Hindsight

Graduate History Journal

Spring 2008 Volume II

Hindsight
Graduate History Journal

Hindsight Graduate History Journal is published annually by the graduate students of the Department of History at California State University, Fresno. All interpretations of fact or opinion, as well as content accuracy, are the sole responsibility of the authors and may not reflect the views of the editorial staff.

The journal is also published online at www.csufresno.edu/historydept/hindsight.htm

Questions or comments may be directed to:

Hindsight Graduate History Journal
Department of History
California State University, Fresno
5340 N. Campus Dr. M/S SS21
Fresno, CA 93740

The Hindsight Graduate History Journal editorial board wishes to thank the College of Social Sciences and the Division of Graduate Studies at California State University, Fresno for providing funding for this project.

California State University, Fresno

Staff

Senior Editors

Shawna Herzog

Tristan Shamp

Junior Editors

Melissa Morris

Faculty Advisors

Dr. Maritere López, Senior Advisor

Dr. David Berkey

Table of Contents

True Threat Or Victim Of Circumstance?

Fray Luis de Granada's Libro de la Oración y Meditación and the Spanish Inquisition

By

Daniel I. Wasserman- Soler
University of Virginia

One of the most popular books during Spain's Golden Age was Fray Luis de Granada's *Libro de la Oración y Meditación*, or *Book on Prayer and Meditation*, which was published in 1554.[1] The Dominican priest's book was also one of the most widely-read books in colonial Latin America.[2] The network of support for Granada's work was quite wide-ranging: it was so popular that street merchants often read it while they awaited their customers. Furthermore, it was an object of admiration and support within many elite circles. Among the prominent Catholics who counted themselves as advocates of Granada's *Libro* were John III, King of Portugal; Saint Carlo Borromeo, Archbishop of Milan; Pedro Castro, Bishop of Salamanca; and none less than Pope Pius IV.

Although the book had widespread fame during Spain's Golden Age, it is currently the object of a surprisingly small amount of scholarly attention.[3] The fact that scholars do not regard the *Libro* as a "classic" text is bewildering given that it surpassed by far all other texts of the Golden Age in the number of published editions.[4] It even had more editions than *Don Quixote de la Mancha*, which modern scholars consider the most important work of

---

[1] Keith Whinnom, "The Problem of the Best-seller in Spanish Golden-Age Literature," *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies* 57 (July 1980): 189-98.

[2] Teodoro Hampe-Martinez, "The Diffusion of Books and Ideas in Colonial Peru: A Study of Private Libraries in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries," *The Hispanic American Historical Review* 73, no. 2 (1993): 211-233.

[3] Elizabeth Rhodes, "Spain's Misfired Canon: the Case of Luis Fray Luis's *Libro de la Oración y Meditación*," *Journal of Hispanic Philology* 15 (1990): 43-66.

[4] Whinnom states that if we examine the books of the Spanish Golden Age (sixteenth & seventeenth centuries), Fray Luis de Granada's *Libro de la Oración y Meditación* had, "...almost twice as many editions as its nearest rivals[...]It went through twenty-three editions in the first five years of its life[...]and after the Spanish authorities had insisted on a series of corrections, it appeared in print again and went through another eighty editions," 194.

the Golden Age.[5] Moreover, Granada's book has quite an intriguing history. Even with the support he obtained from a number of influential ecclesiastical and secular leaders, his book was placed on the Spanish Inquisition's Index of Prohibited Books in 1559 by Fernando de Valdés, the Inquisitor General. Valdés's Inquisition was unique in its prosecution of Granada; neither the Roman nor the Portuguese Inquisitions banned the book. Cristobal Cuevas writes that despite approval by others, Spanish Inquisitorial censors disapproved of the book's use of *oración mental*, or silent prayer.[6] These censors, Melchor Cano and Domingo Cuevas, accused Granada of using the vernacular to popularize a spiritual doctrine that was the domain of a minority of Christians, of promising perfection to all classes of people, and of incurring theological errors that were similar to the doctrine of *alumbradismo*.[7] In 1566, however, Granada completed a revised edition of his previous work. The original edition remained on the Index, but the revised one was so different that the Inquisition – now in the midst of a leadership transition – did not place it on the Index.

One of the dangers of the spiritual doctrine in the *Libro*'s original version was the power which it placed upon silent prayer. Granada wrote that Christians "can try speaking internally with God, saying these things or other similar words: 'Lord, give me grace so that I might love you with all my heart and soul, for you are an infinite goodness and beauty that deserves to be loved with infinite love.'"[8] Interestingly enough, in Granada's revised, post-Index edition, he wrote no less about silent prayer. The main difference between the two versions was that he now discussed silent prayer in the context of other Christian virtues:

---

[5] "Golden Age," in *The New Encyclopaedia Britannica*, vol. 5 (Chicago: Encyclopedia Britannica, 1995).

[6] There is no censure of Granada's *Libro*. This one comment that the censors make about Granada's book comes from a passage in their censure of Bartolomé Carranza's *Comentarios sobre el Catechismo Christiano* (1558). Because Carranza had a seventeen-year Inquisitorial trial (starting in Spain and ending in Rome), there is far more documentation that allows scholars to know what Inquisitorial authorities found dangerous in his work. For Granada, however, we do not have the same sources.

[7] Cristobal Cuevas, "Introducción," in *Fray Luis de Granada, Obras Castellanas*, vol. II, ed. Cristobal Cuevas (Madrid: Turner, 1994-1997), x; I will explain *alumbradismo* in more detail below.

[8] Fray Luis de Granada, *Libro de la Oración y Meditación* (1554), in *Fray Luis de Granada, Obras Castellanas*, vol. II, ed. Cristobal Cuevas (Madrid: Turner, 1994-1997), 254: "…podemos tratar hablando interiormente con Dios, diciendo estas u otras semejantes palabras: 'Señor, dame gracia para que te ame yo con todo mi corazón y ánima, pues tú eres una infinita bondad y hermosura que mereces ser amada con amor infinito.'"

> To praise this virtue (prayer) is not to praise only this virtue, but rather to praise jointly with her all the other virtues which walk in her company; because with the true and perfect prayer which is praised here walk always faith, hope, humility, patience, fear of God, and many other virtues which are never separated from her…[9]

Although differences exist between the two versions of Granada's *Libro*, one could suggest that the prohibition of the original edition had more to do with the circumstances under which Granada published the book and less to do with the actual content of the book. In his authoritative work on the Spanish Inquisition, Henry Kamen writes that the Inquisitor General of this period, Fernando de Valdés, was "a ruthless careerist who saw heresy everywhere."[10] Kamen adds that during the late 1550s, "A merciless repression was set in train by Fernando de Valdés, who was concerned to exaggerate the menace [of heresy] in order to regain the favor he had recently lost with the court in Spain."[11] Furthermore, Kamen says that the 1559 Index of Prohibited Books "seems to have been…an ill-thought-out attempt to control some aspects of creativity; and…a hostile response to aspects of native spirituality."[12] José Millán Martínez adds that Valdés attempted to use the power of his office to show King Philip II that the people[13] in whom he confided were dangerous because of their heterodox religious ideas.[14]

If one considers Fernando de Valdés's motivations and the fact that Granada's book had the support of numerous well-respected secular and ecclesiastical leaders, it is easy to come to the conclusion that the *Libro* was not dangerous and that Granada was a victim of

---

9 Granada, *Libro de la Oración y Meditación* (1579) in Fray Luis de Granada, *Obras Completas*, vol. I, ed. Álvaro Huerga (Madrid: Fundación Universitaria Española, 1994), 465: "…alabar esta virtud no es solo alabar esta virtud, sino alabar juntamente con ella todas las otras virtudes que andan en su compañía; porque con la verdadera y perfecta oración que aquí se alaba, anda siempre la fe, la esperanza, la humildad, la paciencia, el temor de Dios, y otras muchas virtudes que nunca se apartan de ella…"

10 Henry Kamen, *The Spanish Inquisition: a historical revision* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1998), 92.

11 Ibid., 94.

12 Ibid., 112-113.

13 A number of the individuals in the court of Philip II, and especially in that of his father Charles, were enthusiasts of Erasmus, whose ideas the Inquisition associated with the growth in adherence to Protestantism in Europe.

14 José Martínez Millán, *Felipe II (1527-1598): la configuración de la monarquía hispana*, (Valladolid, Spain: Junta de Castilla y León, Consejería de Educación y Cultura, 1998), 64: "…utilizando el poder que le confería el cargo de inquisidor general, trató de demostrar al joven monarca que los servidores en los que él confiaba, seguían una ideología religiosa heterodoxa y defendían una concepción política que no le convenía…"

the politics surrounding Valdés's tenure. However, this assessment is not entirely accurate. While Valdés may have used the threat of heresy to his advantage, the fear of heresies such as Protestantism and *alumbradismo* was very real for Inquisitorial and ecclesiastical authorities. José Luis González Novalín, an authority on Valdés and his historical context, writes that around 1540 Spain had a "crisis of orthodoxy" which resulted from the exchange of ideas that existed with central Europe, especially Germany. González Novalín believes, however, that the danger posed by the German reform programs was still only a "latent" threat. Still, by the late 1550s Protestant communities were discovered in Seville and Valladolid. Therefore, if one considers the fear that resulted from the threat of heresy, one finds much in Granada's 1554 work that Inquisitorial leaders could have interpreted as a problem for religious authority.

In the first section of this study, I discuss the *Libro*'s *editio princeps*, and in the following section, I compare the original and post-Index versions. This study uses two recent critical editions of the *Libro*, the *editio princeps* available in the *Obras Castellanas* published by the Biblioteca Castro and, for the post-Index version, the *Obras Completas de Fray Luis de Granada* published by the Fundación Universitaria Española. The latter critical edition uses the final version of the *Libro* (1579), which was the result of some minor emendations which Granada made to his first post-Index version in 1566. For the purposes of this paper, either the 1566 or the 1579 edition would be suitable because each is a post-Index version and illustrates the changes made in an effort to clear the book's name.

The Inquisition's fear of the *editio princeps*

In the prologue to the original version of the *Libro*, Granada put forth a risky piece of advice; he said that one should "…choose that which best suits one's purpose."[15] Granada made a similar suggestion to his readers near the end of his text, where he noted that

[15] Granada, *Libro de la Oración y Meditación* (1554), 15: "…no veo yo por qué se deba quejar el convidado de que le pongan la mesa llena de muchos manjares, pues no le obligan por eso, como en tormento, a que dé cabo de todos ellos, sino a que, entre muchas cosas, ***escoja lo que más hiciere a su propósito***." The emphasis is mine.

Catholics need not always follow the same methods of prayer and meditation.[16] These recommendations might seem harmless in general, but when placed in the context of fear over the spread of Protestant ideas, the danger in the freedom to choose becomes more apparent. The risk in these statements lay not only in the fact that they allowed for freedom in one's spiritual life, but also in the potential for interpreting them as giving an opportunity for departing from the regular, prescribed rules and practices of the Catholic Church.

The idea of Catholics acting independently of ecclesiastical authority is suggestive of *alumbradismo*, a religious movement denounced as heretical by the Inquisitor General in 1525 and associated with Lutheranism by some Inquisitorial authorities.[17] Lu Ann Homza describes *alumbradismo* as a movement emphasizing an inner and spiritual relationship with God.[18] She adds that *alumbrados* were individuals who abandoned themselves to the love of God and the guidance of the Holy Spirit and, as a result, acted upon inner impulses which they believed were cues from these divine persons. Inquisitors found this belief dangerous because *alumbrados* would follow these divine cues whether or not they were contrary to the teachings of the Church. Because Granada allowed his readers the freedom to shape their own spiritual lives, Inquisitorial authorities interpreted his words as a threat to the authority that the Church and its clergy held over Catholics. In fact, a number of the ideas present in Granada's book fit the category of dangerous, or rather, suspicious material. The content of the *Libro* might have been quite safe for a specific audience that was "learned and of good conscience," but for most others, the potential to fall into heterodoxy seemed very real to Inquisitorial authorities.[19]

---

[16] Ibid., 450.

[17] José Luis González Novalín, "La época valdesiana," in Joaquín Pérez Villanueva and Bartolomé Escandell Bonet, *Historia de la Inquisición en España y América*, vol. I (Madrid: Centro de Estudios Inquisitoriales, 1984), 554.

[18] Lu Ann Homza, *Religious Authority in the Spanish Renaissance* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2000), 7.

[19] Fernando de Valdés, *Index Librorum Prohibitorum*, in *Tres indices expurgatorios de la Inquisición Española en le siglo XVI* (Madrid, 1952); These were the words which the Inquisitor General Fernando de Valdes used to describe the men who determined the texts which were to be included on the Index of prohibited books in 1559.

There are a number of instances throughout the text in which Granada pointedly told his reader that it was permissible to choose the things which one deems most helpful to one's own prayers.[20] An important example is his description of the five parts of prayer.[21] After providing a description of the importance of each, Granada wrote that not everyone needed to use the method he described. Again, the danger present here is that Spanish Catholics could have read this section and arrived at the conclusion that it was best to follow their own intuitions about prayer and not necessarily the directions of the Church for either prayer or other aspects of their religious lives.

At a later point in the *Libro*, Granada recommended that his reader study books of prayer and spirituality, and as any upstanding Catholic friar would, he ascribed special importance to scripture.

> For this same protection and purity of the heart, devout reading of spiritual books also helps…it is convenient to occupy it (our heart) many times with reading the sacred books, because when it must think about something, it thinks about that with which we keep it occupied.[22]

The recommendation to read scripture was not problematic. The danger inherent in this scenario, however, lay in the lack of specificity in Granada's suggestion.[23] He advocated reading scripture, but he did not offer any guidance concerning the truth that is to be found

---

[20] Granada, *Libro de la Oración y Meditación* (1554), 30.

[21] Ibid., 241-2.

[22] Ibid., 320: "Para esta misma guarda y pureza del corazón ayuda también la lección devota de libros espirituales…conviene ocuparlo (nuestro corazón) muchas veces con la lección de los libros sagrados, porque cuando hubiere de pensar en algo, piense en aquello con que lo tenemos ocupado."

[23] While a lack of specificity was a problem for Inquisitorial authorities, one could argue that Granada provided something of a counterbalance against the freedom he allowed in his methods for prayer and spiritual life. He discussed the evils of curiosity and speculation on pages 356-364; furthermore, he said on page 398, that one ought to "follow humbly that counsel for the [Book of] Ecclesiastes, which says: 'Do not wish to inquire into things higher than you, nor to examine that which exceeds your capacity, rather, think about that which God commanded you to do, and do not be curious in wanting to examine his works[…]" ("Pues, por esto, la suma discreción es en este caso que, acordándose el hombre por un cabo de la pequeñez humana, y por otro de la grandeza divina, siga húmilmente aquel consejo del *Eclesiástico*, que dice: 'No quieras inquirir las cosas más altas que tú, ni escudriñar lo que excede tu capacidad, sino piensa en lo que Dios te mandó hacer, y no seas curioso en querer escudriñar sus obras, pues ves que muchas dellas exceden todo nuestro saber.'"). Discouraging curiosity, however, turns out to be one of the things denounced by the 1525 Inquisitorial edict against the *alumbrados; see* Antonio Márquez, *Los Alumbrados: Orígenes y Filosofía* (Madrid: Taurus, 1972), 282. The edict does not specify why it is wrong to discourage curiosity, but it seems that doing so might have been a characteristic of *alumbrados* since they encouraged reliance *solely* upon an inner guiding light that they believed came from the Holy Spirit.

in it. He only made a general exhortation to study the Bible. Inquisitorial authorities most certainly did not agree with the idea of unguided scriptural study, especially in view of the many "heterodox" interpretations that Protestants were gleaning from the same scripture.

In addition to the liberty which Granada gave to his readers, another important threat in his original text resided in the absolutely central role which he ascribed to silent prayer, and by extension, to meditation and devotion. He began the first chapter of the *Libro* by maintaining that there is so much sin in the world because of lack of prayer.[24] Soon afterward, he added that prayer is the "only way" to reach all that is good.[25] This is a critical part of the foundation he laid for asserting the essential role that prayer must have in the lives of Christian people. It seems very likely that the centrality which Granada gave to prayer made the Spanish Inquisition exceedingly apprehensive. While there is absolutely nothing incorrect about advocating prayer as an important part of the Christian life, the importance and uniqueness which Granada attributed to prayer might have seemed to lend itself to the exclusion of other important means of obtaining grace. The Church would not have wanted its members to give less importance to receiving the sacraments, for example. The Inquisition most certainly would have feared a situation in which Catholics gave less authority to the Church by making their own individual, silent prayer the central part of their religious lives – to the exclusion of other Church-sanctioned practices. This central emphasis on silent prayer, meditation, and devotion was highly suspicious because it was suggestive of *alumbradismo*.

Near the beginning of the *Libro*, Granada made another statement that lacked specificity, and in it, some Inquisitorial authorities feared a relationship with *alumbradismo*. He stated that while there are two kinds of prayer (spoken and silent, or mental), the spoken aspect adds nothing to the prayer. Rather, he argued that both kinds use the heart and this is what is important.[26] In making this point, Granada walked on dangerous ground, as a 1525

---

[24] Granada, *Libro de la Oración y Meditación* (1554), 11.

[25] Ibid., 21.

[26] Granada, *Libro de la Oración y Meditación*, 26.

Inquisitorial edict against the *alumbrados* had specifically stated that it was heretical to claim that prayers should be silent and not vocal.[27] Granada did not say that prayer should only be silent, but he came dangerously close to suggesting that silent prayer was more important than vocal prayer. Furthermore, in stating that use of one's heart is the essential component of prayer, Granada might have given some of his readers the impression that heartfelt prayer was always good. However, as the example of the *alumbrados* demonstrates, heartfelt prayer could quite easily include heterodox thoughts or ideas. Because of the threat which the *alumbrados* had posed to Spanish religious authority, the leaders of the Inquisition were quite suspicious of internal religious practices similar to those which Granada advocated.[28]

The importance that Granada attributed to prayer is also problematic because in doing so, one might argue, he gave a substantial, or perhaps disproportionate, amount of power to men and women.[29] In fact, it was precisely the implication that one can reach a kind of spiritual perfection through prayer with which Inquisitorial authorities took issue.[30] When Granada wrote about the power of prayer, he asserted that it allows one to change one's life and become a new person. He said that Christ wished to make apparent "the virtue that prayer has for transfiguring souls, which is to make them lose the customs of the old man and clothe themselves anew…."[31] At a later point in the *Libro*, when Granada discussed the most necessary virtues that one ought to seek through prayer, he wrote that prayer "is the principal medium through which all good is reached."[32] He even described the benefits of holding spiritual conversations with God: "Here it is important to note that,

---

[27] Antonio Márquez, *Los Alumbrados: Orígenes y Filosofía* (Madrid: Taurus, 1972), 275, 278.

[28] Kamen, *Spanish Inquisition*, 88-89.

[29] Although Granada certainly did acknowledge the inherent weaknesses of human beings and the need for humility; see pages 34, 110, and 132 for just a few examples; doing so does not detract from the considerable power which he believed prayer had in the Christian life.

[30] Cuevas, "Introducción," x; see also the 1525 Edict against the *alumbrados* in Márquez, *Los Alumbrados*, 273-283.

[31] Granada, *Libro de la Oración y Meditación* (1554), 23: "…la virtud que la oración tiene para transfigurar las animas, que es para hacerles perder las costumbres del hombre viejo y vestirse del nuevo…"

[32] Ibid., 254: "En estas susodichas virtudes principalmente consiste la suma de toda la perfección. Y por eso, todo nuestro estudio y diligencia se ha de emplear en buscarlas por todos los medios que nos sea posible, y señaladamente por ***la oración, que es el principio medio por do se alcanza todo bien***." The emphasis is mine.

among these five parts [of prayer], the best is when the soul speaks with God, as it does in petition…when we speak with God, there the understanding is lifted on high."[33]

Granada discussed similar themes in a section on the difficulties of attaining true devotion, writing that through the medium of prayer, one tries to reach a perfect union with God.[34] This language advocates seeking spiritual perfection, and by including it, Granada conveyed to his audience certain ideas that placed too much power in the hands of laymen and women. There are similar points in Granada's discussion of devotion, which he described as providing men and women with the "quickness" to do good works and to complete the commandments of God.[35] He added that devotion is "like a door to all other virtues," and shortly after doing so, he described methods through which one can reach the "perfect" prayer.[36] Because of this kind of content, members of the laity might have begun to believe that they had the ability to be saved through their own efforts and, consequently, that they could be good Christians without the assistance and guidance of the Church.

Granada made two related points in a later section on devotional aids. He wrote that God is man's constant companion[37] and that one ought to "take no other caution than to please God, [one ought] not live with any other love, fear, wish, or hope…Know that there is nothing in the whole world other than God and himself…he alone is enough to complete man's happiness."[38] With passages such as these, one can comprehend why the Inquisitorial authorities might have feared a situation in which the *Libro* was available to anyone regardless of theological education. One of the main premises of the *Libro* is that one's religious life centers on an individual's relationship with God, an idea that is suggestive of

---

[33] Ibid., 255-256: "Aquí es mucho de notar que entre todas estas cinco partes, la mejor es cuando el ánima habla con Dios, como se hace en la petición. Porque en la lección o meditación el entendimiento discurre con poco trabajo por do le parece, mas cuando hablamos con Dios, allí se levanta el entendimiento a lo alto…"

[34] Ibid., 299.

[35] Ibid., 294.

[36] Ibid., 296.

[37] Granada, *Libro de la Oración y Meditación* (1554), 314-5.

[38] Ibid., 310-1: "…no tome otro cuidado más que de contentar a Dios, no viva con otro amor ni temor, ni deseo ni esperanza, sino de solo él. Haga cuenta que no hay en todo el mundo más que Dios y él, y así, con ninguna cosa tenga cuenta sino con solo él, pues él solo basta para cumplimiento de su felicidad."

alumbradismo. This notion that anyone could have such a close and direct relationship with God could also be interpreted as quite threatening in another way. During a period in which the Inquisitorial authorities aimed to increase their defenses against Protestant heresy, Granada's words were particularly dangerous because they could be interpreted as undermining the authority of the Church and of the clergy as mediums between God and humans.[39]

Another problem that the Inquisition might have identified also arises early in the *Libro*. In the first chapter, Granada mentioned that prayer helps even simple people.[40] The 1559 Index released by Fernando de Valdes's Inquisition prohibited Granada's book and others for all audiences, even priests and bishops. One cannot help but think, however, that the Inquisitorial authorities deemed the potential effect of Granada's suspicious ideas on the class of common people with little or no education to be a very substantial threat, particularly because of the strong nature of its rhetoric.[41] Granada used vivid and compelling language while describing the passion of Christ, the final judgment of man, and other subjects on which he recommended that his readers meditate.

> In front of the judge (God) will come the royal banner of the cross, with all the other insignia of the sacred passion, so that they might be witnesses of the remedy which God sent to the world, and how the world decided to not receive it. And in this way, the holy cross there will justify the cause of God, and it will leave the evil ones without consolation and without excuse. Then, the Savior says that all the peoples of the earth will cry and reform, and some will wound others in the chest. Oh, how many reasons they will have to cry and reform![42]

---

[39] For Inquisitorial fear of Protestantism in the mid-sixteenth century, see González Novalín, "La época valdesiana," 539.

[40] Ibid., 25.

[41] Rhodes, "Spain's Misfired Canon," 53-57: Rhodes writes about the "[…]devices Granada successfully employed to draw his original readers into his text[…]: frequent paraphrasing of the Bible, a light but cutting touch on a multitude of topics, repeated rhetorical questions, innumerable exclamations and imperatives, parallel constructions repeated up to fourteen times in a row…the *Libro de la oración* is replete with dramatic fictional elaborations on Biblical material, designed to integrate the Christian into the scene by contemporizing it[…]. Most important […], is Granada's insistent use of personal address, and his constant recourse to imaginative and affective discourse," 54-55.

[42] Granada, *Libro de la Oración y Meditación* (1554); 188: "Delante del juez vendrá el estandarte real de la cruz, con todas las otras insignias de la sagrada pasión, para que sean testigos del remedio que Dios envió al mundo, y como el mundo no lo quiso recibir. Y así, la santa cruz justificará allí la causa de Dios, y a los malos dejará sin consuelo y sin

One might argue that the use of powerful rhetoric was not problematic in itself. It would, however, have appeared in a different light to an Inquisition already convinced that Granada's book contained suspicious material. Powerful rhetoric would have been particularly dangerous in situations in which Granada was not specific on the boundary between that which was orthodox and heterodox.

Furthermore, the risk that the *Libro* posed for people of little education was not limited to the laity. The Inquisition also had reason to fear its influence on ignorant members of the clergy. Despite the clerical education reforms instituted by Cardinal Francisco Jiménez de Cisneros in the early 1500s, clerical education had been a particularly pronounced problem in the Spanish Church for centuries.[43] Through their sermons, the clergy played an especially critical role in the informal religious education of church-goers. Therefore, if a cleric inspired by Granada's book did not have an adequate education, his own sermons might propagate ideas of uncertain orthodoxy.

Yet another factor of Granada's book that may have appeared suspicious to Inquisitorial authorities was the wide variety of sources which he cited. In addition to citing pagan authorities such as Aristotle and Plotinus, Granada made references to the ideas of Heinrich Herph, Johannes Tauler, and Serafino da Fermo, all of whom had been implicated in heterodox spiritual movements, such as *alumbradismo*, and each of whom also had writings prohibited by the Inquisition.[44] Although Granada did not cite heterodox passages from these authors, the fact that he referred to their work gave them credibility, especially when he bestowed upon them titles such as "that great master of spiritual life," as he did in the case of Herph.[45]

---

excusa. Entonces dice el Salvador que llorarán y plantearán todas las gentes de la tierra, y que unas a otras se herirán en los pechos. ¡Oh, cuántas razones tendrán para llorar y plantear!"

[43] J.N. Hillgarth, *The Spanish Kingdoms: 1250 – 1516*, vol. I (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976-1978), 114-116.

[44] Granada, *Libro de la Oración y Meditación* (1554), 228. Granada mentions Aristotle in page 132, Plotinus in 497, Herph in 320, and da Fermo in 403. For the Inquisition's view of some of these figures, see Joaquín Pérez Villanueva and Bartolomé Escandell Bonet, eds., *Historia de la Inquisición Española en España y América*, vol. I (Madrid: Centro de Estudios Inquisitoriales, 1984), 819-821.

[45] Ibid., 497.

One other practice which the Inquisition may have found suspicious was Granada's common reference to Old Testament figures, many of whom represented the threat that Inquisitorial authorities recognized in Judaism. Fernando de Valdes's 1559 prohibition of all Hebrew books and any other books containing Jewish ceremonies was part of a long tradition of Inquisitorial suspicion towards "judaizing."[46] Granada's allusions to Old Testament figures involved no explicitly heterodox content, and he certainly did not advocate the practice of Jewish ceremonies. He did, however, ascribe equal authority to figures of the Old and New Testaments:

> What will I say about the other saints, just as much from the Old as from the New Testament? Moses, that great friend of God, writes about himself that he lay prostrate in front of the face of the Lord forty days and forty nights…King David…had occasion seven times a day to praise God and pray. And Blessed Saint Jerome writes about himself that sometimes he joined day with night wounding his chest and praying and that he did not stop this deed until the Lord sent peace into his heart. Also well-known is the prayer and profound meditation of the glorious father Saint Francis…[47]

This passage is, of course, not problematic in itself, but an Inquisition whose defenses were already heightened because of judaizing, Protestantism, and *alumbradismo* might well have seen a problem here; the attribution of equal value to the Old Testament might have attributed too much authority to Judaism.

While the discussion above has addressed the potential danger which the Inquisition of the 1550s found in Granada's *Libro*, it is important to note that despite the threatening material, this paper does not seek to argue that Granada had any intention of communicating

---

[46] Valdés, *Index librorum prohibitorum.* Among many other things Valdés prohibits "Todos los libros Hebraicos o en qualquiera lengua escriptos que contengan ceremonias Judaicas." For a brief discusión of the Inquisition's suspicion of Jews, Judaizers, and *conversos,* see Lu Ann Homza, "Introduction," *The Spanish Inquisition, 1478-1614: An Anthology of Sources* (Indianapolis: Hackett Press, 2006), xv. The Spanish Inquisition had been created to deal with Judaizers, or Christians whom others accused of practicing Jewish ceremonies and espousing Jewish beliefs, and conversos, or Christians who had converted from Judaism. Inquisitorial authorities were concerned over conversos' sincerity of belief and whether they should have the same privileges as other Christians.

[47] Granada, *Libro de la Oración y Meditación* (1554), 498-499: "¿Qué diré de los otros santos, así del Viejo como del Nuevo Testamento? Aquel tan grande amigo de Dios Moisés escribe de sí mismo que estuvo cuarenta días y cuarenta noches derribado ante la cara del Señor…El rey David…hallaba siete veces al día tiempo desocupado para alabar a Dios y hacer oración. Y el bienaventurado san Jerónimo escribe de sí mismo que algunas veces juntaba el día con la noche hiriendo los pechos y haciendo oración, y que no cesaba deste oficio hasta que el Señor enviaba paz a su corazón. Muy sabida es también la oración y contemplación tan profunda del glorioso padre san Francisco…"

heterodox ideas to his readers.[48] Nevertheless, it is not difficult to see how important aspects of his book could potentially have led one into dangerous territory considering the other threats which loomed in this particular period of Spanish history. The question remains: did his revised edition actually solve these problems, or were new Inquisitorial leadership and other factors the reasons why his new edition did not find a place on the Index?

The Changes from Old to New

Scholarship concerning the *Libro* identifies a number of main differences between the Index and post-Index versions: the first section of the new edition contains a substantially revised first chapter and no longer contains the original second chapter; the second section contains a number of additional pieces of advice; and the third section – originally composed of three sermons on prayer alone – still contains three sermons, but they now have added content and different structure. The original three sermons are compressed into the first sermon, and the next two sermons are new, one addressing the importance of fasting and the other addressing the virtue of almsgiving, or works of mercy. Furthermore, the new edition does not contain the names of some controversial figures whom Granada had originally cited.

Regardless of these changes, some scholars of Granada's work maintain that the post-Index version of the *Libro* was fundamentally the same work as the original. Alvaro Huerga, perhaps the most diligent investigator of Luis de Granada's work, mentions the differences above but claims that as a whole, the structure, content, and outward appearance of the book remained unchanged.[49] Huerga's views are similar to those of Atilano Rico Seco, who further argues that the prohibition of the *Libro* did not cause the direction of Granada's

---

[48] Atilano Rico Seco, "Una gran batalla en torno a la mística (Melchor Cano contra Fr. Luis de Granada)," *Revista de Espiritualidad* 34 (Madrid: Carmelitas Descalzas, 1975), 409. He also argues that in some cases, in its effort to fight *alumbradismo*, the Inquisition condemned people who were "of good law."

[49] Alvaro Huerga, "Nota Crítica," in Granada, *Libro de la Oración y Meditación* (1579), 584; see also Huerga, *Fray Luis de Granada: una vida al servicio de la Iglesia* (Madrid: Editorial Católica, 1988).

thoughts to change at all. On the contrary, the prohibition forced him to develop stronger theological foundations for his original arguments.[50] Furthermore, Rico Seco maintains that Granada never spurned vocal prayer and that he did not favor silent prayer exclusively.[51] Rico Seco's argument is in line with that of Raphael Louis Oechslin, who claims that Granada continued to be the "master" of prayer despite his encounter with the Inquisition and that the basic structure of Granada's book remained the same.[52]

On the other hand, some scholars do more to acknowledge difference, even while still emphasizing underlying continuities. Marcel Bataillon, the classic authority on the influence of Erasmus on Spanish spirituality, argues that the additions which Granada made in his post-Index version were things that he "forgot" to include the first time around.[53] While Bataillon seems to believe that Granada made some unintentional mistakes in his original version, Vicente Beltrán de Heredia goes one step further. He maintains that in the later edition, Granada "moderates" the exclusive role which he had given to prayer. Overall, however, Heredia claims that the changes which Granada made were minimal.[54] In a similar vein, Elizabeth Rhodes argues, "...the focus of the 1566 version is significantly more oriented toward formal religious practice than the earlier one [but]...the ideological foundation of the text remained intact."[55]

Thus, while some students of Granada's work argue that the original and post-Index versions of the *Libro* were essentially the same, others acknowledge some difference but maintain that, at its core, the post-Index version is largely the same as the original. In characterizing the changes between the two editions, I agree that much of Granada's message about prayer remains in the post-Index version. However, in this later edition,

---

[50] Rico Seco, "Una gran batalla," 417.

[51] Ibid., 418.

[52] Ibid., 413-414; Rico Seco cites Raphael Louis Oechslin, *Louis de Grenade* (Paris: Le Rameau, 1954).

[53] Rico Seco, "Una gran batalla," 412; see Marcel Bataillon, *Érasme et l'Espagne: recherches sur l'histoire spirituelle du XVIe siècle* (Paris: E. Droz, 1937).

