hawley and Jones were married and had left the Oneida Community.⁴³ Despite their supposedly unsatisfactory scientific combination, they produced five healthy children.⁴⁴

It should also be noted that Noyes intended, through stirpiculture, to further his family’s bloodline. In applying for approval to have children through this program, Noyes’s family members were given special consideration. Theodore Noyes was approved to have a child with Mary Jones despite the fact that he had considerable physical and mental health problems and she was considered weak.⁴⁵ Theodore’s half brother, Victor Cragin, was approved and became the youngest father in the experiment. Between the years 1869 and 1878, one hundred men and women participated in the stirpiculture program. Of these one hundred, eighty-one became the parents of fifty-eight children.⁴⁶ John Humphrey Noyes fathered nine, Theodore Noyes fathered four, and Victor Cragin fathered one.⁴⁷

Women at Oneida not only had sexual liberties beyond those of their mainstream society counterparts, they also had more occupational choices, which were also controlled by Noyes

to some degree. They were not confined to the drudgeries of kitchen, laundry, and childcare work, although women performed these duties alongside men. As stated in *the Handbook of the Oneida Community*:

The two leading businesses of the Community are superintended by women, viz, satchel-making, and fruit-preserving. Women also keep the accounts of the community, and are found well-adapted to this employment. The sexes freely mingle in many departments of industry, and women enjoy many privileges denied them in ordinary society.⁴⁸

Indeed, the women of the Oneida Community did enjoy privileges denied to women in ordinary society in some regards. However, they were not always allowed to choose their own occupation; instead they were often assigned duties by Noyes or other central members. Such was the case of Charlotte Leonard who made several journal entries in 1876 and 1877 pertaining to her various assigned occupations.⁴⁹ She often lamented being assigned to a task that she did not feel particularly suited for or one for which she held no interest. Leonard would dutifully take on each task without objection, but would express her dissatisfaction in her journal. In her 7 January 1876 entry, Leonard described her job as “quite attractive employment. ... I have enjoyed my hours there and find it a good time to reflect.”⁵⁰ In May she was assigned to a different position of which she said, “I could not express my astonishment at the idea” and that it was a “disagreeable post.”⁵¹ Despite her misgivings, Leonard was assigned to her new occupation by mid-June and often wrote in her diary of being overwhelmed and frustrated. The occupations she was assigned to included working in the Children’s House, waiting on visitors, and manufacturing chains. Leonard also expressed in her journal a deep interest in the community newspaper, but she was never given the opportunity to participate in its production.

Some women did participate in the editing, writing, and printing of the community's newspapers. Harriet Worden, who was a highly respected woman at Oneida, a "protégé of John H. Noyes" and a loyal follower, was the editor of *The Circular* until Noyes replaced her with a man. Worden wrote to Noyes on 26 January 1876 after hearing rumors of her imminent replacement. In her letter, she asked whether "a woman editor is expected to be a mere puppet, incapable of originality in any way?" The letter also reveals that Worden had the "general idea ... that a woman's name is put in the editorial as a kind of show-figure; but that in point of fact she is a nobody -- a nothing!"⁵² Still, scholars have found that while women were employed at the various factories and presses of Oneida, the majority were employed in basic domestic tasks.⁵³ This is attributed to the fact that, while there was a sense of equality between the sexes at Oneida, Noyes held a belief that women were inferior. Noyes did seek advice from women, especially from his wife and his sister, but when he was away it was "always a man who was named to stand in for him."⁵⁴ Even in the Children's House the women were assigned to typical domestic chores such as bathing, dressing, and feeding the children, while the entire operation was overseen by a man.

The role of women pertaining to childcare was quite different compared to that of ordinary society. Mothers were not saddled with the daunting responsibility of raising their children alone. Children of the community lived in a separate building, the Children's House. Children remained with their mothers for approximately fifteen months, and after this they lived in the Children's House until they reached puberty.⁵⁵ Once a child went to live in the Children's House, he or she became the responsibility of the community as a whole. A report entitled "General Principles" was issued in *The Circular* in 1863. It contained eight principles regarding parental relations and the care and treatment of infants and young children. It stated that the relationship between a man and woman should not be interfered with by love for a child, the child should be communally raised, and general service – not exclusive devotion

– was more beneficial to the children. Parents were to aspire to please God, not their children.⁵⁶

Unencumbered by the responsibilities of motherhood, women of the Oneida Community were able to travel, pursue interests and education, and hold jobs. Noyes believed that the love between mother and child was dangerous to the well-being of the community, and if this love was demonstrated in too vigorous a fashion, mother and child were often forced to stay apart for extended periods of time.⁵⁷ In Pierrepont Noyes's autobiography, he related a story of how he and his mother were separated due to his "stickiness":

Once, as punishment for some childish sin, Papa Kelly forbade my weekly visit to [my mother's room]. I promptly went berserk. Forgetting my Children's House training. ... I raged; I howled, I kicked, I lay down in the sinkroom floor and exhausted my infantile vocabulary in vehement protestations and accusations. Whereupon Papa Kelly seized me and shook me and commanded. ... 'You have evidently got sticky to your mother. You may stay away from her another week.' The turbulence was mine but the greater tragedy was my mother's.⁵⁸

Parents were also guilty of having special love or "stickiness" to their children, especially mothers. Corrina Ackley Noyes, another community child, recalled the difficulty with which her mother, Alice Ackley, endured their separation. Alice Ackley had been asked to write a testimonial to the virtues of communal childcare, which she dutifully composed. However, in the following months she gave in repeatedly to the 'mother spirit' and was punished by being forbidden to speak to her daughter for days and weeks at a time.⁵⁹ Another example of Noyes's control over childcare is shown in the journal of Charlotte Leonard. The journal begins in October 1870 with Leonard's description of "the past year [which] has been the most trying part of my life."⁶⁰ She

was the mother of an eleven-month old son, Humphrey, whom she had to relinquish care of at the insistence of John H. Noyes, the child's father. She wrote lines such as, "I pray God to help me do right about him [her son] that I might please God and Mr. Noyes" and "I believe the Community is the best mother a child can have."⁶¹ Within a few weeks, when Noyes had given her permission to care for her child again, the tone changes from one of prayerful desperation to one of joy: "This is indeed good news, and I could not hold back the tears. I felt so thankful."⁶² The journal focuses mainly on Leonard's child until January 1872 when he was two years old and Leonard was again required to give up her son, this time to a sister community. The tone then returns to one of self-doubt and earnest prayers to "please God and Mr. Noyes."⁶³ Leonard and other women at Oneida were liberated in the sense that they were allowed to pursue their own self interests, but they were prevented by the doctrines of John Humphrey Noyes from the natural right to care for and love their own children.

Ordinary middle-class American women in the 1800s had few options other than caring for their husbands and children. Some women did have jobs outside the home, most of which were related to domestic service. A few women began to venture into religion and politics by way of joining organizations. But nineteenth-century women who recognized their oppression and sought to change society's attitude toward women were frustrated by the slow pace of change. One alternative that seemed to offer liberation for women in the nineteenth century, the Oneida Community, was in some ways even more limiting than ordinary society. At a glance, the lifestyle of the community seemed to offer liberation for women. They had more freedom and rights than their counterparts in mainstream society. For example, they were given freedom to pursue their interests and have jobs, as long as they did not interfere with the interests and occupations of men. They were free to choose their sexual partners and instigate sexual relationships, provided this was approved by Noyes or other community leaders. They were not expected to be perpetually pregnant or to devote their lives to the care of their

children, though they required committee approval to have a child.

This requirement of approval meant that men, especially John Humphrey Noyes, wielded considerable authority over Oneida women. Noyes even went so far as to limit the women in ways that prevented them from fulfilling the nineteenth-century ideal for women. That is, once women became mothers, they were not allowed to partake in the joys and pleasures of raising and loving their own children. Such limitations suggest that American society in the nineteenth century was oppressive for women, even in its seemingly progressive communities such as Oneida.

The Oneida Community ended in 1880. John Humphrey Noyes went to Niagara Falls, Canada where he remained until his death. Some community members remained at Oneida, but they no longer practiced complex marriage or other principles of Bible Communism. The community became a joint-stock company, Oneida Community, Ltd., makers of Oneida Silverware. Once made by a community that did not believe in marriage, today the silverware is a popular item on bridal registries.

Notes

- 1 For a discussion of society's expectations of women see Mary Beth Norton, "The Evolution of White Women's Experience in Early America," *The American Historical Review* 89 (1984): 593-619; Catharine Beecher, *A Treatise on Domestic Economy* (New York: Source Book Press, 1970/c. 1841); Daniel Blake Smith, "The Study of the Family in Early America: Trends, Problems, and Prospects," *The William and Mary Quarterly* 39 (1982): 3-28; and Elaine Tyler May, "Expanding the Past: Recent Scholarship on Women in Politics and Work," *Reviews in American History* 10 (1982): 216-23.
- 2 For a discussion of women in the nineteenth century, see Mary P. Ryan, *The Empire of the Mother* (New York: The Hawthorne Press, 1982), and Nancy Woloch, *Early American Women, A Documentary*

- History: 1600 - 1900* (New York, et al.: The McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc., 1977).
- 3 Willystine Goodsell, *A History of the Family as a Social and Educational Institution* (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1915), 422.
 - 4 *Ibid.*, 515.
 - 5 For discussions of utopian societies see Lawrence Foster, *Women, Family, and Utopia* (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1991); Brian J. L. Berry, *America's Utopian Experiments, Communal Havens from Long-Wave Crises* (Hanover and London: University Press of New England, 1992), 83; Ira L. Mandelker, *Religion, Society, and Utopia in Nineteenth-Century America* (Amherst: The University of Massachusetts Press, 1984), 1; and John Humphrey Noyes, *History of American Socialisms* (New York: Hillary House Publishers, Ltd., 1961)
 - 6 Lawrence Foster, *Women, Family, and Utopia* (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1991), 75 & 92-102.
 - 7 For discussions of views of various utopian societies see Berry, *America's Utopian Experiments, Communal Havens from Long-Wave Crises*, 83; Mandelker, *Religion, Society, and Utopia*, 1; and John Humphrey Noyes, *History of American Socialisms* (New York: Hillary House Publishers, Ltd., 1961).
 - 8 Spencer Klaw, *Without Sin* (New York: The Penguin Press, 1993), 25.
 - 9 Allan Estlake, *The Oneida Community, A Record of an Attempt to Carry Out the Principles of Christian Unselfishness and Scientific Race-Improvement* (London: George Redway, 1900), 19 & 21.
 - 10 Robert David Thomas, *The Man Who Would Be Perfect* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1977), 143-4.
 - 11 Noyes, *History of American Socialisms*, 616.
 - 12 Constance Noyes Robertson, ed., *Oneida Community, An Autobiography, 1851-1876* (Syracuse University Press, 1970), 10.
 - 13 Dr. John B. Ellis, *Free Love and Its Votaries; or, American Socialism Unmasked* (New York and Cincinnati: United States Publishing Company, 1870), 77.
 - 14 Noyes, *History of American Socialisms*, 624.
 - 15 *Ibid.* 625-7.
 - 16 Mandelker, 121.
 - 17 Estlake, *The Oneida Community*, 90.

