

The Potsdam Historian
An Undergraduate Journal of History

Created by: The History Association of Potsdam
Published by: SUNY Potsdam Central Printing Office
Volume II May 2015

The History Association
9024 Barrington Drive
SUNY Potsdam
Potsdam, New York
13676

SUNY Potsdam Central Printing Office
44 Pierrepont Avenue
Potsdam, New York
13676

Call for Papers

Undergraduates of the State University of New York at Potsdam are invited to submit their history, music history, and art history papers to:

The Potsdam Historian: An Undergraduate Journal of History

*Criteria: 3.3

*In order to submit you must pick up a form in the History Department office next to the submission box (Satterlee 321), fill it out, have it signed by the professor, and attach it to your hard copy.

*Submit your hard copy in the publication box in the office.

*We must also receive an online copy, which can be sent to potsdamhistorian@gmail.com.

*The committee must receive both a hard copy and an emailed copy.

*If you are interested or have any questions, please contact potsdamhistorian@gmail.com, any Potsdam History Association Executive Board Officer, or a History Department faculty member.

Spring 2015

The road to the second edition of *The Potsdam Historian: An Academic Journal* was made easier thanks to experience from last year as well as harder by new challenges, but here we are ready to present the Potsdam History Association's sophomore publication effort. With the continued motivation of encouraging historical inquiry, we are proud to exhibit some of the very best historical studies that the students of SUNY Potsdam have yielded. In this volume, we hope to diversify, entertain, and enrich the intellect of anyone curious enough to open our volume.

The *Historian* is graciously indebted to a number of individuals who not only guided us along the way, but believed in it enough to put time and effort that isn't as easily measured as helpful actions but no less crucial to success. We are grateful to Central Printing Offices in the Physical Plant of SUNY Potsdam for printing the volume you are reading. We would also like to thank the professors of SUNY Potsdam for their support, as well as inspiring the minds that we honor within our pages. The History Department deserves special thanks for its close patronage and assistance throughout the process. We would like to thank department chair Dr. Thomas Baker for his continual interest and investment to the *Historian*, especially in securing counsel from the staff of *Collegiate Anthropologist*, who we would also deeply like to thank. And lastly, we'd like to thank the talented and ambitious intellectuals who submitted their work to our humble pamphlet, for without you we would have nothing for which to thank anyone.

Sincerely,

The *Potsdam Historian* Publication Committee

The Potsdam Historian Executive Committee Members

Daniel Menendez
Chair

Matthew Sabbattis
Associate Chair

Leo'el Jackson
Editor

Kylie Rivers
Layout Director

The Potsdam History Association Executive Board Members

Erin Barr
President

Daniel Menendez
Vice-President

Kasia Watson
Treasurer

Anthony Miller
Comptroller

Bailey Lynch
Secretary

Matthew Hallorhan
Historian

History Association and the *Potsdam Historian* Advisor

Dr. Axel Fair-Schulz

TABLE OF CONTENTS:

I. A Question of Succession: Was there an Amenhotep III/IV Co-regency? Erin Barr.....	4
II. What Did We Fight For: A Documentary Remembering the Civil War William Barr.....	17
III. Deciphering the <i>La Dame à la licorne</i> Tapestries Jeanne Einhorn.....	21
IV. Study of Women in Puritan Society through the Antinomian Controversy Corrine Gabrielle.....	32
V. Creating New York City's Ghettos Joanne Lotfallah.....	42
VI. Medicine versus Ministers: Authority during the Boston Inoculation Controversy of 1721 Charles Murray III.....	50
VII. The Question that Started the Cold War: The Polish Question from 1943 until 1945 Jacob Pauling.....	63

A Question of Succession: Was there an Amenhotep III/IV Co-regency?

By Erin Barr

The question of a co-regency between Amenhotep III and his son Amenhotep IV, later known as Akhenaten, has been a topic of intense debate among Egyptologists. During much of the study of ancient Egypt, the answer has been a resounding no. In fact, a book dedicated entirely to the subject of ancient Egyptian co-regencies lacks any mention of these two kings whatsoever.¹ Recently, those in favor of the co-regency have been gathering support and increasing the amount of proof in their favor. The growing body of new evidence and historical discussion strongly points to a long co-regency of around ten years between Amenhotep III and Akhenaten. This evidence partially consists of a series of reliefs found on monuments and in tombs throughout Egypt.

The classic anti-co-regency narrative is that Amenhotep III reigned from roughly 1390 to 1352 B.C.E.² He is modeled in the likeness of a European absolute monarch: fat, indulgent, and taking complete advantage of his nation's power and wealth.³ Yet, he is also known for reigning during a great period of wealth, prestige, building, culture, and diplomacy.⁴ Amenhotep III's reign is also reputed as a period of relative peace for ancient Egypt, further establishing his time as the height of New Kingdom Egypt.⁵ He and his queen, Tiye, presided over an Egypt that had never been wealthier, stronger, or more culturally rich. A co-regency between this king and his son is doubted by many. Much of this doubt originates in the knowledge that Akhenaten's reign was

such a departure from the norm. A co-regency would mean that Amenhotep III would have been a participant in the great shift towards the worship of the Aten, and this is seemingly too out of character for some Egyptologists.

Amenhotep III's son and successor Akhenaten, originally named Amenhotep IV, has been long dubbed the black sheep of the dynasty.⁶ Reigning from roughly 1352 B.C.E. until 1336 B.C.E., Akhenaten has been almost universally condemned for the destruction of Egyptian traditions, religion, and foreign policy. He has been described as a religious fanatic who was mentally unstable and even physically deformed. He moved the royal residence to the new city of Amarna and disregarded foreign policy. Akhenaten has been blamed for sacrificing all of Egypt's power and glory in favor of his obsession for a sun-disk god, the Aten.⁷ Many historians have claimed that Egypt was only able to return to prominence and normalcy with the birth of the next dynasty decades after his death.⁸

Recently, a different narrative has been gaining acceptance. This one uses newly discovered evidence to support the idea of a long co-regency between father and son. Much of this evidence has been found in private tombs, in the monuments of Amenhotep III, and at Akhenaten's city of Amarna. This new body of evidence suggests that there was a period of co-rule between the two kings of roughly ten years.⁹ Confirmation of a long co-regency between Amenhotep III and Akhenaten would have immense effects on the reputation of both pharaohs. This controversial evidence has forced historians into three major camps.

¹ William J. Murnane, *Ancient Egyptian Coregencies* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1977).

² Ian Shaw, *The Oxford History of Ancient Egypt* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000) 481. All referenced dates will be taken from *The Oxford History of Egypt*.

³ Donald B. Redford, *Akhenaten: The Heretic King* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984), 35.

⁴ Redford, *Akhenaten*, 37-43.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 38.

⁶ The name change occurred in Akhenaten's regnal year 5.

⁷ Redford, *Akhenaten*, 57-58, 67.

⁸ The Amarna Period lasted from 1352 B.C.E. until 1295 B.C.E. when Rameses I ascended to the throne.

⁹ Roughly from 1362 B.C.E. to 1352 B.C.E.

The first emphatically denies the possibility of a co-regency, and place its faith in the older, more established narrative. The second camp gives no opinion at all, and gives little mention, if any, to this ongoing debate. The third, and the one this paper will defend, claims that the new body of evidence supports a long co-regency between Amenhotep III and Akhenaten. These three camps of historical opinion can easily be found in the many biographies that have been written about each pharaoh by a variety of authors.

As previously mentioned, the first camp includes those who support the traditional historical narrative involving a clean succession from Amenhotep III to Akhenaten. In fact, it is only in recent years that a revival of pro-co-regency support has come about. Some current historians like Arielle Kozloff are seeking to tell a more realistic story about the reign of Amenhotep III. In her biography, Kozloff attempts to expose the imperfections of this supposed golden age. Still, the suggestion of a co-regency is too revisionist for Kozloff, who spends no more than a few sentences is on the subject. She briefly mentions that there is debate with little evidence to support the pro co-regency side.¹⁰ Kozloff 's biography attempts to paint a more realistic picture, but she is not in favor supporting any co-regency, least of all a lengthy one. It would be easy to claim that attempts to disassociate Amenhotep III with a co-regency with his son were being done only to save his good reputation. However, there are biographies about Akhenaten that also dismiss the co-regency narrative.

Donald Redford's biography fits the classic narrative of both kings' lives exactly. Amenhotep III takes "full advantage of the status and wealth of the country" while Akhenaten "lacked compared to his father" in almost every conceivable way.¹¹ The topic of

the co-regency is not even addressed as a possibility, as Redford maintains the succession from Amenhotep III to Akhenaten went seamlessly somewhere around the year 1352 B.C.E. when the former died after a lengthy reign. Redford does however explain the classic succession narrative in great detail, which is useful to anyone trying to understand the co-regency debate.

Though Redford's biography is in fact about Akhenaten, he sets the stage with a fairly detailed synopsis of Amenhotep III's reign. According to Redford, Egypt was at the height of its international prestige and domestic prosperity.¹² Though there were official reliefs that portray him as a great warrior, the time was one of relative international peace, meaning that Amenhotep III did little actual fighting. Redford does however praise Amenhotep III's prowess in matters of leadership, diplomacy, and building, and for encouraging culture to thrive via royal patronage and support.¹³ At the end of his life and reign, according to Redford, Amenhotep III was fat and contented, and enjoyed the fruits of a long reign.¹⁴

Redford transitions into his narrative of Akhenaten's life by introducing him as a sickly, second son who unexpectedly became heir to the throne after his brother's untimely death. To Redford, Akhenaten was kept from public view for most of his early life due to the unidentified illness that later influenced his stylistic art.¹⁵ According to Redford, Akhenaten was his father's complete opposite in matters of both foreign and domestic policy. He was also lax in his duties for reasons we can never totally understand.¹⁶ While Redford's traditional narrative is long and detailed, his dismissal of the co-regency is fairly concise. Other Egyptologists attempt to disprove the co-regency in more detail.

¹⁰ Arielle P. Kozloff, *Amenhotep III: Egypt's Radiant Pharaoh* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 7.

¹¹ Redford, *Akhenaten*, 35, 67.

¹² *Ibid*, 35.

¹³ *Ibid*, 37, 39, 42, 43.

¹⁴ *Ibid*, 52.

¹⁵ *Ibid*, 57, 58.

¹⁶ *Ibid*, 167, 199.

John Baines writes extensively on the subject of the co-regency. Much of Baines' essay on Amenhotep III is dedicated to disproving the co-regency as a factor in the start of Akhenaten's reign. Baines makes the bold claim that most Egyptologists would agree that there was no period of co-rule whatsoever.¹⁷ He attempts to re-humanize Akhenaten to readers, but will not go so far as to put some of the blame for Egypt's misfortunes on his predecessor. Dominic Montserrat takes the same approach. While criticizing other authors' interpretations of Akhenaten's life and rule, Montserrat completely dismisses the idea of a co-regency. To him, the evidence is merely circumstantial, leaving the theory with no factual basis.¹⁸

A more recent anti-co-regency proponent is Aidan Dodson, who claims that much of the evidence for the co-regency is merely circumstantial, and could therefore easily be explained without concluding that there was a co-regency. Dodson does admit that co-regencies happened many times before the reigns of Amenhotep III and Akhenaten, but he reminds readers that no true co-regencies had occurred in the generations leading up to Amenhotep III and Akhenaten.¹⁹ Dodson does not base his denial of the co-regency on this fact, but he uses it to make the point that there had been no recent precedent for a period of true co-rule. It is because of the lack of recent co-regencies that he claims the co-regency would be highly unlikely. This is not Dodson's only reason for not supporting the co-regency. He also cites many images of Amenhotep III at his son's city, Amarna. Dodson believes that any images of Amenhotep III that depict him at Amarna with his surviving family members

portray him after death.²⁰ His main argument is that Amenhotep III's family members are bringing him offerings, and that means the king is being worshiped in his own cult post-mortem.²¹ It should be noted that co-regency supporters have used the same images to support the opposite claim.

The works of Kozloff, Redford, Baines, Montserrat, and Dodson are only examples from the large body of work surrounding the anti-co-regency view. These authors and others follow the traditional succession narrative, address the co-regency question in either great or little detail, and then proceed to disprove the theory as false for varying reasons. The authors answer the co-regency question in different ways with a confident "no."

The second camp is made up of those who either do not address the co-regency debate at all. The number of historians who fall into this category seems to be smaller, as most choose a side in the dispute. Barry Kemp is once such author who wrote an in-depth history of the Amarna period from Amenhotep III to Akhenaten and those who followed them.²² Kemp mentions several instances in which images of Amenhotep III and Tiye appeared in both private and public settings in Amarna, yet Kemp does not approach the subject of a possible co-regency. In this work, there is no mention at all of the co-regency or the debate surrounding it.²³ As previously said, there is a book entirely devoted to listing and explaining the context surrounding all the co-regencies in Egyptian history in chronological order.²⁴ This book by William J. Murnane would seem to be the perfect place to search for some information on the Amenhotep III and Akhenaten co-regency, but it lacks any mention of it. It would

¹⁷ John Baines, "Dawn of the Amarna Age," in *Amenhotep III Perspectives on his Reign*, ed. David O'Conner and Eric Cline (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1998), 271.

¹⁸ Dominic Montserrat, *Akhenaten: History, Fantasy, and Ancient Egypt* (London: Routledge, 2000).

¹⁹ Aidan Dodson, "The Coregency Conundrum," *Kmt* 25 (2014): 30.

²⁰ Dodson, "The Coregency Conundrum," 33.

²¹ Ibid, 33.

²² Barry Kemp, *The City of Akhenaten and Nefertiti, Amarna and Its People* (London: Thames and Hudson, Ltd., 2012).

²³ Kemp, *The City of Akhenaten and Nefertiti*, 231, 244.

²⁴ Murnane, *Ancient Egyptian Coregencies*.

seem works in this camp are in support of the traditional narrative by omission.

The third and final camp includes those who fully support a long period of co-rule between Amenhotep III and Akhenaten. One such supporter is Nicholas Reeves. He connects the period of co-rule with the celebration of Amenhotep III's *heb sed* festival.²⁵ The *heb sed* festival was a traditional jubilee celebrated to commemorate the thirtieth year of Amenhotep III's reign. It was during this festival that the pharaoh was symbolically rejuvenated and elevated to the status of a god on earth.²⁶ Reeves argues that Amenhotep III's elevation to a new status would have created the need for a co-regency with Akhenaten so that he could oversee matters of religion, while his son looked after more earth-bound matters of state.²⁷ To Reeves, the co-regency was the natural protocol in the rare event that a pharaoh reigned for thirty years.

More recently, Francisco Martin Valentin and Teresa Bedman have supported the co-regency theory through their find at the tomb of Amenhotep III's vizier, Amenhotep-Huy. The reliefs inside the tomb show the nomen and prenomen of both Amenhotep III and Akhenaten.²⁸ Huy died in the thirty-fifth year of Amenhotep III's reign after a long career of service to that pharaoh. To Valentin and Bedman, what makes this evidence compelling is that the reliefs of the king's names were carved at the same time and there is no evidence of later work on the tomb after the initial construction.²⁹ I will also analyze these reliefs in a later portion of this paper.

²⁵ Nicholas Reeves, *Akhenaten: Egypt's False Prophet* (London: Thames and Hudson Ltd., 2001), 73.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 73, 75.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 75-76.

²⁸ Francisco Valentin and Teresa Bedman, "Proof of a 'Long Co-regency' between Amenhotep III & Amenhotep IV Found in the Chapel of Vizier Amenhotep-Huy (ASASIF Tomb 28) West Luxor," *Kmt* 25 (2014): 19.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 22-23.

Perhaps the strongest and most outspoken supporter of a long co-regency is W. Raymond Johnson. He has published numerous articles and book chapters on the subject, and has used varying pieces of evidence to help establish his arguments. In the article, Johnson argues that the several images of Amenhotep III with other members of the royal family at the city of Amarna are proof of his presence there.³⁰ He maintains that the intimate positions of Amenhotep III in these images are evidence of a then-living king who had come to Amarna to see his wife, children, and grandchildren.³¹ Johnson also explains the co-regency as part of a religious function, much like Nicholas Reeves. However, Johnson's religious explanation compares Amenhotep III, Queen Tiye, and Akhenaten to the gods Aten, Hathor, and Shu respectively.³² With the event of the *heb sed* festival, Amenhotep III became the embodiment of the Aten on earth, and Akhenaten, then still Amenhotep IV, became the god Shu. According to Egyptian religious practices, two gods create one another, and therefore a co-regency would seem to recreate the roles on earth.³³ It is Johnson's opinion that these religious roles carried over into statecraft and that the co-regency lasted around ten years for this purpose.³⁴

In another similar article, Johnson expands this argument. In it he explains that the co-regency itself was a dual partnership of religion and statecraft. According to Johnson, the *heb sed* festival gave Amenhotep III a rare opportunity to mimic the gods on Earth in order to further legitimize his reign and consolidate his power. The Aten and Shu were father and son, but not in the traditional sense. The two gods actually created one another simultaneously,

³⁰ W. Raymond Johnson, "Amenhotep III and Amarna: Some New Considerations," *The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 82 (1996): 72.

³¹ *Ibid.*, 72-73.

³² *Ibid.*, 81.

³³ *Ibid.*

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 82.

making it impossible for one to exist without the other.³⁵ To Johnson, the complete co-dependency of Aten and Shu was reflected in reality after the celebration of the *heb sed* festival. If Aten and Shu could not exist without one another, then neither could Amenhotep III and Akhenaten. In short, the rare religious circumstances of the thirty-year jubilee created the necessary conditions for an equal sharing of kingship between father and son on earth.³⁶ It was this influential event, Johnson says, that led to Akhenaten's devotion to the Aten later in his reign after Amenhotep III had died.

After consulting many secondary sources, including more not mentioned in this literary review, I have come to support the idea of a long co-regency between Amenhotep III and Akhenaten. Those who have supported the co-regency with their written works have relied heavily on primary sources to support their arguments. Those primary sources that I will analyze are visual and consist of reliefs and stelae from tombs, the city of Amarna, and other Egyptian cities. This will not be an exhaustive analysis, but will contain those primary sources that I believe best attest to the existence of the long co-regency. I will divide the primary sources into two categories: those from private locations and those from public monuments.

The first of the primary sources I have considered are the reliefs inside of the tomb of Amenhotep-Huy. Amenhotep-Huy was Amenhotep III's vizier for much of his reign. He was presumed to have died by Amenhotep III's regnal year thirty five in 1353 B.C.E.³⁷ This is a well-accepted fact which makes the findings in Amenhotep-Huy's tomb curious. In my opinion the reliefs themselves call into question the traditional narrative of the succession.

³⁵ W. Raymond Johnson, "The Revolutionary Role of the Sun in the Reliefs and Statuary of Amenhotep III," *The Oriental Institute* 151 (1996): 3.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 3-4.

³⁷ Bedman and Valentin, "Proof of a 'Long Co-regency'," 18.

The first elements in the tomb that bears on the co-regency are a set of cartouches that were carved into the columns of the tomb chamber itself. The tomb is numbered as ASASIF Tomb 28, and the columns are labeled as AIII 1, AIII 2, AIV 1 and AIV 2.³⁸ In this case, AIII stands for Amenhotep III and AIV stands for Amenhotep IV, which was Akhenaten's original nomen. The reliefs on columns AIII 1 and 2 contain a list of titles, praises, and names concerning Amenhotep III. Among these are the two most common names, the nomen and the prenomen.³⁹ These are just two of the five names that an Egyptian pharaoh would have. The nomen was given at birth, with the other four being assumed only upon succession to the throne.⁴⁰

Having the names of Amenhotep III carved into the columns of Amenhotep-Huy's tomb would not seem out of place in the traditional narrative. Both Amenhotep and Nebmaatre, his prenomen, appear on each column associated with Amenhotep III.⁴¹ There is also a name that was assigned to Amenhotep III during his *heb sed* festival in year thirty, around 1360 B.C.E. What is extraordinary is that the columns mention Akhenaten as he was known at birth, by the name Amenhotep IV. They contain his original nomen as well as the prenomen. He did not change his name to Akhenaten until the ninth year of his own reign.⁴² The reliefs also have his prenomen, Neferkheperure, which would not have been assumed without a coronation. This means that two ruling pharaohs have their names in the tomb of a dedicated royal official.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, 19-20.

³⁹ Ian Shaw, *The Oxford History of Ancient Egypt* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 8.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 8-9.

⁴¹ Theresa Bedman and Francisco Martin Valentin, "Proof of a 'Long Co-regency' between Amenhotep III & Amenhotep IV Found in the Chapel of Vizier Amenhotep-Huy (ASASIF Tomb 28) West Luxor," *Kmt* 25 (2014): 19, 22.

⁴² Ian Shaw, *The Oxford History of Ancient Egypt* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 277.

These reliefs by themselves are not a guarantee that the co-regency existed, but they become stronger evidence in support of it when additional context is added. According to Bedman and Valentin, the construction of the tomb took place during Amenhotep III's reign. Additionally, the decoration process, during which the reliefs would have been carved, was ended suddenly between Amenhotep III's regnal years thirty and year thirty-five.⁴³ According to Bedman and Valentin's archaeological evidence, the construction was never resumed after that point.⁴⁴ If this was indeed the case, the columns suggest crowned Amenhotep IV with kingly powers ruled alongside his father at the time the tomb was built for one of their most long-serving officials.

In my opinion, it is the context of the reliefs that makes them into evidence in support of the co-regency between Amenhotep III and Akhenaten. The nomen and prenomen of each pharaoh appear in cartouches on the columns of Amenhotep-Huy's tomb. As previously stated, there is also a title referring to Amenhotep III that was only used during and after the *heb sed* jubilee festival during year thirty. This means that the decoration took place during a narrow time frame after the festival and before the end of Amenhotep III's reign at regnal year thirty-eight. The appearance of Akhenaten's original nomen and prenomen also means that they must have been carved before his name change. This is a very precise window of time. The most convincing factor is the presence of Akhenaten's prenomen, Neferkheperure. The prenomen would only have been chosen after he ascended to the throne and not before. Akhenaten would not have been given any of his four throne names without a coronation and some investment of royal authority. Amenhotep-Huy is also confirmed to have died before Amenhotep III. Due to the fact that the prenomen and nomen of both the kings in

question implies that Amenhotep-Huy served both of them as kings. It is these two facts surrounding the reliefs that serve as proof that there was in fact a co-regency at the time of the decoration of Amenhotep-Huy's tomb.

The next piece of evidence also comes from the tomb of another highly ranked royal official: his name was Huya, and he was the steward to Amenhotep III's great Royal Wife Tiye while she was living at Amarna with her son, Akhenaten.⁴⁵ The evidence from Huya's tomb consists of a relief scene carved into one of the walls. The scene is one of a seated Queen Tiye with one of her daughters by Amenhotep III, Baketaten, who is standing next to her. Behind them is a line of servants with fans in their hands. Opposite of the two women is a seated Amenhotep III. Above them is a familiar feature of the Amarna period: the disk of the Aten with its rays extended to all the characters in the scene.⁴⁶

The anti-co-regency interpretation of this scene is that Queen Tiye and Baketaten are participating in the cult worship of the dead king, Amenhotep III. The chief reason for this interpretation is that a set of cartouches and a line of hieroglyphs separate the two women and Amenhotep III, and that this physical separation of the characters in the scene mirrors the separation of death.⁴⁷ The hieroglyphs do separate them, but the two sets of figures are facing one another. However, I believe that there are details about the positions of the characters that indicate a different activity is being depicted in this scene.

In the tomb relief, Amenhotep III, Queen Tiye, and Baketaten all have their hands raised in greeting to one another. While Amenhotep III is the largest figure in the scene, he is not set any higher. My interpretation, and the interpretation of others, is that Amenhotep III is alive in the scene. More exactly,

⁴³ Bedman and Valentin, "Proof of a 'Long Co-regency,'" 23.

⁴⁴ Ibid, 23.

⁴⁵ Dennis Forbes, "Circumstantial Evidence for an Amenhotep III/IV Coregency," *Kmt* 25 (2014): 38.

⁴⁶ Ibid.

⁴⁷ Ibid.

Amenhotep III is visiting the city of Amarna, and his wife and daughter have come to greet him upon his arrival. Dennis Forbes also interpreted this scene in a similar manner.⁴⁸ Forbes makes the additional point that if this scene was indeed ancestor worship, Amenhotep III would be set up higher than the other figures in the scene. Queen Tiye and Baketaten would also most likely have been standing up out of respect for the dead pharaoh.⁴⁹

To help my analysis, I consulted known relief scenes of both worship and personal intimacy in order to establish some commonalities. There is a relief scene in the tomb of Ay at Amarna which helps to illustrate this point. Ay was the chief steward of Amarna, meaning he was a royal official at or near the same level of importance as Huya.⁵⁰ The scene in Ay's tomb is of Akhenaten, his queen Nefertiti, and four of their daughters offering colorful decorated boxes to the Aten. In the scene, each character is standing with heads tilted upward to face the Aten, whose life-giving rays shine down on them as they present their offerings.⁵¹ If the scene in the tomb of Huya was indeed one of ancestor worship, I would have expected a scene more similar to the scene in the tomb of Ay.