[54] Ibid., 413; see Vicente Beltrán de Heredia, *Las Corrientes de Espiritualidad entre los Dominicos de Castilla durante la primera mitad del siglo XVI* (Salamanca 1941), 143.

[55] Rhodes, "Spain's Misfired Canon," 50.

Granada placed a *substantially* greater emphasis on Christian virtues as the context for discussing prayer. While Granada stated in the original version that prayer was the "principal medium" for reaching all good, he stressed in the later edition that Christian virtues were of equal or even greater importance than prayer in the Christian life.

Despite the fact that there are changes in the post-Index version, Granada's prologue uses exactly the same words to describe the book's first two sections.[56] Because he did not choose to amend his descriptions of the first two parts, one might argue that Granada believed the central message of these sections was largely the same. We will now examine his post-Index edition in order to consider the effect of his emendations upon his original message.

Except for a few important changes, Granada's post-Index version retains the vast majority of the first section's content: his fourteen meditations for each morning and night of the week and his five parts of prayer remain. The notable changes come in nine of this section's two hundred sixty-nine pages: he heavily revised the first chapter and deleted the second chapter, where he had originally mentioned that the vocal aspect of prayer "adds nothing." Most of the second section of the book also remains in the same format: he keeps his brief introduction to devotion and his discussions on the necessary things for reaching true devotion, on the things which impede devotion, on common temptations, and on the ten pieces of advice for the practice of devotion. The notable change is the addition of nine pieces of advice in the last discussion.

There are important continuities between the original and post-Index versions. The main similarity was that Granada still attributed a very substantial role to prayer in the Christian life. In his prologue, he repeated his original argument that lack of prayer is the principal cause of sin in the world.[57] His revised first chapter also included a number of passages in which he retained the notion of prayer as a great helper: combining prayer with

---

[56] Granada, *Libro de la Oración y Meditación* (1554), 14; Granada, *Libro de la Oración y Meditación* (1579), 21-22.

[57] Granada, *Libro de la Oración y Meditación* (1579), 19.

devotion would help Christians to be more virtuous.[58] In another comment that demonstrates continuity with the original version of the *Libro*, Granada reminded his reader of the power of prayer by noting that the Transfiguration occurred while Jesus was praying.[59] Granada also maintained that prayer and meditation were useful for combating temptation and other struggles, and that "continual prayer and sight of spiritual things were more necessary for the just man than many other exercises."[60] Perhaps most important in his many references to the importance of prayer is one in which he defined prayer as "a lifting of our heart to God, through which we reach Him. Prayer is lifting the soul above itself and above all the created, and joining itself with God."[61]

In addition to the continued importance of prayer, there is another significant similarity between the two editions of the *Libro*. In both versions, the prologue contains a passage which briefly discusses the importance of devotion and meditation:

> So that the mysteries of our faith are advantageous and healthy for us, it is best that they be performed and digested in our heart with the warmth of devotion and meditation; because, in another manner, they would be less advantageous. And for lack of this, we see at every step many Christians very complete in faith [yet] quite shattered in life: because they never stop to consider that which they believe. Thus, they hold the faith as if it were in the corner of a chest or as a sword in the sheath or as medicine in the shop, without availing themselves to it for what it is. They believe [everything] that the Church holds…[62]

---

[58] Ibid., 34-35.

[59] Ibid., 36.

[60] ibid., 21: Granada, *Libro de la Oración y Meditación* (1579), 37-38; "…cuanta mayor necesidad tiene el varón justo de la continua consideración y vista de las cosas espirituales que de otros muchos ejercicios."

[61] Ibid., 469: "Pues, según esto, decimos que oración es un levantamiento de nuestro corazón a Dios, mediante el cual no llegamos a él. Oración es subir el ánima sobre sí, y sobre todo lo criado, y juntarse con Dios, y engolfarse en aquél piélago de infinita suavidad y amor."

[62] Ibid., 19-20: "…para que los misterios de nuestra fe nos sean provechosos y saludables, conviene que sean primero actuados y digeridos en nuestro corazón con el calor de la devoción y meditación; porque, de otra manera, muy poco aprovecharan. Y por falta de esto vemos a cada paso muchos cristianos muy enteros en la fe, y muy rotos en la vida: porque nunca se paran a considerar qué es lo que creen. Y así se tienen la fe como en un rincón del arca, o como la espada en la vaina, o como la medicina en la botica, sin servirse de ella para lo que es. Creen así a bulto y a carga cerrada lo que tiene la Iglesia…"

Afterward, Granada continued to emphasize devotion and its potential benefits.[63] Furthermore, the post-Index version contains passages in which Granada gave the reader the freedom to decide the direction of his or her spiritual life. At the end of his prologue, he wrote that one should, "…among many things, choose that which best fits [one's] purpose."[64] He also noted that his reader did not have to use the graces he recommended. He wrote, "One could say that all the graces that although these aforementioned graces are great…they do not close off other paths by which Christians can also reach heaven."[65]

Another link between the two editions is the use of some *potentially* controversial authorities in the *Libro*. He continued to refer quite often not only to the work of Aristotle, Plotinus, Seneca, and Sallust, but also to Old Testament figures.[66] As in his original version, he employed both the Old Testament and the New Testament in a manner suggestive of equal value and thus equal authority.[67] Perhaps more significant in the discussion of controversial figures is a difference between the two versions. In the post-Index edition, Granada removed the names of the most troublesome figures – Herph, Tauler, and Serafino da Fermo.

In spite of the similarities between the original and revised versions of the *Libro*, there are a number of noteworthy differences. For example, while Granada continued to ascribe much importance to prayer, he was much more careful. His revised first chapter includes a new segment that identifies the differences between general human virtues and specifically Christian virtues.[68] He upheld the importance of Christian virtues, especially of faith, hope, and charity:

---

[63] Ibid., 33.

[64] Ibid., 22: "…entre muchas cosas escoja lo que más hiciere a su propósito."

[65] Granada, *Libro de la Oración y Meditación*, 562: "Mas podrá, por ventura, decir alguno que todas estas gracias sobredichas, por grandes que sea, nos convidan, mas no necesitan a usar de esta virtud. Porque, ofreciéndonos grandes favores y medios para ganar el cielo, no nos dejan cerrados otros caminos por donde se podría alcanzar."

[66] Ibid., 31-32. In this edition, Granada mentions Aristotle in page 137, Plotinus in 538-539, Sallust in 523 the Old Testament throughout.

[67] Ibid., 523-526.

[68] Ibid., 26.

> These are primarily those three most noble virtues that are called theological: faith, hope, and charity, which have God as their object.... After these come other principal and excellent virtues, which are very close to these...for us, they are great stimulants and awakeners to do good works...And they are those virtues about which we have spoken...without which our spiritual life would be like a boat without oars...[69]

This discussion of the Christian virtues provided the context in which Granada explained the role which prayer plays in the life of the Christian. He spoke of faith as the first principle and foundation of the Christian life and as something that Christians need to consider with attention and devotion.[70] Granada added that while prayer and meditation are of substantial help to one's faith, faith itself is the first seed and origin of all that was good.[71] By describing prayer together with faith, instead of placing prayer alone at the center, Granada made a substantial change. He became more cautious about the role of prayer in the context of the Christian life. By including this discussion at the beginning of his book, he set a new tone for his work. He continued to demonstrate the significance of prayer, but at the same time, he illustrated the equal, if not higher, importance of Christian virtue.

Granada's new method for discussing prayer within the context of Christian virtues is evident in a number of places in the post-Index version:

> But among all these virtues and defenses that help us, one of the principal ones is prayer, by being a medium so important for reaching grace...[72]

> To praise this virtue (prayer) is not to praise only this virtue, but rather to praise jointly with her all the other virtues which walk in her company; because with the true and

---

[69] Ibid.: "Estas son primeramente aquellas tres nobilísimas virtudes que llaman teologales: fe, esperanza y caridad, que tienen por objeto a Dios...Tras estas vienen otras muy principales y excelentes virtudes, que son muy vecinas a éstas...nos son grandes estímulos y despertadores para bien obrar...Y son aquellas virtudes que dijimos...sin las cuales la vida espiritual fuera como un barco sin remos..."

[70] Granada, *Libro de la Oración y Meditación* (1579), 27.

[71] Ibid., 28-29.

[72] Ibid., 42: "Mas entre estas virtudes y defensivos que nos ayudan, uno de los principales es la oración, por ser un medio tan principal para alcanzar la gracia..."

perfect prayer which is praised here, walk always faith, hope, humility, patience, fear of God, and many other virtues which are never separated from her…[73]

And the general aids for reaching all virtue are not only meditation, but also fasting, silence, prayer, listening to sermons, confession, communion, devotion, and others…."[74]

Among these virtues which always "walk in the company" of prayer is charity. For Granada, it was necessary to continually keep the fire of charity burning with meditation on God's blessings and perfection.[75] In addition, he maintained that charity is important not only in itself, but also for all other virtues.[76] This point is significant because in the original version of the *Libro*, Granada emphasizes prayer, meditation, and devotion above all else. His discussion of charity, however, did not change his message about prayer. Prayer was still central in the Christian life, but it could not stand alone; without charity, he believed that prayer was nothing.[77]

Together with this new section concerning the Christian virtues, Granada also made another important change early in the first section; he deleted the second chapter of his original version. It was here that Granada distinguished between silent and vocal prayer by noting that vocal prayer "adds nothing." He argued that the heartfelt quality of prayer was what was truly important. Did this deletion mark a change in his message? One of Granada's purposes in making the original distinction between silent and vocal prayer was to indicate that his book would focus on silent prayer. Because the post-Index version still demonstrated the importance of silent prayer by retaining the original fourteen meditations, the overall message did not change. Rather, it is possible that he deleted the original second

---

[73] Ibid., 465: "…alabar esta virtud no es solo alabar esta virtud, sino alabar juntamente con ella todas las otras virtudes que andan en su compañía; porque con la verdadera y perfecta oración que aquí se alaba, anda siempre la fe, la esperanza, la humildad, la paciencia, el temor de Dios, y otras muchas virtudes que nunca se apartan de ella…"

[74] Ibid., 38-39: "Y generales ayudas son para toda virtud no sólo la consideración, sino también el ayuno, el silencio, y la oración, y el sermón, y la confesión, y la comunión, y la devoción, y otras virtudes semejantes, que son generales ayudas y estímulos para toda virtud."

[75] Granada, *Libro de la Oración y Meditación* (1579), 31.

[76] Ibid., 39.

[77] Ibid., 468.

chapter in order to remove suspicion that he was disparaging vocal prayer. In the second section of the post-Index version, he even included a very brief section on the value of vocal prayer, and in the beginning of the third section, he stated that one should not limit oneself to silent prayer.[78] Rather, he argued that other kinds of prayer were valuable, as long as one's heart was in them.[79] Thus, Granada certainly moved away from a position that Inquisitorial authorities might have interpreted as undercutting vocal prayer. Nonetheless, he maintained what seemed to be his main point: the heartfelt quality of prayer is what counted. Subsequently, his book continued to devote a sizeable amount of attention to silent prayer and to meditation and devotion.

Despite the continuities in the second section, there are some more significant changes in the new third section. In the post-Index version, Granada combined the three sermons from the original version into the first sermon, and he added the second and third sermons. He did so in order to make the argument that prayer is more perfect when together with fasting and almsgiving.[80] This combination conveyed the same message from his first chapter; prayer is still very important, but nevertheless, it is only one part of the full Christian life.

In his discussion of fasting and almsgiving, Granada brought forth some significant points not present in his first edition. One example is his description of fasting as an act of obedience to the Church.[81] He also described fasting as a necessary practice, one which lifts the burdens that hinder the Christian spiritual life:

---

[78] Ibid., 414-417, 465.

[79] Ibid., 465.

[80] Granada, *Libro de la Oración y Meditación* (1579), 466.

[81] Ibid., 516, 544-545. Fray Luis describes the act of fasting as one of obedience to the Church on at least two occasions in the second sermon.

> As Saint Basil says, just as a soldier cannot fight if he is weighed down by some burden that he carries, in the same way neither can a cleric or religious lift him or herself up to the sacred vigils nor can he or she persevere in them…[82]

The weight that Granada placed on the act of fasting leads us to the larger notion that taking part in external practices of the Church is a necessary part of being a Christian. The addition of the sermon on fasting was a significant one, simply because it lent credibility to the ceremonies and laws which the Church required of its members. Through this sermon, Granada demonstrated that prayer alone did not encompass the life of a Christian. Rather, outward practices contribute to one's spiritual life in a manner equally as meaningful as prayer. One's participation in practices such as fasting strengthens one's prayers, and in turn, one's prayers sanctify the act of fasting.[83]

By examining the content of these two additional sermons, a number of similarities to the way in which Granada discussed the importance of prayer come to light. He described prayer as a medium through which Christians try to achieve a perfect union with God.[84] In the same way, he depicted fasting as an act which makes us lift our soul to God,[85] and he spoke about almsgiving as a virtue which makes man similar to God.[86] In addition, he stated that prayer and meditation were excellent arms for fighting temptation and other vices.[87] Similarly, he maintained that fasting helps Christians to combat the causes of sin[88] and that almsgiving helps one to be forgiven of sin.[89] Furthermore, Granada advocated prayer as a medium through which one reaches virtue.[90] Similarly, he mentioned the importance of

---

[82] Ibid., 519: "…como dice sant Basilio, así como no puede pelear bien el soldado que está embarazado con alguna carga que lleve sobre sí, así tampoco puede el clérigo o religioso levantarse a las sagradas vigilias, ni perseverar en ellas…." For the reference from St. Basil, see St. Basil, *De jejunio*, hom. 1: PG 31, 182.

[83] Granada, *Libro de la Oración y Meditación* (1579), 520.

[84] Ibid. (1554), 299.

[85] Ibid. (1579), 22.

[86] Ibid., 550.

[87] Ibid., 37.

[88] Ibid., 543.

[89] Ibid., 553.

[90] Ibid., 24.

fasting as a way to reach all virtues[91] and described almsgiving as a virtue which provides special privileges with God.[92] Finally, he began his discussion of prayer, fasting, and almsgiving by addressing the need for each specific virtue in the Christian life and by elaborating on his belief that his contemporaries did not sufficiently practice or contemplate these three things.[93]

The centrality that Granada ascribed to prayer alone in the first edition characterized prayer, fasting, and almsgiving in the post-Index version. By placing the emphasis, which was formerly only on prayer, onto other virtues as well, Granada illustrated that prayer, to the isolation of everything else, was not enough. Rather, he argued that it was necessary to focus on a number of important virtues.

Conclusion

This paper has examined the *Libro de la Oración y Meditación* in order to discuss two related topics. It has studied the original version of this important text in order to demonstrate some of the aspects of the book which the Inquisition likely deemed threatening. The fact that many things in the *Libro* were seen as dangerous demonstrates the fear which motivated the Inquisition's heightened efforts in the 1550s to protect Spain from *alumbradismo*, Protestantism, and other attacks upon Church authority. Furthermore, this paper has studied the similarities and differences which exist between the original version of the *Libro* and its post-Index counterpart. In exploring these differences, I have sought to illustrate that prayer holds an essential role in both versions. However, in the changes which Granada made to his later version, he situated the discussion of prayer within the context of other virtues. He did so in order to demonstrate that one could not live a full Christian life by prayer alone. Rather, one needed to engage in other practices that the Church required, such as fasting and almsgiving. By underlining the importance of such practices, Granada

---

[91] Ibid., 544.
[92] Ibid., 557-558.
[93] Ibid., 19, 515-516, 547-548.

lent credibility to the authority of the Church – something which was not obvious in his original edition.

With a study such as this, the temptation is to draw definitive conclusions about whether Granada's 1566 post-Index edition was a different book, conveying a different message than the original version published twelve years earlier. It seems difficult, however, to make such claims. Some scholars are correct in arguing that fundamental continuities exist between the two editions. Nonetheless, it is equally important to bear in mind that one would miss critical aspects of Granada's message if both editions are not considered.

Although it is difficult to answer the question of whether or not the post-Index version was a different book, there is much that one can draw from examining these two sources. One is left wondering about the sincerity of Granada's additions on fasting and almsgiving: his two new sermons covered two topics that *alumbrados* were known to neglect. The eleventh point of the 1525 Inquisitorial edict against the *alumbrados* stated that these individuals believed in neither fasting nor works of mercy (almsgiving) as necessary for salvation.[94] Thus, did Granada only include these two sermons so that he would not be perceived as an *alumbrado*? Or, is the message the reader receives in the post-Index version that of the real Fray Luis de Granada who was simply adding things he "forgot," as Bataillon says? Granada's central message about prayer certainly does remain, and his new material, such as the two sermons, does not contradict his original ideas. Thus, in the post-Index version, the reader still sees the real Fray Luis de Granada, but he was not simply adding things that he "forgot". Granada may have made these additions only to appease the Inquisition, but this is not to say that he did not believe in the truth of what he added.

Would the changes he made have been enough if Fernando de Valdés had still been Inquisitor General? There is, of course, no certain answer, but one would be remiss to explain the absence of the new version from the Index as simply the result of a new administration. Another part of the explanation could be that by 1566 the danger posed by

---

[94] Márquez, *Los Alumbrados*, 276.

Protestantism and *alumbradismo* had subsided.[95] The combination of this possibility and the changes which Granada made may have been enough to prevent his new edition from finding a place on the Index.

Perhaps the clearest insight one can derive from this study is that these two editions are indicative of crucial themes in the history of the Spanish Inquisition. Francisco Jiménez de Cisneros and Alonso de Manrique, two of the Inquisition's leaders in the earlier part of the sixteenth century, did not foster the same kind of atmosphere as did Fernando de Valdés. Both of these earlier Inquisitor Generals were "enthusiastic Erasmians," and thus, humanists and others who were allies of the new learning, such as Luis de Granada, would have found a more hospitable environment at this time.[96] Furthermore, Inquisition scholar Henry Kamen maintains, "Mystical movements and the search for a purer interior religion were common coin in Europe at this time [early 1500s]. In Spain, there was powerful patronage of mystics by the great nobility."[97] As this study has demonstrated, much of Granada's *Libro* is characterized by the importance which he gives to the interior aspect of religion. Among the patrons of these spiritual movements was the Inquisitor General Jiménez de Cisneros. However, Kamen notes that the more open intellectual atmosphere and advocacy of interiorized spirituality were "...soon threatened from within by the growth of illuminism (*alumbradismo*) and the discovery of Protestants...."[98] Thus, the threat of *alumbradismo*, coupled with the rise of Fernando de Valdés – no friend of humanism or interiorized spiritual movements – left those who had benefited from the earlier atmosphere in a dilemma. Because Granada's *Libro* contained material which the Inquisition believed was dangerous in a specific time and context, his book was a true threat while also a victim of circumstance.

---

[95] González Novalín, "La época valdesiana," 538. Novalín argues that Spain experienced the period of greatest threat between 1520 and 1561.

[96] Kamen, *Spanish Inquisition*, 83-84.

[97] Ibid., 86.

[98] Kamen, *Spanish Inquisition*, 85-86.

Another interesting question raised by the early history of the *Libro* is one that involves ecclesiastical authority and politics. Granada's book was supported by a number of respected religious and secular authorities at the same time that it was censured by Fernando de Valdés's Inquisition. In her essay on Granada's *Libro*, Elizabeth Rhodes argues, "...by 1566, Granada had the overt support of men more powerful than Valdés (who died in 1568)."[99] Thus, the history of the *Libro* raises a question concerning the Inquisition and its relationship to other figures of authority. To what degree did leaders both within and outside of Spain influence the Inquisition? The Spanish Inquisitor General was chosen by the Pope but responsible to the Spanish king. Thus, in the very role that the Inquisition occupied within a larger religious and political hierarchy, there was the potential for tension. This tension was present from the establishment of the Spanish Inquisition and continued to be evident in the conflict between the Spanish Inquisition and the papacy over the orthodoxy of Granada's book.[100]

The question of the orthodoxy of Granada's *Libro* was an international one. During Fernando de Valdés's time, the Spanish Inquisition disagreed not only with the papacy, but also with Portugal, whose king advocated Granada's work. This set of conflicts raises other interesting questions for future research: Did these other principalities not have quite the same fear of *alumbradismo* or other heterodox sects of Christianity? What problems of heresy did Portugal and Italy face and how were they different from those of Spain? Studying Spain's approach to suppressing heterodoxy, together with those of Rome and Portugal could also illuminate how the Spanish religious situation affected European perceptions of Spain as an intolerant society. Such a study could also identify the distinct conditions which must have characterized the religious atmosphere in Portugal, where Granada lived over half of his life and published many of his works. What made Portugal a more attractive place for Granada and a number of others like him?

---

[99] Rhodes, "Spain's Misfired Canon," 50.

[100] Homza, "Introduction," xvii.

An examination of the early history of Fray Luis de Granada's *Libro de la Oración y Meditación* illustrates several central topics in the religious and political history of sixteenth-century Spain and its southern European neighbors. The *Libro* emerged from, and was an actor in, an especially rich historical situation. As a result, it is an excellent starting point for understanding and conducting further research on a number of important historical phenomena of its period.

"Ten Years Removed From A Bolo and Breechcloth": Racism and Violence in the Northern California Anti-Filipino Riots of 1930

By

Vernon Creviston
California State University, Fresno

In January of 1930, a race riot erupted in the Watsonville area of California's Central Coast. The violence, directed at the Filipino immigrant workers in the area, spread as far away as San Francisco and focused national attention on the presence of another wave of Asian immigrants in the US. Scholars, in their examination of this event, have generally agreed that the anti-Filipino movement, of which the Watsonville riots were a part, was essentially a continuance of the white nativism that had been evident in the previous waves of anti-Asian sentiment targeting the Chinese, Japanese, and various other East Asian ethnicities that arrived in the US prior to the Filipino.[1] These Asian immigrant groups faced a coalition of forces from the white community that included organized labor, political organizations, and prominent community leaders that retained a core doctrine aimed at reducing the influx, and ultimately at the expulsion of, immigrants from the US.[2] While scholars have covered race relations, especially in the context of earlier periods of Asian

---

[1] The best examples of these arguments come from John Higham, *Strangers in the Land: Patterns of American Nativism, 1860-1925* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1955); Ronald Takaki, *Iron Cages: Race and Culture in the Nineteenth Century America* (New York: Alfred A Knopf, 1979); *Strangers From A Different Shore: A History of Asian Americans* (Boston: Little Brown, 1989); Arleen Garcia de Vera, "Constituting Community: A Study of Nationalism, Colonialism, Gender, and Identity Among Filipinos in California, 1919-1946," Ph.D. diss., University of California, Los Angeles, 2002; in ProQuest Digital Dissertations, http://www.proquest.com.hmlproxy.lib.csufresno.edu/ (publication number AAT 3063917 (accessed January 27, 2008). See also: Howard DeWitt's "The Watsonville Anti-Filipino Riot of 1930: A Case Study of the Great Depression and Ethnic Conflict in California," *Southern California Quarterly* 63, no. 3, (1979): 291-292; DeWitt's *Anti-Filipino Movements in California: A History, Bibliography and Study Guide*, (San Francisco: R and E Research, 1976); and also by DeWitt, *Violence in the Fields: California Filipino Farm Labor Unionization During the Great Depression* (Saratoga : CA Century Twenty-one Publishing, 1980); Manuel Buaken, *I Have Lived With the American People* (Caldwell, ID: The Caxton Printers,1948); Grayson Kirk, "The Filipinos," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, Minority Peoples in a Nation at War* 223 (September 1942); John H Burma, "The Background of the Current Situation of Filipino-Americans," *Social Forces* 30, no. 1 (October 1951); Carey McWilliams, *Factories in the Fields* (New Haven: Archon Books, 1969).

[2] Fred H. Matthews, "White Community and 'Yellow Peril,'" *The Mississippi Valley Historical* Review 50, no. 4 (March 1954), 628; Higham, *Strangers in the Land*, 44-45; and, DeWitt, "The Watsonville Anti-Filipino Riot of 1930: A Case Study of the Great Depression and Ethnic Conflict in California," 292.

immigration, the Watsonville riots and their relationship to race issues in the Western US have been overlooked.

The anti-Filipino movement and the Watsonville Riots of 1930, which remain the significant events during of the movement, serve as a microcosm for the effects of nativism in the West and how the white population interacted with subordinate ethnic groups in the first decades of the twentieth century. These riots illustrate the depth to which the native white population was dominated by the ideals of Anglo-Saxon supremacy, fearing racial mixing or interaction on an almost pathological level.[3] The reprisals by the white community in Watsonville unequivocally demonstrate that the violence sprang from social tensions caused by Filipino attempts to integrate themselves into American society: Filipinos dressed in American fashions; drove American cars; and, without a significant female Filipino population to draw from, felt they had every right to date white women.[4] A close examination of the riots thus provides insight into how racial violence was spawned by the social tensions caused by Filipino attempts to mingle in the white community, and how the white leadership retooled the same arguments used against previous Asian groups to focus attention on efforts to remove Filipinos. Lastly, the riots also demonstrate the manner in which labor leaders and politicians at the state and national levels used local instances like the riots for political gain, and how their efforts reinforced nativism in the West.[5] The case of the Watsonville riots was a matter of local whites, motivated by their racist tendencies, attacking any ethnic group that they believed was overstepping their social bounds and needed to be reminded of their place in American society.

What this ultimately signifies is that immigrant groups to the US, regardless of their fluency in English, acceptance of American fashion, or familiarity with American culture

---

[3] Higham, 170-171. For a general treatment of the development of Anglo fears of immigrants see Ronald Takaki, and Alexander Saxton.

[4] *San Francisco Chronicle*, January 24, 1930: 3; Richard B. Meynell, "Little Brown Brothers, Little White Girls: The Anti-Filipino Hysteria of 1930 and the Watsonville Riots" (paper presented to Pajaro Valley Historical Society Association, September 3, 1996).

[5] Saxton, 260.

(which in all three aspects most Filipino immigrants had attained), initially were not allowed to succeed, or blend into, American society. This case of Filipino exclusion clearly demonstrates the almost formulaic approach used by nativists to combat each successive wave of immigration, and why rioters targeted Filipinos in Watsonville in 1930. Anti-Filipino violence was carried out by white townspeople who felt threatened by the social interactions of Filipino males with white females.[6] While the rhetoric against Filipino immigration came from the traditional sources of the anti-Asian movement, on the local level in Watsonville it was not conducted or organized by labor or political organizations; rather, it sprang from local authorities and townspeople opposed to the continued presence of the Filipino in their community.

A brief review of the anti-Asian movement demonstrates the impact of nativism on white society and the role played by labor and political organizations in spreading nativist fears into white society and national legislation.[7] From the earliest stages of the Asian exclusionist movements, organized labor has played a central role. Starting in the 1870s, national labor organizations like the Knights of Labor and the National Labor Union refused to take in Chinese members and depicted the Chinese as a threat to white labor.[8] Samuel Gompers, head of the AFL, was instrumental in pushing through anti-Chinese legislation on the national level to protect white workers from inexpensive imported competition; once that goal was achieved, he began the process over again, against Japanese immigrants.[9] The

---

[6] For a detailed explanation of the manner in which the white populations responded to the presence of Filipinos in their communities see Meynell, "Little Brown Brothers, Little White Girls: The Anti-Filipino Hysteria of 1930 and the Watsonville Riots."

[7] This review will rely primarily upon general histories of the period that provide a good overview of the principal events and personalities of the period, and is not intended as an in depth study of the anti-Asian movement as a whole. Works referred to for period: Peter Kwong and Dusanka Miscevic, *Chinese America: The Untold Story of America's Oldest New Community* (New York: The New Press, 2005); Carey McWilliams, *Brothers Under the Skin* (Boston: Little Brown and Company, 1943); Iris Chang, *The Chinese in America: A Narrative History* (New York: Viking Press, 2003); Fred H. Matthews, "White Community and 'Yellow Peril,'" *The Mississippi Valley Historical Review* 50, no. 4 (March 1954); Robert G. Lee, *Orientals: Asian Americans in Popular Culture* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1999); Alexander Saxton, *The Indispensible Enemy: Labor and the Anti-Chinese Movement in California* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1971); Frank P. Barajas, "Chinese Exclusion in the United States, 1868-1892" (masters thesis, California State University, Fresno, 1991).

[8] Kwong and Miscevic, 91; McWilliams, *Brothers under the Skin,* 101; Robert G. Lee, 60-62.

[9] Lee, 110; Saxton, 40-45.

anti-Asian movement had laborer's support within California as well, evidenced by the attitude of the California Workingmen's Party in calling for deportations of the Chinese and advocating violence to ensure their point was clear.[10] Labor leaders, like Dennis Kearney of the California Workingmen's Party, were often the ones organizing anti-Chinese demonstrations and ensuring the election of politicians who espoused their nativist agenda.[11] This program was so successful in California that by 1879, no politician dared to go against the exclusionist movement for fear of losing his position.[12]

Arguments against the Chinese used racial pseudo-science to depict the Chinese as mentally inferior, as a disease carrier, and as a source of moral corruption. Politicians and labor leaders also pointed out the stark differences in the manner of dress and culture that the Chinese, as well as other Asian groups that followed, retained. These leaders also insisted that such differences kept Asians from assimilating into American society.[13] These accusations, often communicated by trade or union publications, helped carry the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882 through Congress; still, the Act's terms were still too generous for many of the labor organizations, who demanded the complete removal of the Chinese.[14] Labor leaders began initiating boycotts, and threatened violence to any business owners who employed Chinese workers. They also began direct attacks on Chinese labor camps, gathering mobs of white workers and setting them loose on Chinese workers.[15] Of course, attacks were not limited to labor issues; several communities suffered race riots targeting their Chinese districts in attempts to cleanse them of the offending populations.[16] However, the violence was frequently caused by white labor (primarily miners in the Far West) as an attempt to drive out Chinese competition for work; and, even targeted Asian owned

---

10 Kwong and Miscevic, 92.
11 Ibid., 93; Barajas, 70.
12 Kwong and Miscevic, 93.
13 McWilliams, *Brothers under the Skin*, 102-103.
14 Iris Chang, 119-121.
15 Kwong and Miscevic, 107.
16 Chang, 132; Kwong and Miscevic, 112-114.

businesses, viewed as competitors to white owned establishments.[17] Ultimately, the fear that the white community had about the possible local loss of money from paying immigrant worker's wages was an important factor in how whites justified the violence directed at Asians, including Filipinos.

By the late 1890s the flow of Chinese immigration had been stemmed by the successful efforts of labor-led violence and governmental legislation, only to be replaced by a new 'Yellow Peril' in the Japanese. Japanese immigrants found themselves confronted by the same forces that had aligned themselves against the Chinese, big labor and politicians.[18] Local labor leaders in San Francisco began to enlist the aid of sociologists who depicted the Japanese as racially inferior and a threat to American labor.[19] Politicians in turn took these arguments and alleged that the Japanese immigrant was as dangerous as the American Negro and the Chinese in constituting a disruptive force to the homogenous nature of the American Republic.[20] Indeed, in many respects the community saw little difference between Japanese and Chinese immigrants, and simply continued the previous anti-Chinese policy against the Japanese (as previously noted with Samuel Gompers' quick transition from a leader of the anti-Chinese movement to working against the Japanese).[21]

In California, the California State Federation of Labor, along with the Native Sons of the Golden West, banded together to form the Japanese Exclusion League to oppose Japanese immigration.[22] Most of the opposition to the Japanese came in the form of legislative resistance to immigration; with the successful promotion of legislation, the reliance on violence to control the immigrant population declined in this period. The

---

[17] Chang, 133-134.

[18] Matthews, 614.

[19] Ibid.

[20] Ibid., 619-620.

[21] Robert Higgs, "Landless by Law: Japanese Immigrants in California Agriculture to 1941," *The Journal of Economic History, the Tasks of Economic History* 38, no. 1 (March 1978): 214.

[22] E. Todd Clark, "The Japanese in Fresno County, California: An Analysis of Public Opinion Concerning the Japanese, The Election of 1920, and The Alien Land Law in an Agricultural County" (masters thesis, California State University, Fresno, 1960), 4.

attempt by the San Francisco School Board to segregate Japanese students into their own school in the Chinatown district is but one example of the institutional nature of anti-Japanese discrimination.[23] The politician-labor alliance would direct legislation through the Alien Land Law of 1913 denying Japanese immigrants the right to own lands. Ultimately, it also pressured the Federal government to restrict Japanese immigration through the Alien Exclusion Act of 1924.[24] This halted the influx of Japanese immigrants to the US; however, it only opened the door for another group of Asians - the Filipinos- whose numbers began to increase as the flow of Japanese abaited.

The beginnings of anti-Filipino sentiment had its origins in the already well-established desire to exclude Japanese immigration to the US. Many of the interests that allied against the Japanese, and the Chinese before them, would also become the prime agitators calling for the expulsion of the Filipino.[25] These forces were a combination of newspapermen, including Randolph Hearst and Valentine S. McClatchy, labor organizations such as the American Federation of Labor, and the American Legion.[26] They feared in the Japanese a growing 'alien' element that would undermine the vigor and power of the dominant white society, and thus quickly applied the same concerns to the growing population of Filipinos in California.[27] The depiction of Asian immigrants as both a moral and public health threat to the white community was at the core of the nativist sentiment in the West.[28] Valentine S. McClatchy, part-owner and publisher of several California newspapers, was an especially active leader in both the anti-Japanese and anti-Filipino movements; as early as 1921, he used political fronts like the California Joint Immigration

---

[23] Ibid.