- 18 Victor Hawley, *Special Love/Special Sex, An Oneida Community Diary*, ed. Robert S. Fogarty (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1994), 88.
- 19 Tirzah Miller, "Excerpts from the Journal of Tirzah Miller, 3 September 1867 - 25 July 1877," n.d., available from <http://womhist.binghamton.edu/oneida/doc9.htm>; Internet; accessed 15 October 2003.
- 20 Klaw, *Without Sin*, 235.
- 21 *Ibid.*, 176.
- 22 *Ibid.*, 202.
- 23 Berry, *America's Utopian Experiments*, 93.
- 24 Mandelker, *Religion, Society, and Utopia*, 118.
- 25 Robertson, *Oneida Community*, 336.
- 26 Miller, "Excerpts," 22 August 1868.
- 27 *Ibid.*, 24 April 1868.
- 28 *Ibid.*, 27 March 1869.
- 29 Hawley, *Special Love/Special Sex*, 66.
- 30 Noyes, *History of American Socialisms*, 628.
- 31 Miller, "Excerpts," 25 January 1874.
- 32 *Ibid.*, 25 January 1874.
- 33 *Ibid.*, 6 March 1869.
- 34 "Stirpiculture," *The Circular*, 10 April 1865, Vol. 2, no.4.
- 35 Robertson, *Oneida Community*, 339.
- 36 Robert Allerton Parker, *A Yankee Saint, John Humphrey Noyes and the Oneida Community* (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1935) 256-7.
- 37 *Ibid.*, 259.
- 38 *Ibid.*, 260.
- 39 Hawley, *Special Love/Special Sex*, 62.
- 40 *Ibid.*, 63.
- 41 *Ibid.*, 87.
- 42 *Ibid.*, 120.
- 43 *Ibid.*, 205-6.
- 44 *Ibid.*, 219.
- 45 *Ibid.*, 47-8.
- 46 Robertson, *Oneida Community*, 339-40.
- 47 Klaw, *Without Sin*, 206-7.
- 48 *Handbook of the Oneida Community*, n.d., available from <http://wwwlib.syr.edu/digital/collections/h/Hand->

-
- BookOfTheOneidaCommunity/; Internet; accessed 3 November 2003.
- 49 Charlotte M. Leonard, "Journal of Charlotte M. Leonard," 7 January 1876, 30 May 1876, multiple June 1876 and November 1877 dates, *The Oneida Community Collection*, Special Collections, E.S. Bird Library, Syracuse University.
- 50 Leonard, "Journal," 7 January 1876.
- 51 Ibid., 30 May 1876.
- 52 "Harriet M. Worden to John H. Noyes, 26 January 1876," n.d., available from <http://womhist.binghamton.edu/oneida/doc21.htm>; Internet; accessed 15 October 2003.
- 53 Klaw, *Without Sin*, 138.
- 54 Ibid., 138.
- 55 Ellis, *Free Love*, 221.
- 56 "General Principles," *The Circular*, 1 January 1863, Vol. 11, no. 47.
- 57 Pierrepont Noyes, *My Father's House: An Oneida Boyhood* (New York and Toronto: Farrar and Rienhart, 1937), 66.
- 58 Ibid., 66-7.
- 59 Klaw, *Without Sin*, 142-3.
- 60 Leonard, "Journal," 1 October 1870.
- 61 Ibid., 1 October 1870.
- 62 Ibid., 20 October 1870.
- 63 Ibid., 1 January 1872.

Christopher Rhymer

The Crusade Against Comics

In the 1930s a new form of entertainment developed in America. This medium was the comic book. Comic books gained popularity very quickly. The United States Government, recognizing the popularity of the comic, urged producers to use the stories for patriotic purposes during World War II.¹ After the war years, the industry's popularity continued to expand, as creators were free to develop stories about many topics. Many publishers dominated the industry, but one company, Educational Comics, soon emerged as one of the leaders. In 1947, William Gaines took control of the company and created new opportunities for writers and readers. Gaines changed the company's name to Entertaining Comics (EC) and helped make the 1940s and 1950s the Golden Age of comics, according to contemporary collectors. EC led the way with their horror, crime, and science fiction titles and in light of the company's success, others took notice and attempted to imitate or copy their work. Imaginative and creative, EC, under the leadership of Gaines, provided fresh and original storylines and breathtaking art. However, the rise in popularity of comic books with stories about crime and horror alarmed parents and others. And the environment of post-war America perfectly suited the kinds of questions critics raised and charges leveled.

The origins of the comic book industry in the 1930s owed much to Max Gaines, who was among the first publishers. In May 1934, under his supervision, *Famous Funnies* was the first monthly comic book to hit the stands.² Gaines was very successful and throughout the 1930s the industry grew quickly. By 1941, over 30 comic publishers were producing 150 different comics every month, selling about 15 million comics a month.³ Gaines was very careful about the material he portrayed in his books and he consulted educators and psychologists for advice. In particular, William Marston, a psychologist, not only advised him but also

worked with Gaines to create *Wonder Woman*.⁴ The industry continued to expand, and by 1943 comics were selling about 25 million copies a month. Gaines and his company were producing one third of them.⁵ Although Gaines briefly left the industry and sold his company, he soon returned with a new company, Education Comics. Most of the stories were about bland and inoffensive bible and historical stories and by 1947 the company was not doing well.⁶ That same year, in a boating accident, Gaines died while saving the life of a friend's young son. Max Gaines died a hero.⁷

Ownership of the company passed to Max's son William Gaines, who was unprepared for the role. But he was determined to turn EC around, and in 1948 he hired Al Feldstein, who helped transform the company and increase its lagging sales. Gaines also hired Johnny Craig, a talented artist, and the three men worked together to create stories they enjoyed.⁸

By 1950, they were producing the nation's first horror comics and Gaines changed the name of the company from Education Comics to Entertaining Comics. Gaines had hired a stable of artists and EC's new direction was proving very successful. EC was becoming the trendsetter of the industry. One of the new creators was Harvey Kurtzman, who produced strikingly accurate and realistic war stories. Meanwhile, Gaines and Feldman concentrated on stories of crime and horror. These three genres emerged as the most popular among fans and the most imitated by other publishers.⁹ Soon people across the nation were calling for the end of these kinds of stories. As the leader of the industry, EC was one of the prime targets of the call for censorship and soon EC would pass into legend.

The popularity of comic books among children also triggered a backlash, and public concern about this new medium became widespread. Moreover, the climate of America in the 1950s helped facilitate this public outcry. In 1949 comics were selling 45.6 million copies a month and 59.8 million a month in 1952.¹⁰ Many people in America were concerned about this. Most children in America read comics whether they purchased them or

not and many parents were afraid of what their children were reading.

One of the most outspoken critics was a psychiatrist named Fredric Wertham. Wertham was born on 20 March 1895 in Germany. He moved to the U.S. in 1922 and eventually began working at the Johns Hopkins University. He left Johns Hopkins in 1932 to become senior psychiatrist at Bellevue Hospital in New York. He was a prolific writer and began to focus his studies on criminal behavior. Wertham opened Lafargue Clinic in Harlem in 1946. It was in Harlem that he first became concerned about the effects of comics on children.¹¹

By 1948 Wertham was leading the campaign against comics. Comic books had had their critics since they were introduced, but few people were as critical as Wertham. He wrote several columns for *Colliers* magazine in which he argued against comics.¹² He also gave many speeches to audiences of psychiatrists and to public groups. His campaign quickly found supporters. By August, the New York State Sheriffs Association was asked to take action.¹³ Also in August, comics were blamed for the torture of a small boy by his playmates in Indiana and soon local authorities were calling for comics to be banned.¹⁴ In September, in Chicago, the National Council of Parent and Teachers demanded state laws prohibiting objectionable comic books.¹⁵ *Time* magazine responded with a story linking crime and comic books.¹⁶

Not everyone in the country accepted the rising tide of anti-comic sentiment, however. On 6 October 1948 Edwin J. Lukes, executive director of the Society for the Prevention of Crime, opened a two-day forum on "Proposals for a Better World." In his speech, he asserted that comics were not the real problem and that those who criticized comics were just "running away from the real issue which is, what is the defect in the relationship between children and parents."¹⁷ Some educators even proposed that historians take a cue from comics to make their books more popular among children.¹⁸ Comic publishers themselves turned to self-regulation by forming the Association of Comics Magazine Publishers (ACMP).¹⁹ The ACMP was not very

effective, however. Only a few publishers joined and some of those soon left over disagreements on how their self-censoring should be done.²⁰

By 1949 comics were coming under even more attacks. In early January, the Cub Scouts held a collection of crime comics that ended in a huge burning in New Jersey.²¹ Even the Army decided to ban the sale of material that “goes beyond the line of decency” for soldiers. And Wertham, who was gathering information for his upcoming book, also continued to speak out against the failure of the industry to police itself.²² Later that month the Long Island Federation of Women’s Clubs also resolved to work toward the “elimination of the vicious elements” in comics. They urged citizens everywhere to write to their representatives in Congress, demanding the ban of all comics until publishers improved their standards.²³ In Philadelphia, the American Legion adopted a resolution asking enforcement authorities to halt production and sale of books “which glorify crime.”²⁴

Once again there were those who rushed to the defense of comics. Leading the charge were academic professors who had long studied such subjects as juvenile delinquency. Frederic M. Thrasher, a professor of Education at New York University (NYU) and also a member of the Attorney General’s Conference on Juvenile Delinquency, denounced Wertham. He wrote an essay titled “The Comics and Delinquency: Cause or Scapegoat?” for the December 1949 issue of the *Journal of Education Sociology*.²⁵ He spoke out against the idea of placing the blame for delinquency on any one cause and refuted Dr. Wertham’s arguments. Also in the same issue Mandel Sherman, Professor of Educational Psychology at the University of Chicago, wrote that he had “never seen a case of a delinquent whose behavior was exaggerated by such readings.”²⁶ On 19 February 1949 Dr. Paul W. Tappen a professor of Sociology at NYU also spoke out against “scapegoatism” in a speech at the meeting of the Institutes of Probation in the probation department of the General Session Court.²⁷ On 2 February 1949 publisher Leverett S. Gleason wrote *The New York Times*, noting that between 40 to 60 percent of the 100,000,000

comics sold monthly were bought by adults. He opposed a ban on comics stating that parents should be more selective with their children's reading materials and that eliminating comics meant for adults was clearly wrong.²⁸

Although the proponents of comic books had plenty of educated supporters, Wertham and his fellow opponents included fearful parents eager to find a solution. They also had more widespread coverage and were occasionally sensationalized. Anti-comics stories appeared in magazines like *Time*, *Ladies Home Journal*, and *Collier's*, whereas critiques of these claims appeared in the more scholarly magazines with fewer mainstream readers. And, academic leaders rarely gave speeches to large groups. Moreover, the opponents of comics stepped up their criticisms in the early 1950s, and by 1952 many states were considering bills to ban comics that dealt with crime or horror.²⁹ Merchants, in response to public pressure, also stopped carrying "violent" comics.³⁰ By the end of 1953, an EC comic entitled *Panic* came under investigation by the attorney general of Massachusetts. In *Panic*, EC had run a satire of the poem "The Night Before Christmas." George Fingold, the attorney general, threatened criminal action against the story for "desecrating Christmas" and banned the book from sale in Massachusetts.³¹ Gaines and his attorney quickly responded, claiming both he and his company had suffered "wanton damage" and that the ban was a "gross insult to the people of Massachusetts."³²

In April 1954, Wertham launched his strongest attack on comics with the publication of his book, *Seduction of the Innocent*. This book remains infamous among comic book fans today; it is widely held to be a poorly researched book based on half-truths and shoddy research.³³ However, in 1954 it caused quite a stir among parents and educators. In a review of the book in *Public Opinion Quarterly* by Anita Mishler of Princeton, she states that the only reason to give the book attention was because there had been too few studies of comic books and their effects.³⁴ Wertham believed that comic books glorified crime and provoked kids to commit crimes. He also thought "super hero" comics were harmful as well. He wrote that *Batman* and *Robin* comics

supported homosexuality and even went so far as to say that *Superman* comics were detrimental to kids because they gave children incorrect information about physics and natural laws.³⁵ Indeed, according to Wertham, most comics were bad. Even romance comics, he claimed, might lead to prostitution.³⁶

The *Seduction of the Innocent* was based on inaccurate and skewed data. Wertham studied mainly children who were delinquents, and he merely linked their reading of comics to their behavior: most kids who committed crimes also read comics, so the problem must be comics.³⁷ Parents supported Wertham because they found an easy culprit that minimized their responsibility. In his book, he asserted that parents of delinquents were not to blame for delinquency; rather, it was the fault of comic books.³⁸ He dismissed the disclaimers on many comic books that say "Adults Only" or "Not Intended for Children" as further enticements for children.³⁹

The publication of Wertham's book, along with the public clamor for the banning of comic books, led to the investigation by the U.S. Senate. On 21 April 1954, the Hearings before the Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency of the Committee on the Judiciary opened at the Foley Square Federal Court House in Manhattan.⁴⁰ It was presided over by Senators Thomas Hennings and Estes Kefauver. Among those who testified were representatives from several newspaper comic strips and some representatives from the business administrations of different comic book companies, but no actual comic book creators. Gaines volunteered and his offer to speak was accepted.⁴¹ He was to speak directly after Dr. Wertham. Gaines carefully prepared his opening statement; it said in part:

It would be just as difficult to explain the harmless thrill of a horror story to a Dr. Wertham as it would be to explain the sublimity of love to a frigid old maid. ... My father was proud of the comics he published, and I am proud of the comics I publish. We use the best writers, the finest artists; we spare nothing to make each magazine, each story, each

page, a work of art. ... Our American children are for the most part normal children. They are bright children, but those who want to prohibit comic magazines seem to see dirty, sneaky, perverted monsters who use the comics as a blueprint for action.

The truth is that delinquency is the product of the real environment in which the child lives and not of the fiction he reads. ... The problems are economic and social and they are complex. Our people need understanding; they need to have affection, decent homes, decent food. ⁴²

After his statement, Gaines was questioned by different senators about particular EC Comic stories. In the most famous exchange from these hearings, Gaines was questioned about the cover of one of his comics portraying an axe-wielding man holding the severed head of a woman. Senator Estes Kefauver, (D- Tenn.) asked if he thought that was in good taste. Gaines replied:

"Yes, I do ... for the cover of a horror comic. I think it would be bad taste if he were holding the head a little higher so the neck would show with the blood dripping from it."