I then chose to compare Huya's scene to an intimate scene between Akhenaten and Nefertiti on the Stele of Pay.⁵² In the stele scene, Akhenaten and Nefertiti are seated next to one another. Like most Amarna Period reliefs, the rays of the Aten shine down upon them. The figures are of nearly equal size, and Nefertiti is shown turning her head towards her husband while caressing his chin.⁵³ The scene from the tomb of Huya is not nearly so intimate, as Tiye and Amenhotep III are not touching. However, I

believe the lack of physical touching in Huya's tomb scene can be attributed to it being a representation of a public official event and not a private moment. Still, it is my opinion that the scene of Amenhotep III, Queen Tiye, and Baketaten is one of a royal visit to Amarna during Amenhotep III's lifetime and not of ancestor worship. Huya's tomb scene is not enough like other depictions of ancestor worship. It is with that in mind that I believe it is depicting an actual visit by Amenhotep III to Amarna, further supporting the claim that he and his son Akhenaten did have a co-regency.

The third and final piece of evidence from a private location that I will examine comes from a limestone stele. It was found in the house of Panhesy in the city of Amarna. The two people depicted in the scene are Amenhotep III and Queen Tiye. A very old and slightly sagging Amenhotep III is seated next to his queen.⁵⁴ The two are seated very closely to one another, and it can be inferred that they touching. Around them are offerings, and the rays and disk of the Aten shine overhead. Both pharaoh and queen wear loosely draped robes and sandals, while Amenhotep III wears his blue *khepre* crown. There are cartouches overhead that clearly read Nebmaatre, which was Amenhotep III's prenomen.

There are several aspects of this relief that make it evidence in support of the co-regency. The first of these is the fact that it was found in the city of Amarna, which was built by Akhenaten as part of his break with traditional Egyptian religion and culture.⁵⁵ Furthermore, the style of the Aten's rays suggests that this relief was carved during or after Akhenaten's regnal year nine, around 1343 B.C.E.⁵⁶ It has been suggested that the image was carved after the death of Amenhotep III as a post-mortem reminder of a great king whose memory was

⁴⁸ Ibid.

⁴⁹ Ibid.

⁵⁰ William J. Murnane, *Texts from the Amarna Period in Egypt* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995), 127.

⁵¹ Ibid.

⁵² Dodson, "The Coregency Conundrum," 33.

⁵³ Ibid.

⁵⁴ Forbes, "Circumstantial Evidence for an Amenhotep III/IV Coregency," 37.

⁵⁵ Shaw, *The Oxford History of Ancient Egypt*, 280.

⁵⁶ Forbes, "Circumstantial Evidence for an Amenhotep III/IV Coregency," 36, 37.

held dear my many Egyptians. However, I and Forbes would disagree with that statement.⁵⁷ It is known that Queen Tiye lived for many years after the death of her husband. In addition, she lived in Amarna with her son during the final years of her life. Still, it would be very odd to depict such an intimate domestic scene if one of the characters in the scene was dead. As previously mentioned, Amarna period scenes that depict ancestor or divine worship traditionally have those who are living standing out of respect for the one receiving the worship. If Amenhotep III was dead at the time of this scene, why would he be so close to his wife that they would be touching? I agree with Forbes that this scene likely depicts the royal couple together during one of Amenhotep III's visits to Amarna during the co-regency.

The previously mentioned sources from Panhesy's house and the tombs of Amenhotep-Huy and Ay are private reliefs meant to be seen only by a select few. However, not all the visually depicted evidence for the co-regency is private art. There are several examples of official public monuments that support the co-regency, one of which I will discuss here.

Perhaps the most important public monument that seems to support a co-regency is a relief scene carved into the walls at the Third Pylon at the Temple of Karnak. The scene's main focus is Amenhotep III, but there is a mysterious figure behind him which is of particular interest to co-regency supporters. Amenhotep III, stands on a sacred boat, he is also making an offering to a shrine in front of him.⁵⁸ Behind him is carved a table filled with various offering items. What makes this relief possible evidence is the half-erased figure underneath the offering table. The figure is of a smaller king wearing the same *kheprsh* crown as the larger figure of Amenhotep III, and also has his hands raised in offering to the same shrine in front of the larger figure.⁵⁹

⁵⁷ Ibid, 38.

⁵⁸ Ibid, 41-42.

⁵⁹ Ibid, 42.

It is clear that the original scene was of the two kings making the offerings. Then, at a later date, the image of the smaller king was erased as much as possible and the table was carved over the top to hide it.⁶⁰ The identity of the smaller king is not totally confirmed. Many co-regency supporters, myself included, have suggested that the smaller king figure is in fact, Akhenaten. If this is the case, then the smaller size of his figure would mean the prince was acting as co-ruler with his more experienced father. Other identities for the smaller figure have been suggested, yet there are other reasons to suppose that the smaller king on the Third Pylon is the second son of Amenhotep III, Akhenaten.

First, after Akhenaten's reign ended in 1336 B.C.E., many of his images and monuments were defaced in an attempt to destroy the afterlife of a man many considered to be an enemy. This helps the case for the image to be identified as Akhenaten because the erasure is symptomatic of other images of Akhenaten. Also, at a more southern point on the Third Pylon at Karnak, there is a large image of Akhenaten alone, in the act of killing enemies in a battle scene.⁶¹ The artistic style of the scene is that of his father's reign. Forbes has suggested that the co-existence of this other image of Akhenaten in his father's style would suggest that both reliefs were commissioned by Amenhotep III to commemorate the joint rule by himself and his son.⁶² I would also like to note that both figures are wearing the *kheprsh* crown. This signifies the dual kingship between them. I and others would suggest that the crowns suggest dual kingship, and that the scene shows father and son carrying out religious duties together. It was only later that the smaller figure of Akhenaten was covered with the offering table.

This is by no means a complete list of all the visual representations that could be linked

⁶⁰ Ibid.

⁶¹ Ibid, 42-43.

⁶² Ibid, 43.

to the Amenhotep III and Akhenaten co-regency, and there are still other forms of evidence that I have not addressed. I do believe that these examples provide a good cross-section of the body of evidence as it stands. It is possible to take any one of these examples of pro-co-regency evidence and reject them on circumstantial grounds. However, it is important to look at the body of evidence as a whole, and not as individual pieces that can be disproved. One relief of a half-erased king or one image of Amenhotep III at Amarna can be dismissed as circumstantial, but a large body of evidence that has continued to build is not easily pushed aside.

The proof for the co-regency that I have discussed here comes from several locations throughout Egypt and comes from several different contexts. When taking into account the previously mentioned religious theories presented by W. Raymond Johnson, the new reports by Bedman and Valentin, and the body of primary sources presented here and elsewhere, I believe with some certainty that a long co-regency between Amenhotep III and Akhenaten did take place. Surprisingly, my own findings on the co-regency came, not from a strong supporter, but from a doubter of the co-regency.

As I mentioned earlier, Arielle Kozloff's biography on the life and reign of Amenhotep III attempted to paint a more realistic picture of who is largely considered to be Egypt's greatest pharaoh. Towards the end of her biography, Kozloff claims that Amenhotep III's many building projects and his three jubilee festivals had places and enormous strain on the Egyptian economy.⁶³ She also suggested that Egypt had begun to lose control and influence abroad, specifically in Canaan and Babylon. This combined with poor agricultural yields around the same time had begun to weaken Egypt even before Akhenaten came to the throne.⁶⁴ It is in this new picture of Amenhotep III's reign that I

⁶³ Kozloff, *Amenhotep III*, 208, 222-224.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*

have found a new connection to support the co-regency. Johnson's religious theories surrounding the co-regency, as well as the multiple depictions of Amenhotep III at Amarna, support what I believe could be the primary reason for the co-regency. If Egypt had indeed begun to weaken after many years of stability, the co-regency could have been Amenhotep III's strategy to extend royal authority through Egypt.

Under the long co-regency model, Akhenaten would have control of his own resident city, which he chose to build at Amarna. Two pharaohs with one resident city each would have spread royal authority and control over a greater area. To me, this would have been an effort by Amenhotep III to prevent Egypt from descending into chaos and regional division as it had during previous intermediate periods. With Amenhotep III in his resident city in Thebes, and with Akhenaten further north in the newly-built Amarna, greater control could be enforced throughout Egypt with two royal courts working in with one another. The religious model of the Aten and Shu, the chance to train Akhenaten for eventual independent rule, and the large body of evidence all support my theory and each other, creating a more cohesive and plausible picture of the co-regency.

What makes the co-regency such a highly debated concept are the implications it would have on the history of the Amarna Period. It would call into question Amenhotep III's involvement, or lack thereof, in the rising importance of the Aten. A confirmed co-regency would also alter Akhenaten's biography and reputation. It could also cast doubt onto the succession of the later Amarna pharaohs, specifically Tutankhamun.⁶⁵ In short, it is because confirming the co-regency would alter the histories of both kings so greatly that the co-regency itself is so controversial. A clean

⁶⁵ W. Raymond Johnson and others suggest that a long co-regency between Amenhotep III and Akhenaten could mean that Amenhotep III, not Akhenaten, was the father of the famous boy-king, Tutankhamun.

succession upon Amenhotep III's death would make for clean and easy history, but the possibility of a more complicated version of history must be addressed and properly considered.

Amenhotep III's reputation as a benevolent pharaoh would be altered significantly, especially his life after the first *heb sed* festival during regnal year thirty. The traditional plot line is that Amenhotep III passed down to his son an Egypt that had never been wealthier, more powerful, or better established.⁶⁶ If the long co-regency model is accepted, this would imply that Amenhotep III had a much more involved role in the shift towards the Aten and away from the traditional Egyptian gods and goddesses. As previously mentioned, W. Raymond Johnson has suggested that the shift towards the worship of the Aten was begun by Amenhotep III and Akhenaten jointly, and was continued by Akhenaten alone after the death of his father.⁶⁷

According to Johnson, the shift towards the Aten was all connected with the *heb sed*. During this festival, the pharaoh became the "dazzling Aten" as part of his rejuvenation.⁶⁸ He also established his theory that Akhenaten symbolically transformed into the god Shu as part of the same ceremony, and that the connection between Aten and Shu was both reason for and confirmation of the co-regency.⁶⁹ The implication is that Amenhotep III began and promoted the heightened importance of the Aten as a way of increasing the power of the throne with his rejuvenation. It is my opinion that this theory holds up, and is supported by the body of evidence that exists both at Amarna and elsewhere. Amenhotep would have been an older man by Egyptian standards if he had

reached the thirtieth year of his own reign. He also would have a maturing male heir much in need of leadership experience. While the jubilee did symbolically make him young again, the reality of his physical aging would have remained the same. A co-regency with his son acting as the god Shu would serve both religious and practical purposes, allowing Akhenaten to learn and have real power, while keeping the legitimacy and experience gained by Amenhotep III. It would also explain the need for Akhenaten to have a separate residence city and royal court, though it does not explain why he chose to build a new one at Amarna. In short, a long co-regency would not only mean that Amenhotep III supported his son's initial changes to Egyptian religion and culture, but that the changes originated with Amenhotep III himself.

Just as many revisions would be applied to Akhenaten's biography. He has been almost universally given the blame for the downturn in Egypt's fortunes that occurred during and after his reign. Egyptologists such as Redford have painted him as weak, sick, possibly insane, too obsessed with his own religion to be an effective pharaoh.⁷⁰ While much of what happened during Akhenaten's reign is attributed to his own independent leadership, the origins of the great changes can now be attributed to his father under to co-regency model. This would also mean, as suggested by Johnson, that the worship of the Aten would have been an extension of his father's own policy.⁷¹

The increased prominence of the Aten could also be connected to the common Egyptian practice of worshipping the cult of a deceased king. If Amenhotep III symbolically became the dazzling Aten during his jubilee, that would have connected Akhenaten's worship of the Aten to the cult of his great father. Also, if Amenhotep III had symbolically made his son into the earthly embodiment of the god Shu, that would serve as further motivation for Akhenaten

⁶⁶ Shaw, *The Oxford History of Ancient Egypt*, 8.

⁶⁷ W. Raymond Johnson, "Monuments and Monumental Art under Amenhotep III: Evolution and Meaning," in *Amenhotep III: Perspectives on his Reign* ed. David O'Conner and Eric Cline (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1998), 75.

⁶⁸ *Ibid*, 75.

⁶⁹ *Ibid*, 88.

⁷⁰ Redford, *Akhenaten*, 58, 167, 199.

⁷¹ Johnson, "Monuments and Monumental Art under Amenhotep III," 90.

to act as both the mortal and immortal heir to his father's legacy.⁷² However, there is no way to know if Amenhotep III had intended for his son's policies to go as far as they did after his death. It is unlikely, I think, that Amenhotep III would have abandoned Egypt's traditional gods or encouraged his son to do so. After thirty-eight years of kingship in the traditional Egyptian way, it is difficult to imagine that Amenhotep III would have endorsed a rejection of Egypt's gods. His promotion of himself as the Aten and Akhenaten as Shu was, in my opinion, a way to connect himself and his son to the other gods and goddesses. It was not to make himself and his son the only deities.

It is this revision of Egyptian history that intensifies the debate between co-regency supporters and anti-co-regency historians. Egyptologists have been three categories of opinion. There are those such as Kozloff, Redford, Baines, Montserrat, and Dodson also support the traditional narrative of the succession from Amenhotep III to Akhenaten. This would mean that the crown passed in full to Akhenaten upon Amenhotep III's death with no overlap. This would also mean that the changes to Egypt's traditions in favor of the Aten were completely due to Akhenaten's leadership. There are those few Egyptologists like Kemp and Murnane who do not address the debate at all, or who acknowledge the debate, but do not attempt to give an opinion or address the issue of the succession and its possible co-regency. Many of those who do not address the co-regency debate at all support the traditional narrative by omission. The third group belongs to those who support the co-regency, and it is the ideas of these Egyptologists that I have supported in this paper. Their works support a ten-year period of co-rule between Amenhotep III and Akhenaten. These three varying historical camps of opinion have caused debate over the topic of the co-regency for many years. However, this debate has become more intense in recent years as additional evidence had been

discovered and interpreted as supporting the co-regency.

Given the abundance of primary source evidence supporting the idea of the co-regency, I have limited my discussion primarily to examples of visual art, with a focus on carved reliefs. These reliefs come from the tombs of Amenhotep-Huy and Huyu, who were high-ranking royal officials and served Amenhotep III and Queen Tiye respectively. Other reliefs discussed in this paper have come from the House of Panhesy in Amarna and the Third Pylon at the Temple of Karnak. Arguably, the variety of locations, purposes and types of these reliefs further strengthen the body of evidence to support the co-regency. It suggests that Amenhotep III and Akhenaten were supporting one another from separate locations during the co-regency. As previously discussed, it is easy to dismiss one relief as circumstantial evidence on its own. If the collections of reliefs as a whole are viewed alongside other forms of evidence, however, then the co-regency becomes clearer and more probable.

There may never come a time when the existence of a co-regency between Amenhotep III and Akhenaten can be unanimously confirmed or denied. This possibility must be acknowledged by historians on every side of the argument. At the same time, the past twenty years have seen not only an increase in discussion about the co-regency among historians, but also an increase in the support for the co-regency itself. Evidence supporting the idea of a co-regency as well as Amenhotep III's involvement in the policies of Akhenaten and the Amarna period is, in Johnson's words, "accumulating and providing vital clues to one of ancient Egypt's most fascinating and complex period."⁷³ As a historian, I agree with this statement and would encourage others to consider the co-regency theory as the most

⁷² Ibid, 90-92.

⁷³ Johnson, "Amenhotep III and Amarna: Some New Considerations," 82.

accurate narrative for the beginning of the Amarna period.

Bibliography

Primary Sources:

- Bedman, Theresa, and Francisco Martin Valentin. "Proof of a 'Long Co-regency' between Amenhotep III & Amenhotep IV Found in the Chapel of Vizier Amenhotep-Huy (ASASIF Tomb 28) West Luxor." *Kmt* 25 (2014): 17-27.
- Forbes, Dennis. "Circumstantial Evidence for an Amenhotep III/IV Coregency." *Kmt* 25 (2014): 36-50.
- Freed, Rita E., Yvonne J. Markowitz, and Sue H. D'Auria. *Pharaohs of the Sun: Akhenaten, Nefertiti, Tutankhamen*. Boston: Bulfinch Press, 1999.
- Murnane, William J. *Texts from the Amarna Period in Egypt*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995.

Secondary Sources:

- Aldred, Cyril. *Akhenaten: King of Egypt*. London: Thames and Hudson, 1988.
- Baines, John. "The Dawn of the Amarna Age," in *Amenhotep III: Perspectives on his Reign*, edited by David O'Conner and Eric Cline, 271-311. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1998.
- Bedman, Theresa, and Francisco Martin Valentin. "Proof of a 'Long Co-regency' between Amenhotep III & Amenhotep IV Found in the Chapel of Vizier Amenhotep-Huy (ASASIF Tomb 28) West Luxor." *Kmt* 25 (2014): 17-27.
- Dodson, Aidan. "The Coregency Conundrum." *Kmt* 25 (2014): 28-35.
- Forbes, Dennis. "Circumstantial Evidence for an Amenhotep III/IV Coregency." *Kmt* 25 (2014): 36-50.
- Johnson, Raymond W. "Images of Amenhotep III in Thebes: Styles and Intentions." in *The Art of Amenhotep III: Art Historical Analysis*, edited by Lawrence M. Berman, 26-46. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1990.
- "Amenhotep III and Amarna: Some New Considerations." *The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 82 (1996): 65-82.
- "The Revolutionary Role of the Sun in the Reliefs and Statuary of Amenhotep III." *The Oriental Institute* 151 (1996): 1-7.
- "Monuments and Monumental Art under Amenhotep III: Evolution and Meaning." in *Amenhotep III: Perspectives on His Reign*, edited by David O'Conner and Eric Cline, 63-94. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1998.
- Kemp, Barry. *The City of Akhenaten and Nefertiti: Amarna and Its People*. London: Thames and Hudson Inc., 2012.
- Kozloff, Arielle P. *Amenhotep III: Egypt's Radiant Pharaoh*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- Montserrat, Dominic. *Akhenaten: History, Fantasy and Ancient Egypt*. London: Routledge, 2000.

Murnane, William J. *Ancient Egyptian Coregencies*. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1977.

Redford, Donald B. *Akhenaten: The Heretic King*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984.

Reeves, Nicholas. *Akhenaten: Egypt's False Prophet*. London: Thames and Hudson Inc., 2001.

Shaw, Ian. *The Oxford History of Ancient Egypt*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR: Erin Barr is a senior with majors in History and in Archaeology, and a minor in Classical Studies. She is also an Undergraduate Learning Assistant and is deeply involved with student government on campus. She will be attending Illinois State University in the fall with a full Graduate Assistantship.

What Did We Fight For: A Documentary Remembering the Civil War

By William Barr

Note:

The following paper is not typical of history papers. It was written for a final examination that asked students to craft a film proposal for Ted Turner explaining their ideas about the American Civil War's lasting impact on modern American society, and demonstrating the complexity involved in commemorating historical events. Consequently, this paper lacks traditional citations, relying instead upon a semester's worth of lectures and reading assignments.

How often is it that you stop and wonder to yourself, "Why does that person still fly a Confederate Flag? Do they not realize what it stands for?" Or maybe you ask yourself why is racism still such a big deal, even after slavery has been abolished for over one hundred years? What could be the importance of this, you ask? The answer is, the American Civil War. What does some war from one hundred fifty years ago have to do with us today? Well, Mr. Turner, I have a proposition for you that will make both of us big, BIG bucks in Hollywood: Americans today care just as much about remembering the Civil War as the folks who were fighting in it. The popularity of this war is so massive, in fact, that I guarantee that showing how different people remember this war today will rake in millions of dollars, for both you and me!

Obviously, I owe you an explanation on how this would work. I propose that you and I shoot an independent documentary of want-to-be Civil War actors. The plan is to advertise a fake plot for a movie, one in which a Northern journalist discovers a tale of a southern slave joining the army solely to protect his master, who is a Confederate general at the Battle of Gettysburg. This journalist's aim is not to glorify Southern pride, however, but instead to explain how foolish the Confederate cause was. This "movie" will end with

northern triumph, but it calls for the sympathy for the South. The real movie will consist of interviews with the actors who are pursuing these fake roles, with their consent of course. During these interviews, the role of each character shall be explained along with that character's belief of the most significant outcome of the war on modern America. These actors will then be asked to explain if they agree with the character he or she wishes to depict. By doing this, Americans everywhere will be able to identify with at least one character or actor's belief of what has been the most lasting memory of the Civil War.

The first character shall be the Confederate General Red Forrest. He shall portray the common conception of the southern gentleman. He owns slaves, but he is a good Christian master who never beats them. His only shortcoming is that he never wishes to free his slaves because he knows that the South's economy thrives upon slavery. Believing that the North has gone to war to end slavery, he joins the war in order to resist this change. The memory of the war that Americans will understand today is the romantic view of the southern gentleman who fought with honor and pride to defend his land. Moreover, thousands across the South today still understand the old Confederate men to be of this caliber, most

commonly from their knowledge of the classic film *Gone With the Wind*.

The actor who I have lined up for this position is a veteran Confederate re-enactor named Tommy Jones. He absolutely refuses to betray the image of the Old South for the North. He even has a tattoo on his forearm that says, "The South Shall Rise Again," intertwined with the Confederate Battle flag. The only way he differs from Red Forrest is that he despises blacks and their progress in modern America. He even went so far to tell me that the war in the Middle East was merely a distraction to keep another American Civil War from brewing. Some sort of war effort, I guess. Jones is a firm believer that the most lasting impact of the Civil War – or the War of Northern Aggression, as he calls it – was that the South was wronged. He believes that the North had no right to invade: the South was simply trying to be its own independent country and the rich businessmen of the North were too greedy to let the South slip away, for if they did, they would have lost profits from slavery. It is my firm belief that many southerners today would agree that the North acted as some sort of "Great Invader," but this will not be the most common memory of the Civil War. However, many will agree with Jones due to the recent amount of companies, such as Coca-Cola, that have taken over local farms and shops. According to the likes of Jones, these modern day carpetbaggers are causing as much a ruckus in the South as they did way back in 1865.

The second character is the loyal slave, Emmitt Washington. Worried that his master is going to be killed at Gettysburg, Washington, after discussing the possibilities with his fellow slaves, escapes

the plantation in hopes to save his master from the dangers that await him. Even as a slave, Washington sees no reason to abolish slavery because he believes that black themselves are too ignorant to survive on their own in America. For Washington, slavery provides a safe means of living as long as he serves his master. The long-lasting impact that this character shall exemplify is the view created by many southerners that masters were generally very good to their slaves. Caroline Hentz once made the argument that Jefferson's slaves were extremely glad to see him return, for they knew he was a good master. Many Americans today still believe this is true due to hundreds of reports of gentle masters and obedient slaves – and not just in the South. The standpoint of the cruel master cannot so easily be cast aside, but this more gentle view persists as one of the most intriguing surviving legends that southern Confederates concocted.

William Raashad is the actor interested in this role. Born in New York City, he lived there until he was twenty, moving down to Atlanta shortly after. Ever since, he has traveled to the South and seen the rampant racism that still exists in the South. He disagrees that the gentle master was a common theme, but has decided to play this role simply to challenge himself. As a major supporter of civil and human rights, Raashad is dumbfounded to see that racism still exists long after slavery's abolition. For these reasons, it is his firm belief that the strongest impact of the war is that the question of race was never truly dealt with. He is not unlike Marcus Garvey and many before him that advocated for the "Back to Africa" and colonization movement. Interestingly enough, this idea is

still circulating, although far less popular, as African Americans have made great strides in American society. Kanye West has even said in the past year that he fully supports the “Back to Africa” movement and would willingly go if he could find enough supporters. What has not changed, however, is that racism is still alive. I strongly believe that many of our African American viewers will agree with this impact, along with many other sympathetic human rights advocates. It is not strong enough to be the major consensus of the memory of the war, but it will, however, draw in thousands of paying customers.

Third on the list is northern abolitionist-turned-journalist, Harriet Copeland. Hailing from Maine, she has managed to obtain a writing position because her husband has gone off to war. She believes that inherent in every southern citizen is the seed of evil so delicately placed by the Devil. To her, the South does not exist without slavery and for that, it must be reformed. The South needs to be baptized and cleansed by the waters (armies) of the North. Copeland’s terms dictate that only when the South has been cleansed of slavery shall they be allowed back into the Union. For this reason, Washington and Forrest’s romantic relationship is evil, no matter how noble their cause. Miss Copeland’s view of the war shall be the most prevalent view of the Civil War in America today: that slavery was a moral wrong and the war was fought to end slavery. This idea is often what is taught in public school systems of the North and has been attempted to be integrated into southern school systems. Due to modern human rights beliefs, support for equality and morality is what makes this character’s

view of the memory of the war he most relevant in the minds of today’s Americans.