[24] Robert Higgs, 215.

[25] See Howard DeWitt, *Images of Ethnic and Racial Violence in California Politics 1917-1930: A Survey,* (San Francisco: R and E Research, 1975) for a detailed description of the Anti-Filipino movement in California, and *Anti-Filipino Movements in California: A History, Bibliography and Study Guide,* (San Francisco: R and E Research, 1976), 27-33; and McWilliams, *Brothers under the Skin.*

[26] Raymond Leslie Buell, "The Development of Anti-Japanese Agitation in the United States," *Political Science Quarterly* 38, no. 1 (March 1923): 71.

[27] Matthews, 628.

[28] Saxton, 240-257; Takaki, 217-219.

Committee, which he chaired, as a tool to lead the movement to exclude Filipino workers from California farms.[29] McClatchy's influence was crucial in the depiction of the Filipino immigration as the 'third wave' of Oriental immigration, thus expanding the anti-Japanese movement to include the Filipino.[30] By 1929, the combined interest of community, business, and labor organizations was vehemently calling for restrictions on Filipino labor. They justified their stance by portraying the Filipino as unable to adjust to American society due to their backward culture, as prone to violence, and as a source of disease; specifically, they accused the taxi-dance halls that sprang up in Filipino communities as a primary source of crime and a place of inter-racial mingling.[31] Legally excluded from mingling with white females in everyday society, Filipino males were often persuaded Filipinos to become the frequenters of taxi-dance halls and houses of prostitution.[32] The exclusionist interests used the crimes that occurred in these places, regardless of their frequency, as proof of the corruptible nature of the Filipino.[33] Using claims of racial inferiority, the anti-Filipino movement called for complete exclusion of Filipino labor, which fitted the previous "pattern established with the Chinese, the Japanese, and the Hindus."[34] The initial denouncement of the Filipino based itself on racism, centering on fears of Filipino debasement of white society; the accusations of economic deprivations caused by Filipino workers taking jobs from whites would not surface until the exclusion movement began in earnest.

The influx of Filipinos into California that worried nativists so much was due primarily to a demand for cheap labor created by the agricultural boom of the 1930s along the Central Coast. Large-scale California growers sent representatives to the Philippines

---

[29] Ibid.; DeWitt, "The Watsonville Anti-Filipino Riot of 1930: A Case Study of the Great Depression and Ethnic Conflict in California," 292.

[30] DeWitt, *Anti-Filipino Movements in California*, 30.

[31] DeWitt, "The Watsonville Anti-Filipino Riot of 1930", 293-294; Justine Akers Chacon and Mike Davis, *No One is Illegal: Fighting Racism and State Violence on the U.S.-Mexico Border* (Haymarket Books: Chicago, 2006), 39-40.

[32] Manuel Buaken, 116.

[33] Carey McWilliams, *Factories in the Fields* (New Haven: Archon Books, 1969), 144.

[34] Ibid., 132; Grayson Kirk, "The Filipinos," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 223, Minority Peoples in a Nation at War (September 1942), 46.

with lucrative offers, encouraging young, unattached Filipinos to migrate to the US.[35] Prior to these recruitment efforts by corporate farms, Filipino immigrants were primarily students, sent by white sponsors in the Philippines. However, as the numbers of students relatively low, and scattered throughout the US, few racial problems arose from this type of close social contact.[36] Where there were only 5,600 Filipinos in the US, according to the 1920 Census, by 1930 there were over 42,000; it was this rapid increase that caused so much concern amongst exclusionist groups.[37] Overwhelmingly male in numbers, since family mores prohibited unmarried females from migrating, Filipino workers were often relegated to domestic service, fishing and the canning industry, or agricultural fieldwork.[38]

Filipinos lived together in large groups due to economic necessity (as they were often the lowest paid workers in whichever industry they found themselves), pooling their resources to share clothes, cars and other luxury goods, while often seeking protection from a hostile white community. In the arrangement, they ultimately found themselves on the outside of American society. This isolation and confinement to the lowest paying sectors of the labor market left them exposed to unscrupulous interests that sought to separate the Filipino from his money.[39] Pool Halls and taxi dance halls were ubiquitous institutions in Filipino communities, and the 'social hall' was often a front for gambling and prostitution.[40] These interests were almost exclusively owned or controlled by local whites or Chinese (it was in the Chinese sections of most cities that the Filipino communities established themselves), but usually managed by local Filipinos. Given the atmosphere of economic hardship, and the many avenues for vice available to the Filipino, it is little surprise that

---

[35] Buaken, 98.

[36] McWilliams, *Brothers under the Skin*, 236; Howard DeWitt, *Anti-Filipino Movements in California: A History, Bibliography and Study Guide* (San Francisco: R and E Research Assoc., 1976), 12.

[37] Over 70 percent of this population was made up of unmarried men under the age of 30. See Kirk, "The Filipinos," 45.

[38] McWilliams, *Brothers under the Skin*, 237; Rick Bonus, *Locating Filipino Americans: Ethnicity and the Cultural Politics of Space* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2000), 38.

[39] Kirk, 47.

[40] McWilliams, *Brothers under the Skin*, 238.

Filipino communities neither developed fully nor provided a sense of stability for their populations.[41] One scholars of Filipinos in the US considered this an accurate assessment of most immigrant groups, "so the Filipino is charged with immorality; not without reason, for all large groups of young men without home restraints show a greater immorality than the average population. Yet, since this is a serious charge, and one commonly made against the Filipino-Americans, it is well to remember that almost every minority group has been charged with serious immorality."[42] Regardless of their 'Americanization' or legal right to be in the US, Filipinos were to experience the same level of resentment and mistrust as the Chinese and Japanese had endured in prior decades.

When the Filipino did attempt to mix with white society, he was met with hostility and violence, further reinforcing his isolation from a stable community environment. That the Filipino would attempt to mix freely in white American society was natural; the Filipino was familiar-if not actually part of- American customs and language.[43] American control of the Philippines gave many of the Islanders a familiarity with American ways, and students returning from American universities often took their affection for America to the islands.[44] Filipinos also had a sense of affinity with American political customs, noting that their political system was based upon the American model, and often equated American goods and manner of dress with wealth and success.[45]

Significantly, the first two instances of large-scale anti-Filipino violence in California were precipitated by social interactions, or the fear thereof, between Filipino boys and white girls. In August of 1926, in Dinuba, a small agrarian community in California's Central Valley, a vigilante group of volunteers from the local American Legion hastily formed when they learned that Filipino boys were escorting white girls on the streets of the town. These

---

41 Ibid., 241; Buaken, 106.

42 John H Burma, "The Background of the Current Situation of Filipino-Americans," *Social Forces* 30, no. 1 (October 1951): 45.

43 Bonus, 37.

44 Buaken, 30-33.

45 Ibid., 33-34; Bonus, 35-40.

vigilantes made it their mission to keep Filipino boys from associating with white girls. On the previous day, a group of young Filipino boys had been arrested for attempting to date local white girls.[46] The vigilantes patrolled the streets of Dinuba for several days, watchful for any signs of oversexed Filipino boys attempting to infiltrate social functions and interact with their sisters and daughters.[47] This patrol was not only endorsed by the local community, but California politicians like U.S. Senator Hiram Johnson and Congressman Richard Welch, from the San Jose-Watsonville district, after the event came out in favor of restricting Filipino immigration in a1927 Congressional bill.[48]

Serious violence against Filipinos erupted for the first time on the 24 of October 1929 in Exeter, California. Attending a street fair in town, some Filipino field workers escorted some local white girls to the event; they were verbally and physically intimidated by local whites.[49] Finally, a Filipino, who either had taken enough abuse or feared for his safety, drew a knife and seriously injured one of his antagonists.[50] The response from the local white community was as immediate as it was overwhelming. A mob numbering close to 300, led by the town's Chief of Police, went to nearby farms where Filipinos were thought to be employed and either drove off the Filipinos, or burned down the buildings where they lived.[51] The riot in Exeter was covered by news media across the country and was depicted by most as a race riot, with the emphasis placed on the stabbing of a white by a Filipino.[52] Using the riots in Exeter as a pretext, many of the newspapers in farming regions of California began to call for the disuse of Filipino labor, citing the violent nature of the

---

46 Dewitt, *Anti-Filipino Movements in California*, 34.
47 Ibid., 32.
48 DeWitt, "The Watsonville Anti-Filipino Riot of 1930," 293.
49 *Woodland Democrat,* October 25, 1929: 4.
50 Ibid.
51 DeWitt, "The Watsonville Anti-Filipino Riot of 1930," 294.
52 *Moberly* (Missouri) *Monitor-Index,* October 25, 1929: 11.

Filipino and his "refusal to remain in his place."[53] The incident also made Filipino crimes good copy, as newspapers began to concentrate on stories that involved the islanders.

Many of these stories centered upon instances where Filipino males were found living with white females, and often depicted the Filipino as a sexual predator or corrupter of innocent youth. In the Watsonville area, two such stories concerning Filipinos ran concurrently and would help set the stage for the violence to come. On 5 December 1929, a front-page story in Watsonville's newspaper, *The Evening Pajaronian*, reported the discovery of two white teenage girls from Watsonville living with a Filipino in San Jose.[54] The news shocked the community, as it appeared that the girls' parents had intended to sell them to the Filipino in a form of 'white slavery'.[55] In the same edition as the news of the two girls in the possession of a Filipino, the paper also reported that a Filipino taxi-dance hall was soon to open on the outskirts of Watsonville, in a coastal district known as Palm Beach, and would employ white girls to dance with the exclusively Filipino customers.[56] The reports carried in the paper, coupled with the views being promoted by the likes of McClatchy and his commission throughout California, set the stage for racial violence.

Into this growing atmosphere of white apprehension of the Filipino presence, Judge Daniel W. Rohrback, a justice of the peace and local farmer from the Pajaro Valley near Watsonville, wrote a resolution for the Northern Monterey County Chamber of Commerce. Introduced on 6 December 1929, one day after the news of the white 'slaves' in San Jose and the Filipino dance hall opening ran in the paper, the resolution called for the immediate expulsion of Filipino farm workers, proclaiming them to be a cause of vice and a threat to white womanhood.[57]

---

[53] DeWitt, *Anti-Filipino Movements in California,* 35.

[54] *Evening Pajaronian*, December 5, 1929: 1.

[55] Meynell,17.

[56] *Evening Pajaronian,* December 5, 1929: 1.

[57] DeWitt, "The Watsonville Anti-Filipino Riot of 1930," 295.

The resolution was passed and adopted by the Chamber on 8 January 1930; two days later, the *Evening Pajaronian* interviewed Judge Rohrback about his resolution.[58] The interview covered the major points authored by the judge and allowed Rohrback to expound on his views of the Filipinos. The judge believed that his resolution was merely part of the statewide movement - lead by McClatchy and his committee - to exclude Filipinos and preserve "the white race in the State of California."[59] His nativist sentiments were a mixture of racism, believing that the Filipino race was "but ten years removed from a bolo and breechcloth," and an earnest desire to protect the white community from the corrupting influence of the Filipino lifestyle.[60] Rohrback displayed these sentiments when he noted that Filipinos were willing to accept lower wages than whites, and that their propensity to live together in large numbers, in sub-standard conditions, allowed them more disposable income to use in attracting white women for companionship.[61] It was this aspect of the Filipino presence that troubled Rohrback the most; Filipinos were employed by white farmers and used their money to "dress like Solomon in all his glory" in order to attract white women.[62] Clearly, the judge did not see the adaptation of the Filipino to American dress and custom as a laudable effort on their part, but as a threat to the white community. He went on at length to explain his view that intermarriage between whites and Filipinos was unthinkable, as would create an offspring who "in all measures will be a detriment to the attainment of a higher standard of living for man and womanhood."[63] While earnest in his desire to see the Filipinos removed from American shores, Rohrback was still a Justice of the Peace and, as such, he called on legal and peaceful means to attain this goal. He specifically ruled out violence as a tool to force out Filipinos; instead, he endorsed the immediate

---

[58] *Watsonville Evening Pajaronian,* January 10, 1930:1.

[59] Ibid.

[60] Ibid.

[61] Ibid. Filipino communal living also made the Filipino a disease carrier – specifically for meningitis - in the Judge's eyes.

[62] Ibid.

[63] Ibid.

independence of the Philippines, with a subsequent forced repatriation of all Filipinos back to their homeland.[64] On the following Monday, the Greenfield Chamber of Commerce joined Judge Rohrback and the North Monterey County Chamber of Commerce in calling for an exclusion of Filipino field workers and the "curbing of activities from those already here."[65]

While Rohrback was concerned with the plight of white workers it was only in the context of what the Filipino did in his place: spending money on flashy clothes, cars and dance hall girls. He was not working in conjunction with any local labor leaders or any area politicians in his call for the removal of the Filipino. He reflected the general level of concern that the presence of Filipinos in the community caused on whites, based on their view that a minority group in their midst was acting out of its place. Rohrback's resolution was immediately repudiated by the Filipino community in the area, and brought many Filipinos to Watsonville to protest actively against the judge's slanderous attacks.[66] In response to the resolution, these Filipino groups, primarily from Stockton, began to pass out pamphlets extolling the virtue of Filipinos, their right to seek companionship, and the value of their labor to white farmers.[67]

The next day, a group of 300 Filipinos met at the Hall of Monterey Bay Filipino Club in Palm Beach to answer the accusations made in the recently passed resolution of the Northern Monterey County Chamber of Commerce. The Filipino response, led by local Filipino leaders A. Antenor Cruz and A. E. Magsuci, countered the portrayal made by Judge Rohrback, noting that Filipinos were not the only workers in California accepting low wages, and accusing Mexican and Chinese workers of similar practices in other parts of the state.[68]

---

64 Ibid.

65 *Watsonville Evening Pajaronian,* January 21, 1930: 1. Greenfield is a small farming community approximately 20 miles south of Salinas.

66 Buaken, 104; DeWitt, "The Watsonville Anti-Filipino Riot of 1930," 296; *Monterey Peninsula Herald,* January 24, 1930: 1.

67 *Monterey Peninsula Herald,* January 20, 1930: 1.

68 *Watsonville Evening Pajaronian*, January 21, 1930: 5.

They also took exception to the idea that Filipinos were a menace to the white race. They noted that very few marriages between Filipino males and Anglo females took place, as social and economic factors created effective barriers.[69] The white community of Watsonville saw the Filipino response to Judge Rohrback's resolution and interview as further evidence of Filipinos acting outside their 'place', a view that only heightened white concerns over the Filipino presence in their locale.[70]

Rumors spread through the white community that several white taxi dancers at a Palm Beach social hall were also living on the premises, along with the Filipino operators of the club.[71] A group of whites, many of whom had been turned away from the club when they went to patronize the establishment, returned on the night of 19 January in an attempt to storm the building and shut down the club, which they considered an affront to their moral sensibilities (at least after they had been denied access).[72] Local deputies who had been hired by the real club owners, two brothers from San Francisco, William and Lock Paddon, quickly dispersed the mob. Afterwards, several street fights broke out between small groups of whites and Filipinos; however, these were broken up by the police before serious injury resulted to either party.[73] The violence that had been escalating over the previous two days was now at a critical tipping point, with the white community becoming more aggressive with each attack on local Filipinos.

Early in the morning of 21 January, a carload of whites attacked a bunkhouse on the McGowan ranch outside of Watsonville, in the mistaken belief that Filipinos were employed there. When the armed whites pounded on the bunkhouse door, they were greeted by six Japanese farm workers, who assured the armed men that no Filipinos were to be found there. The whites, not to be deprived of their sport, fired numerous shots into the structure,

---

[69] Ibid.

[70] *Salinas Index-Journal*, January 16, 1930: 1.

[71] *Watsonville Evening Pajaronian*, January 20, 1930: 1.

[72] Ibid.

[73] Ibid.

and only left the scene after emptying their magazines. Luckily, the occupants were able to avoid harm.[74] In other parts of the Pajaro Valley, serious violence was likewise adverted; the Watsonville police actively patrolled the streets, dispersing any large gathering of whites and quietly moving any Filipinos in town out of the path of the mobs.[75] Outside of Pajaro Township, just a few miles east of Watsonville, a curious confrontation occurred on the outskirts of town when Filipinos farm workers confronted a group of townspeople from Pajaro.[76] Before anything more serious than rock throwing developed, a group of Mexican field workers happened on the scene. Both the whites and Filipinos were anxious to see which side the Mexicans were going to take, and when they aligned themselves on the side of the whites, drawing their pruning knives, the Filipinos withdrew from the potentially lethal situation.[77] This confrontation not only illustrated the level of fragmentation within the farm laborer force, but also the complete isolation of the Filipinos from other migratory worker groups.

As night fell on 22 January, white crowds began to form around the downtown pool halls and street corners, as many agitators began urging that action be taken against local Filipinos. These groups of whites were not led by farm workers or labor leaders, as the previous waves of Anti-Asian violence had been; in the Watsonville riots, the leadership was homegrown and saw itself as defending the town against a Filipino invasion. By 11pm that night, a white mob, reported at 500 in strength, formed and began terrorizing local Filipino farm workers; their initial target was a Filipino 'community house' or group home where the farm workers lived on the outskirts of town.[78] The mob, the majority of whom were armed

---

[74] *Watsonville Evening Pajaronian*, January 21, 1930: 1.

[75] Ibid.

[76] Ibid.

[77] Ibid.

[78] The number of participants in the mob activities is significant as it represents about 6percent of the towns population directly involved in the rioting. The 1930 census put Watsonville's population at 8344 Source: California State Department of Finance, Demographic Research Unit, *Historical Census Populations of Places, Towns, and Cities in California, 1850-1990*, http://www.dof.ca.gov/html/Demograp/calhist2.xls (accessed October 13, 1999).

with rocks, although several possessed firearms as well, stormed the house and began savagely beating of the Filipinos found inside. This attack was only halted by the timely arrival of the local police, led by Watsonville Chief of Police Robert Hastings, who took a group of 30 Filipinos to the local jail in an attempt to safeguard them from further harm. Meanwhile, the mob began to terrorize another house used as living quarters by Filipino farm-workers, throwing rocks and firing bullets into the structure. Only the intervention of the Chief Hastings, with a hastily assembled force of officers and firemen who stood between the rioters and the building, saved the structure and its inhabitants. Chief Hastings warned the mob that whites owned this house and that he was prepared to fire on the mob to protect the structure.[79]

The mob then dispersed, only to coalesce again at another Filipino home near the Palm Beach district. This home, also owned by an American, was at the center of the violence, as it was a dance hall where Filipino men were believed to carouse with white women. This time the mob relied on weapons, rather than rocks, to damage the building and its inhabitants; however, the Filipinos inside and the American owner of the structure, forewarned of the white rampage, quickly responded by firing back. A potentially lethal situation was averted by the re-appearance of Chief Hastings and his detachment, which defused the situation by daring the mob to take action against him and his men.[80]

Having been turned away from the nearby targets in Watsonville, the white mobs began attacks on bunkhouses at nearby ranches which employed Filipino workers. At one such bunkhouse, on the Murphy ranch about three miles southeast of Watsonville, a group of whites threw rocks and firing bullets into the building; one of the rounds struck a young Filipino worker, Fermin Tovera, in the chest, killing him and paralyzing about twenty of his

---

[79] *San Francisco Chronicle,* January 23, 1930: 1.

[80] Ibid.

co-workers with fear.[81] Another white mob was responsible for a second attack on a ranch house at the Andrew Storm ranch, similar to the one at the Murphy ranch, only their victim survived.[82]

Early on the morning of the 23 January, the Watsonville police arrested several of the rioters returning from the raids on the Murphy and Storm ranches as they entered town. They were all young men in their teens or early twenties, some still in high school, and members of the Watsonville community.[83] These youths were taken to the Salinas jail in an attempt to dissuade any mob-generated breakout, and members of the American Legion and Veterans of the Spanish-American War were hastily deputized and put on patrol in an attempt to keep a reoccurrence of the previous night's violence from materializing. Pamphlets such as the English-language *Torch,* issued by the Filipino community in Stockton, and the tagalong *Ang Batay* from Los Angeles, began to be circulated around Watsonville; the papers called for Filipino resistance to the American violence and asserted that the Filipinos had as much right to American women as American men had.[84] Publications like these, while intended for their own members by the Filipino communities that produced them, were used by the local white press to demonstrate the unruly character of Filipinos and the danger of their presence to white communities.[85] Rumors began to circulate in the white community that an additional influx of 100 Filipinos was to be expected the next day; these rumors kept the tension and anxiety level of whites in the community at an extreme level.[86] Several civic organizations, alarmed about the level of violence during the riots, attempted to

---

[81] The name of the young Filipino worker murdered during the riots has been variously reported as Tobera, Toberas, Toveras. This study has chosen the Tovera spelling as the correct instance, as Manual Buaken, who claimed to have had personal contact with the victim and references the victim on page 105.

[82] *San Francisco Chronicle,* January 24, 1930: 1.

[83] *San Francisco Chronicle*, January 26, 1930: 2.

[84] *San Francisco Chronicle*, January 24, 1930: 1.

[85] Bonus,162-163; *San Francisco Chronicle*, January 24, 1930.

[86] *San Francisco Chronicle*, January 24, 1930: 1.

mollify the rioters by issuing statements that condemned the violence and called for an end to the raids on Filipino living quarters.[87]

The violence, while being quelled in Watsonville, began to spread to regions bordering the Pajaro Valley. For example, in San Jose, a white man accosted a pair of Filipinos and was stabbed by them when they became frightened for their safety.[88] As word of the disturbances spread, Filipino officials and advocates of Filipino's rights began a call for retribution and justice. Pedro Gueverra, the Philippines Resident Commissioner in Washington DC, went before the House on 24 January calling for an end to US control of the Philippines, using the riots in the Watsonville area as proof of the one-sided nature of US control. He declared that, if a similar occurrence were to take place in the Philippines, with Americans as the victims, military action would ensue. After emphasizing that the Filipinos on the West Coast were entitled to the same protections as any other US citizen, he called upon local and state authorities to control the situation.[89]

As the Filipino response to the violence mounted, white apprehension spread to other parts of the state. In Los Angeles, where a sizable Filipino minority also lived, rumors spread that anti-Filipino riots were planned; the police responded by assigning two officers to guard each hall and assembling two riot squads to patrol the dance-hall district continuously through the night.[90] Also on 24 January, an arrest warrant was issued for Antonole Cruz, the operator of the Palm Beach dance hall, the original center of the violence. The local authorities accused Cruz of running a dance hall business without a proper permit; and, while the charges were denied by his attorney, Cruz and the dance-hall girls all left town after the issuance of the warrant.[91]

---

87 Ibid., 3.

88 *San Francisco Chronicle*, January 25, 1930: 2.

89 *The Fresno Bee*, January 24, 1930: 11A.

90 *Woodland Democrat*, January 25, 1930: 1.

91 *Watsonville Evening-Pajaronian*, January 24, 1930: 1. Notice the newspaper page taken from the *Evening Pajaronian* showing Cruz and the taxi dancers.

The chaotic situation caused by the riots was not accepted by all parts of the Central Coast community, and a civic-minded backlash against the rioting began to develop. In the 24 January issue of the *Monterey Peninsula Herald,* a front-page editorial decried the violence and lawlessness of the previous days. The editorial lambasted the police response to the riots, calling the local Watsonville police "negligent in their duty in not drastically blocking this outbreak before a mob was temporarily out of hand."[92] The *Herald* editorial saw the resolution written by Judge Rohrback as the main catalyst for the white rampage, and called Rohrback's resolution "the matter that seemed most to encourage the lawless and vindictive in taking open mob action."[93] The editorial spoke out clearly against the injustice of the situation: white owners were glad for the profits that Filipino labor provided them, but turned away from their responsibility to protect those workers from white "terrorism… a beastly example of the white man's intolerance of conditions for which he alone is responsible."[94] While *The Monterey Peninsula Herald* was quick to condemn whites for the violence, it was not far removed from the racial superiority it condemned in others. The editorial noted that many of the Filipino immigrants were young in age and that youth was, in the case of the Filipino, coupled with a culture that "never developed…a civilization of its own; and in many instances they ape the worst characteristics of their white neighbors."[95] It also argued against the continued use of Filipino labor, noting that the best source of field labor was the Mexican farm worker. For *The Herald,* the Mexican worker "has his faults and his feuds, but he has been good labor at the jobs that Americans either refused to do, or did poorly; and it is his custom to bring his family with him. That is important; for the field or section gang worker without a family is always a victim of vice."[96] Thus, even while the violence was condemned, it was acknowledged that some foreign workers were needed; it

---

92 *Monterey Peninsula Herald,* January 24, 1930: 1.
93 Ibid.
94 Ibid.
95 Ibid.
96 Ibid.

was just a matter of choosing ones who were acceptable to the community. The editorial not only illustrates how far nativism permeated white society, but also signifies the start of a debate in California as to what type of immigrant was the least objectionable. Many began to feel that the presence of Filipino workers was simply an invitation for trouble, as did local authorities in Gilroy when they went through town and expelled all unemployed white males, females, and Filipinos. They hoped by doing this to avert anything similar to the incident in Watsonville.[97]

Adding to the already chaotic scene in Watsonville, an influx of outside forces tried to capitalize on the publicity generated by the riots. Throughout Watsonville, leaflets signed by the Communist Party, Young Communist League, District 13 from San Francisco were spread calling for an end to the violence between white and Filipino workers and a united front against the growers who were holding down wages.[98] These leaflets, and the young activists passing them out, only reaffirmed for most residents in the Watsonville area that the Filipinos presence only attracted the wrong elements, and was indeed a threat to the community's stability.[99]

By 26 January, it was clear from an article carried by the *San Francisco Chronicle* that politicians were going to use the events in Watsonville to aggrandize their political standing. House Representative Arthur Monroe Free of San Jose was quoted in the article as supporting the rioters, believing that they acted justly - even while doing so without legal sanctions. Further, he believed that the riots were "a forceful expression of a community craving to rid itself of vice dens run by the Filipino colonists."[100] Free went on to declare the Filipinos in Watsonville as "of the lowest types," and that the white community was only defending itself from the "vicious practices of members of the Filipino colony in luring

---

[97] *Watsonville Evening Pajaronian*, January 27, 1930: 5.

[98] *Watsonville Evening Pajaronian*, January 25, 1930: 1. Communist Party Leaflet from January of 1930.

[99] Howard DeWitt, *Anti-Filipino Movements in California*, 55. The entrance of a 'Red Scare' elevated the riots to front-page news across the country as many newspapers like the *Port Arthur News* (Texas) believed the pamphlets would lead to more outbreaks of violence, *Port Arthur News* (Texas), January 26, 1930: 1.

[100] *San Francisco Chronicle*, January 26, 1930: 1.

young white girls into degradation."[101] Supporters for the rioters were to be found throughout the nation, as news of the California riots became national news. In the Danville, Virginia paper, *The Bee*, the editors came out in strong support of the rioting, declaring, "regardless as to the opinion of human rights, international brotherhood, etc., the fact is that white men, in a white country will not allow their jobs or their women to be taken by Asiatics and common sense forbids Asiatic immigration of laborers, from our own Asiatic islands, or any other source."[102] Many in Watsonville must have felt the same, particularly after 28 January, when eight of the white men accused of participating in the violence at the Murphy Ranch were arraigned on assault and petty robbery charges. Significantly, no named charges were ever filed for the murder of Fermin Tovera; the only warrants issued in connection to the murder were for John Does.[103]

While most in the white community were content to forget about the murder of a Filipino, white attention was still focused squarely on the actions of Filipinos in the area. A news article from Monterey reported that a group of Filipinos were to attempt a seizure of arms and ammunition from the Presidio for their defense from white mobs. The details of the plot, according to news reported in the *Woodland Daily Democrat,* were that local Filipinos would first try to steal arms without notice but, if confronted, would set fire to several buildings on the base, to make away with the weapons in the confusion.[104] At the same time, isolated instances of racial violence between groups numbering one to three individuals broke out in San Francisco on the 27 and 28 of January, but further confrontations were averted by a concerted effort of the San Francisco police.[105] Concurrently, in Stockton, which had avoided any violence up to this point while being the home to the largest permanent population of Filipinos in Northern California, a bomb exploded in the Chinese

---

101 Ibid.

102 *The Bee* (Danville, Virginia), January 27, 1930: 4.

103 *Watsonville Evening Pajaronian*, January 27, 1930: 1.

104 *Woodland Democrat*, January 29, 1930: 4.

105 *San Francisco Chronicle*, January 28, 1930: 3; *San Francisco Chronicle*, January 29, 1930: 4.

district of town, destroying a building used by Filipinos for social events. However, local authorities quickly concluded that the Filipinos had simply blown up the building in an attempt to generate sympathy.[106] The outbreaks in San Francisco and Stockton were the last sputtering of a flame that had burned itself out. Watsonville, now heavily patrolled by county law enforcement and local volunteers, had a measure of calm return to the city.

One of the main reasons that calm returned to the white community was the conservative stance taken by the Filipino leadership in the state. Many editors of Filipino newspapers and leaders of Filipino social organizations urged Filipinos to accept a position of second-class citizenship, and called for the closure of the Palm Beach dance hall that set off the riots.[107] Those calling for its closure saw the hall's continued operation as an excuse for whites to raid Filipino social activities and gatherings; they claimed that closing the hall took away justifications for white oppression. More aggressive Filipinos wanted to defend their rights by keeping the hall open. The broken front presented by the Filipino community hampered their ability to protest the conditions leading to the riots, and helps explain the ineffectiveness of Filipino political activities.[108]

As the anti-Filipino violence subsided, many in the white community began to place blame for the disturbances on the growers who imported the Filipinos, rather than entirely on the islanders.[109] The money paid to Filipinos by the growers was considered removed from circulation in the community; the Filipino spent his money in the dance halls and gambling dens of his countrymen. Thus, the hiring of Filipinos was both an affront to white workers who missed pay and to the community that lost out on the white worker's money.[110] This emphasis on economic aspects became the dominant theory for the cause of the

---

106 *Modesto News-Herald* (California), February 4-5, 1930: 2.

107 DeWitt, "The Watsonville Anti-Filipino Riot of 1930," 295-296.

108 Ibid., 299.

109 This result is similar to the reaction of whites during the period of anti-Chinese rioting, when corporations were blamed for bringing in a work force that was a threat to white progress and civilization: see Ronald Takaki, 247-248.

110 *The Fresno Bee,* August 23, 1930: 21.

rioting; many in the white community simply hoped to put the events behind them. Howard DeWitt best elucidated this tie between the economic causes and the underlying racism of white communities when he posited that the direct reason for people taking to the streets may have been over field jobs, but the underlying cause was racial and social tension between the Filipino and white populations.[111]

The local tensions were capitalized upon by the labor/political alliance, which used the events in the Watsonville area to strengthen their leadership positions at the state and national levels. When organized labor joined forces with agricultural groups to limit the intrusion of Filipino laborers and goods into the US through the artifice of having the Philippines legally declared a separate country, they found many politicians willing to aid them in their designs. The legislation had the benefits of keeping the Philippines under the control of the US, while also giving the appearance that preservation of jobs for white workers was the main objective. The eventual passage of the Tydings-McDuffie Act of 1934 was hailed as a victory for the white worker by these reactionary forces; Filipinos were to be labeled as aliens under the act, and any goods from the Philippines were to have tariffs placed upon them, the same as any foreign import.[112] The Act also included a provision limiting Filipino immigration to 50 persons per year, a goal that was crucial for persons like McClatchy and Rohrback.[113] The limiting of Filipino workers worried many in the months following the Watsonville riots. As previous exclusion movements had simply led to the immigration of new groups, some in Congress, such as Arthur Free, feared that Puerto Ricans would fill the void left by Filipino exclusion.[114] Some California lawmakers saw the loosening of restrictions on Mexican labor as the answer for the states labor woes; it would keep out undesirables like blacks from the south or the aforementioned Puerto Ricans.[115]

---

111 DeWitt, "The Watsonville Anti-Filipino Riot of 1930," 298.

112 Bonus, 41.

113 Kirk, 46.

114 *San Francisco Chronicle*, January 31, 1930: 2.