"You've got blood dripping from the mouth," Senator Kefauver pointed out.⁴³ After the exchange, public support turned against Gaines. ⁴⁴ Other people for both sides testified, but after Gaines's testimony and Wertham's, which was basically a summary of his book, they became the symbols of each side. The hearing ended with no legislation, but the public was still staunchly against comics and lawmakers were calling for some kind of action.

Justice John E. Cone of the Court of Special Sessions called on parents to demand that comics that depicted crime, horror, or sex be "driven off the shelves of neighborhood stores."⁴⁵ By June, the Senate subcommittee was still unable to reach an agreement concerning comics and delinquency, announcing that there would not likely be any legislation. However, the Senate members acknowledged the local actions to ban comics that had already

occurred.⁴⁶ The Child Welfare Commission of the American Legion finished a two-day meeting condemning comic books and calling for the industry itself to impose self-regulation.⁴⁷

Gaines decided that publishers needed a united front to respond to the opposition. He rented a hall, called all the major publishers to a meeting, and urged them to form an association.⁴⁸ The publishers agreed on joining together, but not the way Gaines wanted. They decided on a self-regulatory body that became known as the Comics Code Authority. It was established on 16 September 1954. Distributors quickly agreed to carry only books with the seal of approval that the Authority gave to books that passed their standards. It produced some very harsh measures, some of which were clearly aimed at EC.⁴⁹ Gaines canceled his horror comics and tried to change his remaining books to fit within the strict boundaries of the new regulations. In 1955, Gaines submitted a story about a black astronaut. In the story, an astronaut encounters a planet of robots where the orange robots subjugated the blue robots, relegating them to a lower class status. The astronaut left the planet after deciding that the planet was not evolved enough to join the Federation of Planets. Only at the end of the story is it revealed that the astronaut was black. This story was intended to make the reader think about the prevailing attitudes of race in the 1950s. The CCA said that the astronaut character had to be changed to be white so that no one would be offended.⁵⁰ Gaines was furious. He demanded they print the story and the CCA caved. After this Gaines decided that it was not worth producing comics anymore.⁵¹ He cancelled all of his comics to focus on *Mad* magazine. (EC created *Mad* in 1952 when magazines were not subject to the comic code authority.)

Public opposition to comics continued, but the code effectively eliminated many of the types of stories opponents had protested against. After the introduction of the code, comics became essentially a medium only for children.⁵² In 1952, 630 different comic books were published; 1956 saw only 250.⁵³ The Code was instrumental in turning comics from a creative medium for all ages into silly drawings for children. It took decades before society changed enough to allow more creativity into comics.

Although many people note that the rise of television in the 1950s also contributed to the decline in comics, the adoption of the code was the main reason behind the decline of comics and the passing of the Golden Age of comic books.⁵⁴ The status of comics as children's entertainment still constitutes an obstacle to the industry.

As for the two main spokesmen for this debate, William Gaines became wealthier publishing *Mad* than he would have by publishing comics. Gaines and Kurtzman, with others, turned *Mad* into one of the leading sources of satire in America, and Gaines remained happily involved in *Mad* until his death in 1992. Fredric Wertham accomplished his goal in 1954 of eliminating the comic stories he found objectionable and in getting the industry regulated. He continued practicing psychiatry for many years and he wrote several more books about human behavior. It is interesting that in his last book, *World of Fanzines* (1973), Wertham examined fans who produced their own magazines about comics. The writers had been children in the 1950s and were the very kids that Wertham had crusaded to save. In *World of Fanzines* he was very supportive of fanzines, comics, and those involved.⁵⁵ He apparently reversed his earlier opinion about comics. Wertham died on 18 November 1981 at the age of eighty-six. He had insisted throughout his career that he had not intended to harm the comic industry with his crusade.⁵⁶

In the long run, comics recovered. It took decades but the industry regained fresh momentum. Today some teachers promote comics for children as a reading tool.⁵⁷ Among comic book readers Gaines is remembered as an icon of the comic book industry. He is regarded among comic collectors as a champion of free speech and a leader in the fight against censorship. Wertham, on the other hand, is regarded as an opponent of free speech. Many comic fans have long blamed him as the sole person involved in almost destroying comics, which is an exaggerated sentiment. He had the support of many people across America, and the comic industry was too popular and successful for one man to destroy. However, his crusade was very successful in

limiting the creative output of a generation of comic book creators and entrepreneurs.

In 1954, psychiatrist Erik Erickson gave a speech decrying “scapegoatism.” He warned people against looking for one thing to blame their problems on. “When people get worked up they often look for something to blame. That makes them feel better but it doesn’t mean they have found the cause.”⁵⁸ He was speaking about comics then, but his words are still wise. The social problems that Americans faced in the years after World War II were complex, and we must remember that those problems likely created an environment for censorship with which we are dealing today.

Notes

- 1 Ron Goulart, *Ron Goulart’s Great History of Comic Books* (Chicago: Contemporary Books, Inc, 1986), 341.
- 2 Maria Reidelbach, *Completely Mad: A History of the Comic book and Magazine* (Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1991), 5.
- 3 Reidelbach, 8.
- 4 Reidelbach, 9.
- 5 Reidelbach, 9.
- 6 Dick Lupoff and Don Thompson, eds., *The Comic Book Book* (New Rochelle: Arlington House, 1973), 303.
- 7 Lupoff and Thompson, 303.
- 8 Reidelbach, 10-12.
- 9 Reidelbach, 16-17.
- 10 Matthew Pustz, *Comic Book Culture: Fanboys and True Believers* (Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 1999), 33.
- 11 William Christiansen and Mark Seifert “Dark Legend,” *Wizard: The Guide to Comics*, December 1994, 92-8.
- 12 Christiansen and Seifert, 94.
- 13 Goulart, 263; *The New York Times*, 24 June 1948; and 3 August 1948.
- 14 *The New York Times*, 19 August 1948.

- 15 *The New York Times*, 17 September 1948.
- 16 Goulart, 265.
- 17 *The New York Times*, 7 October 1948.
- 18 *The New York Times*, 16 July 1948.
- 19 Christiansen and Seifert, 94.
- 20 Christiansen and Seifert, 94.
- 21 *The New York Times*, 7 January 1949.
- 22 *The New York Times*, 18 January 1949.
- 23 *The New York Times*, 22 January 1949.
- 24 *The New York Times*, 26 January 1949.
- 25 Goulart, 267
- 26 Josette Frank, "Some Questions and Answers for Teachers and Parents," *Journal of Education Sociology* 23 (1949): 210.
- 27 *The New York Times*, 20 February 1949.
- 28 *The New York Times*, 5 February 1949.
- 29 *The New York Times*, 20 February 1952.
- 30 *The New York Times*, 16 February 1952.
- 31 Reidelbach, 24.
- 32 *The New York Times*, 28 December 1953.
- 33 Les Daniels, *Marvel: Fire Fabulous Decades of the World's Greatest Comics* (New York: Harry N. Abrams, Inc., 1991), 71; Christiansen and Seifert, 96-7; Goulart, 270
- 34 Anita L. Mishler, "Review of *Seduction of the Innocent*," *Public Opinion Quarterly* 19 (1955): 115-7
- 35 Fredric Wertham, *Seduction of the Innocent* (Toronto: Clarke, Irwin, and Company, LTD., 1954), 34.
- 36 Daniels, 72.
- 37 Christiansen and Seifert, 96.
- 38 Thompson and Lupoff, 308-9; Fredric Wertham, *Seduction of the Innocent* (Toronto: Clarke, Irwin, and Company, LTD., 1954).
- 39 Wertham, 38.
- 40 Reidelbach, 26.
- 41 Reidelbach, 26.
- 42 Reidelbach, 26.

- 43 *The New York Times*, 22 April 1954.
- 44 Reidelbach, 28.
- 45 *The New York Times*, 3 May 1954.
- 46 *The New York Times*, 13 June 1954.
- 47 *The New York Times*, 29 August 1954.
- 48 Reidelbach, 30.
- 49 Thompson and Lupoff, 312; Reidelbach, 30.
- 50 Thompson and Lupoff, 314-15.
- 51 Reidelbach, 35.
- 52 Pustz, 42.
- 53 Pustz, 42.
- 54 Goulart, 274; Amy Kiste Nyberg, *Seal of Approval: The History of the Comics Code* (Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 1998), xi.
- 55 Christiansen and Seifert, 98.
- 56 Goulart, 274.
- 57 Pustz, 123.
- 58 *The New York Times*, 3 October 1954.

Ryan F. Warner

Adolph Engelmann: Immigrant Soldier, American Hero

The contribution of immigrant soldiers to the United States during the American Civil War was undoubtedly a paramount factor in securing Union for our country. Ethnic units were comprised of soldiers from countless countries, including Ireland, Italy, Britain, Canada, Sweden, Poland, with the largest section coming from Germany. In the Civil War, approximately two hundred thousand Germans fought to preserve the Union, with an undetermined number of men in the Confederate army. These immigrant soldiers came from all walks of life, from farmers who could barely speak English, to prosperous businessmen who had political clout not only in Germany, but also in the United States. For the most part, these units were organized in groups that included most, if not all, of the same ethnic majority. They were commonly organized and officered by prominent men of the same ethnic background. These organizations could be as small as one company – the Swedish Company of the 43rd Illinois Infantry is a good example – or as large as a brigade, such as the famous Irish brigade, led by the fiery Irishman Thomas Francis Meagher.

During the mid nineteenth century, a massive influx of Germans fled political persecution in Europe to settle in North America. A large majority of these settlers moved to the fertile Mississippi Valley of Southwest Illinois. Many of these immigrants first settled in St. Louis, but soon decided to relocate just across the river because of their disgust for slavery, which was fervently practiced in Missouri. These peaceful German immigrants were given the title of “Latin farmers,” for their willing prosperity and undying support for the community in which they lived.

St. Clair County, Illinois proved to be where the majority of German immigrants settled, including some of the most prominent names of the time. Friedrich Hecker, a famous German patriot and political figure settled in Summerfield. Gustavus Koerner, future Illinois Lt. Governor and close friend to Abraham Lincoln, settled in Belleville. (Belleville was destined to be the center for German power in Illinois, as this was the county seat of St. Clair, and a thriving community). Along with these political figureheads, came an element of prominent and prosperous German farmers. Among these well-respected pioneers were Friedrich Engelmann and his family. The Engelmann family settled in the Shiloh Valley, an area that is nestled between the lush farmlands of Mascoutah and Belleville.

Friedrich Theodor Engelmann and his wife Elizabeth, along with their nine children, set sail for the United States in 1831 aboard the Ship *Logan*.¹ The journey proved to be a long one, taking roughly a year and a half to complete. When arriving in the United States, the Engelmann family decided to move to the Belleville area, as it was the bastion for German immigration at the time. Friedrich was the personification of the Latin farmer. His extensive knowledge of flora and the inner workings of cultivating the land gave the Engelmann family the ability to prosper in the new country. In Germany, Friedrich was considered one of the premier botanists and a well-respected man, who passed on his love for nature and the land to his children. The Engelmann family originated in Bavaria, in southern Germany.

Adolph Engelmann was born 11 February 1825 in Imsbach, Pfalz, Bavaria, Germany to Friedrich Theodor and Elizabeth Engelmann.² He was a member of a large and prosperous family, and was the youngest of nine children. He immigrated to America with his parents, and settled on the Engelmann farm at Shiloh in the early months of 1833. His earliest education was on his father's farm, where he was instructed by the older members of the family.³ In 1835, Adolph's older sister Sophie married Gustavus Koerner. The Koerner family lived in nearby Belleville. At the age of nine, young Adolph moved in

with Gustavus and Sophie so he could attend the Belleville public schools.⁴ During his early years, Adolph enjoyed the better of two different worlds. He was able to study and attend school in a reasonably large city, and was also able to experience life on his parents' farm. It was the time he spent on his father's Shiloh vineyards that instilled his love of agriculture.

During his teenage years, Engelmann studied law in the office of Gustavus Koerner. His desire to become a lawyer grew, and he decided to go to St. Louis to study at the offices of Field and Leslie.⁵ Adolph Engelmann was elected to the Illinois Bar in 1845 at the age of only twenty years. He practiced law for a short time in Quincy, Illinois, but then went into practice in Belleville as an associate of Kinney, Bissell & Engelmann Attorneys at Law.⁶

He was practicing law in Belleville when the President called for volunteers at the beginning of the Mexican War. He hastily volunteered for service in the first company he could find being organized in Belleville. He was quickly accepted as a sergeant, and at the official formation, after just turning twenty-one, was commissioned an officer. The company was organized by Captain J.L.D. Morrison, at the Captain's home in Belleville. Judge Nathaniel Niles was named First Lieutenant, and Adolph Engelmann was appointed Second Lieutenant.⁷ After the company had been organized at Alton, Captain Morrison was promoted and received the appointment of Lieutenant Colonel, and Julius Raith of Shiloh was named Captain of the company. The unit would be designated Company "H" Second Regiment of Illinois Foot Volunteers, or Raith's Company. The Colonel of the 2nd Illinois was William Harrison Bissell, executive partner in the law firm in which Engelmann was an associate. Bissell would later become Governor of the State of Illinois. The company was made up of numerous young Germans from St. Clair County who would later find themselves serving together again at the outbreak of the Civil War.