Interestingly enough, Betty Johnson is fond of this role. Originally from New Orleans, it is her strong belief that slavery was the most damaging thing that ever happened in American history. She differs from her character in that she disagrees that the North was always superior, but does believe they had a higher moral consciousness when it came to slavery. Coming from New Orleans, she was around more mixed-race persons than most of the rest of the South. She knew that inequality was only a myth, for it was present in her region of the South, if not entirely dominant throughout. This reasoning is why she supports the northern anti-slavery cause. However, she recalls the Civil War by remembering that women began to fight notably in the South for gender equality. A devout feminist, she has read that Confederate women began their fight for equality by taking up roles in the South that were commonly a man’s job. To her dismay, however, modern America is still a man’s world, so the feminist movements that had a branch in the Civil War is not large enough to cast the majority of modern American’s recollection of the war. It may cast a few sympathizers, but will be far from the dominant memory – probably the least dominant, in fact.

The movie’s main point, then – the fake one, that is – is to show how the fight against slavery was the major consensus in the memory of most Americans. Copeland catches wind of Emmitt Washington going up to Gettysburg to defend his master and decides that this notion is absolutely absurd. She writes a story depicting how the master had compelled his slave to fight for him,

thus making the conception of the southern slave master a nasty and evil-natured person. In turn, she then casts the entire South in this image with only a few strokes of her pen. Meanwhile, Forrest will be engaged in the Battle of Gettysburg. Pinned down to his last stand, he knows that what he is fighting for is on its last legs. At that moment, he sees Emmitt Washington coming up to aid him. Before Washington can reach Copeland, however, he is gunned down. Copeland rushes out to save him, but it is too late. Infuriated with his “Northern Aggressors,” Copeland goes out in a fit of rage and dies attempting to avenge his fallen friend and to protect his homeland. The movie ends in the retelling of how Gettysburg was the turning point for the Union, and no amount of southern pride or honor was able to stop the Union. Copeland and the North eventually reigned supreme over the honor of the southern gentlemen as slavery was abolished two years later. Thus, the viewers are left with the common conception that abolition was the main cause of the war, but are also asked to call into question whether or not they should be sympathetic with the South: were all masters like Copeland? Was the South really as bad or evil as northern abolitionists painted it to be?

What I believe will make this movie incredibly successful, Mr. Turner, is that it plays upon two different generations and their different beliefs in respect to the war.

What is more is that some of the views of the characters and actors overlap, while other characters and actors are polar opposites of one another. The millions of people who view this film will be able to understand two things. The first is that by understanding the characters’ roles, they will have a greater insight on how certain types of people viewed the war in the 1860s. Secondly, by listening to the actors’ beliefs on why the war is still important today, the viewers will be able to either relate or disagree with the multiple recollections of the war. Whether or not they disagree or identify with one certain memory of the war is not so important. Instead, the ultimate goal is to show that there are many different beliefs regarding the true memory of the Civil War. That is the reason for producing a documentary rather than a standard film. While I believe that the viewpoint of abolition and equal rights is the most common memory of the war in America today, the point remains that each American’s memory of the Civil War is cast in a different light. This popularity and remembrance of the war, Mr. Turner, is what makes the Civil War so important over one hundred years later. It will also make you and me millions of dollars richer.

About the Author: William Barr is a History, Literature, and Sociology major at SUNY Potsdam. He works as an Undergraduate Learning Assistant for the SUNY Potsdam History Department and also for Dr. Lisa Wilson of the English Department transcribing and coding letters for the Mary Russell Mitford Project. William expects to graduate from SUNY Potsdam in the spring term of 2016 and pursue graduate work in eighteenth and nineteenth-century British and French history or literature.

Deciphering the *La Dame à la licorne* Tapestries

By Jeanne Einhorn

Medieval art is distinctive in that it encompasses many different styles and media into a single category spanning over one thousand years. One of the period's most interesting aspects are tapestries. No medium of art in the era better conveys the Medieval Europeans' sense of wealth and social status. One set of tapestries that have caused art historians more confusion and disagreement than any others from this time is the *La Dame à la licorne*, or the *Lady and the Unicorn* tapestry set, dating from ca.1500. Art historians' most common theory is that this set of tapestries depict each of the five human senses through the Lady's actions, although, following this notion, the sixth tapestry remains a complete mystery. This paper suggests that the tapestries do in fact depict the five senses, with the sixth tapestry depicting the young bride for and about whom these tapestries were commissioned.

Tapestries were, and are, a distinctive and highly valued form of art. Weaving them involves an intensive and detailed-oriented process that prepares them for daily use as well as admiration. As Phyllis Ackerman notes, "On the one hand, it has been part of household furniture, and, on the other, one of the luxurious adornments enhancing the prestige of the great personalities that have determined or epitomized history."¹ Tapestries conveyed ideas about the wealth and social prominence of their owners, especially if the person or family possessed a set of tapestries, rather than one tapestry alone. This was due in part to the sumptuous materials needed in order to create these tapestries, and the amount of labor that went into the physical construction of them.

¹ Phyllis Ackerman, preface to *Tapestry: The Mirror of Civilization* (New York: AMS Press, 1933), v.

Weavers would work from the back of the tapestry, and weave the image as if it were mirrored, so that the final product would come out how the patron wanted it.² There were multiple ways of weaving that artists would use depending on the intended image outcome. Tapestries at the time were made of expensive materials, such as wool and silk in *La Dame à la licorne*, which also helped convey the same sense of wealth; if one could afford an abundance of those materials to make a decorative hanging for their home, they must have had a high level of social or political importance. The materials used enabled the tapestries to double as a source of warmth for a house as well, and not just a wall decoration, as a painting would have done. The multipurpose aspect of tapestries helped to make them more valuable during Medieval times.

Factually, there is little to be known for certain about the origins of this particular tapestry set. Rumors have continued throughout the centuries that they were commissioned by a member of the Le Viste family from Lyon, a city in eastern France. Art historians have come to this conclusion from the crest that appears on the banners, flags, and shields throughout all six tapestries, because it has been identified as the Le Viste family coat-of-arms.³ This crest appears on flags held by the Lady, the lion, and the unicorn, as well as the shields or capes that can be seen on each of the animals, depending on which tapestry the viewer is looking at. It shows a blue diagonal line going from the top left corner

² Adolfo Salvatore Cavallo, *The Unicorn Tapestries at the Metropolitan Museum of Art* (New York: Harry N. Abrams, Inc., 1998), 81.

³ Helmut Nickel, "About the Sequence of the Tapestries in *The Hunt of the Unicorn* and *The Lady with the Unicorn*," *Metropolitan Museum Journal* 17 (1982): 12.

to the bottom right corner, with three crescent moons inside of it, set against a red background.

Besides the family crest and their found location, there is little else in the tapestries to help suggest any sort of origin, or story of their commissioning other than a general family. By going through records of Le Viste family history, scholars have narrowed down the possible patron to two male members of the family, for at the time of completion there were no other family members alive.⁴ One was Jean IV, the head of the family at the end of the fifteenth century, and the other, his nephew, Antoine. Due to a relatively new theory, it is much more plausible for Antoine to have commissioned these rather than Jean IV, for this it is believed that they were meant to be a wedding gift for his new bride, Jacqueline. Even though he was the head of the Le Viste family dynasty at the time, with his age, Jean IV would have had no apparent or known reason to commission these works, as there are no records indicating a marriage, or any other major life event, that late into his life.

The *Lady and the Unicorn* tapestries were also recorded as being hung in the Château de Boussac, the place of residence for a family who was believed to be distant heirs to the Le Viste family.⁵ It is believed they arrived there through the marriage of Jeanne, the daughter of Antoine and Jacqueline Le Viste, who moved there with her husband, a direct descendant of the château's owners. It is here that they remained until their removal in 1882, when they were brought to the Musée Cluny for restoration and preservation.

There is also little to nothing known about the artist, or weaver of these tapestries. This is mainly because there are no concrete records that art historians

currently know of to indicate anything about the tapestries commissioning, purpose, or any sort of commission contract. Some attribute them to an artist known as 'Master of Anne de Bretagne,' or an artist who worked under the regime of Queen Anne of Brittany.⁶ The main work that this artist is responsible for is *Grandes Heures*, a book of hours illuminated manuscript, which was commissioned and created around the same date that the tapestries were completed. When looking at an image from a page of this manuscript, it is understandable why some attribute the tapestries to the same artist. The way that the fabric of St. Anne's clothing in the manuscript page reflect the light and various highlights and shadows is quite similar to the folds in the sleeve of the Lady in the tapestry "L'Ouïe," or "Hearing." Areas of a lighter, or even different color, are where the artist is trying to depict light falling on the clothing. In tapestry making, "weavers could not literally shade one color into an adjacent one, [but] they could achieve an analogous effect by means of hatching... which, viewed from a distance, give the impression of shaded tones."⁷ While someone creating a manuscript page most likely would not have had quite the same problem to overcome, the technique used to depict light and shadow seems very similar, especially since it was a unique and unusual way for artists to depict this difference at the time.

Another commonality that is visible between the two works of art is the facial expressions of the two primary figures being depicted in both the manuscript page and the hearing tapestry. In a page from *Grandes Heures*, a young girl depicting Mary is so engrossed in her reading that she has a very calm facial expression on showing a sense of concentration, while the woman holding

⁴ Carl Nordenfalk, "The Five Senses in Late Medieval and Renaissance Art," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 48 (1985): 7.

⁵ Cavallo, *The Unicorn Tapestries*, 100.

⁶ John Williamson, *The Oak King, The Holly King, and the Unicorn* (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1980), 76.

⁷ Nordenfalk, "The Five Senses in Late Medieval and Renaissance Art," 86.

the book wears almost a scowl on her face, as she stares at Mary trying to read. The same facial expressions can be found in the tapestry. The Lady playing the table organ is so consumed with her own activity, as if everything else around her does not matter as she has a very peaceful and content expression across her face, while the smaller woman on the other side of the instrument looks almost impatient, and annoyed with the woman across from her. It is very similar to the facial interactions seen in the manuscript, and the figures with each expression can be compared to being similar to one another, as well. In both the tapestry and the manuscript page, Mary and the Lady are meant to be the focus of the pieces, while St. Anne and the Lady's handmaiden are meant to be secondary focal points, noticed only after the actions of the other female figures. The tension between the Lady and her maiden most visible in this tapestry, (the other three with the two women interacting seems to be of a much friendlier nature,) also reflects the state of tension between the unicorn and the lion, both historically and in this tapestry set. This matter is discussed later on in the paper.

While any theories about the artist of the tapestries may be in high debate, the subject matter being depicted in them is less controversial. Antoine commissioned these tapestries with the intent that they would be a present for his beloved in honor of their wedding. Five of the tapestries depict a woman interacting with her surroundings and other figures differently, in a way that is thought to be representative of the five senses. Up until this time, the human senses were depicted in art through the use of male figures. "A sudden change of sex takes place around 1500. From this time the rule is that the Five Senses should be represented as women. The main reason seems to have been the force of the traditional association of womanhood... with sensuality."⁸ If there

⁸ Nordenfalk, "The Five Senses in Late Medieval and Renaissance Art," 7.

was a change at the time from depicting the senses as men to depicting them as women due to a sensual nature, then it is very logical as to why this would be the subject of the tapestries Antoine wanted to gift to his new wife.

At a time when religion had a prominent presence and role in both the lives of people and the subject matter in art, there is some disagreement over whether these tapestries are depicting any sort of religious symbolism, or if the entirety of the pieces remains secular. Art historians such as Phyllis Ackerman believe that the woman in the tapestries is meant to depict the Virgin Mary, for "the lady wears the Virgin's colours of red and blue," in many of the tapestries, and "the crescent was such a favourite emblem of the Virgin at the time."⁹ She believes too that both the lion and the unicorn are meant to be symbolic of Christ, for he is seen to be pure like the white in the unicorn, and a lion is a common symbol often used to indicate his presence by artists at the time.

I believe a stronger case can be made though for the tapestries depicting the senses in a secular manner. The Le Viste family initially came from the city of Lyon, so the lion that always appears on the left-hand side of the tapestries is meant to represent that city, the birthplace of the patron family. The unicorn opposing the lion on the tapestries is meant to be symbolic of the Le Viste family themselves, particularly Antoine, the commissioner. The unicorn is often referred to as a lunar creature,¹⁰ one of night that holds a certain connection with the moon. It makes sense that this would then be the animal chosen to represent this family, for their coat-of-arms depicts three separate crescent moons. "The set comprises six hangings," Weigert says,

⁹ Phyllis Ackerman, "The Lady and the Unicorn," *The Burlington Magazine for Connoisseurs* 66, no. 382 (1935): 34.

¹⁰ Williamson, *The Oak King, The Holly King, and the Unicorn*, 76.

“each of which appear... a lion, said to symbolize the ancient nobility of blood and, on the other, a unicorn, symbolizing the incorruptibility of the new nobility of the magistrature.”¹¹ It is a symbolic way of connecting the commissioner’s past, and his family roots to his future with his new bride, the Lady depicted in each of the tapestries.

The tapestries set out to portray the love that Antoine had for his bride Jacqueline, and she for him, and they do so through the use of the five human senses. Their chosen depiction originated with a representative theory formed by Aristotle. Before him, people often associated certain senses with specific animals, for it is believed that some have stronger connections with the physical perceptive senses than humans do. He chose instead to depict senses through specific actions pertaining to certain objects. “A mirror for Sight, a musical instrument for Hearing, a flower for Smell, a fruit for Taste, and for Touch a harp.”¹² While there are some variations within the *La Dame à la licorne* tapestries, this is predominantly the method that the artist chose to follow in his portrayal of the human senses.

For example, the tapestry entitled “Le Toucher,” representing the sense of touch, shows the maiden not holding a harp as Aristotle’s representation would suggest, but holding the staff with the banner that one of the animals is seen holding in every other individual tapestry. Her other hand is seen around the horn of the unicorn, in a phallic manner, as to suggest some sort of sexual act between the Lady and the creature. Many people would consider this an inappropriate interaction taking place between what is supposed to be representative of the Virgin Mary and Christ, her son, but if one looks at

it with the perspective of a secular piece, it is not so shocking. Expanding on the conclusion that the tapestries were made as a wedding gift from a man to his future bride, perhaps this gesture and particular positioning was a way to connect their love with the sense of touch. From a secular viewpoint, we see the unicorn representing the Le Viste family, which the woman is to be married into. By holding both the unicorn’s horn in an erotic way, and the banner which has the Le Viste family crest on it, Nordenfalk says it is the woman’s way of saying “she feels already entitled to make her bridegroom’s coat-of-arms her own.”¹³

One can also notice this sense of intimacy between the Lady and her soon-to-be new family in the tapestry, “La Vue,” or “Sight.” In it, she uses Aristotle’s direct representation tool of a mirror to portray the sense, but rather than looking at her own reflection in it, she is facing it towards the unicorn, so that it may gaze upon its own appearance. Historically in art, mirrors are used as a symbolic means of reflection for truth, or to convey the vanity of a figure, particularly when it is a female gazing upon her own reflection. When a figure looks in a mirror, they are hoping to see the truth in their own beauty. The Lady in “La Vue” is not trying to see her own beauty, but rather show the unicorn by directing the hand mirror towards his face, forcing him to see himself. By thinking of the unicorn as a representation of the Le Viste family, particularly Antoine whom the Lady, presumed to be Jacqueline, is to marry, one can read this tapestry as a woman showing the man she loves all of the beauty that is inside of him, indicating the strong bond of love between the two figures. Williamson describes the scene as “the unicorn wearing a remarkable expression as he stares entranced at his own reflection.”¹⁴ Today, one might interpret this as the artist adding a

¹¹ Roger-Armand Weigert, *French Tapestry*, translated by Donald and Monique King (Newton: Charles T. Branford Company, 1956), 79.

¹² Nordenfalk, “The Five Senses in Late Medieval and Renaissance Art,” 2.

¹³ *Ibid*, 10.

¹⁴ Williamson, *The Oak King, The Holly King, and the Unicorn*, 167.

touch of humor to the tapestries, for the unicorn is a mythical creature, sure to entrance anyone or anything if that was the reflection staring back at them in the mirror.

If one tries to view this tapestry from a religious standpoint of the Lady as Mary, and the unicorn as Christ, it could be rather unsettling to some viewers, just like “Le Toucher.” The unicorn has propped himself up onto the Lady’s lap with his two front hooves, which can also be interpreted as a sensual and sexual act of consummating the marriage between Antoine and his bride. His hooves are directed towards, and practically placed on top of, her genital region, as the first layer of her dress is pulled up leaving less material between her flesh and the unicorn. This draws the viewer’s attention to the sensual nature that encompasses the tapestries once again. If this were to depict an allegory of Mary and Christ, it would be a very disturbing and unsettling one to think about, for it would be full of incestual actions.

In the other three tapestries depicting the human senses, the Lady is not the only human figure shown; a young maid assists and accompanies her in the rest of her charades of the senses. In “L’Ouïe,” the Lady plays music on a table organ not for herself or her own enjoyment, but for the pleasure of the creatures to each side of the tapestry. This is evident from the directed looks of concentration from the animals towards the Lady and her instrument, and the expressions of enjoyment apparent on the faces of the creatures. While the maiden may not be quite as enthusiastic about the Lady’s music as her animal companions are, as discussed earlier about her facial expression, it does not matter, for she is not the intended audience for music in this tapestry. Again, the Lady is playing her own song of love for her future husband represented by the animals, and her handmaiden is merely a bystander to this act of affection. At this point in the tapestry series as well, the artist backs away from

overly-sexualizing the actions of the Lady with the unicorn.

The tapestry entitled “L’Odorat” depicts the sense of smell also in a loving manner. Aristotle says that a flower should be used in some manner to depict the sense of smell, and in this tapestry the Lady is seen weaving and constructing a crown of red and white flowers, that is presumed to be for her husband. In most instances, the artist would have depicted the Lady smelling the flowers herself, enjoying all of the beauty they have to offer for herself and not sharing it with the world around her; but this artist has done something differently because the main theme of this tapestry set is love. One can assume that since everything else in the previously discussed tapestries has been for the sake and enjoyment of her groom, that the same can be applied to this flower crown. “Instead of inhaling the scent of the flowers herself, she is about to tie them into a love-chaplet with which to crown her fiancé.”¹⁵ More than anything, these tapestries are meant to show and convey the love that exists between Antoine and Jacqueline through the use of the senses between the Lady, and the unicorn and the lion, and this specific tapestry continues to successfully portray that.

In the tapestry “Le Goût,” the last of the five senses, taste, is depicted. The viewer is introduced to a new animal meant to represent Antoine and the Le Viste family, which is the bird resting on the Lady’s hand. Using her other hand, she reaches into the bowl that is filled with the edible treats in preparation to feed it to the hungry little bird. It is apparent that the bird is meant to symbolize her betrothed, because of the endearing and tender expression that is on the Lady’s face. This is also the only tapestry that both the lion and the unicorn are seen fully standing; in every other tapestry, (other than “La Vue” where the unicorn stands on all fours for the woman to

¹⁵ Nordenfalk, “The Five Senses in Late Medieval and Renaissance Art,” 10.

reach his horn,) they are shown either fully sitting, or propped back on their hind legs with the front two wrapped around the poles that hold the flags with the Le Viste family crest. I believe that the artist has done this purposefully, and portrayed them with the strongest sense of movement in the tapestry depicting taste because they are jealous of the bird. They themselves are hungry for the love and affection of the Lady that they have been receiving in all of the previously analyzed tapestries. Elizabeth Sears writes,

A reading is an interpretation from a position – a story told from a vantage point – and often the specific object of study has been chosen because it enables the interpreter to broach an issue of broader significance for the study of visual materials.¹⁶

In this tapestry, the specific object of study is the positioning of the lion and the unicorn in relation to the actions of the Lady, and it comes back to the reason that this set of tapestries was made – as a declaration of love from Antoine to Jacqueline. With the unicorn acting as a representation of the Lady's betrothed, he is standing up to profess his love for the Lady, even if the bird is also meant to symbolize this same man. He has been depicted through the body of the unicorn throughout the tapestries until this point in time, and the unicorn is essentially protesting his right to remain the object of the Lady's affection.

The sixth tapestry remains a mystery to art historians and scholars everywhere, for there is not a human sense left for the artist to portray in this final one. It is what sways many people from believing the theory about the representation of the five senses in this tapestry set. Titled "Mon

seul désir," the Lady is depicted emerging from a tent and reaching for jewels in a box that her handmaiden is presenting to her. The lion and the unicorn to each side of the tent are watching her, and holding the fabric of the tent entrance back so she may exit it to greet the other woman. The writing on top of the tent, from which the tapestry derives its name, reads "À Mon Seul Désir," which translates into "My Only Desire." This tapestry reads definitively as the last tapestry in the set – the final one that the viewer is supposed to see, because it is so drastically different than all of the other tapestries.

It can be argued that this tapestry actually reflects two of the senses: sight and touch. The way the woman emerges from the tent, with the animals holding back the sides for her elegant exit, seems as if this is her grand debut for an important event, like when a bride readies herself to see her groom for the first time on the day of their wedding. The viewer's eyes cannot help but to be drawn to the commotion in the composition that surrounds her, as her gaze rests solely on the item of jewelry that she pulls out of the box. It seems as if she is careful not to touch it directly though, so she uses a cloth to pull the prized jewels out of their box in preparation for her use of them.

Another theory, which goes best with the believed notions that have been discussed in this paper, is that the tapestry artist is creating a sixth sense in this series, which is the desire of the heart.

This tapestry has been regarded by most scholars as an emblematic piece, showing the Lady for whom the series would have been woven as a marriage gift, in the act of choosing her bridal jewels, or, in the most recent interpretation...putting her jewelry back into the casket as a symbol of

¹⁶ Elizabeth Sears, "'Reading' Images in *Reading Medieval Images: The Art Historian and the Object*, ed. Elizabeth Sears and Thelma K. Thomas (Michigan: The University of Michigan Press, 2002): 1.

renouncement of all passions excited by the senses.”¹⁷

In all of the other tapestries, the Lady has been depicted experiencing each of the five senses in a different manner, all of which were coming from a place of love for her husband. In “Mon seul désir,” I believe the Lady is preparing to show all of this love finally to her husband himself, rather than through symbolic representations of him. The five senses help to explain how human beings perceive things in the world around them, and in this tapestry Jacqueline has finally processed how she can show love with all of her senses, and is ready to share that new knowledge with Antoine.

Knowing that this is meant to be the final tapestry seen by the viewer, it is important for the viewer to understand that the tapestries, while able to be seen and understood individually, should also be seen in a specific order if they are to be shown as a set. Nickel has come up with a few different suggestions as to how this set-up should be displayed, ranging from the number of times a Le Viste family banner is seen in a tapestry, to a symmetrical order with the tapestries “Mon seul désir” and “Le Goût” in the middle because they have the most architectural settings and structures in them of all of the tapestries.¹⁸ The way I have chosen to view them is in a sense of progression and growth for the Lady. In the first two tapestries discussed, she has actual hands-on interactions with the unicorn, the symbol for her husband, and she is very involved and engrossed with pleasing the creature. As one moves into “L’Ouïe” and “L’Odorat,” her actions seem to be more about showing love in general, that the animals happen to be benefitting from, rather than stating her love for them as profoundly as she did in the previous

tapestries. In the fifth sense tapestry she has moved on completely from the lion and the unicorn receiving her affection to a bird, a more common animal, until finally in the last tapestry, she only interacts with the other human in the image, as she prepares for her wedding to Antoine. By placing the tapestries in this particular order, it shows the Lady’s evolution of learning how to symbolically show her love for her husband, to how to show it in reality to him as a human being, no longer as a mythical creature.

The development of the Lady as Antoine’s wife, rather than some other ordinary woman of the time is also viewed through the use of the dog in the last two tapestries. In “La Goût” the dog is seated on the bottom part of the Lady’s dress staring up at her, and in “Mon seul désir” it is on the bench next to her, partaking in the same entranced stare as the previous tapestry. Since art in antiquity, the dog has been associated with marital fidelity,¹⁹ so by including it in these tapestries the artist has officially declared the Lady loyal only to the commissioner, Antoine.

Stylistically, these tapestries convey many characteristics that would classify them as being Medieval art, even though their date of creation lies much closer to that of Early or High Renaissance. During the Renaissance period, artists rediscovered the techniques necessary to accurately and realistically portray human anatomy, but in these tapestries, the artist has not quite yet grasped how to depict a realistic human figure. The faces and bodies of both women in all six of the tapestries are elongated and flattened, giving a poor sense of depth and reality to the figures. In addition, any sense of depth among the tapestries as a whole is confusing to the viewer, due to the saturated use of warm colors backing the darker items and objects in the foreground. The human eye therefore perceives the tapestries

¹⁷ Nickel, “About the Sequence of the Tapestries in *The Hunt of the Unicorn* and *The Lady with the Unicorn*,” 13.

¹⁸ *Ibid*, 13.

¹⁹ Mary Jo McNamara, class discussion, November 11, 2014.

stylistically as very flattened pieces of art. Another strong Medieval characteristic of them that distinguishes it from the following art period is the strong and dominating use of mille fiore in the backdrop; the unique pattern of multiple and repeating flowers against the red. It is considered to be one of the strongest uses of this style of decoration for its time, especially since it is being depicted on a tapestry hanging.²⁰

In terms of the visual content appearing in the tapestries, the theme of the relationship between a lady and a unicorn is one that became very popular among artists and writers at this time. While we cannot pinpoint exactly when stories and legends of the mythical creature of the unicorn originate, descriptions of the animal, and activities relating to it date as far back as the fourth century B.C.