115 Ibid.

Mexicans were thought of as more peaceful and less likely to cause serious disruptions in the community.[116]

The social tension that existed between white and Filipino youths did not exist to the same degree with Mexican laborers; Mexicans had ample access to females from their own country. It was the social competition between whites and Filipinos, where white youths, jealous of Filipino males in new suits and cars, that touched off the violence.[117] Whites felt that Filipinos were overstepping their bounds and ignoring the expexted racial separation. That is why the primary target of the hostile whites in the Watsonville riot was the Palm Beach taxi dance hall, where white girls were employed for, and lived, with Filipinos. The rioters only went to attack the Filipinos in the fields after they had exhausted the local supply of Filipino targets, or were turned back by local authorities from continuing their rampage. Also, the fact that the riots do not spread throughout the state, and significantly not into the two largest communities of Filipinos Los Angeles and Stockton, point out that local conditions are the most influential factor in mobilizing nativists to action against immigrant groups. It was the appearance of approval, given to the rioters from state and local authorities through their local newspapers, which set off the chain of events. Without the headlines from state officials declaring the Filipino a menace, and local authorities like Judge Rohrback calling for the expulsion of all Filipinos, the likelihood of a full-scale riot taking place would have been the same as Los Angeles or Stockton's. Most of those involved in, or witness to the riots, declared that it was ultimately racism and nativist sentiment that caused the violence. Whites directed their anger at an ethnic group that they perceived as overstepping their social bounds and responded to thier perceived threat, without any consideration for the larger anti-Asian movement. The *Los Angeles Times,* on the 25th of January, ran a story recapping the events of the past week and declared that "the cause of the rioting this week was social – the employment of white girls as dancing partners at the

---

[116] This belief that the Mexican fieldworker was the answer to California labor needs is one that is supported by Meynell and an editorial in the *Monterey Peninsula Herald* January 24, 1930.

[117] *Watsonville Register-Pajaronian,* July 6, 1978.

Filipino Social Club at Palm Beach started the disorders"; and, perhaps the most telling explanation for the rioters motives comes from one of those arrested after the attacks on the Storm and Murphy ranches. [118] After his arrest for the raid on the Murphy ranch, where Tovera had been murdered, Fred Majors, a member of one of Watsonville's oldest pioneer families, claimed that his chief motivation for joining in the mob violence was "the insolence of the Filipino."[119]

Clearly from statements like these the usefulness of studying the riots in Watsonville becomes apparent. The Watsonville riots provide an event in which it is possible to see not only how nativism, presented itself in the white community, but also how immigrant groups arriving in the US were often bereft of support groups or champions for their rights. Furthermore, the riots demonstrate how these local events are often co-opted or incorporated into larger movements, or used as evidence for the activities of exclusionist groups. Within this single event it is possible to study both race relations and various social forces that work against immigrant groups.

---

[118] *Los Angeles Times,* January 25, 1930: 4.

[119] *San Francisco Chronicle*, January 26, 1930: 2.

THE POLITICS OF GOING HOME: THE DYNAMICS OF AFRICAN AMERICANS FINDING A HOME IN THE CALIFORNIA'S CENTRAL VALLEY

By

Michael Eissinger
California State University, Fresno

The factors that attract (pull) or repel (push) potential residents are probably as diverse as the people upon whom those forces act. Over time, trends indicate patterns from which to make assumptions. Those assumptions, when built upon statistical, census, anecdotal, and empirical data, provide broad insight into the reasons people select one California region or town over another. In this paper, I examine some of the historical factors that have influenced African American housing patterns in California's San Joaquin Valley. Historically, African Americans in valley communities have remained unstudied, even though blacks have lived in the area since at least the 1840s.[1] Although a complete discussion of every community in the Valley is beyond the scope of this paper, representative examples illustrate basic trends and factors that have contributed to why African Americans chose to live in certain valley communities rather than others. I do not attempt, within these few pages, to offer a complete narrative of African American migration and population patterns throughout the region. Rather, I hope to demonstrate broad patterns and cite representative examples.

Although in recent years scholars have spent a great deal of time researching African Americans in Southern California and the San Francisco Bay Area, the San Joaquin Valley remains absent from the academic record.[2] However, from a variety of sources, it becomes

---

[1] Catherine Rehart has suggested that Jacob Dodson, a servant of John Freement, was the first African American in Fresno County prior to California becoming a state. Although she calls him a servant, she also points out that he received no pay for his work with the California Battalion. This would indicate that one of the first black residents of Fresno County was a slave. Catherine Morison Rehart, *The Valley's Legends and Legacys*, vol. 7 (Sanger, CA: Quill Driver Books/Word Dancer Press, Inc., 2006), 19.

[2] For more information about African Americans in Southern California, see Douglas Flamming, *Bound for Freedom: Black Los Angeles in Jim Crow America* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005); Mark Morrall Dodge and Martin J. Schiesl, *City of Promise : Race & Historical Change in Los Angeles* (Claremont, CA.: Regina Books, 2006); and Josh

clear that some towns and cities in the Central Valley have been less accessible to non-whites than others. In fact, some have made extraordinary efforts to keep non-whites out of their communities.

The largest migrations of African Americans into the Central Valley coincided with the Southern Exodus, which began in the 1910s and 1920s and continued in successive waves through the 1960s.[3] Labor agents recruited the first wave of African American migrants to the Fresno area from the Carolinas as early as 1888.[4] Manufacturers and agricultural concerns recruited individuals and families from the South throughout the 1910s, with the largest numbers of African Americans coming from Mississippi, Arkansas, and Louisiana.[5] Like their white counterparts, these black migrants utilized "stem family migration," wherein the earliest migrants acted as anchors for other family members and friends, often from similar points of origin, who followed. As new arrivals became established, they, in turn, attracted other family members and friends, and assisted them in their transition to their new surroundings.[6]

Many factors drew southerners to California. These common pull factors included the possibility of new opportunities to acquire land, employment, or education. These attractive features combined with specific push factors, such as unemployment, poverty, and the effects of the Dust Bowl, all of which apply equally to African Americans and whites who relocated to California.[7] During this time, white southerners, like their black

---

Sides, *L.A. City Limits: African American Los Angeles from the Great Depression to the Present* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2006). For more information about African Americans in the San Francisco Bay Area, and Northern California, see Lynn M. Hudson, *The Making Of "Mammy Pleasant": A Black Entrepreneur in Nineteenth-Century San Francisco* (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2002); Leigh Dana Johnsen, "Equal Rights and The 'Heathen 'Chinee": Black Activism in San Francisco, 1865-1875," *The Western Historical Quarterly* 11, no. 1 (1980); and, Delores McBroome, Parallel *Communities: African Americans in California's East Bay 1850-1963* (Taylor & Francis, 1993).

3 James N. Gregory, The Southern Diaspora: How the Great Migrations of Black and White Southerners Transformed America (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2005), 11; and Jack Temple Kirby, "The Southern Exodus, 1910-1960: A Primer for Historians," The Journal of Southern History 49, no. 4 (1983).

4 "Negro Labor," *Fresno Morning Republican*, July 20, 1888.

5 Kirby, 589-91.

6 Ibid., 591.

7 Gregory, 193-94.

counterparts, formed an ethnic southern identity, which they carried to their new homes in the West.[8] By 1970, over a million and a half southern whites and over half a million blacks from the South, lived in California, representing almost 12 percent of the population of the state.[9]

However, there are additional factors, both push and pull, which affected primarily blacks. For example, an African American from Atwater indicated that one reason his grandfather moved from Arkansas was to avoid growing Ku Klux Klan activity in the 1930s and 1940s.[10] His grandfather leased his Arkansas land to a white farmer and headed for the perceived safety of California. Once in California, African Americans dispersed unevenly across the state. This is especially apparent throughout the San Joaquin Valley, where some communities developed large black populations while others remained predominantly, if not entirely, white (or Hispanic) in makeup.[11]

The distribution of any population that has been in the area for over one hundred years should be, at this point, somewhat consistent. Although a certain amount of fluctuation between counties is normal, statistically the Valley demonstrates a wide disparity between the numbers of African Americans in these counties, from a low of 1.1 percent to over 8.5 percent. Spread throughout the mountains and foothills outside Yosemite National Park, the relatively small overall population of Mariposa County has a different economic dynamic than the rest of the Valley population; however, those numbers are representative of foothill and mountain communities in other counties. Otherwise, within a narrow range of factors, the economy and geography of the remaining counties are quite similar. As such,

---

[8] Ibid., 166.

[9] Ibid., 19.

[10] Allen Cooksey, "Oral History Interview," in *Cookseyville Oral History Project* (Fresno: California State University, Fresno, 2007).

[11] 2000 Census records indicate the percentage of African American population by zip code, in the San Joaquin Valley, ranging from 0.03 percent to 24 percent; U. S. Census Bureau, http://censtats.census.gov/ (accessed October 12, 2007).

it should be safe to assume that the distribution of various ethnic and racial communities should be consistent throughout the region.

According to data from the 1990 Census of the U.S. Census Bureau, African Americans made up over six percent of the population of California, which was half the national percentage.[12] Most African Americans throughout the United States now live in metropolitan areas.[13] San Joaquin Valley communities reflect this trend. With the largest overall population, and the largest urban center in the region, Fresno County contains the largest African American population. Within Fresno County, data indicates that the African American population is concentrated in the urban center of the City of Fresno, with a population of over 8 percent.[14] With less than 2 percent (1.8 percent), Clovis, Fresno's largest and closest suburb, reflects trends more similar to the rural areas of the county.[15]

Several small communities with populations under 1,000 in Fresno County include no African Americans (Cantua Creek, Del Rey, Friant, and Shaver Lake). Whereas Cantua Creek and Del Rey are small valley farming communities with populations over 90 percent Hispanic, Friant and Shaver Lake are predominately white, "foothill" communities.[16] Overall, these statistics demonstrate that the population varies greatly throughout the Valley. Even within each county, the numbers differ significantly from community to community.[17]

---

[12] "American Factfinder," U.S. Census Bureau, http://factfinder.census.gov/home/saff/main.html (accessed December 2007).

[13] The U. S. Department of Commerce: Economics and Statistics Administration, *Blacks* (Washington DC: Bureau of the Census, 1993).

[14] See note 11 in the U. S. Census Bureau website.

[15] Ibid. Most rural communities in Fresno County report less than 2.0 percent African American population, according to the 2000 Census.

[16] Ibid. Friant is over 94 percent white, whereas Shaver Lake is even less diverse with a population that is 97 percent white.

[17] Data from county subdivisions with prisons drastically skews the numbers in those communities. In many cases, the prison population contains significantly larger percentages of African Americans than the surrounding communities. For example, within the Kings County subdivision of Avenal (home to the Avenal State Prison), the percentage of African-Americans rises to almost seventeen percent. The Kern County subdivision of Tehachapi (home to the California Correctional Institution) shows a similar numeric jump, to over nine percent. The numbers for the remaining areas of both counties sit near, or below, the state average. Contrary to that trend, however, is the Corcoran subdivision (home to two state prisons: the California State Prison, Corcoran and the California Substance Abuse Treatment Facility and State Prison), where the percentage of African-Americans is well below the state average.

If African Americans traditionally gravitated to certain communities, while avoiding others, what factors pushed blacks from certain communities and pulled them to others? Sociologist James Loewen suggests that census data is the logical starting point to identify patterns.[18] One factor may be the origins of many of the whites who migrated from other parts of the United States to this part of California.[19] The ties between the South and the Valley run deep, and predate the traditional arrival of the Okies who eventually populated much of Kern County.[20] Visalia, County Seat of Tulare County, is a community with an historic reputation of exclusion and discrimination. A random sampling of census data and anecdotal evidence suggests that forces may have been in effect to limit the black population of Visalia. The roots of the problem go back to the earliest days of the town, when strong ties existed between the Confederate South and Tulare County. In the years leading to the Civil War, the Federal government stationed troops outside of Visalia to quiet the threat of a secessionist revolt.[21]

Figures taken from the Tulare County Death Register from 1875 to 1885 provide an approximate breakdown of the residents of Visalia who were at least twenty years of age by 1865. Based on these numbers, the adult population of Visalia was predominately from the Southern and Border states (47 and 25, respectively) with fewer than half of the population from the Northern states (28).[22] These numbers are, by their very nature, not as accurate as official census data, but they are the best indicator of population from available sources.[23]

Additionally, it appears that the presence or absence of a military base can influence different ethnic percentages within a community.

[18] James W. Loewen, *Sundown Towns: A Hidden Dimension of American Racism* (New York: Touchstone/Simon & Schuster, 2005), 213-215.

[19] Gregory, 166-167.

[20] The moniker "Okie" is often applied to Dust Bowl migrants from Oklahoma and the Southern Great Plains to California. Originally, the term was considered an insult; however, many modern-day residents of the San Joaquin Valley take pride in their "Okie" heritage. For more information, see Peter La Chapelle, *Proud to Be an Okie* (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2007).

[21] Homer G. Delabar, "The Rebels of Visalia, California: 1860-1865" (masters thesis, Fresno State College, 1957).

[22] Ibid., 121.

[23] Ibid. Dunbar uses the following: included in the numbers for the Northern states are Ohio (16), New York (15), Pennsylvania (10), Indiana (4), Massachusetts and Vermont (3 each), Connecticut, Illinois, Iowa, New Hampshire,

The twenty-seven pages of the 1930 census for Clovis do not include a listing for a single African American.[24] However, selecting any of the districts for Fresno in the same census shows a vast difference between the two communities. For example, page four of the census book covering Fresno's Fifth Precinct includes two African American households.[25] The top of the next page includes another.[26] Subsequent pages throughout all the books for Fresno show similar results. In 1930, African Americans lived in almost every neighborhood within the city of Fresno, yet none lived in the adjacent community of Clovis.

This trend remained unchanged in the years that followed. Although African Americans had been arriving in Central California for over a century and a half, one of the largest migrations occurred during the Dust Bowl. From 1935 to 1940, large numbers of migrants from the South (black and white) arrived in the valley.[27] One response to these waves of new arrivals was to restrict where they could live. Initially, this applied to southern whites nearly as much as to blacks, as Kern County housing and businesses regularly sported signs that read "No Okies."[28] Over time, white southerners moved into the mainstream within valley communities, with almost one-third of the population in some towns having roots in the South.[29] Yet, blacks still faced many barriers. In terms of housing, restrictions normally came in two varieties, "sundown towns" and "restrictive covenants." Although not

---

Maine, and Wisconsin (1 each). Southern states include Tennessee (20), Virginia (11), Arkansas (9), North Carolina (4), Georgia, Alabama, and South Carolina (1 each). Border states include Missouri (14), Kentucky (10), and Maryland (1).

[24] The 1930 Census only includes the designation for Negro, to apply to both African Americans and those from African Descent. Each Census uses different racial definitions, including Black, Colored, African American, and Mulatto. In all the censuses from 1850 through 1900, the designation used to indicate citizens of African descent was "colored". Beginning in 1910, the Census used the term "Negro." Recent censuses have used the terms "Black" or "African American" as well as categories for those who specify different categories of mixed races and those who indicate "African Descent" (but, not African American). A few earlier censuses also included categories for mixed race individuals, usually grouped together under a blanket term, such as Mulatto. See the U. S. Census Bureau website.

[25] These include the forty-four-year-old widow, Florence Burns, a housekeeper, her twenty-six year old son, William, a laborer in the printing industry, and his two siblings, fifteen-year-old Mary and eleven-year-old Robert, as well as a lodger, Mr. Lewis B. Porter, from Tennessee. Their neighbor, Robert Jones is listed as owning his own bootblack business. Jones lived with his wife Luella Jones and their infant son Arvin.

[26] The domestic Bertha Lopez, thirty-four, and her two sons Harold and Howard (fourteen and twelve, respectively) is at the top of the page.

[27] Gregory, 30.

[28] Gerald Haslam, *Workin' Man Blues: Country Music in California* (Berkeley: Heyday Books, 2005), 66.

[29] Gregory, 162.

always on the official books as city ordinances, many so-called "sundown towns" made it clear that blacks were not welcome to stay in their community beyond six or nine o'clock at night. These *de facto* and *de jure* laws were advertised via a sign at the city limits or through both verbal and non-verbal threats (often from members of local law enforcement) with the tacit acquiescence of local residents.[30]

Many communities (towns, cities, or neighborhoods) refused to rent or sell homes to blacks. Leases or deeds therefore included restrictive covenants to control the racial makeup of the tenants or homebuyers. The overtly racist wording of these agreements often was sufficient to deter blacks from even attempting to live within those communities. Restrictive covenants remained legal throughout California until 1948, when the United States Supreme Court ruled, in *Shelly v Kraemer*, such restrictions to be unenforceable.[31] However, in California restrictive covenants continued to control the racial makeup of many communities. In 1963, California Proposition 14 negated a statewide fair housing law. The California State Supreme Court overturned the results of that election three years later, making restrictive covenants illegal throughout the State.[32] Although no longer able to enforce racial restrictions through legal means, developers, real estate brokers, neighborhood associations, and other groups now relied on clever marketing to achieve the same result, using phrases such as "good schools" and "gated communities" as coded signals to potential, presumably white residents.[33]

The tradition of hostility against non-whites also characterized the communities that grew up in the oilfields of Kern County where, during the oil bonanza in the early part of the twentieth century, major oil companies only hired white workers. For example Taft, which sits atop the Midway-Sunset Oilfield, was known as "a virulently racist place… and African

---

30 Loewen, *Sundown Towns,* 4.

31 Flamming, 369.

32 Loewen, *Sundown Towns,* 128-29.

33 Lior Jacob Strahilevitz, "Exclusionary Amenities in Residential Communities," *Virginia Law Review* 92, no. 3 (2006): 453.

Americans were especially despised."[34] Whether *de facto* or *de jure,* the "*unwritten law* against the presence of African Americans after sundown" in this Kern County community "was widely, and frequently proclaimed."[35] As author Gerald Haslam explained in his description of growing up in Taft,

> While some "No colored allowed" signs are reported to have been posted, the town's reputation was enough to discourage most nonwhites. It was accepted during my youth that no Negro should allow himself to be found in Taft after dusk, and everyone talked about, but no one ever saw, a sign—"Nigger don't let the sun set on you here"—that was supposed to have been posted on the city limits.[36]

Even if Haslam could not verify the existence of the "sundown" sign, he did acknowledge the reputation that his hometown held among African Americans. Some residents of Taft made little secret about their preference as to the racial makeup of their community. In 1941, Taft mayor H. H. Bell commented on the possibility of African American soldiers being posted to an army base just outside the city by telling Congressman A. J. Elliott of Tulare, "...we had never had any Negro residents in Taft... we would prefer that only white soldiers be sent here."[37]

These attitudes and tactics characterized more than the housing situation in the San Joaquin Valley; area school and college makeup also reflect racial exclusionism. For example, in 1954, Trubee Leslie, then a high school senior in Lodi, was researching a paper at the City Clerk's office. During her research, she came across a city ordinance that required all African Americans to be out of the city limits by 6:00 PM. This was the first time she noticed that there were few, if any blacks, in Lodi. She remembered a few families

---

[34] Taken from an email from Dennis Smith, in James W. Loewen, "Research Notes for Sundown Towns: California File," (2007). Used with permission from both Mr. Smith and Dr. Loewen. These notes were collected for Dr. Loewen's book on Sundown Towns and include numerous correspondences from emails, letters, and phone calls. Generally, these informants asked that their identity be protected. My agreement with Dr. Loewen, for access to these files, requires that I honor these requests. Throughout this text, if I use any of the notes from this file, I will simply cite them as having come from Loewen, except in those cases where I have been in contact with the original informant, through Loewen.

[35] Ibid.

[36] Gerald Haslam, *The Other California: The Great Central Valley in Life and Letters* (Las Vegas: University of Nevada Press, 1999), 126.

[37] "Negro Soldiers Will Be Sent to Taft Air Base," *Fresno Bee,* June 15 1941.

moving in, although they never stayed long. No overt action, such as a sign on the city limits, enforced the ordinance.[38] Numbers from the 2000 Census for Lodi and neighboring towns reveal that, to this day, the numbers of African Americans in Lodi, Galt, and Lockeford remain well below the average of other communities in the Valley.[39]

These numbers indicate the strong possibility that neither Lodi, Galt, nor Lockeford have traditionally welcomed people of color. Whether official or unofficial, sundown policies still remain in effect; it is obvious that African Americans have not flocked to these small San Joaquin County towns.[40] San Joaquin County has the largest percentage of black population, behind Kings County, and is home to one of the largest and longest-standing African American communities in Stockton.[41] However, Lodi's population of blacks in the 2000 Census was little more than 300 individuals out of a total population of just under 57,000 (approximately 0.6 percent), which is almost double the count in the 1990 Census (0.3 percent or about 170 individuals in a total population of over 46,000).[42] Although these numbers appear to be insignificant as a percentage of the overall population, earlier census figures demonstrate an even more alarming statistic. The 1900 Census lists five blacks in Lodi. This number doubled over the next decade to ten, as recorded in the 1910 Census; however, the number dropped to zero in the 1920 Census.[43] When the total population of the town was just fewer than 14,000, during the 1950 Census, the town, once again, included just ten blacks.[44] Both the 1960 and 1970 censuses indicate only three African Americans

---

[38] Trubee Leslie, telephone interview by author, Fresno, CA, October, 2007

[39] According to the 2000 Census, African Americans make up just 0.6 percent of the population of Lodi, 1.2 percent of the population of Galt, and 0.3 percent of the population of Lockeford. See the U. S. Census Bureau website

[40] Comparing the numbers from the 1990 and 2000 Census indicate that, for all three of these communities, the percentage of African Americans has doubled. In 1990, the Census indicated the following percentages: Lodi (0.3 percent), Galt (0.6 percent), and Lockeford (0.1percent). Nevertheless, these percentages remain well below the state average. See *U. S. Census Bureau Website.*

[41] Ibid.

[42] Ibid.

[43] Ibid.

[44] Ibid.

lived in Lodi.[45] Census data, combined with anecdotal evidence, demonstrates a clear pattern of attitudes and activities that historically has limited the black population of Lodi.

The pattern applies further. For example, with a population of over 10,000 residents, Parlier, a community settled by southern whites just fifteen miles south of the city of Fresno, is currently home to less than seventy blacks.[46] In this case, anecdotal evidence again points toward historical exclusion. During the 1957-58 school year, a teacher asked why there were no blacks in Parlier; she was told, "They aren't allowed to spend the night."[47] That same year, Bakersfield's South High School opened for the academic year of 1957-58.[48] When it opened, the school included within its district boundaries the section of Bakersfield known as Cottonwood, one of the city's poorest black neighborhoods. The freshman class from nearby (and predominately white) Bakersfield High picked the school colors and mascots for the new school. The students named the varsity teams for the new school the "Rebels," the junior varsity teams the "Raiders," and the frosh teams the "Riders."[49] Of course, these are direct references to the Army of the Confederacy, and two of the many terms associated, from their earliest incarnations, with the Ku Klux Klan. The new school's mascots received the monikers of Johnny and Jody Reb and the school colors were North Carolina Blue and grey.[50] While the title of the student paper was the "Rebel Yell," the name of the yearbook was the "Merrimac."[51] The Stars and Bars, or the confederate battle flag, was frequently used (banners, marching flags, emblems, and other items used to generate and maintain school spirit), until Principal Don Murfin campaigned to end its use in 1968.[52] Yet, the school's current website shows African American cheerleaders at football games cheering for

---

45 Ibid.
46 Ibid.
47 Loewen, "Research Notes for Sundown Towns: California File."
48 Felilx Doligosa Jr., "Rebel Yell: It's Good to Be Back," *Bakersfield Californian*, September 29, 2007.
49 Ibid.
50 Loewen, "Research Notes for Sundown Towns: California File."
51 Ibid.
52 Doligosa Jr.

their black, white, and Hispanic classmates on teams still named for the Army of the South and the Ku Klux Klan.[53]

By the middle of the 1950s, Taft Junior College had developed a reputation as a football powerhouse. Like many small communities, football took on religious proportions, and winning teams in the small local community college stood at the center of civic pride. However, by 1965 the oil industry had mechanized, requiring fewer workers.[54] The population of Taft dwindled. As the town became smaller, so did the number of possible recruits for the college football team. To remain competitive, the college began searching for athletes from outside the area—many of whom were black. For a decade, tensions rose within the town, as any integration between the African American athletes and the white townspeople proved unattainable. On 25 May 1975, these tensions boiled over. Five carloads of whites attacked three black students walking across the college campus. In the fight, one of the armed white attackers, who was later charged with attempted murder, was shot. By the early evening, sixty whites stormed the dormitory with chants of "Kill the niggers!" When white college students came to the aid of the African American students, the fracas pitted townies against college students. Local police eventually freed the trapped black students and escorted them to Bakersfield. For days, locals terrorized college students and physically attacked the editor of the local newspaper.[55]

Over time, however, the nature of some communities did begin to change. For example, despite a long-standing reputation as a community unfriendly to non-whites, Clovis became more diverse as it grew.[56] However, its perceived status as a redneck town continues. Dr. DeAnna Reese, an African American university professor, stated that upon

---

[53] *South High School webSite*, http://www.khsd.k12.ca.us/south/Specialpercent20Features/Fiftieth/Gamepercent20time.htm (accessed October, 23 2007).

[54] Gerald Haslam, "Oil Town Rumble: The Young Men of Taft," *The Nation*, September 13, 1975.

[55] Ibid.

[56] The current population of Clovis now exceeds 90,000 and the border between Fresno and its closest suburb has blurred after decades of development. As such, the current percentage of African Americans, in Clovis, according to the 2000 Census, has almost reached 2percent. Although this number is significantly less than the percentage of blacks in Fresno, it is an increase over prior years. See U. S. Census Bureau website.

her move to Fresno she had "heard stories" about Clovis, so she opted to live in Fresno proper. Based on past experiences in other communities, she indicated that she is only comfortable going four or five blocks past the city limits of Clovis (to go to the Post Office).[57] Similar stories are common among African Americans in the area. Whether based on urban legend or historical fact, blacks avoid Clovis and other communities in the Valley. This indicates that perhaps the push factors are stronger than the pull factors when it comes to selecting a community.

As recently as January 2007, a Lodi resident wrote that her town was "the whitest town" in which she had ever lived.[58] She also reported a cross burning, vandalism and an apparent unwillingness, on the part of local law enforcement, to investigate such crimes.[59] Another Lodi resident wrote, "Wasn't too long back, they arrested black folks just for being in Lodi."[60] In 1998, there were in Lodi two cross-burning incidents within a few weeks of each other. The first occurred at Tokay High School; the second on an overpass on the freeway that runs through town. So far, no one has been arrested for either incident.[61]

Apparently indicative of attitudes still prevalent in Lodi, one resident wrote, "Growing up in Lodi, we NEVER saw 'African-Americans'! EVER! And if we did, you bet they were watched all the way to the edge of town..."[62] It is safe to assume that Lodi was, and is, a community where some white residents have made their preferences known.

Whereas some suburban areas like Clovis appear to be becoming more diverse, such is not the case with one of Bakersfield's suburbs with the worst reputation for systemic racism. Bakersfield is the largest metro area between Fresno and Los Angeles. Oildale, one of Bakersfield's largest suburbs, has a long tradition as an unfriendly place for African

---

[57] Dr. DeAnna Reese, interview by author, Fresno, CA, November 14, 2007.

[58] Loewen, "Research Notes for Sundown Towns: California File."

[59] Ibid.

[60] Ibid.

[61] Leslie Katz, "K. K. K. Activity in Northern California `a Wake-up Call'," *Jewish News Bulletin of Northern California*, April 24, 1998.

[62] Loewen, "Research Notes for Sundown Towns: California File."

Americans. [63] Various reports describe a sign that stood on the bridge across the Kern River between Oildale and Bakersfield, which read "Nigger, Don't Let the Sun Set on You in Oildale" as recently as the 1960s.[64] Another unconfirmed report suggests that a similar sign was spray painted on the same bridge as recently as the late 1990s.[65]

When asked for information about the old sign on the bridge, one email correspondent offered the following:

> Oildale was DEFINATELY [sic]a "sundown town." I'm 27 years old and a 3rd generation "oakie." … [sic] My father (born in the late '40s) often commented on the sign, and my buddy's father commented that the sign should still be up. He had a gun target with the shadow of a running black man as the bullseye. I contend Oildale is still "sundown" unofficially. I surely never see any blacks venture in. And the Klan and casual racist culture still abound. Personally, I find it quaint and refreshing. It's as if the rebs won in an odessa sense, fleeing to their redneck version of Argentina and raising generations of neo Jim Crowe racists. It is sure a much better place than the integrated urban dumps of America's large metropolisis [sic]. And after all, the blacks have their communities. I wonder if Harlem blacks have a sundown law relating to New York Jews?[66]

A review of a Kottonmouth Kings rap/hip-hop concert, from a website owned and operated by the Bakersfield newspaper, from 2006 included a reference to a Nazi SS hand sign, or hand flash (the Nazi salute). When asked, local teens indicated that it was popular among Oildale youth, and a symbol of White Power.[67] This familiar, almost casual expression by teens and young adults, in Oildale, is indicative of that town's long, well-known, racist history.

However, some parts of Kern County may be overcoming their traditional, white supremacist attitudes and image. In 2002, after a public outcry, the Kern County Fair

---

[63] Ibid.

[64] Ibid.

[65] Ibid.

[66] Ibid.

[67] Matt Munoz, *Live! Kotonmouth Kings at the Dome!* http://www.bakotopia.com/home/ViewPost/18693, Bakotopia, 2006 (accessed October 23, 2007).

removed the performers known as "Prussian Blue," from their roster.[68] This group, supported by David Duke, was known for their songs promoting white supremacy and so-called White Nationalism.[69] Their mother announced, "…that Bakersfield was not *white* enough, so she sold her home, and hopes that she and the girls can find an all-white community in the Pacific Northwest."[70]

In spite of change, there remains much to tell in the story behind why African Americans choose to avoid certain San Joaquin Valley communities while settling in others. The urban centers of Bakersfield (even with its strong racist past), Fresno, and Stockton have attracted African American populations at, or above, the state average. Since the nineteenth century, several all-black or predominately-black townships, such as Teviston, Fairmead, South Dos Palos, the Bowles Colony, or Cookseyville have developed out of unique circumstances. We still understand little of the impact of black colonization projects such as Allensworth, in 1908, and the earlier "Colored Colonization Association of Fresno County."[71] Each of these topics cries out for further study. However, it is safe to say that since statehood, long-standing attitudes of exclusion have contributed to African American population patterns in California's Great Central Valley. Systemic and institutional racism has influenced where African Americans have elected, or been allowed, to live in the San Joaquin Valley.

---

[68] The duo was allegedly given this name to draw attention to their so-called Prussian or *Aryan* heritage, and their blue eyes.

[69] ABC News Primetime, *Young Singers Spread Racist Hate: Duo Considered the Olsen Twins of the White Nationalist Movement,* ABC News, October 20, 2005; http://abcnews.go.com/Primetime/Story?id=1231684&page=1, (accessed October 23, 2007).

[70] Ibid.

[71] "Articles of Incorporation of the Colored Colonization Association of Fresno County," Filed in the Office of the County Clerk of Fresno County December 15, 1891. The stated purpose of this company, according to the articles of incorporation, was to "purchase and acquire lands… [t]o lay out town sites …" and to "form colonies of coloured people on said lands …"

VISCERAL HISTORY: INTERPRETING INDEPENDENCE NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK

By

Michael B. Chornesky
Villanova University, Pennsylvania

Theory and its Influence on Practice at Independence National Historical Park

The eminent French historian Pierre Nora, in his formative work, *Realms of Memory*, posits the existence of "*lieux de mémoire*," or places of memory. According to Nora, these sites are significant because societies define them as areas where history is to be experienced and remembered.[1] A prime example is Independence National Historical Park (INHP) in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, which started operations in 1948 under the auspices of the United States National Park Service (NPS). The park consists of the area from Seventh to Second Streets (west-east) and from Race to Spruce Streets (north-south).[2] Independence Mall was originally established as a state park in 1945 through the efforts of the Independence Hall Association, but was immediately incorporated upon INHP's founding.[3]

Nora's conception of history and memory would designate INHP as a single place of memory. However, this fails to address the park's diversity, as it actually houses a variety of historically significant monuments. The two most important and widely known symbols at the park are Independence Hall and the Liberty Bell, but these only scratch the surface of the park's overall significance. Determining this meaning, however, is complicated by INHP's location and surroundings. While historical parks

---

[1] Pierre Nora et al., *Realms of Memory*, vol. 1 of *Conflicts and Divisions* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1996). See Postscript for a deeper examination of this work in context.

[2] Constance M. Grieff, *Independence: The Creation of a National Park* (Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1987), 5.

[3] The Independence Hall Association was an *ad hoc* group of influential Philadelphians who officially banded together in 1942 (but were active long before that time) to prevent the loss of Independence Hall and the Liberty Bell, and to establish them as national historical monuments.

like Colonial Williamsburg or Valley Forge have problems all their own, the fact that the historical buildings operated by the park exist amid a contemporary urban environment only introduces more complexity into an already complicated case of public history.