The regiment received its military training while at Alton, and remained there until mid July when it gradually moved downstate to be put on transports to go to the Deep South. Gen. John E. Wool of the United States regular army was in command.

The 2nd Illinois was put on a crowded transport and Adolph described the journey as anything but pleasant for the men. "The gradual passing into the southern climate was very interesting to me," he wrote home to his mother and father back in Shiloh, "Otherwise I cannot say I enjoyed the trip."⁸ Engelmann stated while the officers aboard the transports were "living high," the men were crowded and suffered a great deal from the unbearable heat. It is in this same letter to his parents that he boasts about being in the best shape of his life. "I left Belleville weighing 163, now I weigh 174 and no more fat."⁹ After reaching New Orleans, the 2nd Illinois was boarded upon the Steamer *Galveston* and set to sail by water to Port La Vacca, Texas. From La Vacca, the regiment would soon be ordered to march to San Antonio, and later in the month of August, to converge upon the Mexican border.

The letters written by Adolph Engelmann to his parents were done so in German, due to his parent's inability to read or speak the English language. In order to facilitate delivery, Engelmann sent the letters to his brother-in-law, Gustavus Koerner, who delivered them to Adolph's parents.

Lieutenant Engelmann and the 2nd Illinois meandered through Texas and made their way from San Antonio, to Presidio, Monclova, Parras, Saltillo, and finally ended up in Buena Vista, Mexico. While in Texas, Engelmann had leave in San Antonio, and was inclined to write his parents a letter about how he viewed the city. "The little city has but few streets, most of the buildings are around the three squares, which with the stoutly built houses, the old church, the pretty stream, the many canals, the brown Mexicans and the broken Texans altogether make up San Antonio with its peculiarities."¹⁰ He also described a town that was full of saloons and billiard halls, and was a buttress in finding many ways for "a man to lose his money." Soon Engelmann and the rest of the 2nd Illinois would be in Mexico and drawing closer to the enemy.

By October the regiment had crossed the Rio Grande, and was on Mexican soil. Engelmann noted from his experiences that most Mexicans with whom he came into contact were friendly with the American soldiers, probably because the Mexicans had

more to fear from the soldiers of Santa Anna's army, or from tax collectors. In Santa Rosa, he compared the countryside with that of Southern Illinois, complete with orchards. Adolph also noted, however, in a quote that has become quite famous about Mexico during the war, that "All plants here have thorns, all animals stings or horns and all men carry weapons."¹¹

In the early part of February 1847, the command of the 2nd Illinois passed under that of General Zachary Taylor. On 20 February 1847 scouts reported that the enemy was within twenty miles of Buena Vista Mexico, in the vicinity of where the 2nd Illinois was stationed. On the 21st a nearby post at Aqua Nueva was abandoned and the provisions left behind were burned to insure they would not fall into enemy hands. The men from this outpost were sent to reinforce the army at Buena Vista. By the evening of the 22nd, the Mexican Army had formed their line of battle in the valley before Buena Vista. In a letter written to his parents later in the war Engelmann discussed the soldiers' initial satisfaction in seeing the enemy citing, "We marched 1,000 miles to see the Mexican Army and at last our wish was fulfilled, and caused a great deal of satisfaction among the troops."¹² Sporadic fighting had already begun during the night, but the main conflict would start the morning of the 23rd. At 10 A.M. on 23 February 1847 the Battle of Buena Vista began.

The first volley of Mexican musketry came from a ravine just below the plateau where the 2nd Illinois was positioned. It sailed over the heads of the men and no one was injured, save the regimental adjutant who was struck by a spent ball. Capt. Raith's company of the 2nd Illinois was ultimately under the command of Gen. Zachary Taylor, and Taylor gave the order to advance upon the Mexicans and pitch into the fight. The Mexican force at Buena Vista numbered close to 14,000 men, while Taylor had only 5,000 to lead onto the field.¹³ The Mexicans were pushed back and Santa Anna's army was hounded by the cavalry of Jefferson Davis, and the incessant artillery fire of Braxton Bragg. During the battle, the 2nd Illinois was rallied by Gen. Wool, and both Illinois regiments charged the field. It was during this fight that Adolph Engelmann was seriously wounded. He received a musket ball in the shoulder

which rendered him incapable of retaking the field. Although this was the only battle in which Engelmann would participate, or the 2nd Illinois for that matter, his conduct was all that any commander could ask.

The 2nd Illinois had sixty-two killed and sixty-nine wounded, including seven dead and eleven wounded in Raith's company "H." Among these was Adolph Engelmann who, having lost use of his right arm, was compelled to have fellow German soldiers write home to his family to assure them he would be alright. In a letter written home to Shiloh by his future brother-in-law, Max Scheel, Engelmann dictates that although he is wounded he expects to recover rapidly, and in a weak scribble with his left hand Adolph pens, "Wounded but lively, yours for the time being left handed."¹⁴ Engelmann stayed on sick call recovering from his shoulder wound for the better part of three months. On 9 May 1847 from Saltillo, Mexico, Engelmann writes to his parents about recovering from his wound. "About a week ago I suffered an attack of slow fever, which has left me now, although I lost considerable weight. At the same time I also had a severe attack of dysentery but am gradually getting better. In spite of all this the condition of my wound is improving, the swelling is nearly gone and I can move my shoulder better than at any time since I was wounded."¹⁵

This would prove to be the last letter that Adolph would write to his parents while in the Mexican War. The Adjutant General's records show that Engelmann was absent on furlough from 23 May 1847 until 18 June 1847, when his company was mustered out of service. The wounded Engelmann made the trip back to Shiloh enduring a great deal of pain. Strangely enough, the surgeons in the field did not remove the musket ball from his shoulder, and the procedure was not conducted until he reached St. Louis.¹⁶ After he regained his health, Adolph went back into the business of practicing law, first in Belleville, and then for a short while in Chicago. It was while Engelmann was in Chicago that he heard Frederick Hecker give a fiery speech about the high hopes of the new revolutionary movements taking place in Germany. The speech, delivered in June 1849, was all that Adolph

needed to hear to follow his fellow St. Clair County immigrant back to the fatherland to aid in the revolutions.¹⁷ However, on his arrival in London, he learned of the failure of the revolution in Baden. Engelmann then went to Germany, where many of his relatives lived, and spent about a year in Berlin, Frankfurt, and Munich.

The mounting turmoil in Northern Germany, however, would soon be brought to a climax when Schleswig-Holstein revolted against Denmark for its independence. More than one-third of the population of Denmark was German, and most of these Germans lived in the duchy of Schleswig-Holstein. Denmark wanted to incorporate the duchy as a central part of Denmark, while the German population wanted it to be a free state in a new German Republic.¹⁸ In 1850, when Schleswig-Holstein was deserted by the rest of the German powers, they declared war on Denmark, and Adolph Engelmann entered its army. He took part in the battle of Mysunde on 12 September 1850, and also in the siege of Fredericia.

Adolph Engelmann's service in the Denmark War was short lived, as in 1851 Schleswig-Holstein was compelled by Austria and Prussia to discontinue the war. Adolph then returned home to Belleville where he was given the honor of being associated with Frederick Hecker, being a fellow "Forty-Eighter," and being a revolutionary. Soon after his return, his brother Jacob, who had tended the farm for his parents, was lost at sea, and Adolph took over and conducted the farm. He enjoyed the work on the farm and was content being a farmer and fruit grower. The Engelmann farm was always overflowing with numerous varieties of plants, and vineyards were planted so the family could make wine. It was during this time that Adolph met and fell in love with Wilhelmina Schirmer, whom he married on 25 April 1859. He enjoyed great success and was content with farming until the Rebellion broke out, and the call for volunteers was made.

Engelmann's brother-in-law, Gustavus Koerner, a former Lt. Gov. of Illinois and recognized leader of the German population in Illinois, was given the charge of organizing an all

German Regiment for Illinois. St. Clair County would provide the obvious location for enlistment, with a majority of the population being German. In August 1861, Koerner called upon Julius Raith, former Captain in the Mexican War, and his brother-in-law Adolph, to head the Regiment that would be designated the 43rd Illinois Volunteer Infantry, or Koerner's Regiment. Raith, who had established a prosperous flour mill in O'Fallon, Illinois before the war, would become the Colonel, while Engelmann would be designated Lieut. Col. Adolph Dengler, a fellow Belleville German, who was also a Forty-Eighter, and who had already seen action in the Rebellion at Wilson's Creek, Missouri under Franz Sigel, would be commissioned Major.

Recruits filled the ranks of the 43rd and German immigrants from Belleville, Mascoutah, Shiloh, and Lebanon, among others, enlisted to preserve the Union. In September 1861, the regiment was moved to Camp Butler, in Springfield, Illinois. Eight companies were organized and on 12 October 1861, the 43rd Illinois Infantry was mustered into United States service by Capt. Pitcher.¹⁹ The following day Engelmann and the rest of the 43rd moved by rail to Benton Barracks, Missouri. In early November the regiment was moved again by rail to Tipton, then Otterville, Missouri, where it had its first march. Engelmann stated that the spirits of the men were high, and no real sickness or disease had spread through the camps while stationed in Missouri. In January 1862, the regiment was fitted with two more companies, bringing its strength to complete force, and it was ready to disembark for the Southern Confederacy.

The 43rd Illinois was placed on the Steamer *Memphis*, and in a letter written home to his wife whom he affectionately calls "Mina," he gives details of the location and strength of the regiment. "We are currently right above Ft. Henry, Ky. [Though he certainly must have meant Tennessee] and the boys are in good spirits. Our Regiment currently numbers 1,500 strong."²⁰ During the voyage south, only two men from the 43rd were lost, having been taken overboard and drowned.

After the Confederate forces had evacuated Fort Henry, the 43rd was assigned garrison duty inside the fort. Adolph used

this idle time of garrison duty to ride outside the fort. Some days he would spend almost all day in the saddle going as far as was allowed by orders. Col. Raith was extremely disappointed that his regiment was not to take part in the Battle of Ft. Donelson. He pleaded, but to no avail; the 43rd Illinois would have to wait for its first chance in battle. The regiment arrived at Ft. Donelson after the battle, on 26 February 1862, and stayed in garrison there till 4 March 1862. The order was then given to board the Steamer *Eugenia* and prepare to disembark down the Tennessee River to Savannah, Tennessee. While on board the steamer, Adolph wrote home to his wife and sister about the heroic exploits of his brother-in-law, Max Scheel. Scheel, a friend from the Mexican War, and officer in the predominantly German 9th Illinois Infantry, was one of the first soldiers who arrived at Ft. Donelson. Scheel, along with a young Lieutenant from Mascoutah, Fred Scheve, captured a flag from the 18th Tennessee Infantry. Engelmann was proud of his family, but cautious of what could lie ahead. He knew too well what war meant, and knew it would not be long before his regiment would be in a fight.

Engelmann described Savannah in a letter written home to his wife on 15 March 1862 as a town of about half the size of Mascoutah. He also noted that the weather had been extremely rainy and that Col. Raith was sick with fever, but thought he would recover soon if the sun came out.²¹ Not long after arriving in Savannah, the 43rd Illinois, along with a number of other regiments, including the 9th Illinois, floated a few more miles downstream where they docked at a small, muddy trading port called Pittsburg Landing. They went into camp a few miles northwest of a small meeting house called Shiloh. Life in camp for the 43rd Illinois had gone on without much excitement for nearly a week, with only target practice and picket duty to keep the men busy. What the Union Army did not know was that Confederate Gen. Albert S. Johnston was leading his army out of Corinth, Mississippi to attack Gen. Ulysses S. Grant in a surprise advance.