The legendary unicorn, “that beast so much talked of and so little known,” was an austere and noble animal, the inhabitant of solitary places, and to hunt him was the sport of princes. He was never taken alive nor killed by ordinary means. Only a virgin could subdue him, so that in the hunt of the unicorn a virgin was used as a sort of decoy.²¹

And so, the relationship between a female being and a unicorn was born. While this set of tapestries depicts a much different sort of relationship between the two beings, for she has no desire to capture or kill the majestic animal, it is still important to note how their relationship began in folklore. It is a very deep connection that the two must have, for the reason a unicorn is able to be trapped by virgins, is it can tell there is innocence and virtue about the young women, and a unicorn would not expect to be deceived or harmed by one of those girls. “In time, the

legend of the unicorn caught by a maiden came to be associated with allegories of courtly love.”²² Along with the unicorns’ symbolic importance among the Le Viste family, this give Antoine the perfect reasoning as to why he would choose to depict a unicorn in the tapestries he wished to gift for his bride-to-be.

We have also already discussed the relationship that each the lion and the unicorn have to the Le Viste family separately, but the two animals also have a history with each other. Through stories passed through the years, it has been told that the lion and the unicorn will always be in perpetual states of conflict, for they are opposing creatures of nature. Williamson talks of the lunar nature of the unicorn, and how it is a celestial creature representative of fertility and healing, while the lion is a beast of the sun; the waxing sun, in particular, meant to represent life coming into being.²³ While both animals represent life in some way, they contrast each other, in that the lion represents the coming of life with the truth that the light of the sun may bring, and the unicorn brings the mysteries of life as it renews; a monthly cycle of growth and decay. “Upon this premise, the complex iconography of [the] tapestries may be seen as a profound celestial and fertility representation of decline and renewal.”

It is an interesting decision on the part of the artist to choose to depict both of these animals that are in such a permanent state of conflict, when the overarching message and theme of the tapestry set is one of love. Both animals hold a profound bond and meaning to the Christian religion, young virgins, and the patron family. They also fit well with the aspect of this paper’s theory relating to the progression of the Lady throughout each of the individual tapestries.

²⁰ Weigert. *French Tapestry*, 79.

²¹ *The Unicorn Tapestries: A Picture Book* (New York: The Museum Press, 1938), 3.

²² James J. Rorimer, *The Unicorn Tapestries at the Cloisters* (New York: Clarke & Way, Inc., 1938), 3.

²³ Williamson, *The Oak King, The Holly King, and the Unicorn*, 76.

Both the lion and the unicorn are animals of celestial meaning and power, and all things having to do with celestial matters are constantly in a state of change and evolution; just like the Lady's chosen way of showing affection for the man she is about to marry changes from loving an animal representation of himself, to preparing herself for her wedding to the human man; the reality.

The *La Dame à la licorne* tapestry set from c. 1500 is one of the most unique tapestry sets from Medieval times for many different reasons. While it is widely believed to be a depiction of the five senses, art historians have not been able to unanimously agree on what the sixth tapestry could be depicting, and so the content of this tapestry set has remained in question since its nineteenth century move into the museum world of preservation. More so than the five senses, these tapestries convey a strong sense of love as they were commissioned by a wealthy French patron for his new bride as a way of showing his devotion to her. Through their symbolism and representational imagery these artworks bring viewers through the Lady's metamorphosis as she learns to love not only the symbols of her groom, but his humanity, and show signs of this love. "This creature [a unicorn]... dominates the scenes, and not only for its unique phenotypic demeanor. Strong and purposeful, it claims center stage."²⁴ This quote can also be applied to these tapestries' central theme of love.

²⁴ Polyxeni Potter, "Unicorn Tapestries, Horned Animals, and Prion Disease," *Emerging Infectious Diseases* 10, no. 6 (2004): 1181.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ackerman, Phyllis. "The Lady and the Unicorn." *The Burlington Magazine for Connoisseurs* 66, no. 382 (1935): 34-46.
- Ackerman, Phyllis. *Tapestry: The Mirror of Civilization*. New York: AMS Press, 1933.
- Cavallo, Adolfo Salvatore. *The Unicorn Tapestries at the Metropolitan Museum of Art*. New York: Harry N. Abrams, Inc., 1998.
- Husband, Timothy. *The Wild Man: Medieval Myth and Symbolism*. New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1980.
- McNamara, Mary Jo. Class discussion. November 11, 2014.
- Nickel, Helmut. "About the Sequence of the Tapestries in *The Hunt of the Unicorn* and *The Lady with the Unicorn*." *Metropolitan Museum Journal* 17 (1982): 9-14.
- Nordenfalk, Carl. "The Five Senses in Late Medieval and Renaissance Art." *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 48 (1985): 1-22
- Sears, Elizabeth. "'Reading' Images." In *Reading Medieval Images: The Art Historian and the Object*, edited by Elizabeth Sears and Thelma K. Thomas, 1-7. Michigan: The University of Michigan Press, 2002.
- Potter, Polyxeni. "Unicorn Tapestries, Horned Animals, and Prion Disease." *Emerging Infectious Diseases* 10, no. 6 (2004): 1181-1182.
- Rorimer, James J. *The Unicorn Tapestries at the Cloisters*. New York: Clarke & Way, Inc., 1938.
- Weigert, Roger-Armand. *French Tapestry*. Translated by Donald and Monique King. Newton: Charles T. Branford Company, 1956.
- Williamson, John. *The Oak King, The Holly King, and the Unicorn*. New York: Harper & Row, 1980.
- The Unicorn Tapestries: A Picture Book*. New York: The Museum Press, 1938.

About the Author: Jeanne Einhorn is a senior at Potsdam double majoring in Art History and Visual Arts with a photography concentration, as well as minors in sociology and journalism. Her love of travel has greatly influenced her artwork and academic studies. After graduating from SUNY Potsdam in May 2015, Jeanne plans to work for a year before pursuing a Master's degree in Museum Studies.

Study of Women in Puritan Society through the Antinomian Controversy

By Corinne Gabriele

The Antinomian Controversy took place between 1636 and 1638 in the Massachusetts Bay Colony. Founded solely for the purpose of setting up a puritan society, Governor John Winthrop envisioned the area to be a “city upon a hill.” However, during these few years the colony, most notably the town of Boston, did not exactly fit the bill. The main issue surrounding the controversy was religious intolerance and defiance of authority. Anne Hutchinson, whose role in the controversy has made her legendary, and her followers believed in a special kind of salvation that involved unification with God. By going against fundamental puritan belief, ruining the “city upon a hill” image, the “Hutchinsonians” upset many of the colony ministers. Hutchinson based her ideology on John Cotton’s teachings. A prominent minister at the time, Cotton was happy to have the support. However, as Hutchinson pushed farther with her extreme ideas of revelation, Cotton tried to disassociate himself from her, not wanting to have her doctrine mistaken for his. The relationship fell apart and Cotton eventually agreed with the other ministers to have her banished.

The Report of the Trial of Mrs. Anne Hutchinson before the Church in Boston (1638) not only gives dialogue of the specific areas where Hutchinson and Cotton differ but also, on a bigger scale, can help study what made Hutchinson such a “controversy” and what her trial can tell historians about the role of women in puritan society.

Born in 1591 in Alford, Lincolnshire, Anne Marbury was the daughter of Bridget Dryden¹ and nonconformist Francis Marbury.² Well educated by her parents, and part of the

gentry class, Hutchinson grew into a suitable young woman, according to English standards. The puritan religion instructed that women be very submissive.³ However her rebellious nature (that will be seen in Boston, Massachusetts), resembled her father who, in 1578, accused the ministers of being “unfit” for their positions.

The young Anne Marbury married local merchant, William Hutchinson in 1612.⁴ She was 21 years old at time.⁵ What is most surprising about the new Mrs. Hutchinson’s home life is her successful child bearing. By 1631 Hutchinson would have twelve children.⁶ During her time in Lincolnshire, Hutchinson traveled to the town of Boston, twenty miles away,⁷ on horseback to hear the sermons of her favorite minister, John Cotton.⁸ Hutchinson along with many others would gather in Boston at St. Botolph’s Established Church to hear Cotton speak.⁹

Cotton himself was born in 1584.¹⁰ As a child, Cotton suffered a bout of depression. Many people struggled with the anxiety of not knowing if they were chosen ones to be saved by God. Cotton feared he was damned, until he met Richard Sibbes in 1609. Sibbes told Cotton that “it is a sin for a child of God to be too much

¹ Helen Augur, *An American Jezebel; The Life of Anne Hutchinson*, (New York: Brentano's, 1930), 10.

² Marilyn J. Westerkamp, “Anne Hutchinson, the Puritan Patriarchs, and the Power of the Spirit,” in *The Human Tradition in Colonial America*, ed. Ian K. Steele (Wilmington: A Scholarly Resources Inc., 1999), 49.

³ Michael Winship, *The Times and Trials of Anne Hutchinson* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2005), 11.

⁴ Augur, *An American Jezebel*, 13.

⁵ Westerkamp, “Anne Hutchinson, the Puritan Patriarchs, and the Power of the Spirit,” 53.

⁶ Lisa Moore, *Transatlantic Feminisms in the Age of Revolutions* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 35.

⁷ Westerkamp, “Anne Hutchinson, the Puritan Patriarchs, and the Power of the Spirit,” 53.

⁸ David Hall, *Worlds of Wonder, Days of Judgment: Popular Religious Belief in Early New England* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1990), 140.

⁹ Augur, *An American Jezebel*, 4.

¹⁰ Larzar Ziff, *The Career of John Cotton: Puritanism and the American Experience* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1962), 36.

discouraged and cast down.”¹¹ After three years of studying with Sibbes, Cotton claimed he was an elite saved by God.¹² In the midst of his religious career (which included getting a master’s degree at Trinity College),¹³ Cotton was called to preach at St. Botolph’s in 1612 and would remain there for twenty more years.¹⁴ He was a very well respected man, sought out by junior and senior ministers to act as their mentor. In fact, the Puritans that reached the New World before Cotton named the town “Boston,” in honor of him.¹⁵

As he grew older his importance can be seen through the number letters he received from others seeking his advice.¹⁶ In his sermons, Cotton preached true salvation and the covenant of grace. He and his followers accepted the idea that true assurance of salvation came from a revelation, or what was sometimes called “enthusiasm.”¹⁷ Cotton preached that if a person were saved, he/she would experience some sort of internal sign to be assured of their salvation.¹⁸ He felt that if a person not only read the words of God, but heard them, symbolically, he would know he was saved.¹⁹ However Cotton’s methods differ slightly than that of traditional puritanism. In order to understand the division between Cotton and other Puritans, one must evaluate the basic religious ideals of the common Puritan.

“Puritan” is actually a derogatory term given to the group of separatists that fled England because of their desire to “purify” the

Anglican Church.²⁰ The church had headed in a direction of Catholicism and Puritans wanted to follow a more Calvinist theology— a religious idea which teaches that one cannot earn their salvation through good works.²¹ Because humans were born corrupt and sinful, God selected only and elite few to be saved. However humans were helpless to affect their own salvation and God’s graces acted alone.²² Puritans believed that God at one time established the covenant of works with Adam in the Garden of Eden. This agreement meant that Adam would perform good deeds by following God’s will. However, when Adam and Eve took a bite of the forbidden fruit, this covenant was broken. Thus the covenant of grace was created, which stated that one’s good works had no effect on their salvation, God acted alone.²³ However this feeling of human helplessness made people very anxious about their salvation.²⁴ In attempt to reduce this agitated feeling, ministers encouraged the idea that attending church and constant prayer would help people prepare for salvation. Cotton was in disagreement with this concept, thinking it too closely resembled the covenant of works. To him there was no preparation or “steps unto the Altar” that will unify one with God.²⁵ He wanted to devalue human action as much as possible.²⁶

Puritans were also strong believers in discipline. Banning tobacco, instituting the death penalty for adultery, and fining people to disrupting the Sabbath were a few methods of punishment enforced by the ministers.²⁷ They

¹¹ Ibid, 30.

¹² Ibid, 31.

¹³ Augur, *An American Jezebel*, 6.

¹⁴ Ziff, *The Career of John Cotton*, 45.

¹⁵ Augur, *An American Jezebel*, 39.

¹⁶ Sargent Bush, *The Correspondence of John Cotton* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2001), 32.

¹⁷ John Winthrop, “Speech to the General Court,” in *Puritanism in Early America*, ed. George Waller (Lexington: Health Press, 1973), 40.

¹⁸ Michael Winship, *The Times and Trials of Anne Hutchinson* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2005), 15.

¹⁹ Ziff, *The Career of John Cotton*, 107.

²⁰ Westerkamp, “Anne Hutchinson, the Puritan Patriarchs, and the Power of the Spirit,” 51.

²¹ Ibid, 51.

²² William Stoeber, “Nature, Grace and John Cotton: The Theological Dimension in New England Antinomian Controversy” *Church History* 44 (1975): 32.

²³ Winship, *Times and Trials*, 3.

²⁴ Westerkamp, “Anne Hutchinson, the Puritan Patriarchs, and the Power of the Spirit,” 57.

²⁵ Bush, *The Correspondence of John Cotton*, 5.

²⁶ Westerkamp, “Anne Hutchinson, the Puritan Patriarchs, and the Power of the Spirit,” 57.

²⁷ Winship, *Times and Trials*, 26.

also believed in the harsh punishment of God. According to puritans, the misfortune occurring throughout England at the time— plague and famine— were signs of the Last Judgment and God’s way of punishing the people for changing the ways of the church.²⁸ In reality it was just an effect of the rapid population increase.²⁹ The new Catholic Church rituals were too “man-made” for the Puritans’ liking; for example reading prayers from a book.³⁰

Charles I made a decision, without the consent of Parliament, to forbid Puritan practice and imprison its preachers in 1629.³¹ In order to escape the now corrupted Church of England, Puritans decided to flee to the new world to start their own religious utopia. John Winthrop explained their goals clearly in his speech aboard the *Arbella* in 1630: “Wee shall be as a Citty Vpon a Hill, the eies of all people ar vpon vs; soe that if wee shall deale falsely with our god in this worke... wee shall be made a story... through the word...”³² The Puritans wanted to be a beacon of perfect religious and social practice for the mother country, a “city upon a hill.”

Cotton was not as quick as Winthrop to leave England. One must try to understand how hard it is just to up and leave, especially during this time. Making this journey would mean abandoning a house in exchange for a life of uncertainty in, what essentially, is wilderness. This is known as Andrew Delbanco’s “Puritan Ordeal.”³³ However Cotton was eventually forced into hiding and he knew he had to leave. Someone had reported him to authorities in 1632 and was to appear before court. Cotton fled to London where, in 1633, he would depart on a journey to the Massachusetts Bay Colony.³⁴ If he

did not leave, the consequence was prison and for Cotton, he did not feel that he could serve God to the best of his abilities from a jail cell, so he knew he had to go.³⁵ Luckily in the new world, Cotton was able to carry out God’s work effectively. John Wilson was already the established pastor at the church in Boston, but of course they took Cotton on as the teacher who performed sermons alongside the pastor. Because puritans were against the idea of a bishop and felt he was the Anti-Christ, they set up their own hierarchy of church officials. Each church had a church elder who acted as a governor, then there were two ministers per church in the colony (pastor and teacher), and lastly a ruling lay elder.³⁶

Hutchinson followed her favorite minister out to Boston, Massachusetts a year later. While aboard the *Griffin*, headed to their new home, Hutchinson spoke to other passengers about her beliefs and praised Cotton. She spoke of her revelation from Jeremiah 46:27. 28: “I will make a full end of all the nations wither I have driven thee.” To Hutchinson this meant that God would destroy England because of the Catholics and that she would get divine protection on this journey but this new world would also lead to her death.³⁷ Even before arriving to shore, Hutchinson had inspired so many people.³⁸ Soon after their arrival, she and her husband became members of the church on November 2, 1634. To gain membership into a Puritan church one had to be evaluated by the church elders, to make sure he/she was well-versed in the bible, and that the person was accepting of the church officers. Only one fifth of Boston’s whole population were members. Many times the intensity of the process discouraged most from even trying to apply.³⁹ However, due to her great influence on the *Griffin*, and her suspicious prophesizing, ministers were hesitant to grant her membership

²⁸ Ibid, 6.

²⁹ Ibid, 6.

³⁰ Westerkamp, “Anne Hutchinson, the Puritan Patriarchs, and the Power of the Spirit,” 51.

³¹ Bush, *The Correspondence of John Cotton*, 47.

³² John Winthrop, “A Modell of Christian Charity,” in *Puritanism in Early America*, ed. George M. Waller, 5-70 (Lexington: Health Press, 1973), 11.

³³ Bush, *The Correspondence of John Cotton*, 45.

³⁴ Augur, *An American Jezebel*, 40.

³⁵ Bush, *The Correspondence of John Cotton*, 46.

³⁶ Winship, *Times and Trials*, 7.

³⁷ Ibid, 15.

³⁸ Augur, *An American Jezebel*, 52.

³⁹ Ibid, 61.

until Cotton convinced them otherwise.⁴⁰ Because church membership was so hard for many Puritans to obtain, Cotton's good word is of immeasurable importance and can attest to his soft spot for this woman.

Cotton had a strong ally in Hutchinson. She faithfully supported Cotton and praised him during all of her bible study groups. Hutchison was very keen when it came to medicine and herbs and proved to be a very decent midwife in the colony.⁴¹ Due to her job, she knew many of the townspeople and spoke with them often. Soon the women and men came to Hutchinson, leading to the formation of these weekly bible studies—one for women and one for both men and women⁴²—where she would elaborate on that day's sermon.⁴³ Depending on the day, there could have been anywhere between sixty to eighty people in the Hutchinson household.⁴⁴ In a town where the population is only about 600, Hutchinson has the attention of a very sizeable portion.⁴⁵ This is the reason she becomes such a central figure in this religious movement and stands out to the ministers who will eventually put her on trial. In fact, Hutchinson gained so many followers that Governor Winthrop enacted the Alien Law, which stopped all people from traveling to Massachusetts Bay without his consent. Naturally Winthrop would purposely deny any of Hutchinson's friends or relatives from joining her in the New World.⁴⁶

Hutchinson spoke to her listeners about her revelations and of how one cannot simply take the literal meaning of scripture, claiming that when you were saved you felt the "spirit" of

the scripture.⁴⁷ Of course, Hutchinson was not the first to declare her beliefs through direct, immediate revelation. According to historian Jerald Brauer, this "spirit mysticism" (believing in union with God) was common in the 1600s.⁴⁸ Even so, to say one got a direct word from God is a form of heresy. If Hutchinson got orders from a higher power, then the power of the ministers could be disregarded. Not only was she just part of the laity, she was a woman. Now that the ministers felt their power threatened, they began to label Hutchinson and her followers as "antinomians," a slanderous term literally meaning "against the law."⁴⁹ In earlier religious history, antinomians were known as extremists and the ministers wanted to create a poor image of Hutchinsonians.⁵⁰

As talk of Hutchinson spread, rumors started to emerge that she had claimed that the ministers taught the covenant of works.⁵¹ On charges of sedition, Hutchinson was brought forth in front of the courts in Newtown in November of 1637.⁵² Thus began the Antinomian Controversy. The puritans in Boston set up both secular and religious court systems as a way to enforce God's will. In religious courts, not only was it an actual trial but people believed it to be a "trial" from God, testing them.⁵³

In attempts to defend herself against these rumors, Hutchinson stated that she never spoke ill of the ministers' teaching. All she admitted to saying was that Cotton taught the covenant of works *better* than all others.⁵⁴ Cotton actually came to defense in this moment, agreeing with her claim. Later in the trial he

⁴⁰ Ibid, 63.

⁴¹ Lyle Koehler, "The Case of the American Jezebels: Anne Hutchinson and Female Agitation during the Years of Antinomian Turmoil, 1630-1634," *The William and Mary Quarterly* 31 (1972): 61.

⁴² Westerkamp, "Anne Hutchinson, the Puritan Patriarchs, and the Power of the Spirit," 57.

⁴³ James Cooper, "Anne Hutchinson and the 'Lay Rebellion' against the Clergy," *The New England Quarterly* 61 (1988): 382.

⁴⁴ Augur, *An American Jezebel*, 176.

⁴⁵ Westerkamp, "Anne Hutchinson, the Puritan Patriarchs, and the Power of the Spirit," 55.

⁴⁶ Augur, *An American Jezebel*, 160.

⁴⁷ Ibid, 126.

⁴⁸ Marilyn J. Westerkamp, "Anne Hutchinson, Sectarian Mysticism, and the Puritan Order." *Church History* 59 (1990): 492.

⁴⁹ Augur, *An American Jezebel*, 128.

⁵⁰ Ibid, 129.

⁵¹ David Hall, *Puritans in the New World: a Critical Anthology* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004), 89.

⁵² Augur, *An American Jezebel*, 204.

⁵³ Winship, *Times and Trials*, 3.

⁵⁴ Ziff, *The Career of John Cotton*, 136.

came to her defense a second time when Hutchinson slipped up in conversation and mentioned her “immediate revelations.” When Cotton was asked to condemn her, Cotton explained that he cannot unless the kind of revelation she had was clarified. There is a more delusion form of revelations (miraculous) which, if that was the case he would agree with the ministers, but there is also a more symbolic form of revelation (providential) that is acceptable. Hutchinson took advantage of this window of opportunity given to her and explained that yes, it was symbolic.⁵⁵ It is peculiar to note however that Cotton was not jumping to save Hutchinson; he merely responds only when provoked. In the early stages of the controversy Cotton refused to cooperate and take the matter seriously. He was not automatically concerned at the beginning.⁵⁶ At the end of the trial the church was satisfied to have Hutchinson banished to a house in Roxbury.⁵⁷

The controversy also involved other Hutchinsonians being taken to trial. For example Anne Hutchinson’s brother in law (by marriage), John Wheelwright was taken to court for questioning. Wheelwright was denied a public trial and banished from the colony for promoting rebellious views and contempt against the church.⁵⁸ Another one of Hutchinson’s followers, Captain John Underhill was punished by the courts. He was stripped of his title and citizenship for supporting her. While this paper focuses on the relationship between Cotton and Hutchinson, it must be clear that the antinomian controversy had a huge effect on so many more and was an influential movement. Some historians even claim that the completion of the Antinomian Controversy and Hutchinson’s exile marks the moment when puritanism in the Massachusetts Bay colony is finally stable and homogenous.⁵⁹

Hutchinson was brought back to face the church again a year later in March of 1638.

⁵⁵ Winship, *Times and Trials*, 63.

⁵⁶ James Cooper, ““Lay Rebellion,”” 385.

⁵⁷ Winship, *Times and Trials*, 63.

⁵⁸ Augur, *An American Jezebel*, 184.

⁵⁹ Westerkamp, “Sectarian Mysticism,” 485.

After she was visited by Thomas Welde and John Eloit, the men reported back to the church with news of Hutchinson’s belief in the mortal soul. The ministers asked Hutchinson to return to church to try her on claims of blasphemy.⁶⁰ Governor John Winthrop, one of Hutchinson’s most powerful and aggressive opponents, took this opportunity to take her to trial because her followers have dwindled in number. Many left to follow Wheelwright after his banishment.⁶¹

While the report of this trial is about thirty pages long, just the short dialogue between Hutchinson and Cotton can give a lot of insight to their relationship and its downfall.

Shortly into the trial Hutchinson tried to defend herself against the accusations by stating she “did not hould [any] of these Things [she is] accused of, but did only ask a Question.”⁶² An elder minster of the Church, Mr. Thomas Shepherd, responded by saying that the worst errors brought upon the church are always caused by questions. This is the first point where we see Cotton publically favoring the ministers over Hutchinson. He agreed with Shepherd and firmly asked Hutchinson to address the errors stated against her. Hutchinson’s questioning of the church has obviously gone too far for Cotton. By looking closer at the details within the text, one can read the small distinctions between Cotton’s doctrine and Hutchinson’s. They only differ slightly, which is why Cotton had to be careful to differentiate himself from the new Hutchinsonians.⁶³

The first difference that is clearly identified by Cotton is her belief in the soul’s mortality: “Your first opinion layd to your Charge is That the Soules of all Men by Nature are mortal and die like Beastes, and for that you alledge Ecclesiates 3.18-21.”⁶⁴ Cotton then begged Hutchinson to “not shut [her] Eyes

⁶⁰ Augur, *An American Jezebel*, 226

⁶¹ Augur, *An American Jezebel*, 227.

⁶² David Hall, *The Antinomian Controversy 1636-1638: A Documentary History* (Middletown: Wesleyan University Press, 1968), 354.

⁶³ Winship, *Times and Trials*, 39.

⁶⁴ Hall, *Antinomian*, 354.

against the Truth.”⁶⁵ Cotton has a soft spot for Hutchinson and does not want to turn against her, but she is forcing his hand and this is a last, desperate attempt to get her to listen to him. The dialogue continues to include other ministers and what is so shocking is how intellectual the conversation is; back and forth Scripture is quoted between the two sides. She is just as well versed in the Bible as the ministers. Hutchinson then came to the conclusion that she made a mistake, confusing the life of the body being mortal and the life of the soul being immortal.⁶⁶ She was very clear that she felt it was a small mistake however, not an “error.”