For much of its history, the responsibility of providing an interpretation for this significant place of memory has fallen to its Division of Interpretation and Visitor Services (DIVS). The interpretations ascribed to the park by this organization are the primary subjects of this study. While different approaches to INHP (e.g. the physical structures, tours, politics, etc.) should be considered, it is my view that an analysis of interpretation at the park in recent history will be most fruitful. Historian Constance Grieff, who wrote the official institutional history of the park in 1987, supports the primacy of this approach, saying, "The chief purpose of displaying them [the historic buildings of the INHP] to the public was to *teach a lesson* about the events that had taken place at the site, or *interpret* the broad themes in American history they exemplified."[4]

Another fact justifying this approach is the rising number of visitors who attend the park yearly. For example, in the years immediately preceding the 1976 Bicentennial, annual visits to INHP were estimated to be around three million. During the Bicentennial celebration of 1976, that number doubled to six million.[5] By 2004, visits nearly matched the inflated numbers from the Bicentennial, rising 500,000 to 5.36 million.[6] Considering that the goal of the park's interpretive services is to educate and attract these visitors, it would be helpful to establish a history of the various historical meanings offered at INHP.

This study of the DIVS will occur on a variety of levels. Fundamentally, "Visceral History" will analyze the interpretation at the park in both *practice* and *theory*. That is to say, for each time period in which a distinct DIVS interpretation exists, its practical aspects (i.e., the park's exhibits) and their connections to historical scholarship and American history will

---

[4] Grieff, 84. Emphasis added.

[5] Ibid., 248.

[6] National Park Service, "Independence National Historical Park: Preliminary Interpretive Plan" (Philadelphia: National Park Service, 2004).

be considered. This practice will then be connected to historical theory to infer a larger picture of what actually happened at INHP over the years. This analysis will answer certain basic questions: What interpretations has INHP offered to the public in the past? When did these interpretations occur? What theories lurk behind these interpretations? What did these theories translate to in DIVS practice? Were these interpretations of the historical events that occurred at the INHP either conscious and deliberate, or more subconscious and visceral?

As can be deduced by this study's title, "Visceral History," it will be asserted that though INHP advanced conscious interpretations from its inception to the present day, there simultaneously existed unconscious (i.e., *visceral*) reasons for those ideas. This work will illuminate an objective pattern in both levels of the park's thinking, applying that pattern to the interpretation currently being planned. Given this line of argument, INHP interpretations can ultimately be divided into three distinct epochs. First, the period in between the park's establishment and 1976 will be considered. In this period, INHP instantly acquired so many historic landmarks that much of its time was spent researching, evaluating and restoring the spaces, along with catering to its first visitors. However, even with no time to plan or release it, the park practiced an unofficial interpretation that glorified the American story in a classic, idealized narrative. A visceral idea also underlay this practice. This was the concept of "civil religion," first advanced by historian Robert N. Bellah in a 1967 article from the journal *Daedalus*.[7] This study will link civil religion and the original idealized interpretation at INHP, defining that concept and explaining its inadvertent promotion by park interpretive staff.

Next, we will consider the era between the 1976 Bicentennial and 2004, when the DIVS started planning a new interpretation. 1976 is significant for a number of reasons, in this context because it marks the DIVS' first foray into interpretational planning, evidenced by the three major themes presented for the Bicentennial celebration. This era constitutes

---

[7] Robert N. Bellah, "Civil Religion in America," *Daedalus* 96 (Winter 1967): 1-21.

the establishment in *theory* of the *practice* that occurred between 1948 and 1976, a process that upheld the influence of civil religion. Many questions will be asked regarding this era, including why the prior period's interpretation (which *in part* was necessary because of practical needs at the park) was not abandoned, especially since, after the Bicentennial celebration, the practical work on INHP was completed and a more intellectually rigorous story for the park could have been planned and applied.

Finally, the most recent interpretive plan of 2004-2006 will be considered. First, that plan's process will be considered because it constitutes INHP's first real change in interpretation. The practical aspects of the plan will be considered next, including the attempt to unite the park into one homogenous entity and the desire to establish practices that would convince visitors to see the whole park. This runs contrary to common visitor practice, as they tend to only visit Independence Hall and the Liberty Bell. Finally, the historical paradigm behind this interpretive plan will be examined: that of contemporary social history. We will then conclude by connecting conscious social history with the controversial subject of postmodernism (which will operate as the visceral theory in this case), suggesting that the DIVS may be making the same mistake of their predecessors of the early INHP by unknowingly sliding into postmodern park interpretation, ignoring the possibility of a well-reasoned meta-narrative and simply presenting disparate *stories* and *perspectives*, lacking synthesis. Reasons why this is a problem will be presented, offering potential considerations for those in charge of this present interpretive plan. A postscript will then package this case study by placing it in the context of a recent historiographical trend examining the concept of "memory" and its connections to historical understanding and the creation of public history.

1948-1976, The Primacy of Practice- Glorification and "Civil Religion"

"Interpretation," in its most basic form, is a version of historical events advanced by a source. Public historians' definition of it varies. For example, Freeman Tilden's work,

Interpreting Our Heritage, advanced what amounts to the "classic definition" of the term: "...an educational activity which aims to reveal meanings and relationships through the use of original objects, by firsthand experience, and by illustrative media, rather than simply to communicate factual information."[8] Public historian Patricia Mooney-Melvin, former editor of that discipline's official journal, ascribes much more significance to interpretation, claiming that it is "the key to unlocking the historical significance of a site or landscape" and "the medium for educating the public about the history associated with historical sites, cultural landscapes, the built environment, and artifactual remains."[9] While there is evidence that the National Park Service came to support this definition, INHP's ideas during this period differ significantly from those offered above.[10] While their interpretive plan of 1954 hints at this academic definition, they thought that providing "maximum benefit and enjoyment to the visitor and... [reflecting] credit on the National Park Service" was more fundamental to their mission.[11] They classified the role of their interpretive program as "designed to fill a latent but often inarticulate need of the visitor; to assist him where he needs and wants further understanding and appreciation of the thing he came to see."[12] This demonstrates how INHP defined its role as secondary. They did not want to practice a concerted pedagogy, but instead desired to communicate information and stories *as the public requested*. This "all for public's sake" character is critical to understanding the park during this period.

As was asserted in the introduction to this work, INHP lacked an official interpretation and focused on practical functions during this era. The best evidence for this

---

[8] Freeman Tilden, *Interpreting Our Heritage: Principles and Practices for Visitor Services in Parks, Museums and Historic Places* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1957), 8.

[9] Patricia Mooney-Melvin, "Beyond the Book: Historians and the Interpretive Challenge," *The Public Historian* 17, no. 4 (Fall 1995): 78.

[10] See T. Danton, "History and Philosophy of Interpretation Syllabus," National Park Service, http://www.nps.gov/idp/interp/103/intphillp.pdf (accessed December 18, 2007); and Ronald F. Lee, *Public Use of the National Park System, 1872-2000* (Washington D.C.: U.S. Department of the Interior, 2002).

[11] National Park Service, "Independence National Historical Park Operations: Interpretation Plan" (Philadelphia: NPS, March 1954) 23.

[12] Ibid.

is the interpretive plan of 1952-54. It was the last plan of its kind until the 1970s, when Bicentennial plans were well underway, so it can be reasonably inferred that interpretation at the park was essentially dictated by the approach of this document. The interpretive plan of 1952-54 essentially reads as an INHP laundry list, laying out in vivid detail what existed, what happened at those places, and what could be done with them. This approach constitutes 85 pages of the 100-page report, which indicates the practical approach that the newly established INHP intended to implement.

Along with this practical approach, a plethora of evidence suggests the park's desire to inspire a positive attitude toward INHP and draw more visitors. For example, the interpretive report given to park rangers asks them to "have that 'freshly-scrubbed' look; clean shaven, his hair cut and neatly combed, and fingernails trimmed and clean."[13] Provisions of how the park staff should look and talk abounded in the "interpretation," suggesting that the DIVS was sensitive and tried to cultivate the public's perception of them. This sentiment even reared its head in the historical discourse, as rangers were asked to "*avoid jarring the sensibilities of visitors* in manners relating to history. An air of 'debunking' popularly accepted *notions and traditions which may be questionable in historical fact* should be *avoided*."[14] This is especially surprising considering that historical discourse often involves the very approach being rejected in the source. In sum, interpretation at the park during this era privileged visitor experience over the questions of truth in the interest of completing and establishing the park as a viable public historical entity. However, it is important to note that this sacrifice of intellectual rigor did not necessarily distinguish INHP and the National Park Service from the academic community: the 1950s through the early 1960s are historiographically known as an epoch of "consensus history," which was roughly equivalent

[13] Ibid., 2.
[14] Ibid., 3.

(though more justified by use of evidence and argument) to the idealized narrative practiced at the park.[15]

The interpretation of the park during this era is widely known and accepted in America. This is the glorification narrative, which privileges all things positive involving the American Revolution and its founding documents (the Declaration of Independence and Constitution) and avoids mentioning slavery, the lack of women's rights in the new nation, or many of the other implicit paradoxes involved in the new republic. These ideas were especially valid in the Cold War era, where the idealization of American Democracy was seen as an ideological tool with which to fight Communism. Constance Grieff's institutional history's handling of this era reflects this lack of a serious challenge to the consensus in the historiography and the park. While she devotes three chapters of narrative to this period, those chapters' coverage of the years between 1948 and 1972 emphasize the physical establishment of the park (e.g. building restoration) and its fashioning of an operational bureaucracy.[16] In reference to this period, historian Charlene Mires claims that: "By mid-century, the work of the Independence Hall Association had defined Independence Hall and the surrounding area [INHP] as *places for patriotic commemoration of the American Revolution.*"[17] She also refers to INHP's "efforts to create a *controlled environment* dedicated to past events."[18] As Grieff's work sums up this period of interpretation at INHP, "[Their] historians never promoted and publicized their methods and findings… the work at Independence remained relatively unknown to the broader scholarly community."[19] A challenge to this controlled institutionalization and self-establishment of the park occurred in 1973, when the creation of

---

[15] For an early view of this trend, see John Higham, "The Cult of 'American Consensus,'" *Commentary* 27 (February 1959). For the period in context, see Jonathan Wiener, "Radical Historians and the Crisis in American History, 1959-1980," *American Historical Review* 76, no. 2 (September 1989): 399-434.

[16] For this story of consensus history in action, see Grieff, *Independence: the Creation of a National Park*, 77-188 ("The First Wars of Independence," "Restoring the Buildings" and "Telling the Park's Story").

[17] Charlene Mires, *Independence Hall in American Memory* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2002) 203. Emphasis added.

[18] Ibid.

[19] Grieff, 188.

a film for the upcoming Bicentennial included an entrant who wanted to stress a "strong sense of reality and sensitivity to [American history's] human aspects."[20] Grieff continues by pointing out the INHP leadership's adverse reaction to this approach, stating:

> This revisionist view of history was not acceptable to the staff of the National Park Service. Although they were prepared to accept a vision of the founding fathers as less than godlike, they intended to glorify and celebrate the events at Independence, not follow the radical historiography of the Vietnam Era.[21]

The INHP administration's sentiment reflected the desire to interpret American history *only* in the sense of presenting a story that its audience could both relate to and enjoy. The park wanted to inspire return visits, get positive press, and avoid controversy. The approach had its intended effect, as attendance steadily rose.[22] At the same time, DIVS was too busy performing administrative functions, such as policing the look of its guides and other staff in the interest of pleasing visitors, to scrutinize this traditional conception of American history in the period from the park's opening to the Bicentennial.

However, even this controlled glorification of the American Revolutionary narrative may have been overextended. For example, Independence Hall, the Liberty Bell, and the surrounding area are referred to as a "national shrine."[23] Along with this, religious metaphors abound at the site. Even the Liberty Bell itself contains the biblical quotation: "Proclaim Liberty throughout all the land unto all the inhabitants thereof."[24] In this case, the Visceral History practiced has obvious connections to the conception positing the existence of an ever-present civil religion in America. These ideas point toward some deeper sense of American History in the interpretation of INHP in the first and second eras established within this study (1948-2004).

---

[20] Ibid., 216.

[21] Ibid., 217. Emphasis added. In this context, revisionism ran contrary to the glorified consensus of earlier years. This represented a concurrent movement in the academic community, represented at this time by the work of historian William Appleman Williams in the area of U.S. Foreign Relations.

[22] Grieff, 217. Grieff writes, "Although the Bicentennial was still three years away, the crowds at Independence Hall had increased measurably by 1973."

[23] Ibid., 1.

[24] This inscription specifically quotes the book of Leviticus 25:11.

Robert N. Bellah's Civil Religion and its Influence on Public History

In an article following up on his original 1967 work, historian Robert Bellah asserts the existence of "an elaborate and well-institutionalized civil religion in America...alongside of and rather clearly differentiated from the churches."[25] He defines civil religion as the intersection of national identity and religion, using excerpts from speeches by former presidents John F. Kennedy and Abraham Lincoln while paying close attention to the intersection of national and religious language within them. For example, Bellah cites the end of Kennedy's inaugural address as an example of this phenomenon:

> With a good conscience our only sure reward, with history the final judge of our deeds, let us go forth to lead the land we love, asking *His blessing* and *His help*, but knowing that here on earth God's work must truly be our own.[26]

Bellah sums up his analysis of Kennedy's speech by stating:

> The whole address can be understood as only the most recent statement of a theme that lies very deep in the American tradition, namely the obligation, both collective and individual, to carry out God's will on earth. This was the motivating spirit of those who founded America, and it has been present in every generation since.[27]

Bellah moves on by correctly citing French political philosopher Jean-Jacques Rousseau as the originator of the concept of civil religion, though Bellah's own conception differs significantly from Rousseau's.[28] The "life to come," as Rousseau termed it in book four, chapter eight of *The Social Contract*, is not so privileged in Bellah's conception, for he rejects Rousseau's argument that civil religion necessarily implies the "exclusion of religious tolerance," a major point Rousseau cited in arguing against the civil religious trend in his native France.[29]

---

[25] Bellah, 21.

[26] Ibid., 22. Emphasis added.

[27] Ibid., 25. Emphasis added.

[28] Ibid., 26.

[29] Ibid. For the original quote, see Jean-Jacques Rousseau, *The Social Contract*, translated with an Introduction and Notes by Christopher Betts (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994), 158-168.

The general understanding of civil religion that can be derived from Bellah's article is simply the religious character of American politics. This excuses the separation of church and state and cites the continued and repetitive use of the concept of God, the idea of providence, and the goal of doing God's work on Earth by American political figures. Bellah concludes positively that the civil religious character of American society "is a heritage of moral and religious experience from which we still have much to learn as we formulate the decisions that lie ahead."[30] It is apparent that this means that civil religion should not be immediately shirked, as Rousseau argued, but should continue to operate and be analyzed to cultivate a deeper understanding of American identity.

Bellah's first article on the subject inspired a boom in scholarship during the late 1960s and the 1970s. Following this major period of civil religious scholarship, interest in the concept lapsed as a major field of intellectual study. However, as an influence upon contemporary scholarship, civil religion has continued relevance. For example, historian Craig R. Smith recently published a work, *Daniel Webster and the Oratory of Civil Religion* that connected Bellah's concept to former American politico Daniel Webster. Even more historiographically significant was Benjamin Hufbauer's use of the concept in *Presidential Temples: How Memorials and Libraries Shape Public Memory.*[31] Hufbauer's idea of civil religion specifically relates to presidential memorials and libraries. Hufbauer's claim is best summed up by his introduction, which states:

> Presidential libraries are an attempt to construct sites that have all four of the elements of civil religion. They are meant to be sacred national places where pilgrimages can be made to see relics and reconstructions of presidential [or national] history, all in order to elevate in the national consciousness presidents [or the nation] who, even if figures lesser than Washington or Lincoln, are represented as worth of patriotic veneration.[32]

---

[30] Bellah, 41.

[31] See Craig R. Smith, *Daniel Webster and the Oratory of Civil Religion* (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2005); Benjamin Hufbauer, *Presidential Temples: How Memorials and Libraries Shape Public Memory* (Lawrence: University of Kansas Press, 2005).

[32] Hufbauer, 7. These four elements of civil religion (as explained by Hufbauer) are saints (e.g. Washington and Lincoln), sacred places (e.g. Mount Vernon and INHP), sacred objects (e.g. the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution) and ritual practices (the pledge of allegiance and the fourth of July).

The applications of these concepts to Independence National Historical Park are obvious. Some historical work has already referred to this connection. Charlene Mires' work on Independence Hall makes the civil religious connection to Independence Hall even during the 1860s. As she explains, "Representing the foundation of a nation that might have been lost [like the Hall itself in 1816], the building acquired a magnified significance, reflecting a civil religion that united religious belief with faith in the nation's progress."[33] In light of this analysis, interpretation at Independence National Historical Park from 1948 to the new 2004 interpretive plan aimed to establish the park as one of these "sacred national places" where Americans and foreigners are intended (subconsciously) to pilgrimage and consume the idealized conception of America previously offered by such sources as the Division of Interpretation and Visitor Services.

INHP Interpretation from 1976-2006- Recognizing and Accepting Prior Practice

INHP's interpretation hit a pivotal point during the American Bicentennial of 1976. This event commemorated the 200-year anniversary of the Declaration of Independence, and was even celebrated in itself as an important event during which citizens were intended to reflect upon America's founding. Philadelphia was one of the headline cities in these celebrations. Consequently, INHP was one of the institutions pressed into service. Also, as the home of Independence Hall and the Liberty Bell, the park was endowed with added significance in these celebrations. Constance Grieff provides a useful timeline of INHP's awareness of the Bicentennial:

> Although Judge Edwin O. Lewis began reminding the National Park Service of the approach of the Bicentennial in the late 1950s, it was not until 1969 that upper management began to devote serious attention to the park service's role in its celebration. By late 1970 the park had begun to plan for the Bicentennial on a national basis, which would spread its resources to satisfy its countrywide constituency.[34]

---

[33] Mires, *Independence Hall in American Memory*, 114.

[34] Grieff, 233. Judge Edwin O. Lewis was a major figure in Philadelphia's historic preservation. He was the first president of the Independence Hall Association and was the most influential figure in establishing (at least) Independence Mall as a historic site.

With this basic timeline in mind, the history of INHP in this era can essentially be simplified into three elements harmonious with the practice-theory dichotomy considered in the introduction: the completion of research, repair and restoration activities performed since the park's opening; the addition of enhancements to the park prior to the Bicentennial celebration; and the production of an interpretation befitting the park's status as a centerpiece for the celebration. The reference above to 1976 as "pivotal" alludes to its interpretive function, since the era that followed also produced INHP's first codified and implemented interpretation.

The research, repair and setting activities were basically laid out in section two of this work, but they may require a bit more expounding. Research was an ongoing function of INHP, as they attempted to update the park's interpretation with new information and ideas as much as was possible within the context of their glorifying or civil religious interpretation. Repair to the buildings as they were when INHP acquired them and subsequent maintenance of those buildings were similarly continuous after 1976. These were the two main functions of the DIVS after the Bicentennial era.

This era was quite instrumental in the physical development of the park. It took on new staff and opened the Todd House, the Bishop's White House, Pemberton House, and the New Hall to visitors.[35] The opening of the Bishop's White House is immediately relevant to this study, as it exemplified the intersection of religious and national narratives through the figure of Bishop William White.[36] Along with these additions, candlelight tours to Society Hill and the park proper were instituted in 1974, sponsored by the Philadelphia Convention and Visitor's bureau.[37] Carpenter's Hall also saw an increase in attendance due to the commemoration of the 200-year anniversary of the first meeting of the First

---

[35] Ibid., 236.

[36] White was rector of Christ Church and St. Peter's Church, first Protestant Episcopal bishop of Pennsylvania, and chaplain of the Continental Congress. He built the house from 1786 to 1787.

[37] Grieff, 238.

Continental Congress in 1974.[38] Most importantly, the park built and opened Franklin Court and moved the Liberty Bell out of Independence Hall to a pavilion across the street, adding to its sense of significance and allure among visitors.

The Franklin Court project was constructed between 1972 and 1976 under the supervision of the architectural firms Venturi & Rauch and National Heritage.[39] The court consists of three key buildings left over from the era on Market Street (one of which Franklin had owned), along with the foundations of Franklin's original house, which park administrators chose to represent with a steel outline of the structure's original dimensions with peep holes to view the foundations (due to a lack of sources describing the exterior of the house and the existence of good sources from the Franklins themselves regarding the building's interior).[40] This was important relative to the official interpretive themes produced by the DIVS for the Bicentennial (which will be explained below), one of which directly addressed Benjamin Franklin as a "man of ideas."

The biggest move during this era was an attempt to unify the park by augmenting its geography to get Independence Hall visitors to visit other buildings (a major problem for INHP since its inception). The new Visitor's Center, a modern building constructed from 1972 to 1976, was meant to perform this function. It was constructed as an intended starting point to park visits, the idea being to take the visitor east first to City Tavern and then westward to the main part of the park. The building was also meant to directly impact interpretation, as visitors to the center were exposed to an interpretation of INHP through a film shown there. It also featured a Bicentennial Bell cast in the Whitehall foundry, from which the Liberty Bell originated, and featuring the inscription "Let Freedom Ring" (consider the glorifying interpretation).[41] If successful, the center would have significantly impacted the practice of interpreting the park, likely for the better. However, it failed to

---

[38] Ibid., 240.
[39] Ibid., 219.
[40] Ibid., 16-17.
[41] Ibid., 214-216.

inspire visitors or change Independence Hall's dominance vis-à-vis the rest of the park, and the building was eventually appropriated for use as an archeological center (among other purposes) in 2001. Around that time, a new Visitor's Center was constructed at the corner of Sixth and Market Streets. The lasting innovation of the Bicentennial celebration was the creation of the first Liberty Bell Pavilion, a structure displaying and interpreting the Bell's significance. It was placed at Sixth and Chestnut Streets in 2003, adding a permanent interpretive edifice to Independence Mall.

These physical innovations improved the surface image of INHP exponentially and fit with the 1954 interpretive ideal by improving visitors' aesthetic experience of the park. However, more significant to the present study are the interpretive changes that occurred during this time. 1976 marked the first year that a tangible, listed interpretation emerged from the DIVS office. Essentially, that interpretation represents both the understanding of practice in the prior period and the acceptance of that framework for the Bicentennial. This interpretation revolved around three major themes. The first two themes: "Independence and the New Nation" and "Historic Philadelphia, Capital City," according to Constance Grieff, "[were] always central to the concept of the park." Grieff claims that the third theme, "'Franklin, Man of Ideas,' represented a reassessment of values at Independence over a period of some twenty years. This was in large part due to the accumulation of knowledge through the park's research."[42] So, for the first two themes, Grieff explicitly supports the claim that the 1976 interpretation was an official affirmation of prior practice. As for the Franklin theme, while it was not prior practice, it was researched in the 1948-1976 period. Along with this, Ben Franklin is an intimately connected character to the American Revolution and the city of Philadelphia, so the use and glorification of him is no stretch of the imagination. No example elucidates this connection better than INHP's construction of Franklin Court, which essentially represented the final bubbling of these ideas to the surface. As for the first two themes, they are depicted by a number of tangible structures in the park,

---

[42] Ibid., 200.

including Independence Hall, Congress Hall, Carpenter's Hall, and "The Signer" statue erected during the Bicentennial improvements, which sits on the corner of Fifth and Chestnut Streets. These ideas constitute the core of the glorification and civil religious narrative, and yet though they were perceived and understood during the Bicentennial research, they were still confirmed for the celebration. There does seem to be reason for this confirmation, as 1976 constituted a positive event for the country. It was also positive for Independence Mall, which was officially transferred to the National Park Service in a ceremony involving President Gerald Ford. It is apparent that the INHP staff did not want to cause controversy during such an event, again befitting the park's original interpretive ideals.

Current Independence National Historical Park Glorification and Civil Religion[43]

To a certain extent, the glorification narrative expanded following its affirmation for the Bicentennial celebration. Two more recent additions best exemplify this expansion, Welcome Park (constructed in 1982 by the Friends of Independence National Historical Park, a contributory group) and the new Liberty Bell Pavilion (constructed in 2003). These monuments demonstrate the previously established connection between the glorifying interpretation (which was affirmed in this era) and civil religion.

Welcome Park sits on Second Street just south of the intersection with Market, on the site of William Penn's former Philadelphia home, known as the "Slate Roof House." The "park" is a monument to Penn, Pennsylvania founder and a Quaker, whom the Friends of Independence National Historical Park group deifies, placing him among the pantheon of those commonly known as "Founding Fathers."[44] The site stresses the role of Penn's conversion to Quakerism, quoting him, "The Lord visited me with a certain sound and testimony of his eternal word through one of those in the world called a Quaker."[45] His role in the political life of the nation is also expressed with a religious element, as another panel

---

[43] This research was first done in the fall of 2006 in the form of park visits, but its content remains current.

[44] This also coincided with the 300th anniversary of the founding of Philadelphia in 1982.

[45] Welcome Park, visited November 25, 2006. Quote from William Penn, no source provided at the site.

features the quote, "...serve His truth and people, that an *example* may be set up *to the nations*, there may be room there [in America], but not here [in Europe], for such an *holy experiment*."[46] The glorifying and civil religious properties of the site pertaining to park interpretation between 1976 and 2006 are self-evident.

The Liberty Bell Center lies at the corner of Sixth and Chestnut Streets. While the Bell's display changed little there, a series of exhibits leading to the Bell itself were added. These exhibits did not exist before 2003, and give a nice window into the interpretation that existed during the period. For example, one panel refers to the Bell as "...one of the nation's *sacred relics*, preserved as a tangible link to the struggle for freedom that created the nation. Such *hallowed objects* are often located at *sites of pilgrimage* like Independence Hall."[47] Another panel proclaims, "Ring loud that hallowed BELL... ring it till the slave be free..."[48] These obvious examples of the glorified, civil religious interpretation are also mixed with a hint of a new interpretation, evidenced by panels on the Liberty Bell's influences on the emancipation and suffragist movements. One panel in reference to the suffragist movement asserts, "The original Liberty Bell announced the creation of democracy; the Women's Liberty Bell will announce the completion of democracy."[49] Coincidentally, circumstances involving the creation of the Center also advanced the need for a new interpretation, as a major controversy arose over the proximity of the Liberty Bell to the foundations of what interpreters previously called the "First White House" and its slave quarters. This issue is currently being resolved with the construction of a monument to the site, the President's House, though that building is still in its planning stages as of January 2008.[50]

---

46 Ibid. Emphasis added.

47 Liberty Bell Pavilion, visited November 13, 2006. Emphasis added.

48 Ibid.

49 Ibid. Quote from Katherine Ruschenberger, suffragist, *New York Times* (March 31, 1915).

50 Jill Ogline, "'Creating Dissonance for the Visitor': The Heart of the Liberty Bell Controversy," *The Public Historian* 26, no. 3 (Summer 2004): 49-57. For another version, see Gary Nash, "For Whom Will the Bell Toll? From Controversy to Cooperation," in *Slavery and Public History: The Tough Stuff of American Memory*, eds. James Oliver Horton and Lois E. Horton (New York: The Free Press, 2006).

Discontents with the Present Interpretation- Prelude to a New Interpretive Plan

The Liberty Bell Center exhibits were not the first signs of change in INHP's interpretation. In fact, discontent with the presentation offered by the park can be traced back to 1999, as scholars took notice of INHP's lack of interpretive adjustment to changes in the historical field. While the park's interpretation of the Liberty Bell Center represented some recent trends in scholarship, the remainder of the park was woefully antiquated with the continued influence of the civil religious narrative. It took five years for criticism to flow from the level of professional intellectuals to that of the park's interpretive staff, which finally decided to develop a new master interpretive plan in 2004. The National Park Service, not academic historians, was the impetus of this change, demonstrating the bureaucratic nature of that institution in its control over INHP.

The birth pangs of this process can be traced to the publication during the 1990s of a number of harshly critical popular texts regarding the public's conception of history. Prominent examples of this genre include: *Legends, Lies, and Cherished Myths of American History* and *Not So!: Popular Myths About America from Columbus to Clinton.*[51] While these texts did not mention INHP directly, the park did not escape scrutiny for long, as James Loewen's 1999 publication of *Lies Across America: What Our Historic Sites Get Wrong* cited their narrative errors. Loewen complained, "NPS relies on its staff to tell visitors the history that makes this building [Independence Hall] important. Based on my four visits, the strategy doesn't work—the history does not get told… Instead of revealing *what* happened here however, they tell mildly amusing anecdotes about *how* it happened."[52] Loewen went into detail about the events that occurred at the park and how the staff told the story of those events poorly. In one of Loewen's more incisive comments on the subject, he claimed:

---

[51] Richard Shenkman, *Legends, Lies, and Cherished Myths of American History* (New York: Harper Paperbacks, 1992) and Paul F. Boller, *Not So! Popular Myths About America from Columbus to Clinton* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996).

[52] James W. Loewen, *Lies Across America: What Our Historic Sites Get Wrong* (New York: Touchstone Publishing, 1999), 358.

> Guides might also point out the contradiction between the famous phrase, "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all Men are created equal, that they are endowed by their creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness," and the founders' practices of slavery and sexism. Guides say nothing so substantive now.[53]

As will be established in the next section, this is a critique that definitely seems to have been considered and followed by the INHP. Loewen continues, stating:

> Instead of telling about the Constitution [he does explain their better consideration of the Declaration of Independence], guides describe how long it took delegates to get to Philadelphia from South Carolina or New Hampshire. They point out how the delegates sat facing George Washington, whom they expected would be the first president. And they tell how Ben Franklin observed to delegates sitting near him that the back of the president's chair had a sun painted on it. "I have often… looked at that behind the President without being able to tell whether it was rising or setting. But now at length I have the happiness to know that it is a rising and not a setting sun."[54]

His general criticism of INHP's interpretation at that time was that it practiced Cold War era consensus history rather than reflecting recent scholarship, which points more toward conflict (in the form of racism, sexism, and class distinctions among the founding fathers) over consensus in the history of the early American Republic. It is also apparent that the DIVS staff heard these complaints in some form, as a staff member described INHP's presentation as "dated, white, middle-class history… not suited to the increasingly diverse group of visitors to the park."[55] As we shall see below, DIVS, under pressure from the National Park Service, the Organization of American Historians, and INHP administration, resolved to create and implement a new interpretive plan.

The 2006 INHP Interpretive Master Plan- Conception and Major Themes

The most recent INHP interpretation was conceived between 2004 and 2006 by the park staff in consort with a number of peripheral groups. It was, in its most basic form, an attempt to contrive an interpretation befitting present historical scholarship, but also to

---

[53] Ibid.

[54] Ibid., 359.

[55] Stephen Sitarski, interview by Michael Chornesky, November 13, 2006.

conceive a presentation that would make for a pleasurable visitor experience and avert any potential controversy (especially in the wake of the Liberty Bell debacle). Though the interpretation is not fully implemented yet, it has coincided with the stated mission of INHP interpretation by avoiding serious controversy.[56]

The interpretive process began more than two years ago, in October 2004, when a few historians from the Organization of American Historians (OAH), including prominent local historian Gary Nash, were selected to visit the park and submitt lengthy reports to the DIVS.[57] This study pointed out four key problems with INHP services at that time. First was a physical problem, a consequence of the park's setting. As the report states: "The 'park without borders' challenges tourists and residents alike to be alert to their location in a national park."[58] The second problem mentioned is also physical, referenced just below the first, with the claim, "Interpretation at the park core is inflexible. Visitors get a better, nuanced tour when they leave the icons and move to the edges."[59] These two ideas refer to the park's existence within a modern city, which can confuse visitors who do not know where the park "ends" and the city "begins." DIVS traditionally reacted to this problem by confining its interpretation to Independence Mall. But the report suggests that INHP stop compensating for these problems and *solve* them.

This same reasoning is then applied to the park's conceptual interpretation. The report points to the third problem: "The park is bound by the 'inertia of tradition.' Find a way to give 'punch' to canonical stories without diminishing the traditional themes."[60] Finally, the study settles in on the most incisive criticism of the park's ideas, claiming, "Conditions in the park have changed and the park must rethink its approach. These

---

[56] The only serious matters discussed with relevance to the park over the past four months in the press were the process of selecting a design for the planned President's House monument and the implementation of further security measures at Independence Hall.

[57] National Park Service, "Independence National Historical Park: Report on Site Review of Interpretive Programs by the Organization of American Historians" (Philadelphia: National Park Service, 2005).

[58] Ibid., 5.

[59] Ibid.

[60] Ibid.

changes break down into internal factors, external factors and *visitor factors* [the variety of visitors viewing the park]."[61] This seems to have been the main problem with interpretive operations, the telling of a 1950s story to a 1990s audience.

The INHP's newest interpretive plan seeks to solve these problems. Along with the OAH review, the National Park Service imposed new bureaucratic standards calling for a new interpretation every ten years. This was the practical reason for the new plan. Finally, the DIVS sought to ameliorate past interpretive processes by holding a series of meetings with park staff and business interests around and outside of the park's borders.[62]

The results of this process were mixed. While the INHP is working to solve its physical problems by posting an increased number of signs and maps throughout the park, attempts to divert visitors away from Independence Mall remain fruitless. Attendance statistics for sites in the park proper continue to overshadow those for exhibits on the park's periphery. As occurred with the original Visitor's Center concept in the late 1970s, people seem to ignore the rest of the park. Instead of following the suggestion of the OAH and developing the park's periphery to fight this trend, INHP chose instead to develop the park's interior. The development of Independence Mall, the increased security measures there but nowhere else, the recent openings of the Independence Visitor's Center and the Liberty Bell Center within a few hundred yards of Independence Hall, and the planning of the President's House building in the same area seem to point to INHP's *ad hoc* solution to this problem. The problem with this idea is that it continues to divert attention away from park resources on the periphery, such as Franklin Court, Welcome Park, City Tavern and the Second Bank of the United States, to name a few. If this process continues, visits to those resources will continue to decline. This practice, if continued, will likely affect INHP interpretation by limiting the resources from which the story of America's founding is told and thus failing to reveal the full variety of complex circumstances that were required to lead

---

[61] Ibid. Emphasis in original.