On the morning of Sunday 6 April 1862 Col. Raith heard the sound of battle from his position near the Shiloh church. He immediately had the tents taken down, the wagons loaded, and

the regiment paraded on the color line.²² He ordered Lt. Col. Engelmann to ride to Col. Reardon who was in command of the third brigade of McClernand's first division, of which the 43rd was a part, and ask the Colonel to ready the brigade. Reardon, however, was ill. He informed Adolph to tell Col. Raith that he was now in charge of the brigade, as he was the only senior officer left to command. Without any aides, and no mounted orderlies to assist him, Col. Julius Raith was in command of the third brigade, which at the time was only able to assemble one regiment for battle.²³ By this time the enemy was only three hundred yards in front of the 43rd, and driving back startled union troops into their lines. Engelmann was immediately dispatched to the camp of the 49th Illinois and ordered their commander to assemble his regiment in line of battle to face the enemy approaching in their front. The order was received with the inquiry, "For what purpose?" It was believed that the firing in the front was from the men of the 43rd firing off their pieces to empty them from having been loaded for two days. Engelmann himself was confused and rode to the front, but without going two hundred yards from the camp of the 49th, he saw his regiment already engaged with the enemy.²⁴ Due to Col. Raith having assumed control of the brigade, the command of the regiment devolved to Engelmann, who did his best to assemble the other regiments into line of battle. Engelmann ordered the 43rd to advance one hundred yards where it would be partially sheltered by the brow of a hill. This position was immediately to the left of Capt. A.C. Waterhouse's Battery of Illinois Artillery. As the fighting progressed, soldiers from Sherman's and Prentiss's divisions came streaming through the lines. Although much was done to try to rally these men, it was no use. The only thing the retreating men could mutter was, "Don't go in there, you'll catch hell, we are cut to pieces ... we are whipped." The 43rd Illinois maintained its position though, and gallantly withstood a vastly greater opponent, falling back to the battery only when ammunition had run low.²⁵ After withdrawing, Engelmann and the regiment reunited with the rest of the brigade and made a stand along the Hamburg-Purdy road leading east and west through the encampment of the first division. Here Raith

dismounted from his horse to rally the brigade in support of Schwartz's battery. Engelmann had also dismounted from his horse "Peet" and handed him to Private Vogler, the bugler of the 43rd Illinois. The weather had been unseasonably hot leading up to the battle, so Engelmann had buckled his brand new frock coat to his saddle. While Vogler was holding Peet, the horse was shot, and Engelmann lost a new frock coat and numerous personal effects. It was also here while gallantly rallying the brigade that Col. Raith received a minnie ball through the upper right thigh. The brigade made a stubborn stand but was forced to retreat when superior forces pushed them back from the battery.

Four men were put in charge of carrying the wounded Raith from the field, but after only a few yards, the Colonel, being in immense pain from a completely shattered leg, ordered the men to put him down, stating that soldiers can do more in line of battle than carrying off a disabled officer.²⁶ Col. Raith lay against a tree exposed the entire day and stormy night that followed, with no other assistance than was given him by the passing enemy, who on the following morning ransacked his pockets for personal belongings and carried him into a tent. Some hours afterward, the position had again fallen into Union possession. He was then removed to the river bank, and on Sunday morning into the Steamer *Hannibal*, where his leg was amputated on Wednesday morning; but he was too exhausted from exposure and loss of blood, and died on Friday evening. In him the army lost one of its bravest officers.²⁷ The remainder of the day saw the 43rd advancing and retreating, eventually ending up at the center of the Union line. When ammunition ran low, the regiment was ordered to use what was found in the cartridge boxes of the dead Confederates. The 3rd Brigade and the 43rd Illinois, still under the command of Adolph Engelmann, fought on until their ammunition completely ran out. The brigade was withdrawn to the camp of the 9th Illinois where it remained through the night.

During the night reinforcements came when Gen. Don Carlos Buell and his Army of the Ohio arrived at Pittsburg Landing. On the second day, Adolph Engelmann led a charge of the 43rd in part of Grant's counter attack to push Gen. Beauregard

back to Corinth. During this charge, he was hit by buckshot in the breast but no real damage was done because it glanced off his suspenders and just left a "deep red bruise."

The first letter Adolph wrote home to his wife after the horrible two-day battle came on 8 April 1862. The shock of the battle was evident in his letter as he was confused about the dates in which his regiment was engaged, citing the days of battle as the 4th and 5th of April. He also gave preliminary numbers of killed and wounded. Of 500 men who went into battle the first day only 250 returned unscathed. The next day saw only 150 men of the 43rd in action. Raith was seriously injured in the leg. Dengler was shot in the neck. Captains Grimm and Mauss were dead. Chaplain Walther of Mascoutah was dead. Tobein, Ewald, Ehrhardt and Stephani were wounded. Five lieutenants were either dead or wounded. He concluded with "Around me is death and horror." On 9 April he gave the numbers as forty-five dead and 150 wounded. The final total given by the Adjutant General was 500 men taken into action by the regiment and 206 were wounded, 49 of whom died. After a few weeks, the regiments were busy trying to salvage what was left of their camps. In a letter dated 23 April 1862, Engelmann wrote home to Mina about the condition of his camp after the battle:

The field bed stayed in the tent and I found it whole. The tent was, of course, full of holes but it does not leak badly because of the fly over it. In our kitchen the Secessionists found several jars of anchovies, about eight pounds of the best Swiss cheese, four pounds of chocolate and sauerkraut etc. They ate all of this except the kraut, of which they ate only about one quarter of a barrel. To quench their thirst, caused by the salty anchovies and Swiss cheese, they found only water; although they found plenty of bottles for shortly before the battle we had had plenty of beer and Champaign.²⁸

Private William E. Bevens of the 1st Arkansas remembered sitting down in the camp of the 43rd and serving himself from a larder of cheese and chocolate. He also was part of a group of rebels who took the instruments of the 43rd's band.²⁹ Adolph Engelmann and the 43rd Illinois Infantry participated in the advance on Corinth, Mississippi, as the rear guard of Grant's army.

For the better part of 1862, the 43rd Illinois, along with their newly appointed Colonel Adolph Engelmann, were stationed in Southern Tennessee around the vicinity of Jackson, Bethel, and Bolivar. The main purpose of their stay here was to build an extensive system of fortifications, and to guard the railroad tracks from Confederate cavalry and guerillas. Although the 43rd Illinois was ordered toward Corinth, Mississippi in September, and then to dig in at Iuka on the 20th, it returned to Corinth the same day, and then by rail back to Bolivar. On the 29th of October, the 43rd was marched to LaGrange, Mississippi, and then back the next day in the pouring rain.³⁰ The main Confederate force that Engelmann had to deal with was that of Gen. Nathan Bedford Forrest, whose cavalry and artillery had been raiding towns and railroad junctions in Western Tennessee for the better part of the year. On 18 December 1862, Engelmann moved 250 men of the 43rd, along with an equal number of men from the 61st Illinois Infantry, by rail to Jackson, Tennessee, leaving about one hundred men behind in Bolivar under Captain Samuel Schimminger of Mascoutah. Once arriving in Jackson, Engelmann and his command marched down the Lexington road to meet with a detachment of cavalry from the 11th Illinois, 5th Ohio, and 1st West Tennessee, altogether numbering 800 men. Their mission was to watch the Confederate Forrest, who had just crossed the Tennessee River at Lexington with about 1,800 men and artillery. Engelmann's force was now at a strength of nearly 1,300.

The federal force under Col. Engelmann followed Forrest until they could see the campfires of the Confederates flickering only a few hundred yards in the distance. The brigade stopped to bivouac for the night in front of a small country graveyard called Salem Cemetery. The order was given for no campfires to be built

because the enemy was less than one-half mile in the front. Some men of the 61st Illinois, who were without blankets, suffering much from the cold, decided to try to build a small fire out of fence rails. But right then a mounted officer dashed up to the flames. He was wearing big cavalry boots, and stomped the fire out quickly. The officer proved to be Col. Engelmann, and he swore at the boys vigorously, stating that the rebels were sure to “shell the hell out of us” if they gave away their position.³¹ The night was bitterly cold, and in the morning, Engelmann gave the men permission to build small fires to cook their breakfast. After breakfast, Engelmann ordered his brigade inside the cemetery, where they could be formed in a more defensive stance.

The enemy at first moved its cavalry skirmishers by the flanks at both sides of the cemetery. Forrest’s artillery then began to shell the area, but almost all the shots fell too close, or too far to cause any real damage. The cannonade did, however, prevent the cavalry commanded by Major Funk of the 11th Illinois to gain access to the field. The artillery then changed position, and was able to pour a fire into the cemetery that kept the cavalry from being involved in the fight. The 43rd and 61st Illinois were stationed along the wooded area on both sides of the cemetery, which proved to be an excellent position from which to face the enemy. The rebel cavalry in front first came at a walk, then a trot, then at a full on charge with loud yelling and cheering as they raced towards the center of Engelmann’s line.³² Adolph kept the men cool, and when the enemy got within firing distance, the 43rd and 61st opened up with a series of volleys that decimated the enemy. Engelmann was sitting on his horse “Bragg” (whom he called Bragg because of being blind in one eye, just like the rebel Gen. Braxton Bragg) when a riderless horse came through the lines. The horse was frightened and took off with Adolph still in the saddle, moving him dangerously close to the enemy. Engelmann was finally able to control the horse and brought him back to the road between the 43rd and 61st Illinois.³³ The enemy’s artillery fire was starting to become more accurate, however, and one man of the 61st was killed, while three from the 43rd were

wounded. In an orderly withdrawal, Engelmann's brigade moved out of the cemetery, away from the range of artillery fire.

The Battle of Jackson ended with the command of Col. Engelmann checking the advance of Forrest, which proved to be quite an accomplishment. The casualties for Engelmann's brigade were listed as only two killed, with four wounded. Two horses of the 11th Illinois cavalry were also lost. The Confederate loss was substantially heavier, with an estimated sixty killed and wounded, as well as three taken prisoner, including one lieutenant.³⁴ Engelmann's wife Mina had recently been to Bolivar to visit with Adolph and she was in the camp of the 43rd while the battle raged in nearby Jackson. When he returned, she was safe, but all the men and supplies had been moved into the depot and fortifications. This marked the first of many occasions where Mina came to visit Adolph in the field, a practice not so uncommon by high ranking federal officers.

In the early spring of 1863, Adolph Engelmann's brigade was under the command of Brigadier General Brayman, who in turn ordered two hundred men of the 43rd Illinois to be mounted. Expeditions were sent out in a radius of forty miles from Bolivar where many skirmishes were had, and many prisoners and horses taken.³⁵ Adolph disagrees with having the 43rd mounted, however, and insists in a letter home to Mina that a good regiment is wasted when half are mounted. Its only use would be to hunt guerillas. The 43rd would not be staying in Bolivar long, however.

On 31 May 1863 the 43rd Illinois, along with the rest of Col. Adolph Engelmann's brigade, was moved by rail to Memphis, where it was put aboard the Steamer *Tycoon* and moved up the Yazoo River. The ship was unloaded just below Haines Bluff. The 43rd Illinois, which was part of Engelmann's 1st Brigade of Gen. Kimball's 3rd Division, was ordered here to take position in the back of the city of Vicksburg. The mobilization was part of Gen. Grant's siege of the city of Vicksburg to open up the Mississippi River and safely place it in Union hands. The constant cannon blasts were heard day in and day out. Adolph would have to frequently stop letters because the earth would shake so much. The noise was unbearable as well, which caused much frustration

among the men. From this point on, Lt. Col. Dengler was in control of the 43rd Illinois, with Col. Engelmann either being in charge of a brigade or a division. On 4 July 1863, an ecstatic Adolph writes home to Mina about the capture of Vicksburg stating over and over again, "It is ours, it is ours." On the sixth, he was able to tour the city and see the fortifications inside, citing that the city could not have been taken by assault. The fortifications were impregnable, and the 1,900 men inside were heavy with ammunition and ready for duty. On 12 July, Engelmann's brigade was moved to Big Black River, then on the 22nd to Snyder's Bluff, always in the position of rear guard of Grant's army. On 29 July, Engelmann and his brigade were moved to Helena, Arkansas, where they were designated the First Brigade of the Second Division, Seventh Army Corps, Major Gen. Frederick Steele commanding.

For the first two weeks of August 1863, Adolph had a furlough to go back to Shiloh to see his wife and family. In a letter written home to Mina on 19 August from the Steamer *Atlantic*, in Cairo, Illinois, Adolph writes that he had missed his first train in O'Fallon, and was compelled to go to Lebanon to catch a late train leaving at seven in the evening. While in Lebanon, he was met as a hero, and a whole band was brought out to recognize his presence. After a few words spoken, and a "great deal of beer, wine, and whiskey drunk," he was off to Cairo to board the first steamer heading south.³⁶ On the steamer, Adolph was informed that his command had left Helena on 12 August, and was on its way to Little Rock, Arkansas, under the command of Gen. Steele. Adolph arrived in Memphis on 21 August, and then moved by rail, arriving in Helena on 23 August, where he was informed that his command was on the White River, at Duvall's Bluff, Arkansas. On 25 August he was able to secure passage on the Steamer *Prairie Rose*, to take him down the White River to meet his command on Duvall's Bluff.