Hutchinson talked herself right into another predicament by stating that she does question whether the same body that dies will rise again. She claimed to not deny the body’s resurrection, but she denies that it is the same body that resurrects.⁶⁷ Once again Hutchinson upset the ministers and John Davenport replied that it is opinions like that, that “shake the very foundation of [their] faith.”⁶⁸ This is one of the reasons why so many people, especially the elite, disapproved of Hutchinson. The puritans enjoyed their calm, stable society and a sense of community. Dissenters such as Hutchinson ruined this idealistic perception of their life.⁶⁹ People also felt that Hutchinson’s direct word from God meant that she abandoned the Bible,⁷⁰ which added to this feeling that their way of religious practice was being disturbed.

Cotton was actually the one asked by the ministers to deliver Hutchinson’s “admonition,” or cautionary counseling. They felt that coming from him it might be more respected by Hutchinson.⁷¹ In later documents, Winthrop recalls Hutchinson looking “somewhat dejected”

after hearing Cotton address the admonition.⁷² Cotton first addressed her sons in the speech. He explained that while it is in their nature to jump to the defense of their mother, by “nourishing her in her unsound Opinions” they have actually done her harm and must stop. He called them “vipers” instead of loving children.⁷³ Next Cotton addressed the women in the congregation that Hutchinson affected, fearing they had been “too much seduced and led aside by [Hutchinson].”⁷⁴ Cotton warned them what while Hutchinson may have provided some help spiritually, she held “dangerous” principles and cautioned them about her opinions.⁷⁵ It is actually very tragic how Cotton, a man Hutchinson had so much love for, helped turn even those closest to her, against her through this speech.

Finally Cotton addressed Hutchinson directly. He applauded her for how helpful she was in bringing righteousness to many of her followers, but that her evil opinions brought “dishonor” to God. Cotton tries to discourage her from continuing her errors by stating that the “filthie Sinne of the Comunitie of Woemen... and filthie cominge together of men and Woemen without... Relation of Marriage” during her bible studies would surely be another charge brought up against her.⁷⁶ According to Cotton, in *Signing of Psalms a Gospel-Ordinance*, women are most susceptible to these “errors,” so he is trying to help her avoid future ones.⁷⁷ He again praised her incredible gift with words: “the lord hath inbued yew with good parts and gifts fit to instruct your children... and be helpful to your husband.”⁷⁸ While Cotton agreed she has a talent, he felt it is better served

⁶⁵ Ibid, 355.

⁶⁶ Ibid, 360.

⁶⁷ Ibid, 354.

⁶⁸ Ibid, 364.

⁶⁹ Hall, *Worlds of Wonder*, 20.

⁷⁰ Michael Ditmore, “A Prophetess in Her Own Country: An Exegesis of Anne Hutchinson’s ‘Immediate Revelation’,” *The William and Mary Quarterly* 57 (2000): 354.

⁷¹ Hall, *Antinomian*, 368.

⁷² Charles Francis Adams, *Three Episodes of Massachusetts History: The Settlement of Boston Bay; the Antinomian controversy; A Study of Church and Town Government*, (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin and Company, 1896), 533.

⁷³ Hall, *Antinomian Controversy*, 369.

⁷⁴ Ibid, 370.

⁷⁵ Ibid, 370.

⁷⁶ Ibid, 372.

⁷⁷ Koehler, “American Jezebels,” 72.

⁷⁸ Hall, *Antinomian*, 371.

inside the home. This single phrase addresses another significant part of Hutchinson's trial—her femininity.

It is possible that a larger cause than a minor dispute over beliefs underlay Cotton's dismissal of Hutchinson.

Sexual tension, traditional gender roles, and Hutchinson's defiance of those roles played a huge role in the Antinomian Controversy.⁷⁹ The church certainly worried about the Hutchinsonians causing a schism,⁸⁰ but of equal concern was Hutchinson's challenge to the established patriarchal order.⁸¹ Because Hutchinson's religious views differed so slightly from those of most Puritans, many historians view that reaction as an irrational one. The ministers only felt inclined to hold a trial because Hutchinson was a woman.⁸² Hutchinson was an easy target for the ministers because she was "a woman out of place."⁸³ Her male counterpart, John Wheelwright, was an intellectual man and the ministers' religious equal, so despite his banishment, Wheelwright was allowed to return after a few years and was granted renewed church membership.⁸⁴

Throughout the controversy, Winthrop constantly addressed the matter of Hutchinson's gender. He claimed that the bible study meetings she held at her house were "unfit for her sex" and that the practice caused division between husbands and wives.⁸⁵ According to the St. Paul's doctrine, a woman was expected to be submissive, quiet, and modest. She could never be allowed to "usurp authority over the man" in church and must remain silent.⁸⁶ Both Winthrop and Shepherd favored submissive women. In Winthrop's familial correspondence, his wife thoughtfully signed off as "your loving and

obedient wife." Shepherd also treasured his own wife's "meekness of spirit."⁸⁷ Rumors were even spread that Hutchinson's voice emasculated her own husband.⁸⁸

At one point, Hutchinson tries to defend her revelations with God by comparing them to Abraham, when he was told by God to sacrifice his son. Historian Michael Ditmore believes that this was Hutchinson's real "error"—identifying herself with a male figure, in a society that "valued submissive women."⁸⁹

While labeling Anne Hutchinson a feminist may be imposing too modern a understanding of her actions, she did open a door to allow women to counter their frustrations with prevailing gender roles. Guided by her example, they could freely rebel through the form of a religious controversy.⁹⁰

Unfortunately, after the trial Hutchinson was excommunicated on account of her "troubl[ing] the church with [her] Erors and hav[ing] drawn away many a poor soule," along with upholding her revelations.⁹¹ She also had her membership in the Church of Boston revoked. The ministers told her to act as a "leper" and withdraw herself from the congregation.⁹²

Following orders Hutchinson left with her family and headed to Rhode Island, where her husband was on an expedition. They purchased a piece of land on March 24, 1638.⁹³ Hutchinson never preached again but she still offered spiritual help to those who sought it.⁹⁴ In Rhode Island one of Hutchinson's sons was imprisoned after traveling to Boston on an errand.⁹⁵ The backlash to her trial still had a strong hold on her family even after she obediently left the colony. Meanwhile in Boston, after her excommunication, the ministers put

⁷⁹ Koehler, "American Jezebels," 52.

⁸⁰ Augur, *An American Jezebel*, 135.

⁸¹ Westerkamp, "Sectarian Mysticism," 492.

⁸² Michael Ditmore, "Prophetess," 351.

⁸³ Jane Kamensky, *Governing the Tongue: The Politics of Speech in Early New England* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997), 77.

⁸⁴ Bush, *The Correspondence of John Cotton*, 58.

⁸⁵ Koehler, "American Jezebels" 61.

⁸⁶ *Ibid*, 57.

⁸⁷ *Ibid*, 58.

⁸⁸ Kamensky, *Governing the Tongue*, 90.

⁸⁹ Ditmore, "Prophetess," 375.

⁹⁰ Koehler, "American Jezebels," 59.

⁹¹ Hall, *Antinomian*, 388.

⁹² *Ibid*, 388.

⁹³ Augur, *An American Jezebel*, 240.

⁹⁴ *Ibid*, 258.

⁹⁵ *Ibid*, 275.

Hutchinson's other female followers, including the young Mary Dyer, on trial;⁹⁶ As many as thirty-five embarrassed Hutchinsonians came forth and admitted their mistake.⁹⁷ In response to the controversy, the church also instituted new rules intended to quash verbal assault. Parishioners were not allowed to speak without permission from church elders; wrongful speech was also punishable, according to the Bodies of Liberties.⁹⁸

Hutchinson then moved again. In 1642, after the death of her husband, she settled her family in a Dutch colony that was under the protection of the Prince of Orange.⁹⁹ Due to previous disagreements between native Indians and local Dutch settlers, the Hutchinson family was caught, undeservingly, in the middle of an attack in 1634.¹⁰⁰ Anne Hutchinson was killed and her youngest daughter Susan was taken captive.¹⁰¹ When the ministers back in Boston were informed of the news, Winthrop and they agreed that her death was God's way of punishing Hutchinson, as well as the symbolic "death" of antinomianism.¹⁰²

In one of Cotton's letters, he regretfully acknowledges his blindness to the problem at the start of the controversy. Writing to Samuel Stone on March 27, 1638, only a few days after Hutchinson left for Rhode Island, Cotton wrote how he now saw the "painful errors" committed by members of his church, specifically naming Hutchinson.¹⁰³ But Cotton claimed that he felt deceived by the people and that the Hutchinsonians used his name and doctrine as a cover for themselves.¹⁰⁴ His soft spot for Hutchinson had disappeared for good.

The dialogue between Anne Hutchinson and John Cotton in the trial of March 1638 clearly exhibits their doctrinal differences. As

both Cotton's language and Hutchinson's intellectual responses show, however, Cotton's dismissal of his most loyal follower arguably had more to do with her gender transgressions than with their minor doctrinal differences.

⁹⁶ Koehler, "American Jezebels," 69.

⁹⁷ Cooper, "'Lay Rebellion,'" 390.

⁹⁸ Kamensky, *Governing the Tongue*, 95.

⁹⁹ Augur, *An American Jezebel*, 281.

¹⁰⁰ Kamensky *Governing the Tongue*, 88.

¹⁰¹ Augur, *An American Jezebel*, 294.

¹⁰² Koehler, "American Jezebels," 77.

¹⁰³ Bush, *The Correspondence of John Cotton*, 51.

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid*, 53.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adams, Charles Francis. *Three Episodes of Massachusetts History: the Settlement of Boston Bay; the Antinomian Controversy; a Study of Church and Town Government*. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin and Company, 1896.
- Augur, Helen. *An American Jezebel; the life of Anne Hutchinson*. New York: Brentano's, 1930.
- Bush, Sargent. *The Correspondence of John Cotton*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2001.
- Cooper, James. "Anne Hutchinson and the 'Lay Rebellion' against the Clergy." *The New England Quarterly* 61 (1988): 381-397.
- Ditmore, Michael. "A Prophetess in Her Own Country: An Exegesis of Anne Hutchinson's 'Immediate Revelation'." *The William and Mary Quarterly* 57 (2000): 349-392.
- Hall, David D. *The Antinomian Controversy 1636-1638: A Documentary History*. Middletown: Wesleyan University Press, 1968.
- Hall, David D. *Puritans in the New World: a Critical Anthology*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004.
- Hall, David. *Worlds of Wonder, Days of Judgment: Popular Religious Belief in Early New England*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1990.
- Kamensky, Jane. *Governing the Tongue: The Politics of Speech in Early New England*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- Koehler, Lyle. "The Case of the American Jezebels: Anne Hutchinson and Female Agitation during the Years of Antinomian Turmoil, 1630-1634." *The William and Mary Quarterly* 31 (1972): 55-78.
- Miller, Perry. "The Puritan Way of Life." In *Puritanism in Early America*, edited by George M. Waller, 5-70. Lexington: Health Press, 1973.
- Moore, Lisa. *Transatlantic Feminisms in the Age of Revolutions*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Stoeber, William. "Nature, Grace and John Cotton: The Theological Dimension in New England Antinomian Controversy," *Church History* 44 (1975): 222-33.
- Waller, George M. *Puritanism in Early America*. Lexington: Health Press, 1973.
- Westerkamp Marilyn J. "Anne Hutchinson, the Puritan Patriarchs, and the Power of the Spirit." In *The Human Tradition in Colonial America*, edited by Ian K. Steele, 49-70. Wilmington: A Scholarly Resources Inc., 1999.
- Westerkamp, Marilyn J. "Anne Hutchinson, Sectarian Mysticism, and the Puritan Order." *Church History* 59 (1990): 482-496.
- Winship, Michael. *The Times and Trials of Anne Hutchinson*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2005.

Winthrop, John. "A Modell of Christian Charity." In *Puritanism in Early America*, edited by George M. Waller, 5-70. Lexington: Health Press, 1973.

Winthrop, John. "Speech to the General Court." In *Puritanism in Early America*, edited by George M. Waller, 5-70. Lexington: Health Press, 1973.

Ziff, Larzar. *The Career of John Cotton: Puritanism and the American Experience*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1962.

About the Author: Corinne Gabriele is a junior Archaeological Studies major at SUNY Potsdam, with a double minor in History and Museum Studies. Her main area of interest is colonial American Archaeology. She plans on graduating in December of 2015 and hopes to pursue work after college in cultural resource management.

Creating New York City's Ghettos

By Joanne Lotfallah

The creation of New York City's modern ghettos did not occur overnight: they had existed in a less infamous form well before the 1950s. A toxic mix of indifference and politics led to the decline and even eradication of active immigrant and migrant neighborhoods. Using evidence from Joanna Fernandez's "Between Social Service Reform and Revolutionary Politics," Tom Adam Davies's *Black Power in Action*, Ric Burns' 2003 film titled *New York, 1945-2000: The City and the World*, Langston Hughes's poem titled "Let America Be American Again," Victoria Wolcott's "Recreation and Race in the Postwar City," Harry Henderson's "The Mass-Produced-Suburbs," this paper argues that New York City's ghettos of the 1960s were the result of a resounding and catastrophic clash of ideas, visions and interpretations about what America was and what America should be. I will address the formation of radical political movements such as the Black Panther Party and The Young Lords Organization, the effect of Robert F. Kennedy's tour of the Bedford-Stuyvesant neighborhood in 1966, and the gradual creation of the urban ghettos after World War II due to racial and ethnic clashes and short-sighted, discriminatory urban planning.

New York City was already a bustling city in the early twentieth century – a city of immigrants where only a few blocks separated more affluent and established white neighborhoods from the vivacity of the once-predominantly Italian Harlem and the factories and mills of the East Side. Until the 1950s, while the bustling docks and factories remained, there was work to be found. As Burn's 2003 documentary film on New York City notes, following World War II, the city's inhabitants exuded happiness and optimism even while New York's long-term position was weak and grim fate was already set.^{1,2} Forgotten though, in the

glamour of jazz, taxis and the color and activity of big city life as depicted in Frank Sinatra's "New York", are the immigrant workers of the first half of the Twentieth century. New York City wasn't a cheerful picture for all, white or not. It was difficult to move up in society despite a growing and generally improving economy. Many neighborhoods were old; its buildings condemned at the turn of the century. Many immigrant families remained crowded into small apartments, working hard for long hours to pay unfair rents. As mentioned in Fernandez's *Between Social Service Reform and Revolutionary Politics: The Young Lords, Late Sixties Radicalism, and Community Organizing in New York City*, even in the "New York of the 1960s... [thousands of] housing tenements, which were deemed 'unfit for human habitation' in 1901, continued to house predominantly black, Puerto Rican, and Chinese tenants."³ As Davies points out in *Black Power in Action: The Bedford-Stuyvesant Restoration Corporation, Robert F. Kennedy, and the Politics of the Urban Crisis*, when Robert F. Kennedy made the rounds of what became known as Bed-Stuy neighborhood in the center of Brooklyn in 1966, he looked upon "run-down buildings, piles of refuse, abandoned buildings and filthy streets."⁴ The local black community had been struggling for many years now to draw the city government's attention to downward spiral the area had fallen into. Kennedy could sense the

¹ *New York, 1945-2000: The City and the World*, directed by Ric Burns (2001; Alexandria, VA: PBS DVD Gold, 2003), DVD.

² Ibid.

³ Joanna Fernandez, "Between Social Service Reform and Revolutionary Politics: The Young Lords, Late Sixties Radicalism, and Community Organizing in New York City," in *Freedom North: Black Freedom Struggles Outside of the South, 1940-1980*, ed. Jeanne F. Theoharis and Komozi Woodard (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), 270.

⁴ Tom Adam Davies, "Black Power in Action: The Bedford-Stuyvesant Restoration Corporation, Robert F. Kennedy, and the Politics of the Urban Crisis," *The Journal of American History* 100 (2013), 736.

tension blanketing the country, the pressurized frustration already at a boil in several cities. August 1965, just months earlier, had shocked the nation awake when the Watts neighborhood in Los Angeles had exploded into riot. Kennedy feared that Bedford-Stuyvesant was about to explode as well.⁵ New York City had once promised work and a new start for many black Americans leaving the South in the 1940s. A generation later it seemed their hopes and dreams were entombed in the endless concrete. Kennedy recognized a growing ‘urban crisis’. After the Watts Riot he established the Community Development Corporation blueprint as a response to Lyndon B. Johnson’s failing War on Poverty program.⁶ Kennedy’s intention was to grow the black middle class and from it, develop black leadership. By “spreading prosperity and core American values,” it was hope that the undercurrent of escalating anti-American sentiment and racial tensions would be stopped.⁷ “A generation of... young radical activists from diverse social backgrounds,” Fernandez notes, “... mostly minority, [gave] political and social direction to the insurgent mood prevalent in Northern cities.”⁸ The Black Panther Party (BPP) was a controversial forerunner of such radical organizations; among the Puerto Ricans, a nationalist movement, highly comparable to the BPP, called The Young Lords Organization spread, first from Chicago as a politicized gang, and then from New York City.⁹ These groups included radical youth, some college educated, the campuses of which served as catalysts for the movements, and all were desperate for work, suitable dwellings, dignity and a future – the future America had promised.

New York State had long been a massive microcosm of America’s multiculturalism, but for decades upon decades

growing problems and injustices had been ignored, and New York City, like many large cities such as Chicago, had become pressure cookers of ethnic and racial tensions. At first, immigrants arriving to America and sticking together was a survival technique. If someone came from Italy not speaking a word of English it made sense to connect and settle in with fellow expats his or her former country. Slowly immigrants became confined to what few neighborhoods would rent to them, and these were generally concentrated around the industrial areas where they would find work. These laborers could walk to work, and the entrepreneurs among them set up shops side by side to supply for their daily needs.¹⁰ Their lives were played out within a few blocks radius and immigrants established their own rhythm and new identities, and learned to get along with one another if not entirely like each other. In New York City they were a collective minority but a growing one.

The growing strain on America’s multicultural fabric is beautifully captured in celebrated black poet, Langston Hughes’s *Let America Be America Again*, which was quite critical of the American Dream that seemed elusive but all but a few of America’s minority citizens:

Let America be America again.
Let it be the dream it used to be.
Let it be the pioneer on the plain
Seeking a home where he himself is free.

(America never was America to me.)

Let America be the dream the dreamers
dreamed--
Let it be that great strong land of love
Where never kings connive nor tyrants scheme
That any man be crushed by one above.

⁵ Ibid, 736.

⁶ Ibid, 737.

⁷ Ibid, 738.

⁸ Fernandez, “Between Social Service Reform and Revolutionary Politics,” 255.

⁹ Ibid, 258, 256.

¹⁰ Burns, *New York, 1945-2000*.

(It never was America to me.)...¹¹

“Where never kings connive nor tyrants scheme
That any man be crushed by one above,” writes
Hughes.¹² For New York City, the new King
would be the politician and the urban planner.
The old dream of New Yorkers, not that there
was ever any ‘one’, would be replaced by the
new dream of steel columns and glittering glass
piercing the sky, of capitalism and global
business, of blinding speed and progress.
Already at the end of World War II, New York
City was moving towards the age of post-
Industrialism.¹³ A hundred years before blacks
had moved out of New York City, and now,
especially beginning in the 1940s, they were
moving back in, trying to escape the often-
violent racial tensions in the South. Puerto
Ricans followed the blacks, totaling 300,000 in
the five boroughs in the 1950s. New York City’s
many factories had promised jobs but they had
come too late: the factories were being boarded
up. These enormous numbers of migrant
workers were pushed into the slums – the only
places that would have them. Blacks competed
with immigrants again for jobs and space. They
had moved to New York to be industrial workers
and were now left behind by a city transitioning
to a post-industrial economy.¹⁴

In December of 1945 Mayor
LaGuardia’s term ended and urban planner
Robert Moses was unleashed on the city.
LaGuardia had been able to balance two
competing visions of New York City, one being
the old working city of neighborhoods and the
street, and the other, Robert Moses and other
progress-minded individuals who saw New York
City as the shining city of tomorrow.¹⁵ Amassing
more and more power to him, Moses marked the

arrival of a new globalism where New York City
would become the new office space capital. One
of the first things Moses did was raze huge
swathes of Manhattan’s once industrial East side
to the ground to build the first of his enormous,
glitzy corporate buildings. The crowning jewel
was the UN headquarters, a fitting shrine to his
vision of globalism. He saw the old industrial
areas as blights, scars across a city he wanted to
turn pristine. The neighborhoods represented the
old and he wanted the new: a city dedicated to
the automobile – one he had never driven once
through a city he never saw from the back of his
limousine.¹⁶ As New York City grew vertically,
the neighborhoods began to shrink, and one by
one, they began to disappear. This was the story
of many towns and cities across the Northeastern
United States.

Southern blacks were moving into
northern towns and cities in large numbers in the
mid-twentieth century. One city that saw a large
influx of blacks was Buffalo, New York.
Starting in the 1920s, racial and ethnic tensions
began to rise for the same two reasons as in New
York City: short-sighted, poor urban planning,
which exacerbated pre-existing, unaddressed,
prejudices between groups, which created a
negative feedback loop in which safety and
segregating blacks from whites, became
synonymous.¹⁷ White New Yorkers balked at the
rapid change. New Yorkers had always been
politely prejudiced: perfectly happy to co-exist,
do business and even say a polite hello-how-are-
you provided everyone stayed on their side of
town. To add to increasing tensions: black
migrants were pushing for their rights,
sharpened, honed and mobilized by life in Jim
Crow South. They were no longer content to be
second-class citizens and were not to be
deceived and enticed by substandard plots of

¹¹ Langston Hughes, “Let America Be America
Again,” 1938, <http://www.poemhunter.com/langston-hughes/>.

¹² Ibid.

¹³ Burns, *New York, 1945-2000*.

¹⁴ Ibid.

¹⁵ Ibid.

¹⁶ Ibid.

¹⁷ Victoria W. Wolcott, “Recreation and Race in the
Postwar City: Buffalo’s 1956 Crystal Beach Riot,”
The Journal of American History 93 (2006), 64.

land removed from whites “in Franklin and Essex Counties.”¹⁸

Interestingly, it was amongst the urban youth that much of the rising racial tensions played out. As neighborhoods became increasingly segregated, the idea of turf and gangs grew. School rivalries moved outside of the fields and gymnasiums to the streets. Black teenagers played on these fears when they pushed for the integration of hallmarks of American recreation and youth culture such as amusement parks and beaches, which had long been ‘white territory.’ As Wolcott points out, “there was among whites a palpable fear of the threat of black youth gangs and rising delinquency... In the midst of ethnic and racial succession, national hysteria about juvenile delinquency, and a strengthening civil rights movement, even minor race riots received widespread publicity.”¹⁹ In Buffalo’s Crystal Beach, like many other amusement parks, pools, parlors and dance halls across the nation, was the center of the city’s postwar urban crisis.²⁰

Urban centers of amusement and recreation, which white people in the 1940s and 1950s were desperately clinging onto as a last refuge against interracial integration, appealed to black youth as an opportunity to defy white resentment of their presence in their cities. They played a very important role in ‘collective racial action’. These actions could sometimes lead to spontaneous, small-scale riots or acts of protest.²¹ Swimming pools and beaches were amongst the last things to be desegregated, even if they were part of a recreational complex that was desegregated itself. As Wolcott explains, “In the water [blacks] directly confronted stereotypes about African Americans' health and

cleanliness.”²² Activities wherein bodies were close together or scantily clad highly tested white tolerance of interracial mixing, and for whites and blacks to swim or dance together went against societal proscription.²³

As part of forming identity and claiming turf many black teenage girls, as Wolcott notes, “distinctive clothing [such as] jackets with their club names emblazoned on the back... [and] others khaki colored carhop coats. The jackets were worn with pride, a symbol of neighborhood, school, and race.”²⁴ Schools saw club and gang jackets as a sign of increasing teenage mischief and falling standards of behavior. They initiated a campaign that promoted middle-class standards of dress.²⁵ Rock’n’roll was an explosive urban trend during the 1950s. This black musical culture quickly became popular among white youth. At the opening of the Zanzibar Lounge in Buffalo, Wolcott says that “white and black teenagers flocked to the club. The club “represented the possibility of an interracial community based on a shared black youth subculture [that.] in the midst of a growing civil rights movement and [in light of] rising rates of juvenile delinquency, community elites deemed...subversive.”²⁶

Leaders of the black community became worried about perception of “African American crime and juvenile delinquency,” which Wolcott argues was “[accelerating] white suburbanization” due to media coverage the black leaders deemed biased.²⁷ While the local newspapers had promised to only include mention of race and nationality for more exceptional stories, they did not act on these promises in most cases. Black leaders found this to be one of the poisoning factors in cross-race relations in the city.²⁸

¹⁸Milton C. Sernett, “John Brown’s Body,” in *North Star Country: Upstate New York and the Crusade for African American Freedom* (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 2002), 199.

¹⁹ Wolcott, “Recreation and Race in the Postwar City,” 66.

²⁰ Ibid.

²¹ Ibid, 64.

²² Ibid, 76.

²³ Ibid, 65.

²⁴ Wolcott, “Recreation and Race in the Postwar City,” 65.

²⁵ Ibid, 69.

²⁶ Ibid, 83.