[62] Stephen Sitarski, interview by Michael Chornesky, November 13, 2006.

to that outcome. As the report suggests regarding this practice with one such peripheral resource, Franklin Court: "[The exhibit] needs major rethinking. Consider making it a museum about pamphleteering and the press and Franklin's scientific experiments."[63]

Finally, there is the change in the park's interpretation, which revolves around its four new major themes: "Liberty: The Promises and the Paradoxes," "E Pluribus Unum: Out of Many, One," "What was revolutionary about the American Revolution?" and "Benjamin Franklin- the relevant revolutionary." While on the surface this seems to continue the 1976 themes (except for numbers 1 and 2), in fact, they expand those themes. "What was revolutionary…" is the development of the American Revolution theme of 1976, and significantly improves it with the proposal of the theme in the form of a question. This reflects historical scholarship on the radicalism of the Revolution, specifically the more recent work of Gordon Wood and others.[64] "Benjamin Franklin" is an obvious continuation of the 1976 theme of the same name, only he is now a "relevant revolutionary." This makes him look more human, removing the veneer of deification and civil religion from the theme. "E Pluribus Unum" and "Liberty, the Promises and Paradoxes" are entirely new, and certainly fit with current trends in historical scholarship (e.g. the predominance of social history). In essence, they aspire to analyze the American "melting pot" and the social paradoxes inherent in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. According to the interpretive plan, its themes were innovated "during a series of workshops involving a cross-section of park staff, constituents and partners."[65] More importantly, the plan declares a clear approach to its subject: "The purpose of Independence National Historical Park is to preserve its stories, buildings and artifacts as a source of inspiration for visitors to learn more

---

[63] National Park Service, "Independence National Historical Park: Report on Site Review of Interpretive Programs by the Organization of American Historians," 6.

[64] See Gordon Wood, *The Radicalism of the American Revolution* (New York: A.A. Knopf, 1992).

[65] Division of Interpretation and Visitor Services, "Long-Range Interpretive Plan for Independence National Historical Park" (Harpers Ferry, VA: National Park Service, 2006), 13. Emphasis in original.

about the ideas and ideals that led to the American Revolution and the founding and growth of the United States."[66]

Visceral Postmodernism- Meaning, Potential Problems and Their Solutions

Of course, this interpretation is not without its problems. A critical thinker might note the contradiction inherent in the physical and conceptual proposals. The physical actions taken by INHP suggest a pulling inward of the park's resources to Independence Mall, while the new conceptual proposal emphasizes broader expansion and variety. Also, it is apparent that the visceral component of civil religion might just sneak up on INHP again. This could occur through the interpretation's reliance on the now popular conception of "social history" for its ideas. The visceral mechanism being posited here is the connection between current "social history" and the controversial conceptual paradigm of postmodernism, which this study contends are closely linked.

The relationship between the two approaches is one of the overarching theory (postmodernism) and its subsidiaries within the historical field (social history being one, subaltern history and the dominant emphasis on race, gender, and culture as sources of historical knowledge being a few others). Most literature on the subject rejects a tidy, dogmatic definition of the term "postmodernism." However, postmodernist doctrine consistently features a few basic themes. First, there is the meaning of the term *post*modernism: a rejection of modernity and the intellectual structures that supported the period (those of the Enlightenment).[67] Jean-François Lyotard defines the second theme within his work, claiming, "Simplifying to the extreme, I define *postmodern* as incredulity toward metanarratives [the grand narratives alluded to above]."[68] The third theme is expressed in the work of historians Michel Foucault and Michel-Rolph Trouillot, both of

---

[66] Ibid., 7. Emphasis added.

[67] Examples of this theme can be seen in David J. Herman's article "Modern/Postmodern," in the anthology *A Postmodern Reader* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1993), 157-86.

[68] Jean-François Lyotard, "Modern/Postmodern," in *A Postmodern Reader*, edited by Joseph Natoli and Linda Hutcheon (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1993), 72.

whom tend to express their perceptions of history in terms of social *power* relations. They show the diffusion of postmodern ideas into both academic and public history respectively.[69] Finally, there is an undercurrent to these themes that is especially pertinent to INHP: the presentation of material in terms of *stories* and *perspectives*. This last theme can be summed up as the *subjective* character of postmodernism, the primacy of individual approaches over the generalized and all-encompassing narrative. All of these basic aspects of the postmodern approach are explicitly and repeatedly employed in the recent DIVS *Long-Range Interpretive Plan*.

Postmodernism's connection to the new interpretive plan is evident. For example, the plan asserts, "Park interpreters will provide visitors with opportunities to make *intellectual and emotional connections* to park sites and *stories*, fostering the public's interest in the stewardship and preservation of the park's resources."[70] Foucault might interpret this statement as the park's manipulation of visitors, but the true idea behind this statement is more one of *personal* interpretation. This meshes with postmodernism's emphasis on individual understanding over the structural approach utilized by the *Annales* School. Also, the preface to the explanation of the interpretive themes contains the loaded statement: "They [focused themes] open minds to new ideas and perhaps to *multiple points of view*. When linked to commonly held *emotions* or universal *human experiences*, themes encourage audiences to *see themselves* in a park's story and *discover personal relevance*."[71] While INHP mediated thematic choices, their content and the approach applied to them are symptomatic of postmodernism's ubiquitous influence. In fact, this tendency goes against one of the OAH's recommendations, which warns park staff to, "Avoid interpretive tokenism by segregating

---

[69] See Foucault's *History of Sexuality* and Trouillot's *Silencing the Past: Power and the Production of History*. Foucault's concept of power relations is the original and likely inspired Trouillot's.

[70] National Park Service, "Long-Range Interpretive Plan for Independence National Historical Park," 11. Emphasis added.

[71] Ibid., 13. Emphasis added.

diverse stories into special tours; integrate those stories throughout all of the tours."[72] If this suggestion is good enough for the park's tours, why should it not apply to the larger interpretation of the park?

So, what can we conclude based on the above processes and patterns? Is postmodernism a positive development which stresses the stories of the formerly repressed over consensus narratives (e.g. the popular field of subaltern history)? Or is it, as Larry Laudan, Alan Sokal, and Jean Bricmont claim it to be, "[...]the most prominent and pernicious manifestation of anti-intellectualism in our time."[73] This story is yet to be told. However, INHP's movement in this direction must, unlike in the case of civil religion, be accompanied by a sense of self-reflection and understanding of previous tendencies in park interpretation: a movement beyond Visceral History.

Postscript- Connecting Visceral History to Conceptions of "Collective Memory"

The introduction of this work depicted Independence National Historical Park as an exemplification of French historian Pierre Nora's concept of realms or places of memory. If this connection is valid, the park is one of many settings in the United States where American and foreign visitors go to *experience* the nation's history. While that observation remains correct, it is also an incomplete thought. It neglects a burgeoning historical discipline partly inspired by this idea and others from Nora's work, *Realms of Memory*: the examination of memory, specifically what is called "collective memory."

In its beginnings, the study of collective memory, of "a set of potentially absolute meanings and stories, possessed as the heritage or identity of a community," was interdisciplinary, a dialogue between intellectuals of other disciplines and historians.[74] Thus,

---

[72] National Park Service, "Independence National Historical Park: Report on Site Review of Interpretive Programs by the Organization of American Historians," 6.

[73] Alan Sokal and Jean Bricmont, *Fashionable Nonsense: Postmodern Intellectuals' Abuse of Science* (New York: Picador Press, 1998), 50.

[74] David W. Blight, *Beyond the Battlefield: Race, Memory, and the American Civil War* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2002), 1.

the figures cited as figuring in the predawn of the discipline are sociologist Maurice Halbwachs, psychologist Sigmund Freud, and philosopher G.W.F. Hegel.[75] After Nora's seven-volume French language version of *Realms of Memory*, published between 1984 and 1992, American historians applied his conclusions regarding French national history to American examples, beginning with Michael Kammen's 1991 work, *Mystic Chords of Memory*. Our primary concern is the state of the field after this original period of study, as these ideas in context add meaning to the above case study.

While the study of memory as a historical concept has developed much since Nora's original work, the definition of the term has changed little. Nora defines the term in a variety of ways, at times contrasting it with history, at others connecting it to history. Overall, he deems the concept irrevocably tied to the period in which it is invoked, calling it "life, always embodied in living societies… subject to the dialectic of remembering and forgetting" and "always a phenomenon of the present."[76] Subsequent historians have defined it more literally, corresponding to the increased sophistication of the field. Kerwin Lee Klein claims that, "If memory is objective in the coldest, hardest sense of the word, memory is subjective in the warmest, most inviting senses of that word."[77] He goes on to define memory more specifically as "not a property of individual minds, but a diverse and shifting collection of material artifacts and social practices."[78] Historian David Blight further explains the distinctions between history and memory:

> Memory is… owned; history interpreted. Memory is passed down through generations; history is revised. Memory often coalesces in objects, sacred sites, and monuments; history seeks to understand contexts and the complexity of cause and effect. History asserts the authority of academic training and recognized canons of

---

[75] Kerwin Lee Klein, "On the Emergence of *Memory* in Historical Discourse," *Representations* 69 (Winter 2000): 133.

[76] Nora et al., 3.

[77] Klein, 130.

[78] Ibid.

evidence; memory carries the often more powerful authority of community membership and experience.[79]

Perhaps this draws the distinction too sharply. While these historians seek contrasts between history and memory, there is much to suggest the deep connections between these two windows to the past. As we have already seen with Independence National Historical Park interpretations before 2004, to advance a historical interpretation without the application of intellectual rigor, to historicize memory, poses certain dangers. However, the last 20 years in the historical field and the last 3 in the history of the park have also demonstrated that, at least in the minds of many historians, history is not quite as "objective" as Kerwin Lee Klein connotes it. The study of memory was widely ignored prior to 1991, but by 1997, it was featured prevalently in issues of both *The Public Historian* and the *American Historical Review*, with historian David Glassberg referencing memory as "a new way to think about public history, a common intellectual foundation for the diverse enterprises taught and practiced under its name."[80] This fast-paced succession of historical trends and the content of those trends have brought the very notion of truth in history into question. In this sense, memory was historicized and history was made increasingly like memory.

Nevertheless, there is a reality behind the vagaries of this "text." While recent developments have revealed a certain subjectivity in historical study, they have also overshadowed its evidential and argumentative rigors. This is proven by the application of context to a term as loaded and complex as memory in the sources above. In addition, the attempt to apply memory, in the form of the idealistic, civil religious narrative, to a historical site in the preceding narrative lends extra credence to the use of memory as a subject of historical study. Conversely, it demonstrates the weakness of memory as a source of historical knowledge. This is evident in light of a recent historical debate over the weaknesses of oral and interview sources. This is odd given the visiting public's reliance on

---

[79] Blight, 2.

[80] David Glassberg, "Public History and the Study of Memory," *The Public Historian* 18, no. 2 (Spring 1996): 8.

that very memory, either in terms of their education or direct experience in more recent history, for knowledge.[81] In this context, public history revolves around certain questions: Why do visitors come to INHP and parks like it? Do they come to hear the sacred story of an ideal America, like before 2004? Do they come to hear facts and stories, as they will in the near future? Or do they come for different reasons?

[81] For more on this problem, see Roy Rosensweig and David Thelen, *The Presence of the Past: Popular Uses of History in American Life* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1998)

THE TOBACCO CONTROVERSY OF 1857

By

Colin Mustful
Minnesota State University

In May 1851, the Great Exhibition was held at London's Hyde Park.[1] The exhibition was a grand display of modern industrial technology, design, and innovation. It represented a move toward industry and capitalism that continued well into the twentieth century. At the time, Britain was the leader in industrial growth as well as imperial expansion.[2] In order to achieve this, the nation relied on endless numbers of low-class, low-wage labor as a foundation to fledgling capitalism.[3] Long hours and deplorable conditions were commonplace as a result of what Karl Marx called unbridled selfishness.[4]

Alongside a growth in industry was the growth of media. This became apparent through the daily coverage of the Crimean War. Reports given by William Howard Russell of *The Times* were an historical innovation that allowed people to follow the events of the Eastern campaign.[5] The newspaper became the instrument of information and made possible the sharing of opinions. In addition to media expansion, tobacco smoking also emerged from the Crimean War.[6] Western observers took to the habit, and with their newfound capitalist ambition, brought the habit back to England to be exploited.[7] It was not long before the addictive narcotic enamored the British people, especially its workers. Though smoking had previously been engaged in, never had it become so public as after the Crimean War. The new accessibility of the press and the constant industrious attitude of

---

[1] A.N. Wilson, *The Victorians* (New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 2003), 127.

[2] Ibid., 124.

[3] Ibid., 148. Historian A.N. Wilson noted that, "industrial manufacturing capital . . . needed an army of near-slaves to keep the ever-expanding industries going."

[4] Ibid., 150.

[5] Ibid., 175.

[6] Ibid., 197. As A.N. Wilson reported, "two things emerge from the Pandora's box of war . . . the importance of photography, and a change in the Western world's smoking habits."

[7] Ibid.

advancement developed a setting for wholesome dispute. In 1857, this led to the Tobacco Controversy, a discussion held in the pages of *The Lancet* debating the effects of tobacco smoking on the character and well-being of its users.[8]

The contenders in the Tobacco Controversy of 1857 set out to determine whether tobacco smoking was injurious. Physicians were ready and even enthusiastic about the question and the topic. Physicians and other commentators made their opinions known and encouraged responses and criticism. They believed that smoking was an important public issue that had not yet been discussed but needed to be. Unfortunately, the debate led to no immediate results, producing no initial action from Parliament. It did, however, create public awareness as it allowed smoking to be publicly discussed. The 1857 controversy was the first real discussion in a debate that continued for years. However, it was not until 1908 that a new generation of tobacco opponents achieved any results from their predecessor's strenuous efforts. By this time, smoking had taken on a new character, surrounded by separate social problems. The debate in 1857 had several motives, which by 1908 had changed. The Tobacco Controversy created an important and necessary discussion about the advantages and disadvantages of tobacco smoking and although it produced no immediate results, it generated a long, enduring, and important debate over the effects of tobacco smoking.

By 1857, it was not unusual for British men to smoke. Many sought the comfort and relaxation of the pipe or cigar after a long day.[9] Throughout the century, men perceived smoking as something to be enjoyed. Smokers shared the notion that a pipe was a great soother and a pleasant comforter. They believed it was a great benefit to the heart and brain which allowed them to be admirable thinkers and proper gentlemen. Others, however, did not consider the practice of smoking to be so pleasing. As early as 1604, King James I

---

[8] Thomas Wakley, ed, *The Lancet: A Journal of British and Foreign Medicine, Physiology, Surgery, Chemistry, Criticism, Literature, and News* i (1857).

[9] G.L. Apperson, *The Social History of Smoking* (London: Martin Secker, 1914), 177; Apperson noted that smokers believed that "[tobacco] ripens the brain, it opens the heart; and the man who smokes thinks like a sage and acts like a Samaritan."

denounced the habit in his *A Counterblaste to Tobacco.*[10] In 1859, Oxford University posted a bulletin in open opposition to tobacco smoking in which they called the habit "ungentlemanlike."[11] Though smoking was denounced by some, it was exalted by others, a fact that by 1857 created the necessary atmosphere for a controversy to occur.[12]

The practice of smoking went through several changes during the nineteenth century. Early in the century, tobacco was consumed mostly through a pipe, but eventually the cigarette became the preferred method of smoking tobacco. No matter the method, it is clear that tobacco consumption boomed over the course of the century, with consumption increasing at a rate of 750,000 pounds per annum by 1871.[13] Before the cigarette gained popularity, smoking was considered somewhat of a vice only to be practiced away from the public eye.[14] Men had to find private places to smoke, largely because women resented the habit. Most women had an "invincible repugnance to tobacco smoke" and refused to disregard their rule of abstinence toward smoking.[15] Many men, however, still smoked and considered it as a necessary part of life. For men who smoked, tobacco was as vital as clothing and became something they could not do without.[16] Life was difficult and men believed that smoking eased their hardships and that it helped them to relax.[17] Smoking

---

[10] King James of England, *A Counterblaste to Tobacco* (Amsterdam: Theatrum Orbis Terrarum, 1604).

[11] Apperson, *The Social History of Smoking*, 172; The statement at Oxford University read that "whereas complaints have been made that some undergraduate members of the University are in the habit of smoking at public entertainments, and otherwise creating annoyance, they hereby are cautioned against the repetition of such ungentlemanlike conduct."

[12] Historian A.N. Wilson commented that at the time of the Tobacco Controversy, "smoking was seen as both a blessing and a curse." Wilson, *The Victorians*, 197.

[13] Harriette Noel-Thatcher, *The Fascinator; or, The Knights Legacy: A Prize Essay on the Moral, Social, and Economical Results of the Use of Tobacco* (Manchester: Abel Heywood and Sons, 1871), 81.

[14] Apperson, *The Social History of Smoking*, 156.

[15] Ibid., 162.

[16] Historian V.G. Kiernan wrote that smoking, "came to be felt as part of the normal condition of masculine life, like wearing trousers." V.G. Kiernan, *Tobacco: A History* (London: Hutchinson Radius, 1991), 219.

[17] Matthew Hilton, *Smoking in British Popular Culture, 1800-2000* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000), 56.

became associated with working-class culture. Even the poorest working class men had money for tobacco,[18] and they began to rely on smoking as an essential part of life.[19]

In the 1850s, the Crimean War contributed to the growing popularity of smoking as soldiers brought the habit home with them. For military men, smoking was hugely popular, and was perceived, even by those who considered smoking to be harmful, as an excellent method to calm the nerves and ease the suffering of those men made weary by war.[20] For soldiers, smoking helped them to escape their surroundings. When they returned home, they found it difficult to abandon the habit on which they came so heavily to depend. By popularizing the cigarette, the Crimean War had a lasting legacy and a notable consequence upon the people of Great Britain.[21]

As smoking became more practiced, and noticed, so did its effects. In 1856 the proliferation of smoking led physician Samuel Solly, a respected member of the Royal College of Surgeons, to write in *The Lancet*, "it is my business to point out to you all the various and insidious causes of general paralysis, and smoking is one of them."[22] Solly also noted that that there was "no single vice which does so much harm as smoking."[23] His remarks prompted a flurry of opinion by physicians, smokers, and the general public who defended or promoted the habit. Numerous opinions about smoking and its effects soon appeared in *The Lancet* throughout the first half of 1857.[24] Essentially, between January and April 1857 there was an ongoing debate laid out in the pages of *The Lancet* which was titled "The Great Tobacco Question," or "The Tobacco Controversy."[25]

---

[18] Many prioritized the purchase of tobacco because, "decent status came to depend partly on ability to buy and exchange cigarettes." Kiernan, *Tobacco*, 221.

[19] Hilton, *Smoking in British*, 48.

[20] Historian G.L. Apperson wrote that "even the strongest of anti-tobacconists would have felt that there was at least something, if not much, to be said for the abused weed, when in times of campaigning suffering it played so beneficent a part in soothing and comforting wounded and weary men." Apperson, *The Social History of Smoking*, 174.

[21] Wilson, *The Victorians*, 199.

[22] Samuel Solly, "Clinical Lectures on Paralysis," *The Lancet*, ii (December 13, 1856): 641.

[23] Ibid.

[24] Wakley, *The Lancet*.

[25] Ibid.

The debate acted as a dialogue between those who favored the use of tobacco through cigarettes, cigars, and pipes, and those who did not. Furthermore, the effects of tobacco on the body, mind, and well-being of a smoker were debated. Each week, new editorials replied to previous ones, which in turn provoked new arguments to be made. Those who contributed to the debate were often medical physicians, but contributors also included a variety of men, all of whom sought to have their opinions heard. Although the debate lasted only a few months, the controversy itself continued through pamphlets, books, and lectures by authors who argued the injury or benefit caused by tobacco smoking.

The principle question considered during the controversy was whether tobacco smoking was injurious. From this question physicians hoped to discover clearly both the physical and mental effects of tobacco smoking.[26] Supporters of the habit, which included physicians as well as the general public, believed that tobacco was beneficial and that any negative effects from smoking were far outweighed by positive ones. The physicians and various men who opposed the habit believed that tobacco was not only injurious to the body, but to the mind and soul as well. Overall, strong arguments were made by both sides of the debate on smoking's physical, moral, and even intellectual effects.

Those for and against smoking agreed that the effects of tobacco smoking were significant and needed to be discussed. Physicians believed that such a discussion would add to the science of medicine in a positive and necessary way, since tobacco smoking had not previously been fully considered.[27] The issue of smoking was not altogether avoided by physicians, but it did not yet thoroughly enter the medical realm. By 1857, tobacco smoking could no longer be overlooked, as physicians agreed that "it is surely high time, both for the

---

[26] Specifically, David Johnson, a member of the Royal College of Surgeons, asked, "is it a fact that the smoking of tobacco is physically as well as morally pernicious?" David Johnson, "Is Smoking Inurious?" *The Lancet*, i (January 3, 1857): 22.

[27] Ibid. In his editorial in *The Lancet* written January 3, 1857, physician David Johnson stated that "there can be no doubt that the moral and physical evils occasioned in this country by the use of this plant are of the most extensive and frightful kind; and as these arise from a habit the physical advantages of which have never been thoroughly discussed by competent physiologists, such a discussion would, I submit, form a very important and valuable contribution to medical science."

honor of the medical profession, and for the sake of the public, that this question should be definitely stated."[28] *The Lancet* publicized the issue. One physician stated, "your pages cannot be devoted to a more important subject."[29]

The initial statement that sparked the Tobacco Controversy was a medical one. In it, physician Samuel Solly attributed the effects of paralysis largely to the habit of smoking, and argued that tobacco smoking also led to a variety of other negative health effects including irritability, nervousness, and intermittent pulse.[30] Many physicians agreed with Solly and made similar arguments. While these physicians noticed that smoking was harmful to the body, it was not until the controversy became public that physicians expressed theories and beliefs about the negative effects of smoking. Physicians at the time may not have known the exact effects of tobacco smoking, but many considered it harmful and they made arguments based on their observations. For instance, physician Benjamin Ward Richardson observed that it was not possible "that any man can constantly smoke a foul pipe without being as constantly a martyr to extreme dyspepsia."[31] Numerous physicians saw and considered these same effects and noted that tobacco smoking takes life away from the smoker.[32] In much the same manner as Samuel Solly, John Lizars, a surgeon with the Royal Infirmary of Edinburgh, added the effects of tobacco to a long list of hazardous health problems, which even included cowardice.[33] Those arguing against the use of tobacco made

---

28 Arthur Hill Hassall, *The Lancet*, i (February 21, 1857): 197.

29 P.J. Hynes, *The Lancet*, i (February 21, 1857): 201.

30 Matthew Hilton and Simon Nightingale, "A Microbe of the Devil's Own Make: Religion and Science in the British Anti-Tobacco Movement, 1853-1908," in *Ashes to Ashes: The History of Smoking and Health,* eds. Stephen Lock, Lois Reynolds, and E.M. Tansey, (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1998), 45.

31 Benjamin Ward Richardson, *For and Against Tobacco; Tobacco in its Relations to the Health of Individuals and Communities* (London: John Churchill and Sons, 1865), 26.

32 John Budgett wrote that "the smoker lives on, but with only half the attributes of life." John Season Burgess Budgett, *The Tobacco Question, Morally, Socially, and Physically Considered* (London: G. Philip, 1857), 13.

33 Lizars argued that smoking was the cause of several diseases and ailments such as, "giddiness, sickness, vomiting, dyspepsia, vitiated taste of the mouth, loose bowels, diseased liver, congestion of the brain, apoplexy, mania, loss of memory, amaurosis, deafness, nervousness, palsy, emasculation, and cowardice." John Lizars, *Practical Observations on the Use and Abuse of Tobacco,* 5th ed. (Edinburgh: W.H. Lizars, 1856), 19.

it clear that they saw no health benefits from smoking. Rather, it was considered a major health risk which led to numerous diseases.[34]

Despite these claims, there remained physicians, as well as others, who refused to add tobacco smoking to the causes of disease. The advocates of tobacco did not perceive smoking as physically harmful. They constantly rejected the claims of physicians who criticized the use of tobacco, and contended that the anti-smokers could not prove their argument because they had no clear facts connecting disease with tobacco smoking.[35] In an 1857 essay, physician J.L. Milton countered the belief that smoking hindered the development of youths. He claimed that the causes which led to stunted growth were completely unknown and therefore could not be attributed to the use of tobacco.[36] Tobacco advocates did not accept the arguments of their opponents. They opposed every claim, and referred to the arguments of the opposition as fabled horrors and impossibilities.[37] Strong denials by those in favor of tobacco smoking worked to arouse further debate as more physicians rejected the idea that smoking was injurious to health. According to proponents of tobacco smoking, evidence suggested that smoking was positively beneficial.[38]

Those opposed to tobacco use often noticed a physical difference in smokers. Tobacco opponents recognized the effects of smoking, although they may not have known precisely what diseases it caused. In a lecture delivered in 1859, Francis Close, the once Dean of Carlisle and president of the Anti-Tobacco Society, stated that any who smoke are

---

[34] When commenting about the disease of consumption and chronic bronchitis Benjamin Ward Richardson stated that "I could quote example upon example where persistence in smoking has tended to sustain and confirm the malady." Richardson, *For and Against Tobacco*, 68.

[35] One author strongly suggested that "not one of the anti-smokers has produced a single clear fact showing the connection of the diseases named with the alleged cause!" One Who Smokes, *Know All Men: A Doctor's Fallacy on Smoking and Smokers, Examined and Explained by One Who Smokes, and a Medical Practitioner of Twenty-five Years Experience* (London: John Wesley and Co., 1857), 54.

[36] J.L. Milton stated that "the causes which arrest or accelerate growth are as yet totally unknown to us, whatever may be said to the contrary." J.L. Milton, *Death in the Pipe; or, the Great Smoking Question* (London: George Philip and Son, 1857), 22.

[37] "A New Tobacco Question," *Times*, November 28, 1857.

[38] Author John Fiske noted that "as the physiologic evidence now stands, there is a quite appreciable preponderance in favor of the practice of smoking." John Fiske, *Tobacco and Alcohol: I. It Does Pay to Smoke II. The Coming Man Will Drink Wine* (New York: Leypoldt and Holt, 1869), 20.

"distinguished by a generally deteriorated physique."[39] It was believed and argued by the opposition that when one smokes, it is certain to be followed by physical ailment of some degree. They contended that the debilities caused by tobacco smoking could not be avoided by any who engaged in the habit.[40] Despite a limited knowledge, the adversaries of tobacco were certain that it was harmful and therefore they persisted in their opposition.

Most tobacco opponents promoted total abstinence from smoking. They believed there was no benefit to smoking and argued that to abstain is to live with comfort and health while avoiding constant cravings.[41] Through abstinence, it was declared, men would be free from the diseases and harm caused by smoking.[42] The opposition to the habit supported throwing away tobacco forever as the best cure from its harmful effects.[43] Physician Henry Gibbons, in an 1868 essay written about tobacco and its effects, argued that there are no circumstances under which one should indulge in smoking and stated, "every use of poisons in health is an abuse."[44] It was apparent to opponents that if men completely abstained from tobacco, they would readily avoid any negative effects it produces.

Although many physicians involved in the controversy considered tobacco a poison, some argued instead that tobacco acted as a stimulant. It was believed that when not used in excess, tobacco was not a narcotic. For this reason, some argued that smoking did not have the negative effects of a narcotic. Countering Samuel Solly's assertion that smoking caused paralysis, tobacco proponents argued that "taken in a stimulant dose, tobacco is not only not

---

[39] Close also added that smokers are marked by "a sallow, dyspeptic appearance, deficiency of energy and nerve, and inability or disinclination for manly exercises." Francis Close, *Tobacco: Its Influences, Physical, Moral, and Religious.* A Lecture Delivered at the Anthenaeum, Carlisle, October 27, 1859 (London: Hatchard, Piccadilly, and Seeley, 1859), 13.

[40] As stated by John Budgett, when one smokes "an atony, a debility, is sure to follow. It may be more or less distant, but come it will . . . to rich and poor, who seek comfort in tobacco." Budgett, *The Tobacco Question*, 13.

[41] In the words of physician Henry Gibbons "the normal condition of the abstainer is that of comfort and health; and it is unalloyed by the torment of perpetual craving." Henry Gibbons, M.D., *Tobacco and Its Effects: A Prize Essay Showing That the Use of Tobacco is a Physical, Mental, Moral, and Social Evil* (New York: Nelson and Phillips, 1868), 41.

[42] Ibid.

[43] Lizars, *Practical Observations.*

[44] Gibbons, *Tobacco and Its Effects*, 47.

a producer, it is an averter, of paralysis."[45] Furthermore, proponents contended that tobacco was a healthful and reparatory stimulus.[46] This was a strong argument widely utilized by tobacco advocates. As noted by Benjamin Ward Richardson in 1865, "the small dose will often produce effects diametrically opposite and antagonistic to those of the large dose."[47] In this way, even if opponents claimed that tobacco was a narcotic, proponents could agree while still supporting their side. Still, many proponents held that tobacco was anything but a narcotic and argued that "in truth, the idea that tobacco is a narcotic is as false as it can be."[48]

As a stimulus, proponents of tobacco believed that it was beneficial and soothing. They contended that through smoking the mind and body is able to avoid exhaustion.[49] While writing in *The Lancet,* physician D. Hooper commented that a cigar can be useful when it is employed at the proper time and in the proper quantity.[50] Furthermore he wrote that "it is one of those agreeable and refreshing stimuli which restore the equilibrium of the jaded and over-worked nervous systems of the times in which we live."[51]

Smoking opponents claimed that tobacco was a poison which acted solely as a narcotic. Opponents saw no benefit from tobacco smoking, even in moderation. They believed that smoking offered no value to the body.[52] Rather than being soothing and calming, opponents argued that smoking was an abuse of a poison, no matter how it was employed, and therefore could not be promoted.[53] The theory that tobacco could be a stimulus was totally cast aside by opponents. They held that tobacco was strictly a narcotic

---

45 Fiske, *Tobacco and Alcohol*, 28.

46 Ibid.

47 Ibid., 33.

48 Richardson, *For and Against Tobacco*, 14.

49 J.R. Pretty, "Benefits and Evils of Smoking," *The Lancet*, i (February 28, 1857): 230.

50 D. Hooper, "Moderate and Immoderate Smoking," *The Lancet*, i (March 7, 1857): 250.

51 Ibid.

52 One author noted that "the smoke inhaled has not the slightest pretence to be nutritious." "To Smoke or Not to Smoke," *All the Year Round* 13 (1865): 414.

53 James Ranald Martin, "Effects of Tobacco on Europeans in India," *The Lancet*, i (February 28, 1857): 226.

which had dubious effects on the moral and physical character of those who smoked.[54] Opponents sought to make it undeniable that tobacco smoke acted as a narcotic from which no advantage could be obtained. They proposed that tobacco destroyed the well being of those who used it and noted that "the poison, though not directly fatal, indirectly undermines the health, and reduces the constitution of its victims to half their natural entity."[55] Throughout the Tobacco Controversy opponents maintained that tobacco smoking was poisonous and therefore injurious to the health of its users.

In another point, advocates argued that tobacco smoking calmed and relaxed the overworked lower classes. They believed that smoking was more than just a luxury for the working classes, but rather a necessity because of its ability to calm and soothe and suggested that the habit could be defended on physiological grounds.[56] Proponents pleaded that tobacco was beneficial for the worker and stated that "there is no harm in a bit of weed."[57] Through smoking they believed the lower classes were afforded peace, quiet, and rest; something they earned and deserved as a consequence of their labor.[58] Proponents perceived tobacco as the lower classes' only means of escape. Since they could not afford the finer luxuries, proponents argued that the lower classes should be allowed the simple pleasure one receives from tobacco smoke. Physician P.J. Hynes expressed the belief that a pipe is a man's friend because it takes him away from "the thousand and one annoyances that daily cross his path."[59] Thus advocates believed that tobacco smoking was a necessary

---

54 J.G. Schneider, *The Lancet*, i (January 31, 1857): 127.

55 Samuel Solly, *The Lancet*, i (February 14, 1857): 175.

56 Physician J.C. Bucknill claimed that "the use of tobacco [. . .] by men exposed to labor, anxiety, and hardship, is a practice which may be defended on physiological grounds." J.C. Bucknill, "Smoking Not a Cause of Insanity," *The Lancet*, i (February 28, 1857): 227.