When arriving at Duvall's Bluff, Col. Engelmann was sent to Gen. Steele to report his delay in returning to his command. A formal inquiry was organized to investigate this issue, and for a short while Adolph was without a duty, or a command. The

Colonel of the 43rd Indiana, although not being the senior Colonel, had succeeded in transferring his regiment to the place of the 43rd Illinois, and assuming control of the Division, a post which Col. Engelmann had earned. While the formal inquiry was going on, evidence was brought to light that the Indiana Colonel had tendered his resignation, only to have it rescinded by the Governor of Indiana when the post of Division command was opened up in Arkansas. Gen. Steele informed Adolph that if this information was true, and the inquiry proved he was merely just delayed in returning to his command, he would receive the command of the division, and the 43rd Illinois would be restored to that Division.³⁷ On 2 September 1863, Col. Adolph Engelmann was given command of the Second Division, 7th Army Corps.

Adolph Engelmann and his Second Division were ordered with the rest of Gen. Steele's corps to advance on and capture the city of Little Rock, Arkansas. On 10 September 1863, right outside the city of Little Rock, at Bayou Forche, Engelmann's Division was briskly engaged with a Confederate force trying to protect Little Rock. In his report to Gen. Steele he commended the superior artillery of his army in using rifled cannon at great precision at up to two miles.³⁸ After the engagement at Forche, the city of Little Rock, Arkansas was easily taken, with the 43rd Illinois being the first regiment inside the town. Adolph Engelmann and his command, including the 43rd Illinois, were stationed at Little Rock until March of 1864. During their stay, Mina Engelmann came down and spent several months with Adolph.

On 13 March 1864, Engelmann's command was reassigned to that of the Third Brigade, Third Division, Gen. F. Solomon commanding. Maj. Gen. Steele would be in command of the entire Red River Expedition. They moved out of Little Rock on 23 March 1864. On 2 April 1864 Engelmann's Third Brigade was trying to cross the Little Missouri River at Elkin's Ferry, when a brigade of Gen. Jo Shelby's cavalry tried to halt their advance. The roads in this part of Arkansas were impassable, so an alternate route had to be found to get to Camden. The skirmish amounted to nothing for the Confederates, as it did not stop the advance of Steele's army. In Engelmann's brigade, casualties were listed as three

killed, and three wounded. The Division total was listed as thirty-eight killed and wounded, with Confederate losses estimated at double that figure.³⁹ On the 10th, Engelmann's brigade was involved in a skirmish at Prairie D'Anne, where the 43rd Illinois served quite honorably, repulsing numerous charges by superior Confederate forces, lasting until 10:30 in the evening.⁴⁰ On 12 April 1864, Steele's force reached Camden. The purpose of the expedition was to unite with Gen. Banks's forces at Shreveport, but information was soon obtained that Banks was defeated, and the Confederates were planning to advance on Steele's army. Steele decided to turn around and return to Little Rock at 1 A.M. on 27 April.

During the retreat back to Little Rock, the rear guard of Steele's Army, commanded by Adolph Engelmann, was in constant combat with the advance forces of Gen. E. Kirby Smith's Confederate forces. On 30 April 1864 in the Saline River bottoms near Jenkins' Ferry, Arkansas the rebels attacked Steele's army hard. Colored troops of the 2nd Kansas and 1st Arkansas joined with the 43rd Illinois to overtake a Confederate artillery position. The troops accomplished this feat, and came away with two captured rebel guns.⁴¹ The repeated attacks caused heavy losses for the rear guard forces with 521 Union soldiers being killed or wounded, the 43rd Illinois taking the brunt of the abuse, but handing it right back, inflicting 443 killed on the Confederate side.⁴² It was considered a Union victory while in retreat. Col. Engelmann and the remainder of Solomon and Steele's army arrived back in Little Rock on 3 May 1864.

After Engelmann and his command returned to Little Rock, his brigade was used as garrison for the city. The 43rd Illinois would serve out the rest of its three years service while at Little Rock. Adolph used this time to invite Mina down to visit him, which she did, on a few different occasions. When Mina was not with him, he wrote home frequently, with the source of his letters revolving around obtaining enough recruits to fill the 43rd so Lt. Col. Dengler could be promoted to Colonel of the 43rd Illinois Consolidated Regiment. Engelmann himself wanted a promotion, and felt that he deserved to be promoted to the rank of

Brig. General. On 1 October 1864, he was given the command of the whole city and military post at Little Rock, Arkansas, a huge accomplishment of which he was very proud.⁴³ Adolph Engelmann served out his term of military service at Little Rock, Arkansas, being mustered out of United States service on 31 December 1864. Shortly after, Lt. Col. Dengler was able to acquire enough troops to have the 43rd remain in the field and receive his promotion to Colonel. On 13 March 1865, Adolph Engelmann was promoted to Brevet Brigadier General of United States Volunteers. This would become a title used by many back home that held this heroic German in high regard. The 43rd Illinois Volunteer Infantry served out the rest of its service at Little Rock as well, being finally mustered out of service at Springfield, Illinois on 20 November 1865.

General Adolph Engelmann returned triumphantly to Shiloh, Illinois, and settled quietly on his farm with Mina by his side. The couple would have three children; Anna, Josephine, and Otto. Engelmann loved living the quiet life of farmer and father. He enjoyed attending veterans' reunions, and was an executive officer of the Shiloh Valley Gun Club.⁴⁴ Tragedy struck though in the spring of 1880, when Mina passed away on 21 May. She was buried in the family cemetery on the Engelmann farm. He was granted a military pension for the wound he had received in the Mexican War, and was awarded fifteen dollars a month.⁴⁵ In April 1886, Adolph moved to Belleville, and was appointed Postmaster by President Grover Cleveland. He served at this post until 1890 when he moved back to the farm in Shiloh. On 4 October 1890 he was taken ill while attending to business in Belleville, and complained of chest pain when he returned to his farm. Shortly after noon on Sunday, 5 October 1890, Adolph Engelmann died quietly on his farm in Shiloh, Illinois. He left behind Anna and Josephine, aged 20 and 18 years respectively, and Otto, aged 15 years.

The funeral service was conducted by Hecker Post of the Grand Army of the Republic and was attended by hundreds of family and friends. Civil War airs such as "The Vacant Chair" and "Resting in the Shade of the Trees" were played.⁴⁶ A brief speech

was made chronicling Adolph's life, which was taken from Gustavus Koerner's, "Die Deutsche in Amerika." Perhaps Koerner said it best when he summed up the chapter about Adolph Engelmann: "Er ist der Sohn seines Vaters; das sagt genug." He is his father's son; that says enough.

Notes

- 1 "Adolph Engelmann Genealogy," <www.familysearch.com>, 1 December 2003.
- 2 Engelmann-Kircher Family Papers. Illinois State Historical Library, Springfield, Illinois.
- 3 "Death of Col. Adolph Engelmann," *Belleville Weekly Advocate*, 10 October 1890.
- 4 "Mexican War Letters of Adolph Engelmann 1846-1847," *Journal of the Illinois State Historical Society*, Vol. 26, April-Jan. 1933, edited by Otto Engelmann. (These letters were translated by Adolph Engelmann's son, Otto, in his later years, following his service in World War I.)
- 5 *Belleville Weekly Advocate*, 10 October 1890. (Due to the age of these papers, page numbers on most newspapers are either illegible, or non-existent.)
- 6 Ibid.
- 7 Ibid.
- 8 "Mexican War Letters of Adolph Engelmann 1846-1847."
- 9 Ibid.
- 10 Ibid.
- 11 Ibid.
- 12 Ibid.
- 13 "The Battle of Buena Vista," <www.americaslibrary.gov>, 1 December 2003.
- 14 "Mexican War Letters of Adolph Engelmann 1846-1847."
- 15 Ibid.
- 16 "Death of Col. Adolph Engelmann," *Belleville Weekly Advocate*, 10 October 1890.
- 17 Gustave Koerner, *Die Deutsche Element in den Vereinigten Staaten von Nordamerika, 1818-1848* (Cincinnati: U. C. Wilde, 1880), 43-50.

- 18 "The Schleswig-Holstein Rebellion," <www.milhist.dk>, 1 December 2003.
- 19 Adjutant General's Report, 43rd Illinois Infantry.
- 20 Engelmann-Kircher Family Papers. Illinois State Historical Library, Springfield, Illinois.
- 21 Ibid.
- 22 Adjutant General's Report, 43rd Illinois.
- 23 Report of Lt. Col. Adolph Engelmann, USA, Forty-third Illinois Volunteer Infantry, Third Brigade, First Division, Army of the Tennessee. O.R., X, pt.1, 143.
- 24 Ibid.
- 25 Ibid.,144.
- 26 Ibid.
- 27 Ibid., 145.
- 28 Engelmann-Kircher Family Papers. Illinois State Historical Library, Springfield, Illinois.
- 29 "Account of Private William E. Bevens," <www.civilwargazette.com>, 1 December 2003.
- 30 Adjutant General's Report, 43rd Illinois.
- 31 Leander Stillwell, *Story of a Common Soldier of Army Life in the Civil War* (Erie?, Kansas, 1920), 114-5.
- 32 Report of Colonel Adolph Engelmann, Forty-third Illinois Infantry, of engagement near Jackson. O.R., Chapter XXIX, pp. 555-7.
- 33 Engelmann-Kircher Family Papers, Illinois State Historical Library, Springfield, Illinois.
- 34 Report of Lt. Colonel Adolph Engelmann, 555-7.
- 35 Adjutant General's Report, 43rd Illinois.
- 36 Engelmann-Kircher Family Papers, Illinois State Historical Library, Springfield, Illinois.
- 37 Ibid.
- 38 Report of Colonel Adolph Engelmann, Forty-third Illinois Infantry, commanding Second Division, of engagement at Bayou Fourche. O.R., Chapter XXXIV, 513-4.
- 39 Reports of Colonel Adolph Engelmann, Forty-third Illinois Infantry, commanding Third Brigade. O.R., Chapter XLVI, 720-1.
- 40 Adjutant General's Report, 43rd Illinois.
- 41 Ibid.
- 42 "Jenkins's Ferry Battle Summary," <www.cr.nps.gov>, 2 July 2000.

- 43 Engelmann-Kircher Family Papers, Illinois State Historical Library, Springfield, Illinois.
- 44 *Belleville Weekly Advocate*, "Reunion of Union Veterans," 24 October 1879.
- 45 "Pensions Granted," *Belleville Weekly Advocate*, 2 November 1883.
- 46 "Death of Col. Adolph Engelmann," *Belleville Weekly Advocate*, 10 October 1890.

Corey B. White

The Cherokee Triangle Association:
A History of Affluence and Segregation

Louisville, Kentucky in Jefferson County is a city situated along the Ohio River on the border of Indiana and Kentucky. In 2003, the city and county governments merged. However, this merger will not have an effect on the vibrant and colorful neighborhoods that pepper the greater metropolitan area. Louisvillians are neighborhood-conscious people by nature and reserve a certain amount of pride toward their individual stomping ground. In a discussion of Louisville neighborhoods prepared by the Public School's Division of Curriculum and Research for Jefferson County, the author, Lourena Eaton wrote, "The story is told that if a Louisvillian away from home is asked where he lives he will not answer 'Louisville,' but will say ... some other section of the city."¹ As the document goes on to indicate, "neighborhoods don't 'just happen.'"² They were created out of a demand. Sometimes this demand was centered on geographic needs like a neighborhood starting around a factory that houses the employees that work there. But most often, neighborhoods were plotted land grants that were sold off in order for people to build homes. Such is the case of one neighborhood in Louisville, the Cherokee Triangle.

The Cherokee Triangle comprises 237 acres, approximately 88 percent of which are residential.³ Unique to the Cherokee Triangle is its designation as a National Register and Local Landmark District due in large part to the efforts of the Cherokee Triangle Association (CTA).⁴ According to *The Encyclopedia of Louisville*, the CTA strove to attain this distinction for their neighborhood because they claimed they needed to "stop the decline of their neighborhood."⁵ Residents at the time felt that the historic character and traditional architecture of the neighborhood were in jeopardy.⁶ Although the CTA claims to have been formed solely to preserve their neighborhood's historic diversity, specific

evidence also indicates they were perhaps partially motivated by a fear of the introduction of people of lower socio-economic class in their streets and homes.

The quintessential literary work for anyone interested in the Cherokee Triangle itself is *The Cherokee Area: A History*, by Anne S. Karem. In her book, Karem traces the history of the area of land sectioned-off as the Triangle from the 1869 purchase by real estate developers James Henning and Joshua Speed from George Douglass to the early twentieth century.⁷ Karem employs a street-by-street breakdown in order to map a district of decadence and privilege. The affluence of the neighborhood began in 1871 when James Henning built the first house on the primary artery of the neighborhood, Cherokee Road. The house, built on a lot large enough for three houses, was a wedding present for Henning's daughter and son-in-law, J.J.B. Hilliard.⁸ James Henning seemingly set the tone for the future of his neighborhood when he not only built the house on an unnecessary three lots of land, but he paid \$135,000 for the land as well. Henning illustrated the attitude of over-abundance and extreme wealth that came to dominate the Cherokee Triangle and later evolved into a nativist sentiment among its residents.