²⁷ Ibid, 74.

²⁸ Ibid, 83.

Due in part to reaction to youth cultural clashes and mixing, the cities were being redrawn. Black families were pushed out of one district into the next as migrants continued to move into the city. As they moved in, whites fled to suburban communities made popular by the first mass-produced suburb, Levittown, in Long Island, New York.²⁹ This caused a phenomenon that was increasingly being seen across America: in the inner-cities, between the 1950s and 1960s, populations of predominantly blacks were increasing by numbers reaching nearly 100% while that total population of the city fell as whites moved out.³⁰ Blacks in these informally segregated neighborhoods were quickly impoverished and therefore, trapped. Politicians were not interested in their districts; few employers were interested in hiring them, and businesses were moving away. Most blacks did not have the money to start or sustain their own to replace them, and banks would not give them loans. Heartbreakingly for the youth and young children: the recreation centers advertised on TV that they so desired to frequent as equals fell into disrepair.³¹ With no tax base to keep up the inner city, the ghettos were born.

In their mass-produced homes located in their perfectly planned neighborhoods, far away from the smoke and noise of the cities, white urban dwellers, as Wolcott notes, “turned inward toward their television”, and began the lifestyle so criticized today.³² They were delighted and at peace, as they became cocooned within their homes. As Henderson described in his 1953 article *The Mass-Produced Suburbs*, the new cookie-cutter suburbs nested their new residents in all things new, where the schools were good and the yards spacious compared to the Brownstones or the narrow lots of the cities.³³

²⁹ Burns, *New York, 1945-2000*.

³⁰ Wolcott, “Recreation and Race in the Postwar City,” 74.

³¹ *Ibid*, 63.

³² *Ibid*, 77.

³³ Harry Henderson, “The Mass-Produced Suburbs: How People Live in America’s Newest Towns,” *Harper’s Magazine* (1953), 26, 28.

Housewives, finding themselves isolated in their new communities, took to interior decorating and participating in community organizations to meet people and elevate their position in their new society.³⁴ However, as Henderson points out, the suburbs were as free of trouble as they were more due to “the absence of real poverty; the strong ties of family, religious, and organizational activities; steady employment; and the absence of a restrictive, frustrating social structure,” than to the prejudiced assumptions made of riotous, disorderly and dangerous African-Americans and the poor.³⁵

Nevertheless, the media fed the public’s fears about declining inner-city neighborhoods and so major urban renewal projects continued unimpeded to re-settle whites in sprawling, disconnected neighborhoods outside the cities, and concentrate minorities and the poor in Project housing.³⁶ The trend was further fed by real estate agents who actively encouraged whites to buy houses in the suburbs, preying on their fears of crime in the city. In Buffalo, housing abandoned by whites during their flight from the city was all that was available for blacks to rent as the Federal Housing Authority would not grant them loans to purchase houses in the suburbs.³⁷

In New York City’s boroughs massive apartment complexes, built almost as a mockery in park areas, concentrated poverty in areas that completely forgot the need for nearby businesses and schools.³⁸ Robert Moses thought of nothing but the car. Moses saw New York City as a problem that needed fixing, and speed, progress and modernism were his self-indoctrinated answers to that problem. He saw the tenement districts, the narrow-streets of days gone by, the old neighborhoods where grocers displayed their wares on the sidewalks, and where women hung their laundry from window to window as in the

³⁴ *Ibid*, 26, 28.

³⁵ Henderson, “The Mass-Produced Suburbs,” 30.

³⁶ Wolcott, “Recreation and Race in the Postwar City,” 74.

³⁷ *Ibid*, 78.

³⁸ Burns, *New York, 1945-2000*.

'old country', as slums. Moses initiated the Title 1 Slum Clearance Program with the promise of giving better housing to the lower class. The developers were not interested in the poor or race minorities: offices were often built instead of homes.³⁹

The claims of *New York, 1945-2000: The City and the World*, are such that Moses and his fellow planners and the politicians he worked with "disliked diversity, bustle, concentration and New York City's DNA." Indeed, Moses built his office buildings and highways with very little regard for the people he displaced. The Cross-Bronx Expressway is one of the most devastating projects he forced on New Yorkers which cut the community at its heart. Many were displaced and the economy was disrupted irreparably.⁴⁰ Most traumatic to New Yorkers was the loss of the opulent Penn Station, one of America's most breath-taking and triumphant marriages of design and engineering. So upset were New Yorker's by the loss of Penn Station that it finally helped put a halt to Moses' progress-for-progress's sake plans and breathed life and urgency into organizations to protect their cultural heritage.⁴¹ Most importantly, the loss of Penn Station helped mobilize residents of neighborhoods threatened by Moses' plans. A more prominent protester from Greenwich Village was Jane Jacobs. She fought tirelessly against Moses' plans and helped unite Greenwich residents despite their different ethnicities and backgrounds. Jacobs famously said that if a city lost off its buildings of the past people would not be able to understand their place in time.⁴² Greenwich Village won, and a new attitude emerged in urban planning which involved incorporation of existing people and architecture instead of displacement.

The rampant lack of jobs in the boroughs and neighborhoods destroyed by Robert Moses, the substandard education, and the terrible living conditions, along with

shocking neglect from politicians, radicalized many of the black youth. Frustration, anger and desperation rose, and inevitably with it: crime. Crammed into the bleak remains of once vibrant, promising neighborhoods, the forgotten European immigrant, black and Puerto Rican migrant youth, began to organize and by the 1960s some had become militant. The clashes with police and fierce language of their manifestos and protests are in some ways sensationalized; however, these movements were complex in nature.⁴³ Many of these protests were up against, and met with, institutionalized racism, or the juggernaut programs of unseeing corporations, necessary. While some of the disenfranchised residents joined the radical protest organizations, the majority of others were simply inspired and encouraged by the efforts of figures such as Dr. Martin Luther King Jr.⁴⁴ "The emergence of the Young Lords Organization (YLO)," Fernandez states, and as has been described previously, "[was the] product of deep social and economic changes in the postwar period, a context that created social inequality distinct from what had previously been observed in Northern cities."⁴⁵ The YLO's New York chapter was led by a group of college students who were determined to create a revolutionary group which would bring attention to the most glaring aspects of urban poverty which included "inadequate health care, dilapidated housing, hunger, and irregular sanitation services," along with stand up against unfair policing, including police brutality, perpetrated against visible minorities.⁴⁶

The Young Lords Organization emerged first as gang fighting over "turf" in Chicago but then moved on towards "progressive and political community organizing."⁴⁷ Many leaders of these organizations were former gang-leaders

³⁹ Ibid.

⁴⁰ Ibid.

⁴¹ Ibid.

⁴² Ibid.

⁴³ Davies, "Black Power in Action," 738.

⁴⁴ Wolcott, "Recreation and Race in the Postwar City," 74.

⁴⁵ Fernandez, "Between Social Service Reform and Revolutionary Politics," 256.

⁴⁶ Ibid, 256, 261.

⁴⁷ Ibid, 258.

and had become radicalized by their spent time in jail and face-to-face with police. They had experienced the changes in their neighborhoods as whites and non-whites first fought for “turf” around the schools or in the streets, and then as more and more migrants moved into the blocks vacated by white-flight, and “turf” was fought over again.⁴⁸ Ultimately, it was shared class interests that inspired the BPP, the Young Lords, and white gangs of poor whites like the Young Patriots, to cross race-lines and work together to bring about change.⁴⁹ Ironically, as cities such as New York grew throughout the 20th century, so many found themselves shut out of it. People of color such as blacks and Puerto Ricans were disproportionately out of work and confirmed to slums, and as Fernandez points out, “in 1966, forty-seven percent of Puerto Ricans in New York were either unemployed, underemployed, or permanently out of the labor force for lack of success in finding employment.”⁵⁰

Robert F. Kennedy was concerned with the situation in the ghettos of New York City. As the Civil Rights Movement intensified he saw that the ghettos could soon become a war ground. He concluded that completely restoring to life and vibrancy the neighborhoods of the ghettos was the most important factor in the future of black Americans and America’s cities themselves. Lyndon B. Johnson’s War on Poverty plan resulted in the unintended, damaging, and lasting consequence of “polarizing American politics and society,” and played a large part in identifying poverty with black Americans.⁵¹ Kennedy called for cities as a whole to come together with their “skills and resources; along with the skills and resources those who lived in ghettos possessed themselves to fix urban difficulties.”⁵² Kennedy set Restoration plans into place that would encourage an affirmative sense of pride and

identity amongst black Americans, preserve African-American history, and expand black arts and culture.⁵³

New York City’s story demonstrates that the cities have always been about those that live in them: about communities and the city blocks. The people within the stores, the churches, the apartments, the schools, the people walking, running, dancing, holding hands, sipping coffee, sifting through fruit or fabric, airing laundry, or playing in a puddle, are the city. There may be only a handful of people in a block, or several hundred but they are each the ideas, visions and interpretations of what America is and what it should be. New York City is as big as it is as much due to physical geography as to the capacity of its grid and steel to not burst with the millions of hopes and hurried dreams rising up from its streets. It has shown how incredibly small, fragile and personal it is on days like the Victory Day celebrations following the end of World War II, to the Civil Rights protests, through to the unity displayed in Greenwich Village against impersonal and ultimately destructive urban planning. New York City has long been the symbol of the pursuit of these hopes and dreams in America. Looking past the one narrative of yellow taxis, skyscrapers, and fame and fortune, the city tells a much more compelling tale made up of all the millions stories, both triumphant and tragic, lived out over nearly four hundred years.

⁴⁸ Ibid.

⁴⁹ Fernandez, “Between Social Service Reform and Revolutionary Politics,” 259.

⁵⁰ Ibid.

⁵¹ Davies, “Black Power in Action,” 739.

⁵² Ibid, 740.

⁵³ Ibid, 739.

Bibliography

- Davies, Tom Adam. "Black Power in Action: The Bedford-Stuyvesant Restoration Corporation, Robert F. Kennedy, and the Politics of the Urban Crisis." *The Journal of American History* 100 (2013): 736-60.
- Fernandez, Joanna. "Between Social Service Reform and Revolutionary Politics: The Young Lords, Late Sixties Radicalism, and Community Organizing in New York City." In *Freedom North: Black Freedom Struggles Outside the South, 1940-1980*, edited by Komozi Woodard and Jeanne F. Theoharis, 255-287. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.
- Henderson, Harry. "The Mass-Produced Suburbs: How People Live in America's Newest Towns." *Harper's Magazine*, 1953.
- Hughes, Langston. Poem Hunter. "Let America Be America Again., 1938, <http://www.poemhunter.com/langston-hughes/>.
- New York, 1945-2000: The City and the World*. Directed by Ric Burns. 2001. Alexandria, VA PBS DVD Gold, 2003. DVD.
- Sernett, Milton C. "John Brown's Body." In *North Star Country: Upstate New York and the Crusade for African American Freedom* (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 2002), 199-223.
- Wolcott, Victoria W. "Recreation and Race in the Postwar City: Buffalo's 1956 Crystal Beach Riot." *The Journal of American History* 93 (2006): 63-90.

About the Author: Joanne Lotfollah is currently in the Masters of Teaching - Social Studies Program at SUNY Potsdam. She received her Major in Geography at York University. She is completing her student teaching practicum and hopes to teach abroad when she graduates in May 2015.

Medicine versus Ministers: Medical Research Authority during the Boston Inoculation Controversy of 1721

By Charles Murray III

The news had reached Boston that many family and relatives of those in the town had been lost in Europe. The information on the distant army was vague at best, the battles seemed contained to Western Europe. No one expected an invasion from the southern hemisphere, for there was no known fighting there. People in Boston must have felt removed from the bloodshed with hundreds of miles of unbroken ocean separating them from the death, but they were certain that the danger existed. They would not have to wait long, for their fears were justified, as an army marched into Boston on April 22 brought by one of their own ships, H.M.S. Seahorse. This fight was different than what was faced in years before; no cannon fire, no gunpowder, no generals charging into battle, and certainly no drums and fife. There were over 800 casualties, and the city of Boston would be forever changed by the battle against the smallpox virus. The public had fears of contagion coming to Boston from the east as plagues burned through towns and cities, so Boston's selectmen required a thirty day quarantine out by Spectacle Island for any ships coming from Europe. For those old enough in Boston to remember the previous epidemics that swept through the town every fifteen or twenty years, they knew what terror the pox could bring.

With the modern interest of establishing the worth of scientific values and thinking in history, the role of church ministers in scientific efforts of inoculation has received some attention. Historians have come to drastically different conclusions upon the role that the ministry and physicians had in developing the smallpox inoculation controversy of 1721. For example, James Schmotter, noting William Douglass's publication, argued that Douglass introduced early calls for medical professionalism and that the ministry had overstepped its bounds.¹ Schmotter agrees with the interpretation that Douglass was pioneering a new wave of professionalism in the medical field, and that ministers no longer

remained as the premiere authority of medicine and research in the colonies of the new world.

Schmotter argues that the ministers were no longer needed, as the number of physicians in the colonies was increasing and there was less need for the traditional 'medical minister' that the colonies had been used to for three generations. Sick people in the colonies preferred to be treated by educated professionals. Douglass catered to this belief with saying that medical professionals were the only educated medical professionals in the colonies and discounted the non-conventional experience of the ministers. Schmotter said that Douglass appealed to the traditional genteel audience, white men of power, with Douglass making note of the fact that Inoculation was first learned from 'heathen' and any Christian had no place learning from a heathen. This appeal to a genteel audience was a reflection upon the values that Douglass carried with him from the old world overseas.² Schmotter ignores that Douglass was treating others with beliefs that had been established in the old world, and consequently trying to use those same beliefs to establish a foothold in the genteel of colonial Boston. This also denuded the possibility that Douglass was campaigning for a completely 'new type of medical professionalism' when he was simply putting forth more traditional class based elitist values. To take Schmotter at his word that Douglass was trying to create a new medical professionalism, one would have to assume that there was a lack of professionalism in medicine beforehand. There of course was a drastic lack of medical standards amongst the new (and old) world, but in this specific case of Inoculation there was no lack of medical professionalism. Schmotter bases part of his argument on the fact that "medicine was a learned profession requiring special training."³ This 'special training' was actually little more than learning the traditional Galenic herbs and concoctions that England had been using for hundreds of years. Bryan Le Beau describes the traditional educational process, which barely would even compare to the practical expertise gained from fieldwork and

¹ James Schmotter, "William Douglass and the Beginnings of American Professionalism: A Reinterpretation of the 1721 Boston Inoculation Controversy," *Historical Journal of Western Massachusetts* 6 (1977): 23.

² Ibid, 25.

³ Ibid, 23.

experimentation. “The doctor of medicine degree at Oxford, for example, might have taken fourteen years of university-level attendance, but it required no more than a knowledge of ancient authors, especially Galen. Lectures in physis, anatomy, botany, and chemistry were perfunctory and there was no practical instruction.”⁴ Schmotter’s argument that Mather, in comparison to Douglass, was unfit for the practicing of medicine is a difficult pill to swallow.

Robert Tindol denied Schmotter’s claim and supports the argument that the ministry, specifically Mather, was well within traditional practices established earlier by the church in the new world.⁵ Tindol’s argument is based around the idea that Mather had the ability to “reconcile his religious views and scientific adventurousness in a way that diminished neither.”⁶ He suggests that Mather was able to practice the arcane art of interpreting scripture from the Bible and not allow that to interfere with his ability as a scientist. Tindol argued that this meant that Mather’s role as a minister should not have counted against him since he could change roles so completely when needed. Tindol also writes that Mather submitted lab reports up to the standards at which the learned scholars of the Royal Society were publishing, he would also later become a member.⁷ Tindol’s argument stands that Mather had all the necessary qualifications to be considered an academic equal to that of William Douglass.

Maxine Van De Wetering, the author of “A Reconsideration of the Inoculation Controversy” discussed other reasons why Mather and Douglass opposed each other not only in public but personally, professionally, and spiritually. This opposition does not stem from some sort of class or hierarchical difference, but instead comes from a multitude of ethnic, racial, scientific and methodological differences between the beliefs of these two men. Wetering talked about how Douglass was the type of English

gentlemen to bring his preconceptions from England over to Boston, and how that affected his relationship with other people.⁸ He was upset over the lack of professional structure in the new world and proceeded to remind everybody of his disappointment in the structure-less town of Boston with withering remarks and establishing very few friendships. Mather disliked Douglass because he challenged the authority of the ministry, himself especially, over the handling of inoculation. Mather was infuriated by this attack of his authority, but knew that the power of the ministry was not what it used to be and considered holding his tongue to be the right choice for the first few months.

The best-known epidemic was the 1665 London outbreak. This event was seared into the minds of all survivors. There were hundreds lying dead in the street with not enough able-bodied survivors to manage the chaos and the city nearly collapsed. Many of the people in Boston knew that 100,000 people that lost their lives in London that year.⁹ On April 22, 1721, the plague-ridden ship H.M.S. *Seahorse* arrived in Boston’s harbor¹⁰ The ship was not suspected of carrying any contagion because it came from the islands of the Tortugas, far south of any suspected danger, and the city was not aware of any outbreak amongst that region yet. The ship was still searched methodically under standard quarantine procedures but it was quickly allowed to dock at the Long Wharf on the east side of Boston, unloading a hull full of supplies possibly laden with pestilence into the town’s most commercial area. It was reported on that same day that a man on the ship had been sick but he had been properly quarantined in a pest house; a *Lazaretto*, that was protected under armed guard that only allowed a single immune nurse to enter.¹¹

From the founding of Boston there was an intense need for medical professionals as the new world was harsh to many that made the crossing. Traditional medical cures from their mother country were often part of the very few comforts

⁴ Bryan F. Le Beau, “The ‘Angelical Conjunction’ Revisited: Another Look at the Preacher-Physician in Colonial American and the Throat Distemper Epidemic of 1735-1740,” *Journal of American Culture* 18 (1995): 1.

⁵ Robert Tindol. “Getting the Pox off All Their Houses: Cotton Mather and the Rhetoric of Puritan Science,” *Early American Literature* 46 (2011): 1-23.

⁶ *Ibid*, 2.

⁷ *Ibid*, 4.

⁸ Maxine Van De Wetering, “A Reconsideration of the Inoculation Controversy,” *The New England Quarterly* 58 (1985): 54.

⁹ Thomas Vincent, *God’s Terrible Voice in the City by Plague and Fire* (Cambridge: Cambridge Press, 1668).

¹⁰ Schmotter, “William Douglass,” 23-36.

¹¹ Elaine G. Breslaw, *Lotions, Potions, Pills, and Magic: Health Care in Early America* (New York, NY: New York University Press, 2012), 4.

the colonists had in the harsh new world, and many of these cures did not come from physicians but instead came from the ministry. The ministry was the first line of defense against the onslaught of biting cold winters, new hazardous species, new diseases and maladies that ravaged the earliest settlers. It was very common for ministers of early settlements to be the only college trained professional amongst the earliest poor colonists and this created a power vacuum that was eagerly filled. The early colonists developed a non-written covenant with the ministry to defer to its judgment on matters medical and scientific that granted the ministry a wealth of new supporters and respect. There are many instances of the ministry practicing medicine and aiding people but they key difference in this new covenant is that the minister is allowed to step into the realm of physicians and diagnose, formulate medical theories, and treat patients far outside the traditional field of expertise. This created much tension when actual trained physicians came to Boston and experienced the lack of standard professional practice, but they came to a new world with old ways and expected to be treated and venerated as the ministry had been for nearly three generations. The standards and medical practices of the time were derived from traditional Galenic theory. The belief of spontaneous generation was also a theory that coupled with Galenic traditional practice. In 1721 there was considerable technological and medical advancements since the age of Galen and the foremost scientists of the colonial era were beginning to question what were these small animals, which were dubbed “animalcules” by scientists of the time, floating around in our body and for what purpose are they inside us?

Research in Boston was greatly influenced by the Royal Society of London and many of the standard research practices; scientific literature read in the colonies was also written by Fellows of the Society. To understand the scientific research process and subsequently the Boston inoculation controversy it is important to fully grasp the role that the Royal Society played in academics of the time. The Royal Society was the first attempt to standardize and modernize the way which science and research should be conducted. Historian Frederick Brasch wrote that the Royal Society was created for “the express purpose of advancing experimental knowledge

and interpreting nature.”¹² This organization was also created by independent scholars that had interests in furthering the organization of such research and many new scientific standards were published in two of their early works: *The Transactions* and *The Proceedings*. These works were different from most scientific research that came before them because these journals accepted only a certain format that resembled a contemporary lab report. This dispassionate way of writing successfully promoted the scientific standards set forth by the society and promoted early calls for standardized empirical research, research that was based on facts and results rather than only on the conjecture of an author.

Cotton Mather was involved very early on with the Royal Society and he meshed very well into their new empirical style of philosophy and science. He had sent bones to the Royal Society in 1714¹³, which was a year after he had become a fellow, and the analysis of the bones he had sent resembled the dispassionate ‘lab report’ style of writing that objective empirical research required and showed that he *could* write at the highest scientific standards of the time. Historian Robert Tindol described Mather’s scientific “mettle”: “When he wanted to show his scientific mettle to an elite audience, he wrote up observations in a format resembling modern scientific lab and field reports, and then sent them for consideration by the editors of the venerated *Philosophical Transactions*, published by the Royal Society in London.”¹⁴

Mather, among many other scientists, believed those curious animalcules were brought about by an imbalance in humors that caused the body to spontaneously generate these small creatures. Their theory was that these animalcules were a secondary effect, a byproduct of the sickness, but did not suspect these small creatures were the cause of the condition.¹⁵ In his book *Angel of Bethesda*, Mather argued that diseases could be *caused* by animalculum: “It begins now to be vehemently suspected that the smallpox may

¹² Frederick Brasch, “The Royal Society of London and Its Influence Upon Scientific Thought in the American Colonies,” *The Scientific Monthly* 33 (1931): 336-355

¹³ *Ibid*, 337.

¹⁴ Tindol, “Getting the Pox off All Their Houses,” 2.

¹⁵ Kelly Wisecup, “African Medical Knowledge, the Plain Style, and Satire in the 1721 Boston Inoculation Controversy,” *Early American Literature* 46 (2011): 25-50.

be more of an animalculated business than we have been generally aware of.”¹⁶ If he believed, as some historians claim¹⁷, that these diseases were indeed *caused* by the animalculae, then he was an early discoverer of the germ theory of disease. Mather like many great men of his time “stood upon the shoulders of giants” to use the term coined by Isaac Newton. The shoulders upon which Mather based his animalcule theory was the famous Dutch scientist, Anthony Van Leeuwenhoek, a premier scientist and scholar of his time known for his precise microscopes and analysis of all things *tiny*. Mather would have known Leeuwenhoek's writings because in 1708, just a few years before Mather joined the Royal Society, Leeuwenhoek wrote this in the Royal transactions: “I saw a long and slender little worm, that I judged to be a Thousand times smaller than the aforesaid Animalculum, which had insinuated, or bor'd part of itself into the Body of the larger Animalculum.”¹⁸

Puritans held the belief that the disease came from within and the symptoms were shown outside on the surface of the body. They considered smallpox a humoral disease of the blood where the humors infected the blood that in turn pushed the disease to the surface causing boils, sweats, bleeding and a manner of other effects associated with the disease.¹⁹ The importance of traditional medicine in relation to the development and deployment of inoculation is twofold: inoculation was an incredibly new and foreign practice to Boston, and the disease clashed with the typical humoral beliefs in traditional medicine of the time. People took issue with inserting ‘bad humors’ into the body to purposely make a person sick, and it must have seemed like madness to a person that did not experience the disease or cure firsthand.

Typical traditional cures for the smallpox included: purging (vomit), boiling of the skin, fresh air, cooling medicines, abstaining from certain foods like fish and wine, avoiding oils and ointments that would keep the pus in the body, and popping the pustules to release the humors

¹⁶ Cotton Mather, *The Angel of Bethesda* (Boston: MA, 1724), 93-94.

¹⁷ Breslaw, *Lotions, Potions, Pills and Magic*.

¹⁸ Anthony Van Leeuwenhoek, “A Letter to the Royal Society,” *Philosophical Transactions* (1683-1775): 1784-1793.

¹⁹ Thomas Thatcher, *A Brief Rule to Gude the Common People* (Boston, MA: 1702), 1.

from the infected flesh.²⁰ They also thought the seasons mattered a great deal in the outcome of the patient, as most doctors of the time believed it was best to get it in winter rather than summer. They also acknowledged that “Age, Manner of life, and season of the year require a different consideration—requiring the counsel of an expert physician.”²¹ In the most general sense this would have been true that a physician should have been called to decide if a person was healthy enough, the seasons were right, and their lifestyle choices would not hamper recovery *except* that the physicians in Boston at the time had no experience in dealing with smallpox patients. All of the physicians had come over within the last twenty-one years since the previous outbreak and had only textbook definitions with very little field or apprentice training dealing with smallpox.