57 The author here argued in favor of tobacco use among the lower classes when he wrote, "a good, feeling man takes to it, as he does to his home, for the quiet, peace, and rest it affords him after his work; and fortifies him against the roguery, ingratitude, and losses he too frequently meets in his hard battle of life." One Who Smokes, *Know All Men*, 17-18.

58 Ibid.

59 In *The Lancet*, Hynes wrote: "the poor man, and above all the man who is far advanced in the vale of years, having no appliances and means wherewith to minister to his numerous wants and whishes will find in his friendly pipe that tranquility of mind with which the world besides is indifferent in supplying him; and when fretted and chafed, as

luxury. For the working man, the positive effects of smoking far outweighed the negative effects, which led proponents to contend that the working man should be a smoker. Proponents portrayed smoking as a comforting friend of worker and soldier:

> Do not waste breath against that which to the poor man lightens half the burden of labor; which, in cold and rain, is a great coat to his back and dry shoes to his feet; which, in close and wretched lodgings, supplies an easy chair and an aromatic atmosphere; which lightens the pack and shortens the march of the jaded soldier; the ever-present friend of the mariner through the lonely watches of the night; the luxury of the rich, but to the poor the solace of life.[60]

The Tobacco Controversy included a debate over tobacco's effect on the mind. Those who argued against tobacco smoking believed that it cluttered and slowed the mind. They believed that it hindered a person from thinking clearly and thoroughly.[61] Opponents argued that "no smoker can think steadily or continually work on any subject while smoking."[62] They perceived that smoking dulled the mind's ability to think and process information and thereby left a man idle.[63] Opponents argued that tobacco depressed a man's intellect and to them it seemed obvious that tobacco smoking was harmful to the mind. Upon referring to university students, John Lizars argued that smoking destroyed their ability to effectively prosecute their studies and concluded that it impeded their entrance as useful members of society.[64] Opponents maintained that smoking was debilitating, which left the mind incapable of sustained exertion and susceptible to loss of memory.[65] For tobacco opponents it was important to show that smoking was not only physically harmful, but mentally as well.

---

civilized man is doomed to be, by the thousand and one annoyances that daily cross his path, should be a smoker." P.J. Hynes, *The Lancet*, i (February 21, 1857): 201.

[60] Bucknill, "Smoking Not a Cause," 227.

[61] William M'Donald, "Smoking amongst Miners, Navies, and Women," *The Lancet*, i (February 28, 1857): 231.

[62] Ibid.

[63] Francis Close argued that smoking caused "a mode of cerebral idleness, which . . . ends in rendering the mind unfit for anything, in the irremediable torpor of the mental faculties." Close, *Tobacco: Its Influences*, 21.

[64] Lizars, "Practical Observations," 10.

[65] While commenting on the injurious effects of tobacco smoking physician W.H. Ranking wrote that "the mental faculties participate in the general debility; the mind is vacillating, and incapable of sustained exertion, and

Convinced that smoking was mentally deleterious, several physicians contended that to quit smoking encouraged intellectual growth. Francis Close, the Dean of Carlisle, pleaded with smokers when he wrote, "my friends, believe me that if you would break your tobacco pipes …you would rise in the world with a rapidity you little dream of."[66] The absence of smoking, opponents concluded, allowed men to think freely and properly. To support their argument they pointed to the respected intellectuals of the time. Samuel Solly noted that the greatest intellectuals over time were not smokers, and those who were died prematurely.[67] Ultimately, opponents believed that the mind of a non-smoker was much stronger and wiser than the mind of one who smoked.

On the opposite side of the debate, proponents argued that tobacco smoking facilitated the mind's ability to think and work. Many theorized that tobacco helped men think and should therefore be promoted as an intellectual support. Advocates suggested that smoking was popular among learned men. This begged the question that if smoking were so harmful, why did so many eminent men cultivate the habit?[68] In this way, each side pointed to intelligent and prominent individuals who did or did not smoke in order to support their argument. Physician P.J. Hynes stated that "in all parts of the world, [tobacco's] use . . . is conducive to health and tranquility of the mind."[69] It was also proposed that the very conception of tobacco smoking occurred in order to relieve men of severe daily mental labor.[70] Even medical students agreed that smoking benefited the mind and that it assisted them in their studies; they believed that it opened their mind, relaxed their stress, and

---

ultimately in some instances symptoms occur which indicate cerebral softening, such as loss of memory, tendency to causeless weeping, partial paralysis, &c." W.H. Ranking, *The Lancet*, i (February 28, 1857): 228.

66 Close, *Tobacco: Its Influences*, 7.

67 Samuel Solly, *The Lancet*, i (February 7, 1857): 154.

68 In an editorial written in *The Lancet* one author asked the question, "why, sir, if smoking, even but rarely, were so terrible in its effects, can we for one moment suppose that such numbers of eminent and learned men would cultivate the habit!" Sedentary Suicide, *The Lancet*, i (January 17, 1857): 78.

69 P.J. Hynes, *The Lancet*, i (February 21, 1857): 201.

70 Fiske, *Tobacco and Alcohol*, 58.

restored their energy.[71] Those in favor of tobacco smoking believed that it worked to free the mind and allowed one to think without constraint. J.H. Whitling, upon ending his essay in favor of the smoking habit, stated that "I am only as yet a very poor and imperfect smoker, and, as a natural consequence, a very poor and imperfect thinker."[72] Here, Whitling expressed the consensus among most smokers.

During the Tobacco Controversy, opponents developed the proposition that smoking could destroy the nation and they attempted to use fear to their advantage. They argued that if people continued to smoke, England would lose its position as a strong and influential nation. The consensus among opponents was that a nation could not benefit from a luxury such as smoking.[73] Some considered the introduction of tobacco as a curse to the nation.[74] Samuel Solly, in a comment often referred to by other physicians, concluded that "if the habit of smoking in England advances as it has done during the last ten or twelve years, the English character will lose that combination of energy and solidarity which has hitherto distinguished it, and that England will sink in the scale of nations."[75]

In order to support their belief that smoking might cause England to fall in strength and status, opponents pointed to other nations who smoked and blamed their degeneration on tobacco smoking. They feared that "these practices, which have proved an obstacle to the progress of ignorant and enslaved nations, produce also their effects in wise and more civilized countries."[76] Those arguing against the use of tobacco saw what they believed to be the negative effects of smoking on nations such as Turkey and Spain. They used the

---

[71] One medical student commented, "I and many others have found it a great comfort, and even assistance, in the prosecution of our studies, for after long hours of work, when feeling languid, sick, and unable to understand or retain much more matter in one's head, how a pipe freshens one up, and enables one to buckle to work for another two or three hours, without feeling tired." A St. Bartholomew's Man, "A Student's Birds-Eye View," *The Lancet*, i (March 14, 1857): 275.

[72] J.H. Whitling, "Praise of Smoking" *Bentley's Miscellany* 27(1850), 418.

[73] One author wrote, "in the main, smoking is a luxury which any nation, of natural habits, would be better without." "To Smoke or Not to Smoke," *All The Year Round*, 417.

[74] Maurice Evans, *The Lancet*, i (February 21, 1857): 202.

[75] Samuel Solly, *The Lancet*, i (February 7, 1857): 154.

[76] Lizars, "Practical Observations," 12.

misfortune of those countries to defend their argument, and claimed that the unhappiness of their continental neighbors was the consequence of their indulgence in tobacco smoking. This became something opponents wished the English to avoid.[77] Physician John Lizars argued that it was due to their vicious habit of smoking that the Turkish nation became so weak as to require assistance by the British during the Crimean War.[78] Further comments pointed toward Spain which was referred to as a vast tobacco shop. Opponent Henry Gibbons claimed that the Castilian has degenerated himself because of his use of tobacco.[79] Those opposing the use of tobacco in England believed that "fair countries like Spain, Portugal, and Turkey, have become a byword [of decline] among nations."[80] It was because of smoking, they argued, that these once powerful nations became a byword and they feared the same would happen to England. By arguing against the use of tobacco, they sought to avoid the same consequences that occurred to nations like Spain and Turkey, and hoped to turn the English nation away from the habit of smoking.

Many participants gave the Tobacco Controversy great importance and took it very seriously. Men involved in the debate often used emotive language to support their arguments or to deny claims of the opposition. Many resorted to sarcasm or illogical statements to make their points heard. For instance, author J.R. Pretty, slightly sarcastically, argued that "were moderate tobacco-smoking so poisonous and injurious as asserted, the public would have long since discovered this without the aid of our profession."[81] Author J.L. Milton drew an unreasonable conclusion when he compared the habit of smoking to sleeping in a bed or living under a roof and asked why the opponents do not object to such

---

[77] W.R. Pugh, *The Lancet*, i (February 21, 1857): 200.

[78] In Lizars own words he stated, "there can be no doubt, from what has occurred in the war just ended, that had the Turks never indulged in the vicious habit of smoking tobacco, they would not have required the assistance of the French, Sardinians, and British." Lizars, "Practical Observations," 8.

[79] Gibbons emphatically wrote, "see how the noble old Castilian has degenerated! How are his intellectual and moral energies abased!" Gibbons, *Tobacco and Its Effects*, 17.

[80] Budgett, *The Tobacco Question*, 9.

[81] Pretty, "Benefits and Evils of Smoking," 230.

unnecessary luxuries.[82] The same author argued against the claims of opponents by commenting, "if gentlemen will go on theory forging at this rate we shall never be able to keep up with the march of science, and the nuisance will have to be put down by an Act of Parliament."[83]

Also involved in the debate were statements which completely excluded the opinions of the opposite side. Years following the debate, John Fiske concluded in 1869 that the argument made against tobacco was simply a popular delusion.[84] Another contributor called it a fact that men could pass life much easier through genial influences of tobacco.[85] Although the contributor claimed this as a fact, it was only an assertion without any scientific basis.

Occasionally those involved in the debate let their feelings toward the argument get away from them. Proponents of tobacco vigorously defended the smokers' decision to use tobacco and stated that the smoker will not be compelled to give up the great enjoyment and support gained through tobacco smoking.[86] Advocates noted that a smoker would not quit the habit just because of "the terrors of would-be denunciators of death and destruction, nor by the humbug of caterers for scientific fame among only a class of stiff-necked, mealy-mouthed, and self-exalted men, who charitably infer that no one does right but their precious selves."[87] Statements like this contributed an ad hominem attack on the opposition and showed how strongly some of the men involved in the debate felt. However, these attacks did not contribute positively to the debate. Instead they acted to generate similar attacks by those on the other side of the Tobacco Controversy.

---

82 Milton, *Death in the Pipe*, 17.

83 Ibid., 33.

84 Fiske, *Tobacco and Alcohol*, 81.

85 Here the author stated, "it is a well ascertained fact, that on or off duty the men will bear quietly harder privations under genial influences of tobacco than they would without it." One Who Smokes, *Know All Men*, 20.

86 Ibid., 27-28; The author argued strongly that smoking was a great benefit to lower class workers. He believed that the poor man should be allowed and even encouraged to smoke because it was "his stay, solace, and support through half a life."

87 Ibid.

Those opposed to smoking were also guilty of character assumptions. This type of attack demonstrated their fervor against smoking, but also showed a lack of patience and maturity. Name calling was one method of attack employed by opponents who wrote, "of all habits to which men are addicted, none so conduces to slovenliness, and to a disregard of the comfort of others, as the use of tobacco."[88] In another example of name-calling, adversaries of tobacco smoking noted, "there is . . . no more pitiable object than the inveterate smoker . . . tremulous, emaciated, emasculate, his face the color of a faded Palmer's candle, his breath fetid, his mind enfeebled and irresolute, such a being is useless to others, and except when under the influence of his pipe, a burden to himself."[89] One opponent even referred to smokers as cowards, and wrote, "they were too scared to admit that it made them ill."[90] This statement, as well as others, made it obvious that the debate was sometimes personal thereby influencing proponents and opponents alike to rely on ad hominem attacks and sarcasm to support their argument.

Just as advocates of tobacco smoking made emotional appeals and sarcastic comments, so too, did those arguing against the habit of tobacco smoking. Often, opponents struggled to find words strong enough to denounce the habit. Some opponents sought solely to condemn smoking with or without considering facts and observations. They believed that there did not exist terms strong enough in which to rebuke the smoking habit.[91] Furthermore, opponents believed that the injury incurred through tobacco smoking reached immeasurable extents upon the character of its users.[92] They concluded that no decent, moral, and intelligent individual should ever engage in the habit of smoking.[93]

---

[88] Gibbons, *Tobacco and Its Effects*, 30.

[89] Bucknill, *Smoking Not a Cause*, 228.

[90] Hilton and Nightingale, "A Microbe," 55.

[91] Francis Close noted, "it is impossible to speak in too strong terms of condemnation, whether in regard to its effects upon the moral or physical man." Close, *Tobacco: Its Influences*, 14.

[92] As stated by John Lizars, one cannot "ascertain the extent of the injury which the poisonous weed inflicts upon the public health, or the alteration it must necessarily effect upon the character of its inhabitants." Lizars, *Practical Observations*, 4.

[93] Kiernan, *Tobacco: A History*, 220.

Physician Samuel Solly reflected the strong beliefs of opponents when he stated, "were I to relate but a small portion of the results of my personal observation as to the effect of the abuse of tobacco, I might be suspected of exaggeration."[94] In a fit of sarcasm, opponent John Budgett claimed that "if anywhere tobacco smoking is to be tolerated, one would suppose it to be in the wilds of Australia, where man could not annoy his neighbor with his smoke, and where the vaunted companionship of the pipe would be most fully and dearly appreciated."[95] Although Budgett made his opinions clear, his statement had no merit.

The argument of the tobacco opponents was not complete without reference to religion and morality. In addition to other charges against smoking, opponents also believed that it was contrary to Christian doctrine and teaching and was therefore immoral.[96] Critics contended that smoking opposed Christian living and they called upon people to avoid the evil wrought by smoking.[97] Opponents were surprised that Christian men relied on smoking rather than on God; they considered it ungodly when a man presumed he needed tobacco to ease his difficulties when he has the good Word of God all along.[98] Opponents argued that a man knows better than to smoke; they believed his challenges could be met and his grief overcome through much more enriching and Godly fronts than that of smoking.[99] Those who argued against smoking for religious reasons also recognized that many clergymen smoked and they sought to persuade them from it. They believed that a clergyman who smoked set a bad example and claimed that smoking reduced a minister's value and limited

---

94 Samuel Solly, *The Lancet*, i (February 14, 1857): 176.

95 Budgett, *The Tobacco Question*, 17.

96 Samuel Solly referred to smoking as "a moral evil." Samuel Solly, *The Lancet*, i (February 14, 1857): 176.

97 J.Q.A. Henry asked people to "keep clear of the devil's death-traps," and claimed that "cigarette smoking is evil and evil only." J.Q.A. Henry, *The Deadly Cigarette; or, The Perils of Juvenile Smoking* (London: Richard J. James, 1907), 54.

98 Francis Close wrote that it was "an insult to him who has the good word of God . . . to suppose that he, like the men of the world, needs tobacco to help him support his cares and console his fretted spirit." Close, *Tobacco: Its Influences*, 29.

99 Physician Samuel Solly asked, "would not be far more manly, far nobler, far more in accordance with the precepts of Christianity, if, instead of smoking away our grief's and stifling in the pipe our angry passions, we met our difficulties with a manly front, and conquered our evil tempers by the force of our better nature?" Samuel Solly, *The Lancet*, i (February 14, 1857): 176.

his ability to preach.[100] The practice of smoking was considered incompatible with Christian faith because it harmed the body and drew men away from God. Tobacco opponents believed, as asserted by John Gibbons, that "the laws of health are the laws of God. No man can violate them without committing wrong."[101]

During the controversy, some arguments were based on religion or morality that supported the use of tobacco. Those who strongly questioned the religious argument against tobacco smoking deemed it a sin to deny themselves the blessing of tobacco.[102] They considered it as a gift from God to be utilized against their daily toil.[103] Advocates also believed that by smoking men could actually reflect their faith in God. Proponents proposed that men could show their self control through smoking in moderation and commanded for smokers to shine before men by setting an example through the use of tobacco in moderation.[104] In order to support the morality of smoking, one proponent claimed that it was almost unavoidable because of human nature. He noted that even the greatest of men exhibit weakness of the flesh.[105] Thus some proponents conceived smoking as both a reflection of Christian faith and as an opportunity to moderate an indulgence that could not and should not be avoided.

---

100 John Higginbottom, after fifty years of experience with smoking, decided, "tobacco in every form has no redeeming property whatever; and at present time it is a main cause in ruining our young men, pauperizing the working men, and also rendering comparatively useless the best endeavors of minister of religion." John Higginbottom, "Fifty Years' Experience," *The Lancet*, i (February 28, 1857): 228.

101 Gibbons, *Tobacco and Its Effects*, 18.

102 While commenting in *The Lancet*, W. Sumpter asked, "shall we, arrogating to ourselves a greater power of reason than the author of creation, deny ourselves one of the greatest blessings, which in the present age of overexcitement of the nervous system, is peculiarly indicated as a counteracting sedative?" W. Sumpter, "Smoking a Blessing!" *The Lancet*, i (February 28, 1857): 232.

103 Sumpter also asked, "because we abuse almost every blessing which is given to us, are we to designate them as curses?" Ibid.

104 Here the author commanded, "let your moderation be known unto all men – that your good works may so shine, that others, seeing the light, may follow in your path, and there will be cause for thanksgiving." One Who Smokes, *Know All Men*, 56.

105 Gibbons pleaded that "nature declares that when man is great in any sphere of action below the highest and purest, he shall still exhibit, in some direction, the weakness of humanity and the mastery of the flesh." Gibbons, *Tobacco and Its Effects*, 24.

While much was argued by both sides during the Tobacco Controversy, there was little compromise and in the end there were few results. The initial explosion of ideas and opinions laid out in *The Lancet* during 1857 turned out to be the bulk of the tobacco debate. Thereafter, smoking was debated with far less intensity than during 1857. The pleas of tobacco opponents did not realize any legislative results until much later, in 1908, when Parliament passed the Children's Charter Act prohibiting the sale of tobacco to youths under the age of sixteen.

At the time of the controversy, it was recognized that the habit of smoking was most detrimental to youth, and it was agreed upon by physicians that smoking should be prohibited among young people. As early as 1856, Thomas Reynolds, who founded the Anti-Tobacco Society in 1853, wrote *Juvenile Street Smoking: Reasons for Seeking Its Legislative Prohibition*, which showed that even before the Tobacco Controversy, juvenile smoking was a recognized problem.[106] In a statement written by Francis Close in 1859, he urged that the habit of smoking decrease and implored that "we earnestly desire to see the habit of smoking diminish, and we entreat the youth of this country to abandon it altogether."[107] Many agreed that the youth must be directed away from tobacco smoking so that they would never become fond of the habit.[108] Those who argued that tobacco was beneficial nevertheless contended that young men should abstain from smoking. Physician J. Pidduck while writing in *The Lancet* stated, "for old men, smoking may be tolerated; but for young men and boys, it cannot be too severely reprobated."[109] Nearly everyone who made claims for or against tobacco agreed that it should in no way be advocated for young children.[110] This demonstrated that even those who argued in favor of tobacco could see its negative affects

---

106 Thomas Reynolds, *Juvenile Street Smoking: Reasons for Seeking its Legislative Prohibition* (London: British Anti-Tobacco Society, 1856).

107 Close, *Tobacco: Its Influences*, 19.

108 Opponent John Gibbons proclaimed, "we must imbue the entire rising generation with hostility against tobacco. We must educate them to it from infancy." Gibbons, *Tobacco and Its Effects*, 48.

109 J. Pidduck, *The Lancet*, i (February 14, 1857): 178.

110 Benjamin Ward Richardson stated that "it should never be indulged in until the body is fully developed." Richardson, *For and Against Tobacco*, 46.

among youths. Both sides of the Tobacco Controversy believed that "it is truly melancholy to witness the great number of the young who smoke now-a-days; and it is painful to contemplate how many promising youths must be stunted in their growth, and enfeebled in their minds, before they arrive at manhood."[111]

Despite arguments against juvenile smoking throughout the Tobacco Controversy, nothing was done until the passing of the Children's Charter Act of 1908. This led some to question why Parliament allowed the sale of a poison for such an extensive period of time, despite the government's claim to regulate the sale of poisons.[112] Although physicians at the time of the debate knew the injurious effects of tobacco on youth and argued for legislative action against juvenile smoking, it took fifty-one years for their arguments to achieve any legislative results. This is due largely to the fact that the Tobacco Controversy and its apparent result, the Children's Act of 1908, represented related but different debates.

Although the Children's Act and the Tobacco Controversy were separated by many years, the origins of the Act stemmed from contemporary conditions. Commenting on the Children's Act and the reasons behind it, historian Matthew Hilton wrote, "although the justifications for such an Act mirrored the arguments of the anti-tobacco movement, it was a series of other fears surrounding urban youth culture which explain the origins of the legislation."[113] The outcome given in 1908 would have been acceptable to the tobacco opponents of the 1857 debate, however, it was achieved through a separate discourse.[114] Therefore, the arguments put forth during the 1857 debate became a part of the 1908 juvenile smoking debate, but those arguments were not the cause of the action taken by Parliament.

---

111 Lizars, *Practical Observations*, 19.

112 John Budgett wrote, "tens of thousands are licensed to sell a dose of poison for a penny, yet, in face of this fact, we are told in the public reports of our present Parliament, that government intends forthwith to regulate the sale of poisons, and yet not a word has been breathed – not a whiff has been smelt of tobacco." Budgett, *The Tobacco Question*, 3.

113 Hilton, *Smoking in British Popular Culture*, 163.

114 As stated by Matthew Hilton, "the final form of the idea embodies many of the attributes of the initial form, the inspiration for that final form may have come from wholly independent discourses." Hilton and Nightingale, "Ashes to Ashes," 42.

There are several indications which show that the 1857 controversy, although strongly linked to the 1908 legislation, was a separate debate. Firstly, at the time of the Tobacco Controversy, smoking among youths was not nearly as popular as it later became by the twentieth century. After 1857 the controversy died down until it was given new life by cheap, machine made cigarettes introduced in the 1880s.[115] This time, however, "new groups directed not against all smoking but solely against juvenile smoking emerged."[116] This occurred because smoking among youths had become remarkably more prevalent due to the ability of manufacturers to produce cigarettes rapidly and at a relatively low cost.[117] The most notable appliance for the manufacture of cigarettes was the Bonsack cigarette-making machine adopted by the Bristol tobacco firm W.D. and H.O. Wills, which enabled them to produce approximately two hundred cigarettes per minute.[118] Cigarettes could now be sold "at a rate so low that they can be purchased by almost every child."[119] This meant that by 1880 cigarettes had become "cheap, mild, and easy to buy in penny lots at sweetshops."[120] Quantitative evidence supported the growing popularity of cigarette smoking in the late nineteenth century: "the consumption of cigarettes in this country, prior to 1881, was insignificant . . . but in 1897 the production reached 4,153,252,470."[121]

Secondly, in addition to the huge surge in popularity of cigarettes among youth, there were other reasons for the legislative action taken against it, including "fears of national degeneration and . . . defeat of the struggle for survival of the fittest."[122] For example, in 1900 the chief inspector of recruiting at Manchester turned away one-third of volunteers

---

115 Hilton, *Smoking in British Popular Culture*, 162.

116 R.B. Walker, "Medical Aspects of Tobacco Smoking and the Anti-Tobacco Movement in Britain in the Nineteenth Century," *Medical History* 24 (October 1980): 401.

117 Wilson, *The Victorians*, 198.

118 Ibid.

119 Henry, *The Deadly Cigarette*, 29.

120 Walker, "Medical Aspects of Tobacco Smoking," 400.

121 Furthermore, the consumption of tobacco rose from 2.4 percent in 1862 to 4.7 percent in 1863 and an average of around 5 percent per annum for the rest of the century. Henry, *The Deadly Cigarette*, 28; Wilson, *The Victorians*, 198.

122 Walker, "Medical Aspects of Tobacco Smoking," 401.

because they suffered from smoker's heart.[123] This meant that a large portion of young men in Britain were unfit to join the military because of the harmful effects of smoking. The fact that so many able bodied men were made unfit as a consequence of smoking led many to consider that something needed to be done. This, in addition to the vast increase in the consumption of cigarettes caused by the new manufacturing machines, sparked further debate about smoking and reignited the smoking debate. This commotion finally led to legislative results. However, the 1908 legislative success stemmed from an altered public concern "regarding racial and national decline in which anti-tobacconists placed their views on juvenile smoking."[124]

By 1908, Parliament concluded that "the evidence submitted on the point represents a practically unanimous opinion that the habit of cigarette smoking amongst boys is a growing one, and that its consequences are extremely deleterious."[125] The conclusion drawn by Parliament here was that smoking was injurious, proving that the earlier Tobacco Controversy did carry influence. They knew that tobacco smoking was exceedingly harmful when practiced before maturity was reached and through this they concluded that it must be restricted among youth.[126]

Although Parliament could agree in 1908 that juvenile smoking was injurious, the tobacco question raised another issue that was not included in the debates in 1857. During debate, members questioned whether or not the State acted appropriately by interfering in the home life of the youth.[127] Some believed that "the House would be taking an extremely strong step" if it passed the Children's Charter Act.[128] Thus, in 1908 Parliament became worried not only about juvenile smoking but also about the role of government. Parliament

---

123 Ibid.

124 Hilton and Nightingale, "Ashes to Ashes," 59.

125 Parliamentary Debates, vol. 194 (October 13, 1908), 178.

126 In *The Lancet* it was noted that "tobacco smoking before maturity was reached had a most prejudicial effect upon physical development" and that "this evil could not be too strongly denounced." "Parliamentary Intelligence: Notes on Current Topics: Juvenile Smoking," *The Lancet*, i (March 28, 1908): 977.

127 Parliamentary Debates, vol. 194 (October 13, 1908), 173.

128 Ibid.

was concerned that if they had passed a law against juvenile smoking it would be "the most drastic attempt at interfering with popular habits that had ever been proposed in any legislature under the sun."[129] Since the Act passed, this indicated that Parliament was more concerned about juvenile smoking than they were about the role of government. However, the differences in the 1908 smoking debate demonstrate that it was far beyond the discussion presented in *The Lancet* fifty one years earlier.

In 1857, the implications of smoking needed to be publicly discussed. This need exploded on to the pages of *The Lancet* in the form of a debate. For months arguments were made by both those in favor of and against tobacco use. Through the use of medical, physical, intellectual, and moral arguments each side overtly pushed its case. Although no agreements as to public policy were reached and no conclusions were drawn, the controversy became a starting point for further discussion about the effects of tobacco smoking. People began to notice that smoking may have negative effects which encouraged them to attempt to determine if tobacco smoking was injurious. People considered the great tobacco question for many years following the 1857 controversy; but, it was not until 1908 the question had been answered and action was finally taken. As a result of the much earlier Tobacco Controversy, legislators in 1908 knew that tobacco smoking was harmful, freeing them to examine other issues surrounding the habit. Had this debate not occurred, action may not have been taken against smoking as early as 1908; smoking might be thought of differently than it is today.

---

129 Ibid., 177.

DEVIL-WORSHIP, REGICIDE, AND COMMERCE: THE PROFESSIONAL NECROMANCER IN LATE MEDIEVAL ENGLAND

By

Esther Liberman-Cuenca
Fordham University, New York

At the beginning of the fourteenth century, Walter Langton (d. 1321), Bishop of Coventry and Lichfield, was tried for devil-worship, one of many accusations lodged against him in an attempt to ruin his political career. Although found innocent by Pope Boniface VIII (d. 1303) and the archbishop of Canterbury, Langton remained vulnerable to attacks on his character, and continued to fight for several years against those who resented his extensive landholdings and royal influence after his trial.[1] Boniface VIII, who had cleared Langton of the charges, had also come under attack for similar charges by Phillip IV of France who, only a few years later, instigated charges of diabolism, or devil-worship, against the Knights Templar. The accusation of devil-worship, especially in regards to men belonging to the nobility or possessing high ecclesiastical offices, was an effective method in curbing their authority and influence. With the exception of the trial of Alice Kyteler in Ireland (1324), presided over by an English inquisitor trained on the Continent, the few criminal acts of diabolism for which we have evidence were primarily male-oriented transgressions and mostly motivated by financial concerns. Furthermore, it seems that at this time the hiring of professional necromancers—or men reputed to have skills for

Many thanks to Dr. Marie Kelleher, Dr. Elaine Wida, Dr. Moshe Sluhovsky, Dr. Miguel Aparicio, Samantha Sagui, the participants of the 2007 Medievalism Transformed conference at the University of Wales, Bangor, and my anonymous reviewers at California State University, Fresno for their invaluable comments and suggestions for this article.

[1] The trial of Walter Langton is discussed in depth by Alice Bearwood in her monograph, *The Trial of Walter Langton, Bishop of Lichfield, 1307-1312*, found in *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society* 53 (1964): 1-45.

performing sorcery, usually in the form of diabolical magic—was an activity that was perceived to be potentially useful and personally beneficial. As we shall see below, both the client and the necromancer stood to benefit from their relationship.

Sorcery accusations lodged against members of the English aristocracy, prominent ecclesiastics, and clergymen during this period perhaps resulted from broader changes to the fabric of religious, political, and social life in Europe: the papal schism early in the fourteenth century divided Europe's loyalties, and the papacy would never again wield the influence it once had. In addition, a series of plagues wiped out approximately one-third of Europe's population and, with the lack of able workers to till the land, the binary foundations of most medieval communities—peasants and their lords—began to give way toward more diverse social and economic relationships.[2] With the onset of uncertain times and the upheaval of traditional social structures, rising concerns about diabolical heresy and illicit magical practices coincided with new religious movements condemned by Christian orthodoxy. Moreover, the ruling and religious elite were not entirely immune to damaging accusations of necromancy and sorcery.

Yet one cannot attribute the seeming rise of sorcery accusations solely to broader social changes in this period, as these social, political, and economic developments do not adequately account for the variations in detail and motivation among different sorcery cases. Instead, one must also look at the world of medieval politics—and the noblemen, aristocratic women, bishops, and kings who inhabited this world—as an exclusive community operating on a similar set of fears, ambitions, and motivations as their less fortunate counterparts. The threat of sorcery was very real to late medieval aristocrats and ecclesiastics, and the purposes of accusing another prominent figure of sorcery did not differ drastically from those of commoners litigating against their neighbors for crimes of the same

---

[2] Samuel K. Cohn, *Lust for Liberty: The Politics of Social Revolt in Medieval Europe, 1200-1425* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2006), is a good survey of the effects of economic upheavals and the Black Plague on the population of late medieval Europe.

nature: the accuser not only was able to ruin his opponents by imputing to them occult crimes that could possibly bar them from the political scene, but also could plausibly make such accusations in a culture that supported and spread beliefs about sorcery and cults of devil-worship.

Criminal charges of sorcery directed at clergy and the ruling nobility also appear to have been colored by the necromantic and heretical practices tried at that time in both royal and ecclesiastical courts. As we shall see in the following pages, professional necromancers, or sorcerers who were either paid by, or in the service of, wealthy and influential people, were almost always men. Indeed, wealthy clients, such as noblemen or women, possessed the financial resources and connections necessary to purchase the services of professional necromancers to achieve their malicious ends. Richard Kieckhefer, in his various works on medieval magic and necromancy in the Middle Ages, has discussed evidence such as necromancers' handbooks and inquisitional records for what he perceived to be an all-male clerical underworld, which was inhabited by necromancers with at least some type of religious training.[3] It is perhaps no wonder that these professional necromancers—who were almost always drawn from the educated and privileged sectors of society—were sought out by those able to buy their services for personal and political issues needing satisfactory resolutions.

The Business of Magic and Devil-Worship

While the ruling elite's practice of hiring professional necromancers is the best documented, they were not the only ones to engage in this practice; poor commoners and women, too, seem to have widely participated in it. For example, a fifteenth-century case

---

[3] Richard Kieckhefer, "The Holy and the Unholy: Sainthood, Witchcraft, and Magic in Late Medieval Europe." *Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 23 (1994): 355-85. Arguably, Richard Kieckhefer is one of the foremost authorities on the practice of magic in the medieval world. His books *Magic in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989) and especially *Forbidden Rites: A Necromancer's Manual of the Fifteenth Century* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1997) discuss in even more detail the taxonomy of magic and the social and intellectual background of necromancy, as well as its prosecution in the courts.

brought before the Chancery dealt with an adulteress named Tanglost, who was accused of hiring two experienced sorceresses to avenge herself on her lover Thomas, who had spurned her after he made an oath that he would refrain from committing adultery.[4] Tanglost was also said to have killed Thomas's wife with "wychecraft," although this was not the primary charge against her; it was also alleged that Tanglost and two other women fashioned three wax effigies to destroy Thomas. They were thwarted in their efforts when Thomas came to learn about their malicious plans, and Tanglost was forced to flee. Similarly, in a 1446 case brought before a church court in Durham, two women, Mariot de Belton and Isabella Brome, were accused of performing love magic on behalf of single women in want of a husband. They both denied the accusation and were ordered to clear themselves of the charges by compurgation, or by calling upon witnesses able to testify to their good characters.[5]

Of course, it is entirely plausible that women could have hired the services of the local sorceress as well as men, but both the Tanglost and Belton-Brome accounts fail to mention whether any money changed hands. This is not to say that sorceresses-for-hire worked for free or did not engage in some trading of goods, but that women may not have been hired in the same way that their male counterparts were for similar services. In accounts where male sorcerers are involved, there is usually a clear indication as to how they were hired, or how their clients had the means to afford such services. In some of the cases that will be discussed below, the accused necromancers either were motivated by the promise of financial reward or worked under the auspices of generous benefactors or

---

[4] C. Trice Martin, "Clerical Life in the Fifteenth Century, as Illustrated by Proceedings of the Court of Chancery," *Archaeologia, or, Miscellaneous Tracts Relating to Antiquity* (1907): 374-5. The ecclesiastical court records in Latin may refer to a woman accused of witchcraft as a *sortilega*, or a sorceress, and sometimes as an *incantatrix*, or an enchantress. However, the secular accounts recorded in English use the terms *witch* and *witchcraft*, often with different spellings, as is the case here with Tanglost.