Released in the spring of 2003, Samuel W. Thomas's book *Cherokee Triangle: A History of the Heart of the Highlands* provides an informative history of the neighborhood through interviews, newspaper excerpts and many other sources. In the coming years, the 270-page work will surely become the definitive resource for the Cherokee Triangle. Picking up where Karem seemingly left off, Thomas not only revisited the origin of the neighborhood, but traced the recent history (since 1975) as well. Thomas even dedicated the book to Karem, his predecessor.⁹ Thomas's views reveal certain levels of bias that clouded his interpretation of the CTA. A long-time resident of the Triangle, Thomas could never cast his own neighborhood in a bad light, not to mention the association that partially funded his book. The true story of the CTA is one that has been ignored for too long, and it all began over a hundred years ago.

One of the first formal suburbs of the sprawling riverside city, the Cherokee Triangle drew some of the most opulent citizens to fill its houses. As one writer, Wendy Conlin, pointed out, "Only those affluent enough to have access to transportation – mainly horses – could reasonably consider entering the new neighborhood."¹⁰ Indeed the fountain located at the top of the steep hill to the entrance of the bordering Cherokee Park was built, as a promotional "guidebook" notes, to serve "many thirsty horses which had pulled carriages up the many steep park hills."¹¹ Even the homepage of the CTA claims, "Only affluent Louisvillians could afford to move to the new development. It was a necessity for residents to own horses and carriages for transportation."¹² The association did not seem interested in concealing the idea that their neighborhood should only be reserved for the upper class. A report done for the Historic Landmarks and Preservation District discovered the following about an independent town that existed within the Triangle until 1896 called Enterprise: "Indicative of the town's affluence, its charter provided for fines of \$20 for violations of certain ordinances, a fee schedule twice that of Parkland, a less affluent suburban town in the West End."¹³ Moreover, even public recreations like the park, which no one person laid claim to, were reserved only for the elite who could afford horses to scale the imposing hill that kept out those wishing to enter on foot. But other distinctions about the neighborhood before the founding of the CTA can be made as well.

Recognized as the first wealthy suburb in Louisville, it was only natural that the first electric streetcar in the city ran along the street adjacent to the Triangle. In 1889, Baxter Avenue provided access from the downtown slaughterhouses to residents of the more southern neighborhoods called the Highlands. In order to shorten the time of their daily commute, the city wanted to construct a route along Cherokee Road and began to lay tracks. Protest immediately arose as residents in the neighborhood refused to allow the lower-class Highlanders to pass through their neighborhood, even if confined to a streetcar. The protest method perfectly epitomized the elitist sentiment of the Triangle as

described by Conlin: "The women of Cherokee Triangle grabbed their knitting needles and their chairs and sat in the street in a quiet defiance."¹⁴ However, despite the efforts of the xenophobic residents of the Triangle, the new streetcar line was installed and actually spurred commercial business along nearby Bardstown Road.¹⁵ Demonstrations like this were not common to the Cherokee Triangle. However, the idea that this movement even occurred proved that from its inception, the neighborhood's inhabitants held very exclusionary sentiments.

In the twentieth century, the benefits of living in the Triangle extended beyond well-furnished parks and streetcars. The "Real Property Survey" for Louisville, Kentucky for 1938-1939 uncovered the conditions of other residents of the city when compared to that of the residents of the Cherokee Triangle. Although unimaginable by today's standards, many areas of the western neighborhood in Louisville, a traditionally poorer region of the city, registered between eighty to one hundred percent of dwelling units without a private toilet or bath. Titled the "Sanitary Facilities Map," the area around the Cherokee Triangle reported between one and nineteen percent dwelling units without proper sanitation conditions.¹⁶ This was a difference of up to 99 percent! This map is one of many that showed the disproportionate makeup of a deeply-divided city. Another map from the same report showed the average monthly rental cost for a house in March of 1939. The Triangle reported a monthly rent of at least forty dollars for the vast majority of their houses, whereas the less prestigious western Louisville neighborhood rarely exceeded twenty dollars.¹⁷ African Americans dominated the western neighborhood and had an average monthly income of fifty-three dollars.¹⁸ This would have left a mere thirteen dollars a month for every other necessity had an average African-American family actually been able to afford the cost of living in the Cherokee Triangle. These sharp contrasts represented a deeply segregated city where the distribution of wealth reached remarkable proportions. This uneven distribution would be the rallying cry needed to begin the formation of the CTA.

The actual founding of the CTA seems to be conveniently shrouded in mystery. According to the official CTA website, the association “was formed in 1962 to infuse new energy into a deteriorating urban neighborhood.”¹⁹ However, on the same page, under “CTA Accomplishments,” the first bullet-point professes the founding of the association “around 1962.”²⁰ Here it is also unclear exactly when the first meeting might have occurred. The association itself is less than forthcoming with materials about its first years in existence. The original “Cherokee Association,” as it was first known, formed in late 1962. The association’s claim of its creation because of deteriorating living conditions was reinforced by others writing about the Triangle.

In a 1989 article for the Louisville-based newspaper, the *Courier-Journal*, Wendy Conlin claimed “many of the large homes fell into disrepair [as] many affluent families left the city for the suburbs” after World War II.²¹ In a neighborhood analysis for the “Louisville.com” website, editor Robin Garr claimed the Triangle “took a turn for the shabby during the 1960s when ... old houses were converted into inexpensive apartments that became immensely popular with the era’s young ‘hippies.’”²² Both articles go on to congratulate the CTA for their foresight and initiative for being one of the first neighborhood associations in the city of Louisville. However, despite the interpretation of other historians, when measured against demographics from the time, the association’s claim that their neighborhood was deteriorating loses some legitimacy.

Volume one of *Urban Indicators*, a report from the Jefferson County Planning Commission, illustrated some contradictions to how historians remember the Cherokee Triangle in the sixties and seventies. A map illustrating the median income of families in 1959, three years before the purported founding of the CTA, found Triangle residents earning from \$6,017 to \$7,117, which was above average. The neighborhoods that seemed to have experienced the lowest income, less than \$3,819, saturated the west end of the city, according to the figures from the map.²³ Ten years later, in 1969, the median income for all families in the Triangle was above the average, as the west end continued to sink

further into poverty.²⁴ The levels of poverty were documented later in the Commission's report when it showed from zero to 6.3 percent of Cherokee Triangle residents were living below the poverty line. Compare this figure with the 26.2 percent that dominated the lower socio-economic neighborhoods around Louisville, including the underdeveloped south end.²⁵ This unbalanced distribution of the city's poverty-stricken residents illustrates that the notion of preserving the Triangle's heritage was false. Another telling statistic shows that the average number of school years completed in 1960 was 11.8 for the Triangle, almost a full high school diploma, while the west and south ends marked as low as less than 8.4 — a middle school education at best.²⁶ Further, the correlation coefficient is remarkably high (+.8199) between the 1960 median number of school years completed and the 1959 median income of all families.²⁷ This indicated that, as the residents of the Cherokee Triangle gained more education, the correlation with a higher income increased. Even more indicators continued to show the discrepancy between what historians have written about the Triangle and the reality of its quality of life at the end of the 1950s.

One of the claims for the founding of the association was that hippies dominated the population of the neighborhood. The hippies, as described earlier, brought with them the stereotype of low property values and the redistribution of wealth. The upper-middle class purists refused to allow the apparent infiltration of their neighborhood by these so-called "hippies." However, the average monthly rent for the Triangle was at least seventy-five dollars in 1960, the highest possible demographic. These figures seem to portray a Cherokee Triangle not suffering from the invasion of young hippies but, instead, a neighborhood that continued to flourish under the aristocratic hierarchy established by years of isolation.

This segregationist sentiment was further reinforced by the results of interviews conducted by the Urban Studies Center at the University of Louisville in 1975. The interviewees answered a series of questions relating to the major concerns and issues facing their neighborhood.²⁸ One specific question, number eleven,

asked, "Are there parts of Louisville and Jefferson County where you would like to go but do not because you would not feel safe?" To this, 70 percent of residents of the east end (including the Cherokee Triangle) answered yes, while only 28 percent of residents of the west end responded with a yes.²⁹ The very next question read, "(If yes) which part of the city of Louisville would you feel least safe going to?" Forty percent of east end residents claimed the west end was the place where they felt the least safe.³⁰ Where did residents of the west end feel the least safe? Of the 19.2 percent of residents that responded, 80 percent of that number claimed their safety was most threatened in their own west end!³¹ Four-fifths of west end residents that responded did not even feel safe in their own neighborhood. Therefore, crime could not have been as influential of a reason for founding the CTA if its own residents felt fully secure in their neighborhood. It seems the west end was the area more in need of a neighborhood association.

In April 1989, the CTA published a plan calling for the revitalization of the neighborhood. In his cover letter, President of the CTA Gerald R. Toner described the Triangle as "a relatively secure and desirable neighborhood with excellent neighbors and a pleasing ambience." Toner went on to explain the motivation behind the drafting of the Neighborhood Plan. He mentioned the removal of trees, the condition of alleys, and the necessity of owner-occupied housing. He wrote, "If trees are being lost on one edge of the neighborhood, it affects the lifestyle and property values of someone at the opposite edge."³² Clearly, Toner's concern for property values was something the Cherokee Triangle had dealt with before. The plan was over one hundred pages of residents' documented anxieties and apprehensions. It addressed the establishment of stop signs throughout the Triangle to lower speed limits and even offered some statistical information concerning the state of the Triangle. A table appearing in the neighborhood plan found the 1960 median family income to be \$7,151.³³ The average for the city of Louisville was \$5,280. The 1960s were supposed to be the time when the Triangle was suffering hard times and, as the "Louisville.com" article explained, was a time the Triangle played host to hippies. They

must have been a more positive form of hippies that did not fit the stereotype implied by the website; otherwise, how could they stay almost two thousand dollars above the average income. Another indicator of the prestige that still accompanied the Cherokee Triangle and warranted the creation of an association to keep out undesirables was the median number of school years completed. For the Cherokee Triangle, this number was 17.5, the equivalent of a college education, while the city at large registered a pathetic 9.3, barely creeping into high school.³⁴ So not only were these “hippies” making sizable incomes for the 1960s, most of them had bachelor’s degrees as well. These figures, published in the Triangle’s own neighborhood plan they compiled, illustrate how the Cherokee Triangle in the 1960s was not only doing fine for itself, but the residents residing there were some of the most prestigious in Louisville. How is one expected to believe the founding of the CTA was motivated by a small group of residents wanting to, as the Association’s website puts it, “infuse new energy into a deteriorating urban neighborhood,” when the neighborhood simply was in no real jeopardy.³⁵

This raises the question about why people form neighborhood associations in general. In his 1975 thesis, James Michael Penning examined neighborhood associations for Louisville and Jefferson County, Kentucky.³⁶ Penning suggested two hypotheses for why neighborhood associations are founded. The first, called the “threat hypothesis,” suggested the motivation behind the formation of neighborhood associations is based on “specific threats to neighborhood physical and/or social integrity.” The “social function hypothesis” implied that already existing associations begin to engage in political activities as a result of “land-use threats” (i.e. exterior paint palettes, lawn-care maintenance, property hazing, etc.).³⁷ Evidence has already proven that there was no inherent threat to the physical infrastructure of the Cherokee Triangle. Instead, a threat to the “social integrity” of the Triangle spurred the formation of the CTA. The CTA currently subscribes to the second theory about their formation, which is evident by the neighborhood’s

involvement in zoning ordinances and even exterior paint on houses.

A 1991 article for the *Courier-Journal* told the story of two Cherokee Triangle residents, Katherine and Richard von Dreele. The von Dreeles invested time, energy, and four thousand dollars in renovating the exterior of their house, which included a yellow paint job. Although Katherine von Dreele described the house as a “fresh, sunny yellow” in an article for the *Courier-Journal*, the Triangle spokesperson from the Landmarks Commission who oversaw architectural ordinances was quoted in Samuel Thomas’s book describing it as “electric yellow” and wanted it changed immediately.³⁸ An editorial written about the controversy for the *Journal* ended with, “It’s amazing what cosmic debates result from a little yellow paint.” In recalling this brief feud over the von Dreele house, author Thomas even chimed in his opinion, adding that in the years since the yellow paint debate “the color has aged and faded.”³⁹ Thomas’s opinion implies that no other colors besides yellow would have deteriorated and illustrates how even the color of one’s house can cause debate that refuses to die out within this community.