Early professionals that traveled to Boston roughly three generations after the ministry had staked its claim had trouble generating the same status and professional practice that they had back home in England. With the establishment of modern cities like Boston there was an extremely limited amount of resident practitioners, over 1000 residents per doctor in a city of 12,000 strong.²² This also exacerbated the effect that charlatan doctors, peddling their snake oils, had on the medical community in early Boston. The issue of medical professionalism was a hot-button issue during 1721. This is best illustrated by James Schmotter, who wrote, “only the ministry possessed the authority and organization to control entry into its ranks.”²³ This meant that the ministry was the only authoritative body that possessed the ability to restrict access to its ranks and could provide certain standards that medical professionals could not yet guarantee in Boston at the time. The prominent Bostonian figures involved in this vitriolic dispute were the handful of physicians and ministers that tasked themselves with keeping the people of Boston healthy. Cotton Mather was the most notorious out of all the ministers included in the debate and his ministerial authority was challenged more than any other. William Douglass was the most prominent

²⁰ *Ibid*, 4-7.

²¹ *Ibid*, 4.

²² Elizabeth Winslow, *A Destroying Angel* (Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin, 1974), 38.

²³ Schmotter, “William Douglass,” 25.

physician in the city and had great influence amongst the public and other physicians.

Each side of the argument used their elevated positions to garner authority for their claims. Douglass noted rather frequently that he was the only doctor in Boston that actually had a medical degree from a college.²⁴ In the eyes of the public this gave his argument a considerable advantage even before the battle lines were drawn. The hasty adoption of this new practice was called into question by Douglass, who was afraid to be upstaged by a Layman²⁵, quickly after the first three initial inoculations. Douglass challenged many things about this new procedure: the expedience of it, source, ethics, procedures, and everything in between.

The foundation of Douglass's distrust with this process started at the source. Before the outbreak he had loaned Mather the very accounts of Timonius and Pylarinus, which Mather later based his inoculation movement after, and then proceeded to withhold them because he knew these were from Asia, which he called "levant men"²⁶. The importance of the Royal Society to the academic community in the colonies was great, as much of their research was done either as submissions to the Royal Society or to a member but always done in a format that the society prescribed. The society had a vast influence upon the research being done in the colonies but could not penetrate the wall of traditional biases that many academics had about foreign origins. This distrust of foreigners and foreign culture was not new and Douglass was surely not the only one with misgivings about the origin of the cure. He was a firm believer in the traditional class system of English culture and thought very highly of himself and the traditional way in which research was being done in colleges. The problem with this was the traditional ways of 'old world' academia were being challenged by amateur scientists in the colonies. Douglass not only brought over his major medical expertise but also brought along "the preconceptions of medicine in England; propriety, exclusiveness, and rank."²⁷ He took the introduction of this new practice as an affront to

his medical post and as an attack on his authority as the premiere doctor of Boston.

The city of Boston in 1721 was under a great sway of influence from enlightenment thinkers and amateur scientists practicing and preaching their new anti-authoritative way of life. Not everyone heard or adhered to the message, but it continued to be a prevailing trend in Boston; people were tired of simply accepting authority. This caused a great deal of problems for the current authoritative figures of the time like the ministry and the government since the ministry was a domineering force over the lives of many people in Boston. The H.M.S. Seahorse is the sailing vessel largely credited with bringing smallpox to the port of Boston. Mather and Dr. Boylston, his assistant practitioner, were the very essence of this new enlightenment thinking that did not require a university, but only required a deep sense of curiosity and fulfillment from learning. The covenant established by early settlers in the colonies is the authority that Mather rested firmly upon. This informal covenant was established in a time when there were no professional doctors in the colonies and the only college-trained person was usually a minister. This covenant was a great source of pride, and also a great source of hubris for the church as the colonies developed. Mather was used to being a very important and powerful voice in the city and, when Douglass, a foreign physician that had not come into contact with smallpox patients, challenged Mather, he balked at this affront but did not engage immediately. The ministry had been under attack lately and outright challenges to its authority were becoming more common, this would dramatically increase as the months of the outbreak continued on.

Mather was full within his right to assert his practical medical suggestions to the physicians of Boston as many ministers before him had done. Douglass interpreted his suggestions, and later demands, as the figurehead of a domineering ministry that has exceeded its boundaries. In terms of exceeding boundaries, Mather was far from the only one in the debate, as many other unqualified voices spoke up. Tobacconists, apothecaries, public, and many others weighed their opinions against the professionals. More than a few times Douglass tried to counter religious arguments put forth by Mather but were met with succinct and swift retort from him, as Douglass had no place in interpretation of scripture.

²⁴ Wetering, "A Reconsideration of the Inoculation Controversy," 1.

²⁵ Breslaw, *Lotions, Potions, Pills, and Magic*, 33.

²⁶ William Douglass. *Postscript* (Boston, MA: Franklin, 1722), 3.

²⁷ Wetering, "A Reconsideration of the Inoculation Controversy," 54-55.

Much of the focus between Mather and Douglass was on their academic experience. Their academic skill was incredibly important to the people of Boston and historians alike. Bostonians preferred to be treated by trained professionals and would often pick someone with a degree over an apprentice physician. This choice affected the outcome of the inoculation controversy greatly; who had the better education to handle the new process of inoculation? Mather or Douglass? The person with a better education would be seen as the appropriate administrator for the process.

Medical school would have taught the many difference Galenic and traditional ways to treat diseases, the appropriate seasons of operations, the appropriate containment of the sick, and many more things that only professional physicians would be responsible to know²⁸. This knowledge, although ancient even by colonial standards, was the traditional type of courses and learning a student of medicine would get from a medical program. Medical students were urged to use direct examination and observation as the essential way of information gathering for medicine.²⁹ This meant that most doctors would use empirical evidence and rational questioning through a rigorous empirical process that was extremely resistant to change. Douglass would later let his animosity about Mather cloud his judgment. He was the only one in Boston with a formal medical degree and this gave his argument incredible gravitas even if he ignored the empirical processes by which he was trained. He ignored many opportunities to visit Boylston in his operation and refused to even observe his notes or suggestions, he flat out refused to listen to anything Boylston had to say, probably because Douglass considered him such a lesser practitioner.

Mather went directly against this process that was resistant to change, challenging ways in which the professionals at the colleges would conduct scientific research. This upset Douglass because he knew that if Mather could conduct these tests then there would be increased competition in the medical field. Douglass must have felt that non-college trained physicians should not practice experimental science. This is apparent because Douglass argues that Mather and Boylston did not follow proper procedure in

their first initial inoculations. The only reason that the proper procedures (time of year) were not followed was because that none of the physicians would agree to meet with Boylston or Mather to approve the method, so before the epidemic took a further hold, Mather gave the order to begin the inoculations without support from the medical community in Boston.

Mather was not a college trained physician but he was greatly educated and was part of the Royal Society of London, which was the foremost research authority in the English world at the time. Mather showed his ability to produce standardized tests and sample collection even without college training, showing that he knew how to conduct basic tests and match even the highest scientific standards of the time. Mather was a minister, but some Puritan ministers had the unique experience of reconciling “science and religion into a coherent whole.”³⁰ This allowed Mather to step into his laboratory and have the ability to be a scientist first and glorify the discoveries he made towards furthering the discovery of god’s world. Mather was actually at the cutting edge of microbiology, noting little “animalculum” (little animals) swimming around underneath the microscope. Mather even went so far as to test the effects that inoculation had on the survivors of smallpox obtained in the common way: “the inoculation being tried on such as have had the small pox before, it had no effect at all on them.”³¹ The knowledge of immunity was common, you get infected once and then you are free of the disease for the rest of your life, and Mather discovered and confirmed that Inoculation could convey that immunity and also protect you for life with much less of a greater risk.

The field of microbiology did not exist yet, but Mather was along the spearhead of early amateur microbiologists making discoveries. Douglass constantly railed against this upstaging minister, saying that Mather should remain inside his own sphere of influence at the ministry and not seek scientific enlightenment. This is a claim that many other doctors agreed with and considered barring Mather from further inspiring Boylston to practice any more inoculations, but

²⁸ Winslow, *A Destroying Angel*, 114.

²⁹ Ibid.

³⁰ Tony Williams. *The Pox and the Covenant: Mather, Franklin, and the Epidemic that Changed America's Destiny* (Naperville, IL: Sourcebooks Press, 2010), 39.

³¹ Cotton Mather, *Some Account* (Boston, MA: Gerrish, 1721), 4.

the covenant of the ministers held strong and Mather refused to give up.

It is important to point out that all of the doctors in Boston at the time were from a young generation that was fresh out of school, and almost all of them (including Douglass) had not even seen a smallpox patient in person. Compare this to the experience that Mather has had in smallpox sick-houses or having to give funeral sermons for his deceased neighbors and loved ones. Mather was entrenched in the field even without a medical degree because the ministry was always aiming to help those affected by adversity. Douglass had the brash argument of letting smallpox simply run a "natural course", even when the only smallpox he ever had come into contact with had been drawings of victims in textbooks. How could he overlook the tremendous suffering and calamity of it all? How could he not accept the cure once it was put in front of him? Mather commented on Douglass's outright refusal with: "But I think it rather becomes a considerate man to decline foolish contentions: especially at a time, when there is a grievous calamity upon us."³²

Douglass, seeing Mather rather as usurper than saint, disapproved of Mather's versions of the accounts of Timonius and Pylarinus. He argued that Mather was being swayed by slave testimony and that inoculation was "useless in preventing the smallpox from occurring in the common way."³³ Mather had already disproved that statement earlier with his experiments upon already-immune patients, which proved inoculation could prevent the smallpox in the common way. Douglass disagreed with Mather and even refused to look at the results or findings of the inoculations practiced up to that point, his animosity towards Mather easily got in the way of his professional duty as a doctor.

Much of the argument between Douglass and Mather stemmed from the perceived skill associated with a degree. Douglass had a formal degree from an accredited university while Mather was self-taught from his father's library. Both men would have been equally inept at preventing the disease had they tried to use the methods learned from traditional Galenic theories, as we know that they simply did not work. A

person going to medical school would find the cures as useful as "getting a medical degree from Oxford for shoemaking."³⁴ Lea Beau writes that "The doctor of medicine degree at Oxford, for example, might have taken fourteen years of university-level attendance, but it required no more than a knowledge of ancient authors, especially Galen. Lectures in physic, anatomy, botany, and chemistry were perfunctory and there was no practical instruction."³⁵ This situation is why the *perceived* skill associated with the degree matters so much for historical argument because the education and degree itself contributed very little to patient outcome. Take the fact that the perceived value for such a degree is high, even though we now know it healed little, but was Douglass correct in his assumption that his degree should overshadow years of unofficial experience? In almost all medical programs there was a heavy stress upon looking at the patient objectively, looking at symptoms "as they are," and not make conjectures. I do not think for one second that Douglass believed inoculation was a farce or a lie from a slave. His field was being challenged and encroached upon by non-professionals. Douglass was defending his turf from potential trespassers, but he went against all of his fourteen years of schooling when he refused to look at their evidence.

Mather knew that if smallpox made it into the city there should be ways in which the doctors and officials could try and reduce the amount of casualties. He thought the best way to start this process was to convene the physicians and come up with a plan to try and stem the flow of disease throughout the city. Mather produced a short invitation to all of the medical personnel in Boston: doctors, apothecaries, and nurses. His response was met with silence from all, except one, a Dr. Zabdiel Boylston. Mather knew that the only way to prevent catastrophic losses was to introduce a new practice, which he learned years earlier, to try and help the non-immunized survive a potential outbreak. Mather knew that the outbreak was much more than potential and knew that once the first person fell ill the process would be thrown into action and there would be nothing to prevent the virus from spreading. He knew that when the H.M.S Seahorse arrived in port in April

³² Cotton, *Some Account*, 10.

³³ Kenneth Silverman, *The life and Times of Cotton Mather* (New York, New York: Harper, 1984), 344.

³⁴ Wetering, "A Reconsideration of the Inoculation Controversy," 1.

³⁵ Le Beau, "The Angelical Conjunction Revisited," 1.

that smallpox had arrived at their front door.

Mather called for the doctors again and still was met with stalwart denial, even on June 6th when the pox was spreading rapidly they still denied an audience with him. They denied him an audience for a few reasons: it was still considered a 'heathen' practice, it was unknown to European medicine, and they considered it immoral to purposely infect someone.³⁶ Mather knew that he needed to proceed and protect the citizens of Boston no matter what cost, so he contacted Boylston on June 24th with a proposal. Mather suggested a few initial inoculations to be practiced in secret as to not shock the town. On June 26th the first inoculations were done by Boylston in his home on three individuals: his son, a slave and the slave's son.³⁷ This sounded like a noble effort by Mather and Boylston but actually it was quite risky and underhanded considering all of the other physicians of Boston refused to meet with Mather and considered inoculation just another curious idea that Mather was wrapping himself up in. This practicing of the first few inoculations marked the beginning of many more but also outraged the physicians and people of the city. With the virus spreading rapidly during the ten days of July 17th-27th Boylston met his first public and also professional criticism. He was brought in front of the selectmen of Boston and told to cease and desist the now expanding procedure of inoculation for fears of spreading the disease further as Boylston's patients were not under any type of quarantine. Boylston invited the physicians to see the miracles being made by inoculation but they all refused and Douglass considered pressing felony charges.³⁸ Douglass was right about the dangers of contagion, an inoculated person could still infect other people.

Douglass was correct about the dangers of contagion but he was backwards in most of the other things he considered the practice to be. Mather knew that the testimony of his slave, and the accounts which he borrowed from Douglass, were indeed correct and collaborated a strong case in favor of inoculation. This is why Douglass chose to withhold any further use of said book because he knew that if those facts got out then his case would be greatly damaged. Even if Mather and Boylston jumped the gun and started

the inoculations before everyone had accepted it, they did it for the right reasons and if there was much death involved at least the few inoculated were to be spared.

August 1, 1721, Mather was approached by his son Sammy, who asked to be inoculated after Sammy's roommate in college died from smallpox. Sammy begged and pleaded with his father to save his life, but Mather hesitated, broadsided by such a request from his only son. Mather was overcome with a sense of dread when his son approached him begging to be inoculated, could he permit his only son to undergo a procedure that could result in his death? He was stuck in a seemingly unwinnable situation between his trust in science and his love for family. If he did not permit Sammy under inoculation, others would pick that choice apart and ask why he would submit their sons' when he would not submit his own? If he submitted his son to the procedure and his son succumbed to the sickness afterward, he would never forgive himself and would be seen as a killer in the eyes of everybody in Boston. Did he not trust in the procedure? Mather withered for days in his study, sometimes lying on the floor on his back staring at the ceiling, praying, asking God what to do. After two weeks of silence from his father, Sammy asked his father again to be inoculated and this time Mather consented to Sammy's wishes. He would permit the potentially dangerous procedure on his sole progenitor, and consequently put the movement into jeopardy should his son perish.

Much more than death happens when an epidemic, or any natural disaster, occurs to a large population—many worse things than the epidemic itself can occur overnight. It was early September when Mather finally could catch his breath, his son Sammy was recovering from his unusually long and dangerous battle with inoculation. Sammy became well at just the right time to be able to witness the society of Boston brought to its knees and the facade of normalcy disappearing from the already scarcely populated streets. Summer for the physicians of Boston brought about numerous amounts of problems related to the epidemic. There is a belief in humoral theory that in summer the distemper would act differently; more vigorously rather than in winter when the condition would be slight in comparison. Thomas Thatcher was a colonial physician and he noted the effects of seasonal

³⁶ Breslaw, *Lotions, Potions, Pills, and Magic*, 30.

³⁷ *Ibid*, 32.

³⁸ *Ibid*.

change on the spread of the disease: “Age, manner of life, season of the year require a different consideration” and he also notes that “the disease is made worse by too much heat.”³⁹ This perceived increase in virulence gave the situation an ever-increasing sense of urgency, only to be compounded with economic and social problems later in the summer as the dire situation worsened.

The omnipresent tolling of the large bells clanging through the warm summer air was a constant reminder to the dire situation that the city was facing. Smallpox was not the only threat that Mather and the other people of Boston had to fend off. The sound from the bells caused such problems there was reports of psychological breakdowns and relations with the offending churches were strained. The cacophonous tolling became so untenable that laws were created to regulate the bells tolling because it “spread despondency and fear among the living.”⁴⁰ This is just one simple example of the complexity of problems that occurred from the introduction of the virus into Boston. The other, more serious problems were quickly made apparent when the shops on the port ran out of wood for the first time in the history of the city.

This would not have been an issue if the virus had been introduced months before when the need for wood was low, but September was the month when many began stockpiling wood. Wood is the lifeblood of a colonial city and without wood the very stability of city living was being challenged. The typical colonial city was a glutton for wood and Boston was no exception, with one of the largest ports for receiving wood in the colonies. Wood was such a staple that some people preferred to be paid partially in wood. Mather was worried about the ability of the selectmen to prevent rapid inflation because the supplies of wood did not believe that the city was safe. Mather's worries during that summer were not unfounded because when the wood went dry in early September people quickly resulted to stripping wood off of structures, furniture, homes and the price of firewood skyrocketed. Fights over firewood broke out on the pier and in town squares as hundreds feared the harsh winter looming in the months ahead. The city was, of course, NOT safe to enter by any means because at the time there was significant deaths and the

spread of the disease was city-wide. There needed to be a way to convince others or find a way around getting wood into the city without the drastic inflation that it then was experiencing. The selectmen were not able to prevent the spread of the virus with numerous quarantine efforts but their ability to inspire commercial workarounds paid off. Spectacle Island, just off of the coast of Boston, was used for quarantines but would be transformed into a transfer station for wood without the loggers needing to contact the city directly and the selectmen would pay the loggers nearly double for their efforts. This was a blessing for Boston because without wood many would have died simply from exposure to the elements, let alone the virus that was ravaging through the city. This only added to the urgency that had been building up in the war of words between Douglass and Mather. When the lifeblood of the city was cut off it became more than a war of words between the two men, their arguments became inflamed by the urgency injected by the wood shortage.

As the paper war raged throughout the city, the smallpox maintained its rate of infection and staggering destructive power. With the increasing ‘bills’⁴¹, as the dead were called, the anxiety and emotions of the city were peaked. During October, the war of words and the ravaging sickness were both at their peak; with a mind-numbing four hundred and eleven deaths that month, the anti-inoculators could not hold anything back from their protests.

Douglass focused his attacks on Mather’s “clerical meddling” in affairs in which, Douglass presumed, Mather ought to have no business in the first place.⁴² Douglass challenged everything about Mather from his upbringing to spiritual devotions. He considered nothing sacred in this print war. Douglass also brought to his argument all of his preconceptions from his rearing as a genteel scholar in England which were “propriety, exclusiveness, and rank.”⁴³

The span of Douglass’s attack was immense and effective against a slow to react Mather, who retorted to these accusations with “said W.D. Is a credulous and whimsical Brute, a

³⁹ Thatcher, *A Brief Rule*, 1, 4.

⁴⁰ Williams, *The Pox and the Covenant*, 1.

⁴¹ Mather, *Angel of Bethesda*, 683.

⁴² Wetering, “A Reconsideration of the Inoculation Controversy,” 46-67.

⁴³ Wetering, “A Reconsideration of the Inoculation Controversy,” 54.

madman and a Fool, and his account is full of lies and equivocations.”⁴⁴ Douglass was young blood amongst these seniors of the Boston community but he demanded his entitled respect as a doctor with a medical degree, and he had the words and skill to back himself up. Before the inoculation controversy, Douglass was a critic with a sharp eye and an even sharper tongue on controversial issues. This meant that in the paper war Douglass, not Mather, had the home field advantage. Mather was mostly caught on the defensive by jabs from Douglass, but he managed to respond with equal furor to most of attacks. Mather was an experienced writer, publisher, and speaker but he was no match in print against Douglass who was virile, punitive, and unrelenting in his attacks upon his enemies.

When it came to writing scientific reports or accounts it was Mather who adhered tighter to the regulations set by the Royal Society. Douglass did not have the same level of field research or skill. John Bumstead, Historian, puts it this way “years of writing pamphlets were not conducive to the development of dispassionate reporting and analysis.”⁴⁵

Douglass did not attack with only his polemics but he also based large amounts of his anti-inoculation claim upon the denial of African medical practices. Mather first learned of inoculation accounts from his slave he named “Onesimus.” Many people felt uncomfortable with such a volatile experiment being built upon from the testimony of a black slave.⁴⁶ Douglass used this sentiment to attack Mather's argument again without the need to provide contrary evidence to the actual practice of inoculation, he would attack Mather instead of attacking Inoculation. Douglass also appealed too many of the doctors, practitioners, surgeons, and even apothecaries that believed themselves to be gentlemen. He used their sense of heightened social status as a weapon against Onesimus's credibility, asking how such learned gentlemen could trust the testimony of a slave?⁴⁷ Puritans rarely had positive views of outside cultures if they were not Christian. So not only was Onesimus's testimony invalidated but Pylarinius

and Timonius, which were the men that submitted papers of inoculation to the royal society, any testimony besides anybody purely “Puritan” would not suffice as a legitimate. Douglass challenged their testimony because they were of eastern descent, which he generalized them as simply “levant men” without looking into their credentials or experiment success.⁴⁸

Mather argued against this interpretation because he considered a practice valid not based upon where or whom it came from but the “efficiency” of the experiment. If inoculated people survived the outbreak he did not care about the origins of the cure, as he believed that all men were subjects of God and all his children were equals. Mather also notes the hypocritical view of this because their fathers and forefathers have been learning from natives on how to treat rattlesnake bites with anti-venom and Mather notes “I enquire whether our Hippocrates were not an' heathen? And whether our Galen were not an heathen?”⁴⁹ This was an argument that must have been hard for Douglass to rebuke considering Galen was a pagan, and most of their traditional medicine was based upon his texts. Douglass had the advantage of being a better critic than Mather, but where Mather exceeded Douglass was in his ability to interpret scripture. When Douglass stepped into the realm of interpreting scripture, Mather knew that he had a distinct advantage that could turn the battle of inoculation in his favor. Mather supported his argument with the belief that the 6th commandment *compelled* him to practice inoculation, as getting smallpox in the common way was almost a certain sentence to death. Douglass and many other physicians argued just the opposite and said that it was against the bible to infect an inherently healthy person. At this juncture in the argument there is a disagreement between the two about what is ‘appropriate’ preventative medicine. Mather argued that “the use of emetics, and cathartics to prevent a sickness which they are afraid of”⁵⁰ showed that Puritans were okay with using preventative treatment to sidestep a serious disease, but Douglass disagreed vehemently. Douglass shot back with typical virility but

⁴⁴ Isaac Greenwood. *A Friendly Debate* (1722): 1.

⁴⁵ John M. Bumstead, “Doctor Douglass’ Summary: Polemic for Reform,” *The New England Quarterly* 37 (1964): 242-250

⁴⁶ Wisecup, “African Medical Knowledge,” 27.

⁴⁷ *Ibid*, 26.

⁴⁸ William Douglass, *Inoculation of the Smallpox as Practiced in Boston* (Boston: Franklin, 1722), 5.

⁴⁹ Cotton Mather, *Some Account of What is Said of Inoculating or Transplanting the Smallpox* (Boston: 1721), 21.

⁵⁰ Tindol, “Getting the Pox off All Their Houses,” 5.

insisted that Mather was now entering upon the field of medicine (which he was) and that he should stick to his “sphere” of service. This was attacking his credentials rather than his argument.⁵¹

Both sides quoted Biblical passages as the rational discourse upon the merits of inoculation fell apart and, as the outbreak continued, the discussion became a full on colonial cat-fight. Mather argued his interpretation of science as a way which you could uncover God, so he did not let his religious convictions undermine his ability to practice science effectively and objectively.⁵² Douglass likened the ‘infatuation’ with the practice of inoculation as to Mather’s role in the witchcraft trials, as a troublesome man who should not be meddling in things he does not know about. This is again typical of Douglass’s attack on Mather rather than debating the aspects and merits of inoculation.

There is ample evidence and testimony to support that Mather held the medical authority to propose inoculations to Dr. Boylston and the knowledge to accompany such a proposal. William Douglass argued out of an ever-receding pocket of ignorance, elitism, and self-servitude that alienated him from many of the other prominent Boston scholars until he eventually admitted that inoculation was a valid practice, but even after that admission he still argued until his death that Mather and Boylston had administered it inappropriately. Mather and Boylston would manage to get the last victory against Douglass’s hidebound supporters as soon after the controversy was over, for nobility in England were being inoculated by the dozens. The Royal Society admitted Boylston into their ranks and awarded him with their highest commendation for his performance under scrutiny during the controversy. Mather later goes on to give all the credit to Boylston for the success of inoculation during the controversy and promoted him as the poster child for non-professional physicians in the Royal Society. Mather and Boylston triumphed over the forces that sought to discredit inoculation, the men associated with it, non-professional scientists, and enlightenment ideals.

In the end there were over 800 casualties due to the smallpox virus; but though the city of

Boston was shaken, over two hundred people lived because of inoculation. Inoculation would later be practiced all across the colonies, saving countless thousands over the years. Both Mather and Boylston challenged the idea that college-trained physicians held the premiere authority in an empirically-based academic setting, effectively changing the paradigm of debate about medical research authority between amateur scientists, scholars and professionals for years to come.

⁵¹Wetering, “A Reconsideration of the Inoculation Controversy,” 1.

⁵² Tindol, “Getting the Pox off All Their Houses,” 15.

Bibliography

Note: Brackets denote Evan's collection numbers.