[5] James Raine, ed., *Depositions and Other Ecclesiastical Proceedings from the Courts of Durham, Extending from 1311 to the Reign of Elizabeth* (London: J.B. Nichols and Son, 1845), 29: "Mariot de Belton, Isabella Brome. Quod est sortilega, et quod utitur illa arte, et dicit mulieribus solutis, nubere volentibus, quod faciat eas habere quos affectant et desiderant habere. Negat, et habet ad purgandum se cum xij manu. Similiter imponitur Isabellæ. Negat, et habet ad purgandum cum iiij manu."

benefactresses.[6] For example, the case of Richard Laukiston, which came to the attention of the London Commissary in 1492 on the strength of public rumor, illustrates how a professional sorcerer could have come into contact with a potential client.[7] Laukiston is accused of having offered to find Margaret Geffrey, a widow whom he attempted to defraud, a rich husband by having a sorcerer perform love magic to entice into marriage a man of her choosing. Laukiston had probably approached Margaret about his offer because he was under the impression that she might have been receptive to his idea, so much so that she would have given up her valuables to pay for such a service. He was proven right, as she did indeed give up two expensive mazers worth 5 marks and 10 shillings.[8] Margaret was by no means wealthy herself, but she had some financial assets that made the matter of Laukiston's offer plausible in the eyes of the court. Laukiston's offer to make the arrangements with the sorcerer to secure Margaret an advantageous match sheds some light on how professional sorcerers came to be known and recommended: most seem to have been successful at networking. Laukiston's wife knew the sorcerer, who in turn told Laukiston of his cunning skill, who was then recommended to Margaret, and so on and so forth.

---

[6] The outsourcing of this type of activity to experienced sorcerers indicates how the economic changes in the fourteenth century that saw the rise in the use of cash capital enabled some to cultivate this "profession" on the side. The epidemic of 1348-9 signaled an upward trend in workers able to take on short-term work for higher wages, and combined with employers tempting their workers to stay by offering extra gratuities in cash, produced a class of consumers with perhaps more disposable income than was the case in the pre-plague years. See Christopher Dyer, *Everyday Life in Medieval England* (London: Hambledon, 1994), 185-6. However, this is a gross oversimplification of the financial situation of the medieval worker in England. Particularly helpful is chapter nine, in which Dyer explains at length the complex financial situation faced by the average worker in medieval England.

[7] William Hale, ed., *A Series of Precedents and Proceedings in Criminal Causes: Extending from the Year 1475 to 1640* (London: F. & J. Rivington, 1847), 32-3, has the entire trial transcribed in original Latin and in the vernacular English of the defendants.

[8] Ibid.; "…Ricardus protulit ista verba vel eis consimilia, predicte Margarete in Anglicis, Thow arte a poor widow, and it wer almes to helpe the to a mariage, and if thow wilt do any cost in spendyng any money, thow shalt have a man worth a thousand pounds. Tunc respondebat predicta Margareta vidua, How may that be? Tunc dixit Laukiston, My wif knoweth a connyng man, that by his connyng can cause a woman to have any man that she hath favour to, and that shalbe upon warranties; for she hath put it in execucion afore tyme, and this shall cost money. Tunc dixit predicta Margareta, I have no good save ii masers for to fynde me, my moder, and my children, and if thei wer sold and I faile of my purpose, I, my moder, and my children wer undoen. Tunc dixit dictus Ricardus Laukiston, Delyver me the masers, and I wille warrant thyn entente shalbe fulfilled. Tunc predicta Margareta deliberavit sibi ii murras ad valorem v marcarum et xs. in pecuneis."

The centrality of networks and word-of-mouth in the linking of necromancer and client can also be seen in a 1331 Southwark case adjudicated at King's Bench. Three men—Andrew of Oxford, John son of Robert of Gloucester, and Robert de la Marche—appeared at court for conspiring to kill a man named Robert of Ely and his mother Margery by having Marche perform a specialized type of sorcery. Andrew had heard about Marche's talent for alchemy and magic and recommended him to John, who had apparently implored and paid Marche a good amount of money to perform some complicated magical procedures that included the use of spells and image magic.[9] The apparent availability of many of these professional necromancers, who were offering their services to those able to afford them (and especially in relatively densely-populated areas such as London), indicates that there was likely a high demand for their services. Indeed, in 1426, a knight and a yeoman, along with a number of their associates, were accused in London for contracting the services of *multiple* expert necromancers, one of whom was a chaplain, to "weaken and annihilate, subtly consume and altogether destroy" a certain William Botreaux by engaging in "soothsaying, necromancy and art magic."[10] The demand for professional necromancers for homicidal magic, especially in relation to premeditated plans for murder, was likely a "specialty" for which potential clients especially valued the necromancer's occult skills.

However, not all necromancers were hired in the sense that they were promised remuneration for their services. In cases dealing with necromancers and the nobility, the relationship between the two is best characterized as a form of patronage. Indeed, the patron-necromancer relationship is colorfully illustrated in the 1330 confession of Edmund, the Earl of Kent (1301-1330), which he gave to the Coroner of the King's House.[11] In the

---

[9] G.O. Sayles, ed., *Select Cases in the Court of King's Bench under Edward III*, vol. V (London: Selden Society, 1958), 53-7.

[10] *Calendar of the Patent Rolls, Preserved in the Public Record Office, Henry VI A.D. 1422-1429* (Nendeln/Liechtenstein: Kraus Reprint, 1971), 363.

[11] The transcript of the Earl of Kent's confession can be found in the *Journal of the British Archaeological Association* VII (1851): 140-3.

confession, he described how he contracted the services of a certain friar to summon a devil in order to ascertain whether his brother, King Edward II (r. 1307-1327), was still living. Edmund was executed on political grounds for conspiring to put the deceased Edward II, who he was led to believe was still alive, back on the throne. Edmund's removal from the political scene ensured that the interests of the dowager Queen Isabella and her associates were protected, as they had wanted the weak Edward II removed from power. But why was it necessary to accuse the Earl of Kent of diabolical improprieties in particular? The account of his confession indicated that there were some incriminating letters of dubious origins that nonetheless, in the hands of Queen Isabella, were able to secure Edmund's conviction for high treason.[12] One can deduce from the document that Edmund's demands to the reprobate friar, who had "raysed up a devell" for him and engaged in blatant apostasy, were meant to convey to the English people and Parliament that the popular Earl of Kent was not only a traitor but a heretical one at that.[13] The idea that noblemen or high churchmen, such as Walter Langton, the aforementioned Bishop of Coventry and Lichfield, and Edmund, the Earl of Kent, consorted with the devil or demons, might have been easily believed in a society where the belief in sorcery was prevalent. These men were in positions of authority and were seen as able to secure the services of demons or those who knew how to summon them.

The frequency with which magic and diabolism were conflated made it problematic, even for educated churchmen, to discern the distinctions between the two. If a pact was made with the devil, the human supplicant was allegedly given supernatural powers in exchange for his or her loyalty and soul. Hence, sorcery and devil-worship were one and the same to theologians and inquisitors who wrote about magic and witchcraft during the late

[12] Ibid., 142.
[13] Ibid., 140.

medieval period.[14] According to their perspective, a pact with the devil or a demon served a purpose similar to the hiring of a professional necromancer: the devil or demon was in fact "commissioned" by the sorcerer to either do his bidding or imbue him with the powers necessary to bring about the desired results. The relationship between the demonic force and the sorcerer is thrown into sharp relief in a curious 1337 case from a manorial court in Hatfield. One man was tried for failing to deliver the devil to another man in a commercial transaction, perhaps indicating how ideas about devil-worship and sorcery were incorporated into the broader commercial culture of late medieval England:

> Robert de Roderham appeared against John de Ithen, because he had not kept the agreement made between them, and therefore complains that on a certain day and year, at Thorne, there was an agreement between the aforementioned Robert and John whereby the said John sold to the said Robert the devil, bound in a certain bond, for three pence halfpenny…[Yet] the said John refused to deliver the said devil…to the great detriment of the said Robert…and because it appeared to the court that such a suit ought not to exist among Christians, the aforementioned parties are therefore adjourned, as far as hell for the hearing of their judgments…[15]

Although it is most likely that this "case" was in fact an attempt at injecting some levity into a hypothetical case for students studying contract law, the details are nevertheless suggestive of a male-centric view of how the power relationship between the demon and the male sorcerer favored the latter, with the demon having severely limited powers in relation to its human master. The power of the devil and the devil's supernatural hold over his human subjects is amusingly diminished here, as it seems that the devil was merely an object

---

[14] Michael D. Bailey, "The Feminization of Magic and the Emerging Idea of the Female Witch in the Late Middle Ages," *Essays in Medieval Studies* 19 (2002): 120-134, has a good summary of this argument.

[15] Thomas Blount, "Conventio," *Nomo-Lexicon: A Law Dictionary* (Los Angeles: Sherwin & Freutel, 1970): "Robertus de Roderham obtulit se versus Johannem de Ithen de eo quod non teneat Conventionem inter eos factam, & unde queritur, quod certo die & anno apud Thorne convenit inter prædictum Robertum & Johannem, quod prædictus Johannes vendidit prædicto Roberto Diabolum ligatum in quodam ligamine pro iii^{d}. ob…idem Johannes prædictum Diabolum deliberare noluit…ad grave dampnum ipsum Roberti…Et quia videtur Curiæ quod tale placitum non jacet inter Christianos, Ideo partes prædicti adjournantur usque in infernum, ad audiendum judicium suum…" Cf. C. L'Estrange Ewen, *Witchcraft and Demonism* (London: Heath Cranton, 1933), 33-4. Ewen does not seem to question whether this trial indeed took place, despite its ridiculousness. He barely analyzes it, which suggests that he was merely interested in the account as an anomalous oddity that had to be included for the sake of making his exhaustive work seem more complete.

that could be bartered, traded, or bought under ordinary and mundane circumstances, and acquired in such a way because it was believed to be a relatively inexpensive and useful object for someone to have. The two men in this account are clearly in a position of authority over the diabolical force, since they have the power to dispose of the devil in any which way they choose. This, we might note, contrasts starkly with some of the accounts from the Continent that describe women being decidedly subordinate to their demonic familiars. Indeed, in Ireland, the near-contemporary account of the trial of Alice Kyteler, tried according to Continental ideas about witches, describes how she and a coven of female devotees paid homage and made sacrifices to the devil.[16] Alice herself was accused of sexually submitting to her demonic familiar, who took on various shapes and disguises.

However, even if we regard the Hatfield case as a sort of quodlibetal exercise, or perhaps a theological joke, written for the sake of law students in need of a little amusement, it still reveals how the author of the account viewed the role of the devil in human affairs. By describing the overly ridiculous situation of the devil as being some sort of desired commodity that could be bought and sold at will, the author throws into sharp relief how diabolical nuisances often tempted the weak and the corruptible. More importantly, the exaggerated absurdity of the idea that the devil could trade hands so easily is meant to highlight what so many thought was the frightening nature of devil-worship: the devil's services could indeed be bought, but not for a pittance. It would cost one's immortal soul, ensuring eternal damnation.

Sorcery cases involving diabolical necromancy, once brought to secular and ecclesiastical justices, could not have escaped the notice of prominent royal figures or churchmen who wished to prosecute necromancers more fervently. One such case from Southwark in 1371 describes a certain man named John Crok, who was tried by a royal court

---

[16] L.S. Davidson and J.O. Ward, eds., *The Sorcery Trial of Alice Kyteler: A Contemporary Account Together with Related Documents in English Translation* (Binghamton: Center for Medieval and Early Renaissance Studies, State University of New York at Binghamton, 1993).

for invocation and using a Saracen's skull, which he had bought in Toledo, and a necromancer's manual found in his bag in order to trap a demonic spirit "so that the said spirit would answer questions."[17] Crok was dismissed after having sworn an oath that he would refrain in the future from engaging in such practices, and the bag holding all the items was destroyed by the bailiff; yet this case apparently came to the attention of the king, who directed the archbishop of Canterbury's bailiff to immediately take action against Crok and to deal with the matter of the Saracen's skull, having found the situation sufficiently disturbing.[18] While the primary charge against Crok was for the invocation of a demonic force, the justices seemed to have been more preoccupied by the forbidden items purchased abroad, without which Crok's attempts at magic would have failed. Clearly, the success of this type of diabolical magic hinged on the sorcerer's wherewithal to purchase the devices necessary to harness the demon's powers.

The few legal and narrative references to diabolism that survive in England at this time indicate that the notion of devil-worship was widespread across all levels of medieval society, but that the intentions behind the summoning of diabolical forces were relatively benign and somewhat materialistic, and not used—just to provide an example—to smite neighbors with sickness or death, as we see in witchcraft trials of early modern England. One such account in a 1366 chronicle reveals how financial considerations played into the practice of diabolism. It tells a story of a man who confessed to his neighbors that he had made a pact with the devil to overshadow his competitors in the carpentry business:

> In this year a certain carpenter died, who, over the past fifteen years, worshipped the devil, so that he could excel in his craft over the other carpenters. Having foreknowledge of his end, he asked his comrades that they not permit him to harm anyone around him. But with all of them having been summoned, they returned, placing him in an empty room so that he might get some sleep. Shortly after waking to

---

17 Sayles, *Select Cases in the Court of King's Bench*, vol. VI, 163: "Qui dicit quod capud illud fuit capud cuiusdam Sarisini et quod ipse capud predictum in Tolet in quadam ciutate in Ispannia emit causa includendi in eo quendam spiritum ut idem spiritus ad interrogata responderet…"

18 Ibid.

his shouting, upon entering the room they discovered him extracting his own intestines from his stomach; putting back his still warm entrails into his belly, they called together all their neighbors and priests, along with the Bishop, for witness, and when he confessed in secret and openly of his sins he died in the Catholic faith having received the holy viaticum.[19]

While no judicial proceedings were recorded, one can conclude from this rather mundane account of devil-worship that the man was chiefly motivated by financial gain. The chronicler's moral angle to this story makes it clear to the readers that the carpenter ultimately caused his own physical deterioration by compromising his spiritual allegiance to the faith. It is interesting to note that the carpenter's neighbors seemed to have known about his pact with the devil and that he still had friends who rallied for his well-being and redemption. Perhaps the man's devil-worship was not seen by his neighbors and associates as too horrible, since he was not specifically targeting anyone with malicious magic. The evidence suggests that, at least during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries in England, demonic pacts were at the very least a small part of a popular conception of what sorcery could involve, but that diabolical practices were aimed toward resolving personal or financial problems rather than bringing physical harm to others. The prevalence of women as targets of accusations involving the diabolical pact in early modern England was perhaps indicative of the shift in the perception of witchcraft as being a primarily female crime. What exactly precipitated a change in the gendering of diabolical magic is difficult to say, but perhaps the gradual spread of ideas about devil-worship eventually influenced the ways in which women were seen to obtain the powers needed to make their witchcraft effective.

Diabolical magic at this time was also intimately associated with the business of magic and sorcery, which often included the exchange of money or favors for the performance of a

---

[19] James Tait, ed., *Chronica Johannis de Reading et anonymi Cantuariensis, 1346-1367* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1914), 176: "Obiit et hoc anno quidam artifex lignarius qui annis quindecim præteritis diabolo servivit, ut ceteros carpentarios excelleret operando. Ille finis sui præscius a sociis petiit, ne aliquid quod posset lædere alicui circa se permitterent. At illum, sublatis omnibus, in camera vacua collocantes ut sompnum caperet, redierunt; clamore cujus paulo post excitati, cameram ingredientes propria viscera de ventre extrahentem reperierunt; quæ adhuc calida in utero reponentes, vicinos in testimonium sacerdotesque cum Corpore Dominico convocarunt, ac ubi secrete et palam de peccatis confessus cum sacro viatico in fide Catholica decessit."

certain act of sorcery. As we have learned, the sorcerer-for-hire was used by noble and commoner alike for very specific, and usually very personal, reasons. The evident demand for the services of professional sorcerers suggests that a good number of men, and maybe even some women, made at least a partial living this way, and that there was never really a shortage of people in need of such services. The specialized skills of a necromancer-for-hire were deemed necessary for the proper performance of serious types of magic, such as homicidal magic, that could potentially alter one's standing within the community. As we shall see below, the far more serious kind of homicidal sorcery—regicidal magic—was also typically performed by professional necromancers, as they were perceived to have the ability to engage in such pernicious sorcery with adequate skill and discretion.

Regicide

Legal and narrative accounts of regicidal magic in late medieval England prominently feature expert necromancers, whose clients were either rich or influential enough to secure their services. Usually, the individuals contributing monetary aid or another form of support to the professional necromancer for regicide were also implicated as part of this larger conspiracy against the king. The 1325 testimony from Robert le Mareschal, who lodged an appeal against Master John of Nottingham and twenty-five burghers from Coventry, describes how he was a boarder at Master John's residence when these twenty-five men beseeched both him and Master John to perform murderous sorcery directed at the Prior of Coventry, a few of his supporters, and the king himself (Edward II).[20]

Men's predominance in the practice of diabolism or professional necromancy seemed to be intimately tied to their financial circumstances, and this was particularly true when a certain malefactor paid another to perform sorcery, or when the sorcerer had to purchase special items needed to work his sorcery. This connection is well supported by the case of

[20] F. Palgrave, ed., *Parliamentary Writs and Writs of Military Summons*, vol. II (London: Record Commission, 1832), 269-70.

Robert and Master John, whose reputation as a necromancer was apparently well-known, since the burghers negotiated a pricey deal with both Master John and Robert: the former would receive twenty pounds and the latter fifteen, and they were duly supplied with the items needed for the task. Master John and Robert fashioned six wax figurines in the likeness of their intended targets, but made a seventh in the image of a certain Richard de Sowe, which they set aside in order that they might test the efficacy of their magic. According to Robert's account, Master John told him to impale the forehead of Richard's image with a lead skewer, then bade him to visit Richard the next day to inspect their handiwork. Richard was apparently in a lot of pain, shrieking, braying, crying out "Harrow!" until Master John stuck the skewer in the heart of the figurine a couple of days later, which then, shortly thereafter, caused Richard's death. Indeed, image magic was a popular form of sorcery requiring easily attainable skills that practically anyone could learn, especially when compared to the more intricate rituals typical to necromantic practices. Master John probably had some knowledge of necromancy, but fused it with perhaps more traditional forms of sympathetic magic using dolls or wax images; furthermore, he was probably perceived to be successful at it, since he developed a reputation as a "nigromauncer" whose services could not be bought on the cheap.[21]

Regicide by way of magic was essentially an anonymous crime of treason; for this reason, it was difficult to prosecute and required the cooperation of those willing to come forward to confess their culpability or inform on other people's regicidal activities. Robert's appeal to the Coroner of the Hospital, and then to the King's Bench, was an attempt to commute his sentence to a lighter one by naming his accomplices in the matter of Richard de Sowe's death, thus forcing this criminal matter to come to light. Master John ended up dying in prison but the other men were acquitted in *visnet*—meaning, by a jury of twelve

[21] Ibid.

men.[22] As this case came to the attention of the King's Bench, it probably reinforced among the ruling elite the terrible image of the male sorcerer who, at will, *and secretly*, was able to cause death or ruin to the king, important churchmen, and magistrates.

Since sorcery could be performed secretly for malicious purposes and political advancement, prominent women of the royal court were not above being blamed for using magic or employing necromancers to carry out their regicidal conspiracies. Having magic performed on their behalf illuminates one of the ways in which these women were able to exercise agency behind the scenes in the male-dominated world of high politics; their roles in these alleged plots tended to highlight how their male contemporaries viewed their power or influence on the politics of the court. To take one notable example, Alice Perrers (d. 1400), mistress of King Edward III (r. 1327-1377), was accused of having hired a Dominican friar, who at first claimed to be a physician, to perform love magic directed at the king.[23] According to the chronicle, written by a monk at St. Albans, the Dominican forged two wax effigies in the likeness of Alice and Edward, and utilizing these with some potent herbs, managed to get the king under Alice's thrall. The author also makes a curious reference to a *magus famosissimus*, the ancient Egyptian King Nectanebo, and the making of memory rings so that the king could not forget his mistress.[24] The monk's allusions to ancient magic may illuminate his belief in the potency of the Dominican's sorcery, as he provides the mystical precedents for the practice of this type of magic. The sorcerer-monk of these tales is likely a negative projection of the piously humble monk, whose inverted image of malice and worldliness enhanced the spiritual piety of the true mendicant.

---

[22] Ibid.; see also William Renwick Riddell, "A Trial for Witchcraft Six Hundred Years Ago," *Journal of the American Institute of Criminal Law and Criminology* 8 (1917): 40-44, for his useful explanation of the legal jargon found in the text.

[23] Edward Maunde Thompson, ed., *Chronicon Angliæ, ab anno domini 1328 usque ad annum 1388* (London: Longman, 1874), 97-100.

[24] Ibid., 98; George Lyman Kittredge, *Witchcraft in Old and New England* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1929), 105. As legend has it, the exiled Nactenebo II came to Phillip of Macedon's court in the guise of a magician. He seduced Olympias, Phillip's wife, and from their coupling Alexander the Great was conceived.

The regicide case made against Joan of Navarre (1370-1437), dowager queen and stepmother of Henry V (r. 1413-1422), had aspects similar to the Perrers case, although it was the king himself who accused her of encouraging her sometime confessor Friar Randolf to engage in regicidal magic. It was announced in Parliament that "Queen Joan of England had schemed and imagined the death and destruction of our Lord the King in the most horrible manner that one could devise."[25] A contemporary narrative source is much clearer on the subject of the alleged magical harm directed at the king: it states that Friar Randolf had specifically used "sorcerye" and "nigromancie" when he had later confessed to his crimes.[26]

However, the consequences of Queen Joan's alleged crimes were not altogether dire. Her lands were conveniently forfeited to the crown in 1420 following this incident, and she was put under house arrest while her accomplice was incarcerated. Despite all this, Queen Joan was kept relatively well during her years without her dower lands; the king paid the salaries of the men under her employ and apparently kept her household well supplied with food, livestock, and other myriad items necessary for her retinue.[27] In fact, in the same year before his death in September of 1422, Henry sent out a writ expressing his will that his stepmother should be restored to her dower. The queen then petitioned to Parliament on this matter, and she was then monetarily compensated for the loss of her lands.[28]

The reasons for Henry's personal vendetta against Queen Joan, and why it took such an ugly turn, are unknown, but it can be said with some certainty that Henry and his prelates were paranoid about the presence of sorcerers in the realm. In fact, the king's fear is further illuminated by a 1419 mandate to the bishop of London, in which the archbishop of

---

[25] *Rotuli parliamentorum; ut et petitiones, et placita in parliamento*, vol. IV (London: 1767-83), 118. "…Johane Roigne d'Engleterre, avoit compassez & ymaginez la mort & destruction de n[ot]r[e] dit S[i]r[e] le Roi, en le pluis haute & horrible manere, q[ue] l'en purroit deviser."

[26] Nicholas Harris Nicolas, ed., *A Chronicle of London, from 1089 to 1483* (London: Longman, 1827), 107-8.

[27] *Calendar of the Patent Rolls, Henry V A.D. 1416-1422*, vol. II (Nendeln/Liechtenstein: Kraus Reprint, 1971), 276, 294, 304, 362, 396, 402.

[28] *Rotuli parliamentorum*, 247-9; *Calendar of the Patent Rolls, Henry VI A.D. 1422-1429*, 84, 166.

Canterbury describes ordering processions and prayers on behalf of the king in his war against the French.[29] Above all, the king desired protection from the "superstitious operations of necromancers, particularly like those that recently had been plotted through some against his person, according to reports."[30] Because so much of Henry's power as king depended on his ability to be successful in war, the idea that a sorcerer's pernicious magic could tip the scales against Henry's army—even if only in one battle—was a terrifying thought indeed.

That a network of sorcerers was behind intricate and perfidious plots involving regicide or some type of treachery directed at the royal household may not have been merely a figment of a monarch's wild imagination. A monk at St. Alban's told of an incident that took place in 1430, when "around Christmastime certain witches, seven of them from different parts of the realm, were captured in London and incarcerated at Fleet Prison, all of whom plotted the death of the king."[31] The text is frustratingly vague on the details, but the monk suggests that this was a coven of female witches (*maleficæ*) who, although individually hailing from different parts of the country, convened in London in order to collude more efficiently with each other. The notion that these women, when united in their wickedness, possessed the type of agency that could possibly bring about the demise of a king shows how learned conceptions of sorcery envisioned women as being part of this bigger picture. Women could exact the same results as the monk-necromancers described in the aforementioned accounts, but did not utilize the same learned methods.

As was seen in the aforementioned accusations involving women of the royal court and their personal magicians, the employment of male necromancers to perform sorcery for

---

[29] David Wilkins, ed., *Concilia magnæ Britanniæ et Hiberniæ*, vol. III (London: Fleetstreet, 1727), 393-4.

[30] Ibid., 393. "...superstitionis necromanticorum operationibus, talibus præsertim, quales jam tarde in perniciem et destructionem personæ suæ per nonnullos, ut refertur, excogitatæ fuerant."

[31] John Amundesham, *Annales monasterii S. Albani*, ed. Thomas Riley, vol. I (Nendeln/Liechtenstein: Kraus Reprint, 1965), 56-7. "Circa hos dies Christi Natalitios, quædam maleficæ, numero septem, de diversis partibus regni, captæ sunt in Londiniis, et incarcerantur apud le Fleete, quæ machinatæ sunt interitum Regis."

them is indicative not only of personal and political issues these ladies sought to resolve via magic, but also of the lengths to which they would use their wealth and influence. According to several fifteenth-century accounts, one noblewoman, Eleanor Cobham, Duchess of Gloucester, attempted to use her position of power and connections to kill the king by way of a certain Roger Bolingbroke's "werchynge of sorcery."[32] She was accused in 1441 of conspiring with Bolingbroke, who was a clerk, Canon Thomas Southwell, and the infamous Margery Jourdemayn, for attempted regicide.

While this could be classified strictly as a case of attempted regicide—and Bolingbroke indeed was hanged, drawn, and quartered like all common traitors—the case involved other elements of interest relevant to a discussion of sorcery practice among the ruling elite, such as Eleanor's recruitment of various sorcerers, all of whom had different positions within their lay and ecclesiastical communities. When Bolingbroke was arraigned for the charges brought against him, he was made to stand on the scaffold with all of his "instrumentis" around him. He was then examined and eventually convicted before the lords of the king's council—his benefit of clergy apparently not being enough of a reason to save him from secular justice and the scaffold. Canon Southwell died in prison, for his role in the matter, which was apparently to say masses consecrating Bolingbroke's instruments of "nygromancie," which were images of either the devil or the king, made of silver, wax, or other metals.[33] Eleanor acknowledged using these items, but she claimed to have wanted these diabolical items to help her bear a child "by hir lord, the Duke of Gloucestre," meaning that she had hired Bolingbroke for that purpose.[34] Eleanor's fertility problems were probably very serious, as she also consulted with the notorious Margery, who was

---

[32] Nicolas, 128.

[33] William Marx and John Silvester Davies, eds., *An English Chronicle, 1377-1461* (Rochester: Boydell Press, 2003), 76, 147-8, 151.

[34] Friederich W. D. Brie, ed., *The Brut; or, The Chronicles of England*, vol. II (New York: Kraus Reprint, 1971), 480; Thomas Hearne, ed., *Liber niger scaccarii*, vol. II (Oxonii: e Theatro Sheldoniano, 1728), 460-1; Marx and Davies, 93. The story's appearance in at least three different chronicles may point to either its popularity amongst the neighboring communities or the importance which the authors attributed to it.

known to her community as the Witch of Eye (meaning, the Eye manor near the city of Westminster). Nine years earlier Margery was apprehended for sorcery (along with a monk and a clerk), but was released from prison when her husband paid a bond to the Chancery.[35] However, this time, Margery did not get off so easily: she was burned at Smithfield, probably as a relapsed heretic. The Duchess herself was given penance in the form of public humiliation; she was ordered to walk through the streets "openly berhede with a keverchef on hir hede" and with a penitential taper in her hand to various places.[36] Then she was sentenced to life in prison for the charges imputed to her.

As the above examples illustrate, aristocratic women such as the Duchess of Gloucester and the dowager Queen Joan were perceived to have resources and people available to them for the implementation of their malevolent plans. Ecclesiastics, too, were considered particularly dangerous. As is made clear in the example below, ecclesiastics' international connections were thought by many to afford them greater means for magical devilry. In London in 1496, a Frenchman, Bernard de Vignolles, confessed in a deposition given to the king that he was the agent of John Kendal, the prior of St. John of Rhodes, a knight (Kendal's nephew), and the archdeacon of London, all of whom had hatched a plot to murder the royal family and some of Henry VII's councilors by using sorcery.[37] Bernard had been ordered by Kendal and the archdeacon to meet up with a Spanish astrologer in Rome to acquire a certain magical ointment to smear across a doorway entrance so that when the king passed through it those who loved him most would be compelled to rise up and kill him.[38] Bernard, on his way back to England, was not able to go through with the

---

[35] Thomas Rymer, ed., *Fœdera, conventiones, literæ, et cujuscunque generis acta publica, inter reges Angliæ*, 3d ed. (Farnborough: Gregg P., 1967), 178: "...dicta Margeria exoneretur de Prisona, sub Securitate Mariti sui in Cancellaria Regis facienda."

[36] Nicolas, 129.

[37] The text of the deposition can be found in James Gairdner, ed., *Letters and Papers Illustrative of the Reigns of Richard III and Henry VII* (Nendeln/Liechenstein: Kraus Reprint, 1965), 318-23.

[38] Ibid., 320: "...oingnement, qui estoit en ladite boueste, au longe et travers de quelque huys ou porte par ou passeroit le roy, affin que passat par dessus; le quel astreloge disoit, que sil est ainsy fait, que ceulx qui avoint et portoint plus damour au roy, que seroint ceulx qui turoint le roy."

plan and decided to throw away the box containing the magical ointment. He instead bought a similar box from an *apoticaire* and filled it with foul-smelling substances to make it seem like the original, and brought this ersatz potion back to the conspirators. Kendal was not able to go through with the plot either, and told Bernard to get rid of the box. Since, obviously, there was no murder and hence no crime, it never went beyond Bernard's confession, and the king gave Kendal a general pardon that same year.[39]

Regicide was a treasonous crime punishable by death, and with the perceived increase in the amount of necromancers and witches in the realm, it also seemed increasingly urgent to prosecute these malefactors, whose treachery and vice would be practically impossible to trace because of the anonymity that sorcery practices provided. Bernard's testimony implicated prominent church figures in this regicidal conspiracy, but most importantly, he was able to put a face on a generally faceless crime. But if this story tells us anything, it is that those accused of working sorcery for regicidal purposes, with the exception of the unnamed London witches in the above mentioned chronicle, tended to be easily identifiable people with vested interests in the Crown or the Church. The same could also be said of the accusers, whose status or security was better guarded by the removal of threatening individuals from the political arena. The Robert le Mareschal case was an example of an attempt at regicide that was prompted by purely monetary concerns, although the burghers that provided the funding were unequivocal about their treasonous wishes.

Since men, especially clergymen, were also by and large more educated than women, it was they who were perceived to have been more likely to cultivate viable professions as necromancers, and more able to entice both commoners and nobility with certain promises about their abilities. Perhaps encouraged to develop such a livelihood by those willing to pay for their services with money or goods, professional necromancers in this sense were not much different from goldsmiths, shoemakers, and other traditionally male-dominated trades

---

[39] *Calendar of the Patent Rolls Henry VII A.D. 1485-1509*, vol. II (Nendeln/Liechtenstein: Kraus Reprint, 1971), 49.

that required a certain amount of training. Of course, this comparison falls short when one considers the guilds that set prices and controlled the standards by which young men became apprenticed, but the evidence shows that necromancers-for-hire had to cultivate a reputation for their experience and skill in sorcery in order for them to be recommended to potential clients—and this probably meant that the professional necromancer must have had, at one point, several satisfied customers.