Penning’s dissertation also investigated the funding of neighborhood associations. He found that “neighborhood associations [in Jefferson County] tend to be relatively low-budget operations.” Indeed, a recent issue of the CTA Newsletter published in the spring of 2003 reminded its readers to update their membership at the cost of fifteen dollars for an “owner,” ten for a “renter,” ten for a senior (sixty years of age or older), and one hundred-fifty dollars for a lifetime membership.⁴⁰ Penning also discovered that approximately seventy-two percent of funding for Louisville-based neighborhood associations depended on voluntary contributions, with the Triangle depending on both membership dues and donations.⁴¹ Recent projects funded by the CTA include the 1992 cleaning of the statue of John B. Castleman, a Triangle fixture, which cost the CTA approximately ten thousand dollars.⁴² Publishing of Thomas’s aforementioned book cost the Triangle an estimated sixty thousand dollars.⁴³ These figures clearly indicate that the residents that support the CTA

have been able to finance the association well above Penning's \$4,816 mean annual budget for inner-city Louisville neighborhood associations.⁴⁴ Clearly, this exemplifies the gross disparity between neighborhoods in Louisville if one neighborhood association can appropriate five figures worth of funds to projects while others scrape by on annual budgets as low as \$750.⁴⁵ At that rate, it would have taken a west end neighborhood association eighty years to produce a book about its history! By the time the first volume would be printed, a second volume could begin.

Thomas described the founding of the organization and its first quasi-constitution. "[Harry Lewman] urged me to call some people to my house one afternoon to see whether there existed sufficient interest to consider establishment [of the Cherokee Association]."⁴⁶ Toward the end of 1962, sufficient interest existed and the association established itself and drafted its first articles of incorporation. According to Article II, the aims of the organization were:

- (1) To unite property owners in the Cherokee Road-Cherokee Parkway area and vicinity in Louisville, Kentucky.
- (2) To encourage civic improvements and betterments in that area.
- (3) To promote community activities and interest of an educational or civic nature in that area.
- (4) To cooperate with other organizations and persons having similar objectives.
- (5) To promote community planning, area development, and the furthering of public aesthetic consciousness, for the educational benefit of the general public, both directly and by the application of assets to the use of individuals or any corporation, trust, fund or foundation whose purposes and operations are in the field of civic education.⁴⁷

Nowhere in the articles of incorporation do the founders mention anything about the name "Cherokee Triangle." This is because at the time, the area was not formally known as the

Cherokee Triangle. Not until a formal request was written to the Jefferson County Planning and Zoning Commission identifying themselves as the Cherokee Triangle (probably because of the geographic shape of the neighborhood) was the area given an official title. One of the architects of that plan, John Anderson, defended the plan saying, "It was the Yuppie place to live. We paid good price for our property and put a lot of money into the house and yard, and our neighbors were doing the same."⁴⁸ The plan itself read, "The Cherokee Triangle is inhabited by people who live there by choice – not economic necessity."⁴⁹ Once again, the mouths of the people at the time contradict how historians have remembered the founding of the CTA. This plan was submitted in April 1963, supposedly at the height of the terrible sixties that plagued the neighborhood, but the plan itself claimed its inhabitants lived in the neighborhood under their own accord, not because the neighborhood had become deteriorated. As has been proven previously, the dilapidated neighborhoods resided in the west end.

The Cherokee Triangle Neighborhood Plan of 1989 called attention to the necessity to replace asphalt with brick in alleys where potholes had been filled.⁵⁰ Apparently, whether or not their alleys have brick instead of asphalt was a major concern of the CTA in 1989. What is even more depressing is that the fall 2002 CTA newsletter contained an article, "New Bricks in an Old Alley," written by Triangle resident Amy McTyeire. Apparently, McTyeire noticed that the City's Public Works Department filled her potholes with asphalt instead of brick. Redundantly, she wrote, "Brick alleys make an historic contribution to the historical character and charm of the Cherokee Triangle." McTyeire quickly notified her local alderman and the Director of Public Works to the atrocity that occurred in her alley. In less than a week, the asphalt was removed and bricks filled the potholes instead.⁵¹ This is just a small example of the century of privilege and decadence that personifies this community. Had a resident from the west or south ends of town complained about a pothole being filled with the wrong material, unless that resident resides in one of the other

two historic neighborhoods, the request would have most assuredly been denied.

These troubled areas of the city were the focus of a year-in-review work published in 1974, the year before the Cherokee Triangle saw itself supplanted as an historic preservation district. Two articles, "Slum Housing" and "Home, Sweet Slum" described the conditions of residents of the city of Louisville stating that "Most are small wooden buildings, gray from lack of paint, with broken windows, town screens, rotting steps and porches. Yet few people see the despair of the families who live behind these doors."⁵² This sort of publicity led to speculation about the housing conditions in 1962 and the years leading up to the CTA's founding. It is highly likely that houses like the ones described in the book were few and far between. However, residents of the Triangle felt their neighborhood to be somehow in danger, despite the statistical data that placed the Triangle well above the average for income and years completed in school, two highly prized indicators about the progress of a neighborhood. Most unfortunate about the CTA's stranglehold on the neighborhood is that it continues to this day. One cannot help but wonder how much longer the city of Louisville will allow single-parent families to barely earn a living while the residents of the Triangle complain about potholes and hide behind the veil of being a historic preservation district. Of the 1976 inventory of public housing units (mostly apartments) in the city of Louisville, not one of the forty-seven facilities (almost ten thousand dwelling units) appeared in the Cherokee Triangle.⁵³ However much the CTA can be criticized, their methods worked perfectly. They no longer have to worry about a family from Shively, or Iroquois, or Smokestown, or Algonquin (all traditionally low socio-economic neighborhoods) moving into their neighborhood. Founded by people that built parks only they could frequent, the Cherokee Triangle and the CTA have become synonymous with prestige in the ever-evolving Louisville neighborhoods.

Notes

- 1 Lourena Eaton, *Louisville in Kentucky* (Louisville: Louisville Board of Education, 1950), 23.
- 2 Ibid., 34.
- 3 Gerald Toner et al., *The Cherokee Triangle Neighborhood Plan* (Louisville: The Cherokee Triangle Association, 1989), 12.
- 4 John Kleber, ed., *Encyclopedia of Louisville* (Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky, 2001), 176.
- 5 Ibid., 177.
- 6 The City of Louisville Neighborhood Directory, "Cherokee Triangle," 10 August 1984.
- 7 Anne S. Karem, *The Cherokee Area: A History* (Louisville: The Cherokee Triangle Association, 1971), 3.
- 8 Ibid., 4.
- 9 Samuel W. Thomas, *Cherokee Triangle: A History of the Heart of the Highlands* (Louisville, KY: The Cherokee Triangle Association, Inc. and The Louisville Friends of Olmsted Parks, Inc., 2003), 4.
- 10 Wendy Conlin, "Cherokee Triangle," *A Place in Time: The Story of Louisville's Neighborhoods* (1989): 30.
- 11 Kenny Karem, "Cherokee Triangle: Reflections of a Village," *Discover Louisville: An Illustrated Activity Guidebook for Exploring the City and Its Neighborhoods*.
- 12 The Cherokee Triangle Association, "The Triangle," n.d., <http://www.cherokeetriangle.org/triangle.html>; accessed 10 March 2003.
- 13 *Louisville Survey East Report*, City of Louisville, Community Development Cabinet, 1979, Historic Landmarks and Preservation Districts Commission, 75.
- 14 Conlin, "Cherokee Triangle," 30.
- 15 Ibid., 30.
- 16 Works Progress Administration, "Volume 1: Real Property Survey and Low Income Housing Area Survey of Louisville, Kentucky." Co-Sponsored by City of Louisville Municipal Housing Commission and City Planning and Zoning Commission (1938-1939): 45.
- 17 Ibid., 51.
- 18 Ibid., 61.

- 19 The Cherokee Triangle Association, "The Association," n.d., <http://www.cherokeetriangle.org/association.html>; accessed 10 March 2003.
- 20 Ibid., "The Association."
- 21 Conlin, "Cherokee Triangle," 31.
- 22 Robin Garr, "Focus on the City: The Cherokee Triangle," n.d., <http://www.louisville.com/nabes/cher.shtml>; accessed 24 November 1998.
- 23 *Urban Indicators: People Places, Problems*, Louisville and Jefferson County Planning Commission, 1975: 30.
- 24 Ibid., 29.
- 25 Ibid., 37.
- 26 Ibid., 44.
- 27 Ibid., 12.
- 28 Urban Studies Center at the University of Louisville, *Report & Community Priorities and Evaluations: Results of the Third of a Series of Consultations Among Citizens of Jefferson County, Kentucky*, 1975: 1.
- 29 Ibid., II-84, II-42.
- 30 Ibid., II-85.
- 31 Ibid., II-43.
- 32 Louisville and Jefferson County Planning Commission, *The Cherokee Triangle Neighborhood Plan*, April 1989, letter dated 21 September 1988.
- 33 The 1960 median family income was previously described to be between \$6,017 and \$7,117, which was taken from *Urban Indicators*. The statistics presented here are relevant because they differ somewhat from the information provided by *Urban Indicators*. Note the differences between what the objective *Urban Indicators* reports and what the subjective *Neighborhood Plan* reports.
- 34 Louisville and Jefferson County Planning Commission, *The Cherokee Triangle Neighborhood Plan*, Appendix D.
- 35 The Cherokee Triangle Association. "The Association."
- 36 The year 1975 is both the year of Penning's dissertation and the year the Cherokee Triangle was installed as a historic preservation district. This seemed to be a coincidence. Penning never mentioned preference of the Triangle because of the aforementioned distinction.

-
- 37 James Michael Penning, "Neighborhood Associations and Land-use Decision-making: The Case of Louisville and Jefferson County, Kentucky" (Ph.D. diss., The University of Kentucky, 1975), 23.
 - 38 Martha Elson, "Yellow Home's Owners, Land Mark Commission Clashing Over Its Color," *The Courier-Journal*, 4 December 1991.
 - 39 Thomas, *Cherokee Triangle*, 242.
 - 40 Lynne Lyndrup, "Remember to Renew Your Membership!!!," CTA Newsletter of the Cherokee Triangle Association, XII (2003): 5.
 - 41 Penning, "Neighborhood Associations," 85.
 - 42 Kristen Faurest, "Reigning in the Ravages of Time," *The Courier-Journal*, 15 April 1992.
 - 43 Christopher Hall, "Book Explores Triangle's Rich History," *The Courier-Journal*, 23 April 2003.
 - 44 Penning, "Neighborhood Associations," 81.
 - 45 Ibid., 81.
 - 46 Ed P. Jackson, as quoted in Ibid., 218.
 - 47 Ibid., 218.
 - 48 Ibid., 219.
 - 49 Ibid., 220.
 - 50 Cherokee Triangle Neighborhood Plan, v.
 - 51 Amy McTyeire, "New Bricks in an Old Alley," *CTA Newsletter of the Cherokee Triangle Association*, XI (2002): 2.
 - 52 Samuel W. Thomas, ed., 1974: *As We Saw It* (Louisville, KY: Courier-Journal Press, 1975), 90.
 - 53 Louisville and Jefferson County Planning Commission, 1976 *Comprehensive Plan Revision Background Information Series*. "Housing," June 1976, 43.

Contributors

JESSICA BENTON is a senior History major with a minor in Sociology. After graduating in the spring of 2005, she plans to further her education in law school. Her article was written for HIST 492 as her senior paper in conjunction with HIST 452—The United States Civil War. She also had an article in the 2003 volume of *Legacy*.

DUSTIN BROWN is a junior History major with a minor in Museum Studies. After graduating from SIUC in the summer of 2005, he plans to either attend graduate school to work toward a Master's degree in History or explore possibilities in the job market. His paper was written for HIST 392—Historical Research and Writing.

JOSHUA WILLIAM GAETH is a senior in the History Department. He is planning to enter a graduate program upon his graduation. His paper was written for HIST 392—Historical Research and Writing.

AMBER JERALDS is a senior in History Education with a minor in Political Science. After student teaching in spring of 2005 and graduating from SIUC in May 2005, she plans to attend law school. Her paper was written for HIST 392—Historical Research and Writing.

KAREN MYLAN is a senior History major with a minor in Psychology. After graduating in December 2004, she plans on attending graduate school at SIUC. Her paper was written for HIST 392—Historical Research and Writing—and won the 2004 Edward J. O'Day Prize.

CHRISTOPHER RHYMER was a senior in History at Southern Illinois University Carbondale. He graduated in December 2003. He currently resides in Jonesboro, Illinois and is undecided about his future education plans. His paper was written for HIST 392—Historical Research and Writing.

RYAN F. WARNER is a senior in History with a minor in Museum Studies. His work has been published in a variety of monthly Civil War publications, including *The Western Campaigner*, and the *Big River Gazette*. He would like to obtain a position in the museum field, with a focus in Civil War studies. His paper was written for HIST 492 as his senior paper, and was part of his work in HIST 452—The United States Civil War.

COREY B. WHITE is a senior majoring in History Education and Cinema & Photography. He is a native of Louisville, Kentucky. After graduating in December 2004, he hopes to work as a traveling consultant for his fraternity, Beta Theta Pi. He also plans to eventually pursue graduate school in History. His paper was written for HIST 392—Historical Research and Writing.



Southern
Illinois University
Carbondale