A Dialogue Between Rusticus and Academicus. Boston, MA: 1722. [2386]

A Letter From The Country. Boston, MA: 1721. [2229]

Blake, John B. *Public Health in the Town of Boston, 1630-1822.* Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1959.

Brasch, Frederick E. "The Royal Society of London and Its Influence Upon Scientific Thought in the American Colonies." *The Scientific Monthly* 33 (1931): 336-355.

Breslaw, Elaine G. *Lotions, Potions, Pills, and Magic: Health Care in Early America.* NY: New York University Press, 2012.

Boylston, Zabdiel. *An historical account of the small-pox inoculated in New England, upon all sorts of persons, whites, blacks, and of all ages and constitutions: with some account of the nature of the infection in the natural and inoculated way, and their different effects on human bodies: with some short directions to the unexperienced in this method of practice.* London, EN: Cross-Keys Press, 1726.

Boylston, Zabdiel. *Some Account of What is Said of Inoculating.* Boston, MA: Green, 1721. [2206]

Bumstead, John M. "Doctor Douglass' Summary: Polemic for Reform." *The New England Quarterly* 37 (1964): 242-250.

Burleson, E. *A Lamentation in Memory of the Distressing Sickness in Hartford.* New London, CT: 1722. [2617]

Colman, Benjamin. *Some Observations Of The New Method.* Boston, MA: 1721. [2211]

Douglass, William. *Inoculation of the Small Pox.* Boston, MA: Franklin, 1722. [2332]

Douglass, William. *Postscript.* Boston, MA: Franklin, 1722. [2333]

Douglass, William. *The Abuses and Scandals of some late pamphlets in favour of inoculation.* Boston, MA: Franklin, 1722.

Grainger, Samuel. *The Imposition of Inoculation.* Boston, MA: 1721. [2222]

Greenwood, Isaac. *A Friendly Debate.* Boston, MA: 1722. [2339]

Hawke, David Freeman. *Everyday life in Early America.* New York, NY: Harper, 1988.

Le Beau, Bryan F. "The 'Angelical Conjunction' Revisited: Another Look at the Preacher-Physician in Colonial America and the Throat Distemper Epidemic of 1735-1740." *Journal of American Culture* 18 (1995): 1-10

Mather, Cotton. *Angel of Bethesda.* New London, CT: 1722. [2352]

Mather, Cotton. *Wholesome Words.* Boston, MA: 1713. [1630]

Mather, Cotton. *Some Account.* Boston, MA: Garrison, 1721. [2242]

- Mather, Increase. *Several Reasons*. Boston, MA: 1721. [2258]
- Mather, Increase. *Some Further Account*. Boston, MA: 1721. [2259]
- Mather, Cotton. *Some account of what is said of inoculating or transplanting the small pox*. Boston, MA: Harvard online library, 1721.
- Mather, Cotton. *Diary of Cotton Mather*. Compiled by Chauncey Worthington Ford. New York, NY: Frederick Ungar Publishing, 1964.
- Schmotter, James. "William Douglass and the Beginnings of American Professionalism: A Reinterpretation of the 1721 Boston Inoculation Controversy." *Historical Journal of Western Massachusetts* 6 (1977): 23-36
- Silvermann, Kenneth. *The Life and Times of Cotton Mather*. NY: Harper, 1984.
- Thatcher, Thomas. *A Brief Rule to Guide the Common People*. Boston, MA: 1702. [1096]
- Tindol, Robert. "Getting the Pox off All Their Houses: Cotton Mather and the Rhetoric of Puritan Science." *Early American Literature* 46 (2011): 1-23
- Vincent, Thomas. *God's Terrible Voice*. Cambridge, EN: Cambridge Press, 1668. [132]
- Wetering, Maxine Van De. "A Reconsideration of the Inoculation Controversy." *The New England Quarterly* 58 (1985): 46-67.
- Williams, John. *An Answer To a Late Pamphlet*. Boston, MA: 1729. [3217]
- Williams, John. *An Answer To a Late Pamphlet Intitled A Letter To A Friend in the Country, attempting a Solution of the Scruples and Objections of a Consciencious or Religious Nature, commonly made against the new Way of receiving the Small Pox*. Boston, MA: 1721.
- Williams, Tony. *The Pox and the Covenant: Mather, Franklin, and the Epidemic that Changed America's Destiny*. Naperville, IL: Sourcebooks Press, 2010.
- Williams, John. *Several Arguments*. Boston, MA: 1721. [2307]
- Winslow, Elizabeth. *A Destroying Angel*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin, 1974.
- Wisecup, Kelly. "African Medical Knowledge, the Plain Style, and Satire in the 1721 Boston Inoculation Controversy." *Early American Literature* 46 (2011): 25-50

About the Author: Charles Murray is a senior with a major in History and a minor in Environmental Studies. He is a group tutor in history and enjoys helping students achieve their academic goals. He will be graduating with honors in May 2015 and will begin his MST in Secondary Social Studies Education in summer 2015.

The Question that Started the Cold War: The Polish Question from 1943 until 1945

By Jacob Pauling

My task as minister of foreign affairs was to expand the borders of our fatherland. And it seems that Stalin and I coped with this task quite well.¹

Soviet Foreign Minister V.M. Molotov

Who started the Cold War? Although one side cannot be fully blamed, the Polish question shows which side deserves more blame. The Polish question entailed the composition of Poland's government during and after World War II and territorial adjustments. In 1939, Joseph Stalin signed a non-aggression pact with Adolf Hitler that partitioned Poland and signaled Soviet expansion. The discovery in 1943 of Polish officers executed by Soviet secret police in 1940 highlighted Stalin's cold-blooded calculations for Poland. Great Britain, the United States, and the Soviet Union met at the Tehran Conference in 1943 to discuss military matters and the post-war vision for Europe. Tensions among the "Big Three" slowly developed as leaders debated the Polish question. The London and Lublin Poles vied for leadership of Poland. Eventually, the competition between the London and Lublin Poles heightened during the Warsaw uprising in August 1944 with Stalin's reluctance to aid the Polish Home Army. The Polish Home Army sided with the London Poles and Stalin wanted the Lublin Poles to gain the advantage in the post-war Polish government. The Lublin Poles' ascension to power upset United States President Franklin D. Roosevelt who messaged Stalin about it in December 1944.² The Soviet Union

¹ V.M. Molotov and Felix Chuev, *Molotov Remembers: Inside Kremlin Politics: Conversations with Felix Chuev*, ed. Albert Resis (Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 1993), 8.

² President Franklin D. Roosevelt to Marshal Joseph Stalin, 16 December 1944, in *My Dear Mr. Stalin: The Complete Correspondence of Franklin D. Roosevelt and Joseph V. Stalin*, ed. Susan Butler

initiated Cold War tensions because of its policy to politically dominate Poland as World War II ended.

Cooperation among the "Big Three" peaked at the Yalta conference in February 1945. At Yalta, the Polish question was an important issue. According to United States Secretary of State Edward Stettinius, Jr., all sides agreed upon "free and unfettered elections" for Poland.³ The Soviet Union argued Poland was an issue of national security. In contrast, the West respected Poland's right for self-determination. The United States Secretary of Commerce, Henry Wallace, presented a strong case regarding the hypocrisy of the United States having spheres of influence; modern-day revisionists regularly invoke this argument.⁴ Revisionists such as Oliver Stone and Peter Kuznick also argue that Stalin never intended to dominate Poland politically.⁵ Soviet domination of Eastern Europe, however, was unacceptable to the United States's foreign policy interests, a fact noted by even Marxist dissenters from Stalinism. Tensions after Yalta heightened between Roosevelt and Stalin over the Polish question. In March 1945, Roosevelt expressed anger to Stalin over violations of the Yalta agreement concerning Poland.⁶ When Harry Truman became President, the Polish question necessitated a quick decision. This decision turned into an unofficial declaration of the Cold War when Truman berated Soviet

(New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2006), 275-76.

³ Edward Stettinius Jr., *Roosevelt and the Russians: The Yalta Conference*, ed. Walter Johnson (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1949), 346-47.

⁴ Henry A. Wallace, *The Price of a Vision: The Diary of Henry A. Wallace*, ed. John Morton Blum (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1973), 503, 536.

⁵ Oliver Stone and Peter Kuznick, *The Untold History of the United States* (New York: Gallery Books, 2012), 122-126.

⁶ President Franklin D. Roosevelt to Marshal Joseph Stalin, 31 March 1945, in *Dear Mr. Stalin*, 310-312.

foreign minister V. M. Molotov in April 1945. Political conditions in Poland deteriorated, and the Soviet Union clearly reneged on its promises.

Scholars, since the Cold War started, fleshed out different arguments concerning who started the Cold War that created a rich historiography. After World War II, the orthodox paradigm portrayed the Soviet Union as the aggressor bent on expansion.⁷ In this view, the United States acted in self-defense.⁸ Undoubtedly, the United States government promulgated this argument.⁹ Orthodox scholars include Samuel Flagg Bemis, Joseph Jones, Robert Ferrell and, to a certain extent, Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., and Adam Ulam.¹⁰ Schlesinger is perhaps the best-known orthodox historian. He argues that Stalin's paranoia, totalitarian regime, and Marxist ideology of global communist revolution necessitated American action.¹¹

In the 1950s, 60s, and 70s revisionist scholars challenged this paradigm.¹² Among these revisionists are William A. Williams, Gar Alperovitz, Thomas G. Paterson, Fred W. Neal, Richard Barnet, Denna Frank Fleming, Walter LaFeber, David Horowitz, and Lloyd C. Gardner.¹³ Revisionist arguments vary, but generally agree on the idea that the United States tried to use its atomic monopoly and economic hegemony to intimidate the Soviet Union.¹⁴ Gar

Alperovitz, in *Atomic Diplomacy: Hiroshima and Potsdam*, argues that the dropping atomic bombs on Japan were unnecessary and directed at intimidating Stalin.¹⁵ Lloyd C. Gardner argues, in *Architects of Illusion*, "that the United States was responsible for the way the Cold War unfolded."¹⁶ According to him, the Cold War occurred the way it did because of "America's use of economic aid as a lever against the Soviet Union, failure to deal with the German question of disarmament and peace, and failure to pursue international cooperation on atomic energy between 1945-1949."¹⁷

By the 1970s, these polarized interpretive extremes shifted toward a middle ground in which one side was not entirely to blame. Post-revisionism, so-called, replaced revisionism in that the new paradigm acknowledged the complexities of the onset of the Cold War, but identified the intransigence of the Soviet Union as the chief problem.¹⁸ Indeed John Lewis Gaddis's *The United States and the Origins of the Cold War: 1941-1947* argues that both sides made mistakes and were at cross-purposes ideologically and in Eastern Europe.¹⁹ Stalin, however, had more of an opportunity to seek cooperation with the West because he was a dictator.²⁰ Since the 1980s, post-revisionism remains the predominant school of thought regarding the origins of the Cold War despite revisionist attacks.

As a result of revisionist attacks and as new evidence has become available, early Cold War interpretations are becoming polarized again. Vladislav M. Zubok, for instance, argues that the Soviet Union started the Cold War

⁷ Edward Crapol, "Some Reflections on the Historiography of the Cold War," *The History Teacher* 20 (1987): 252-54.

⁸ Ibid.

⁹ Ibid., 253-54.

¹⁰ Thomas G. Paterson, introduction to *Problems in American Civilization: The Origins of the Cold War* (Lexington, MA: D.D. Heath and Company, 1970), ix.

¹¹ Arthur Schlesinger Jr., "Origins of the Cold War," in *The Origins of the Cold War*, eds. Joseph J. Huthmacher and Susan I. Warren (Waltham, MA: Ginn and Company, 1970), 70-73.

¹² Crapol, "Historiography of the Cold War," 256-257.

¹³ Paterson, introduction to *Origins of the Cold War*, ix.

¹⁴ Crapol, "Historiography of the Cold War," 256-57.

¹⁵ Gar Alperovitz, *Atomic Diplomacy: Hiroshima and Potsdam: The Use of the Atomic Bomb and the American Confrontation with Soviet Power* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1965), 13-15.

¹⁶ Lloyd C. Gardner, *Architects of Illusion: Men and Ideas in American Foreign Policy, 1941-1949* (Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1970), 316-18.

¹⁷ Ibid.

¹⁸ Crapol, "Historiography of the Cold War," 257-59.

¹⁹ John Lewis Gaddis, *The United States and the Origins of the Cold War, 1941-1947* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1972), 359-61.

²⁰ Ibid.

because Stalin relied on traditional Tsarist methods of expansion to ensure national security.²¹ Craig Campbell and Sergey Radchenko, by contrast, argue that the United States started the Cold War and the atomic bomb made the Cold War inevitable because Stalin became deeply suspicious of the West.²² Oliver Stone and Peter Kuznick argue further that the atomic bombs were unnecessary to end the Pacific War, and America's atomic monopoly greatly contributed to the onset of the Cold War.²³

I call my take on these issues *post-revisionist* because the Cold War's onset was a complex development. This paper particularly emphasizes the Soviet role in *initiating* the Cold War in regard to the Polish question from 1943 until 1945 and the controversial Hitler-Stalin Pact of 1939. Orthodox scholars often lament Poland's fate as a Soviet puppet state, but place too much blame on the Soviet Union for the shaping of the Cold War. By contrast, revisionists downplay Poland's significance or leave out the question altogether, dismissing its importance. Furthermore, most Western scholars overlook Marxist critics of Stalin's foreign policy from 1939-1945. These include Wolfgang Leonhard, Leon Trotsky, Isaac Deutscher, and Valentin Berezkhov.

The Soviet-German non-aggression pact of 1939 initiated a trend in Soviet foreign policy toward imperial expansion against bordering countries. The argument for a post-World War II Soviet sphere of influence in Eastern Europe hinged on the Hitler-Stalin non-aggression pact of 1939. This precipitated a kind of Soviet expansion that Marxist scholars view as unjustified. According to Wolfgang Leonhard, the Soviet Union argued that the pact gained time and space, but only after Operation

Barbarossa was this argument ever invoked.²⁴ Instead, the non-aggression pact enabled Stalin to establish a sphere of influence in Eastern Europe and annex Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, half of Poland, and Bessarabia.²⁵ Stalin, moreover, signed the pact to turn Germany on the Western Allies.²⁶ Soviet propaganda, for example, switched from anti-fascism to anti-imperialism of Britain and France.²⁷ The strength in Leonhard's argument is Leon Trotsky who viewed the non-aggression pact as a betrayal of communist principles.²⁸ The pact's secrecy, for Trotsky, was its treachery.²⁹ Ultimately Stalin viewed Hitler as a leader he could work with.

As a result of being crushed between Germany and the Soviet Union, the Polish people viewed the pact as an invasion by both countries. In addition to well-documented German atrocities in Poland, the Soviet Union sent over a million Poles to labor camps deep in Russia.³⁰ Despite these atrocities, beginning with the start of Operation Barbarossa the Polish government-in-exile (London Poles) and the underground resistance agreed to cooperate with the Soviet Union against the common German enemy.³¹

Soon, however, the Katyn Massacre undermined cooperative relations between the London Poles and the Soviet Union. The Katyn massacre revealed Stalin's brutal machinations. On April 13, 1943, the Germans uncovered mass graves of over 10,000 Polish officers and

²¹ Vladislav M. Zubok, *A Failed Empire: The Soviet Union in the Cold War from Stalin to Gorbachev*, ed. John Lewis Gaddis (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 2007), 29.

²² Craig Campbell and Sergey Radchenko, *The Atomic Bomb and the Origins of the Cold War* (New Haven, CN: Yale University Press, 2008), xi-xxv.

²³ Stone and Kuznick, *The Untold History*, 172.

²⁴ Wolfgang Leonhard, *Betrayal: The Hitler-Stalin Pact of 1939*, trans. Richard D. Bosley (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1986), 62-63.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, vii, viii, x.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, xi, xii.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 57-58.

²⁸ Leonhard, *Betrayal*, 168-171. See also Leon Trotsky, *Writings of Leon Trotsky: 1939-1940*, eds. Naomi Allen and George Breitman (New York: Pathfinder Press, 1973), 76-89, 139-157.

²⁹ *Ibid.*

³⁰ Stanislaw Mikolajczyk, *The Rape of Poland: A Pattern of Soviet Aggression* (New York: Whittlesey House, 1948), 14-16.

³¹ *Ibid.*, 16-18.

blamed the Soviet Union for the massacre.³² A discovery of this sort raises the possibility of German fabrication. The Polish government-in-exile, however, had evidence the Soviet Union perpetrated the atrocity in 1940-1941 during the occupation.³³ According to the Polish government-in-exile, when the Soviet Union occupied Eastern Poland, Polish officers went missing.³⁴ After the discovery, a member of the London Poles, Stanislaw Mikolajczyk, met a Soviet officer who recalled that Stalin issued the order to “liquidate” the Polish officers.³⁵ The Soviet government, outraged over the allegations, ended recognition of the Polish government-in-exile.³⁶ In his memoirs, Soviet official Andrei Gromyko called the Polish government-in-exile openly hostile to the Soviet Union.³⁷ Which side told the truth? A recent *New York Times* article reveals the latest evidence and lingering controversy about the Katyn massacre.³⁸ According to journalists Alan Cowell and Andrew Roth, in 2010 the Russian government finally admitted Stalin’s responsibility for the deaths of over 20,000 Poles.³⁹ The Polish officers were innocent and Stalin viewed them as potential threats to his domination of Poland.

Nevertheless, cooperation between the Polish government-in-exile and the Soviet Union seemed possible when Stanislaw Mikolajczyk became Prime Minister of the London Poles in July 1943.⁴⁰ Mikolajczyk was a well-respected Polish politician of the Peasant Party who sought cooperation with the Soviet Union. In July 1943, Mikolajczyk gave a speech that stated, in his words, “[t]he Polish government desires a permanent understanding and

collaboration with the USSR.”⁴¹ Mikolajczyk, moreover, added that “Marshal Stalin has announced that he desires a ‘strong and independent Poland’ and he does not wish to interfere in our internal affairs.”⁴² Mikolajczyk believed excellent Soviet-Polish relations were imperative for the health of Europe.⁴³ Would Stalin support Polish self-determination? Prior to becoming Prime Minister, Mikolajczyk met Roosevelt heard the President say that “Stalin is not an imperialist.”⁴⁴ Roosevelt, however, added “[i]n all our dealings with Stalin we must keep our fingers crossed.”⁴⁵ At times Roosevelt appeared too idealistic, but he was aware of Stalin’s totalitarian regime. This necessitated formal negotiations on the Polish question.

Formal negotiations over the Polish question began at Tehran over the Curzon Line. British Prime Minister Winston Churchill and Roosevelt agreed with Stalin that Poland’s border should roughly be along the Curzon Line.⁴⁶ This drew the ire of the Polish government-in-exile because, following the Treaty of Riga in 1921, Poland held territory east of the Curzon Line.⁴⁷ Churchill, ever the realist, told Mikolajczyk to accept the Curzon Line or possibly face Soviet domination.⁴⁸ At Tehran, the “Big Three” failed to obtain a guarantee on Poland’s future sovereignty that angered the Polish government-in-exile.⁴⁹ These two problems intensified as the Red Army liberated Poland.

After Tehran and with the the Red Army march on Poland, Roosevelt hoped Stalin respected Poland’s self-determination. Roosevelt

³² Ibid., 27-29.

³³ Ibid.

³⁴ Ibid.

³⁵ Ibid., 38.

³⁶ Ibid., 29-33.

³⁷ Andrei Gromyko, *Memoirs*, trans. Harold Shukman (New York: Doubleday, 1990), 81.

³⁸ Alan Cowell and Andrew Roth, “Ruling on Katyn Killings Highlights Russia-Poland Rift,” *New York Times*, October 21, 2013.

³⁹ Ibid.

⁴⁰ Mikolajczyk, *Rape of Poland*, 264.

⁴¹ Ibid.

⁴² Ibid.

⁴³ Ibid.

⁴⁴ Ibid., 59.

⁴⁵ Ibid., 60.

⁴⁶ Valentine M. Berezhkov, *At Stalin’s Side: His Interpreter’s Memoirs from the October Revolution to the Fall of the Dictator’s Empire*, trans. Sergei V. Mikheyev (New York: Carol Publishing Group, 1994), 301.

⁴⁷ Mikolajczyk, *Rape of Poland*, 16, 48, 51-53, 261-262.

⁴⁸ Ibid., 49-53.

⁴⁹ Ibid., 49-52.

messed Stalin on February 7, 1944, and expressed continued cooperation on the Polish question.⁵⁰ Roosevelt mentioned that Molotov proposed a Polish government based on Poles from abroad.⁵¹ Reflecting on this deal years later, Stalin's interpreter, Valentine Berezhkov, argues Roosevelt and Churchill missed an opportunity for a resolution on the Polish question.⁵² Tensions over Polish question, however, concerned Roosevelt and he opted to wait on a resolution until the Poles chose their own government.⁵³ In the words of Roosevelt, "neither party shall by hasty word or unilateral act transform this special [Polish] question into one adversely affecting the larger issues of future international collaboration."⁵⁴ At this point in time, Roosevelt wanted to unpack the Polish question at a future date and suitable setting. The key word in Roosevelt's message was 'unilateral' because cooperation among the "Big Three" remained essential for future peace.⁵⁵ How long did this cooperation last? Perhaps Mikolajczyk could solve the Polish question.

Evidently, Mikolajczyk impressed Roosevelt so much that the President communicated this to Stalin on June 17, 1944.⁵⁶ Roosevelt stated Mikolajczyk had the utmost integrity who cared deeply about Poland and cooperation with the Soviet Union.⁵⁷ Regarding future Soviet-Polish cooperation, in Roosevelt's words, Mikolajczyk "will make every effort to achieve that end."⁵⁸ Stalin replied the Soviet government wants to "see Poland strong, independent and democratic" as the basis for

future mutual friendship and cooperation.⁵⁹ Again, Stalin reiterated the idea of forming a Polish government with Poles abroad and within.⁶⁰ Political maneuvering and rhetoric disguised Stalin's intentions.

Bulgarian Communist Georgi Dimitrov, for instance, reveals Stalin's maneuvering to place Lublin Poles in control of a future Polish government. In a diary entry dated June 27, 1944, Dimitrov recorded a meeting between Stalin and the Polish Communists.⁶¹ According to Dimitrov's observation, the post-war Polish government might be headed by the Western-supported Mikolajczyk, but Lublin Poles would control the ministries of war, foreign affairs, and internal affairs.⁶² The Lublin Poles, in effect, would dominate post-war Poland and establish Soviet-style socialism. This framework persisted until 1947 when the Communist Party officially took power through force and rigged elections, despite Western attempts for fairness.

Meanwhile, Stalin precipitated the Warsaw uprising. In the words of Marxist scholar Isaac Deutscher, "Stalin's role [in the Warsaw uprising] appeared extremely ambiguous and even sinister."⁶³ According to Mikolajczyk, Moscow radio on July 29, 1944 broadcast a message to Warsaw that encouraged the Polish underground to revolt.⁶⁴ According to Mikolajczyk, the last line read "Poles, the time of liberation is at hand! Poles, to arms! There is not a moment to lose!"⁶⁵ So it was that Stalin helped to start the Warsaw uprising on August 1, 1944.⁶⁶ The fighting against the might of the *Wehrmacht* was perhaps the fiercest of the entire war.

⁵⁰ President Franklin D. Roosevelt to Marshal Joseph Stalin, 7 February 1944, in *Dear Mr. Stalin*, 201-02.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*

⁵² Berezhkov, *At Stalin's Side*, 258-260.

⁵³ President Franklin D. Roosevelt to Marshal Joseph Stalin, 7 February 1944, in *Dear Mr. Stalin*, 201-02.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*

⁵⁶ President Franklin D. Roosevelt to Marshal Joseph Stalin, 17 June 1944, in *Dear Mr. Stalin*, 237-38.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*

⁵⁹ Premier Joseph Stalin to President Franklin D. Roosevelt, 21 June 1944, in *Dear Mr. Stalin*, 239-40.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*

⁶¹ Georgi Dimitrov, *The Diary of Georgi Dimitrov: 1933-1949*, ed. Ivo Banac, trans. Jane T. Hedges, Timothy D. Sergay, and Irina Faion (New Haven, CN: Yale University Press, 2003), 323-24.

⁶² *Ibid.*

⁶³ Isaac Deutscher, *Stalin: A Political Biography*, 2nd ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1967), 522.

⁶⁴ Mikolajczyk, *Rape of Poland*, 69.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 69-70.

As the uprising unfolded, Stalin hampered Western efforts to aid the Polish resistance. Mikolajczyk and Deustcher agree the United States and Great Britain tried to supply the Polish insurgents by air, but logistical issues and Stalin's intransigence to not allow Western planes on Soviet soil hampered efforts.⁶⁷ Stalin, for his part, flew in a meager amount of supplies including unusable ammunition.⁶⁸ Throughout 1944, the Red Army bulldozed the Germans westward. During the Warsaw uprising, however, the Red Army waited outside of Warsaw and any relief attempts were uncharacteristically incompetent.⁶⁹ Stalin's motives were clear.

Accordingly, Stalin wanted the Germans to destroy the pro-Western Polish underground to create a political vacuum for the Lublin Poles to fill. While the Warsaw uprising occurred, Mikolajczyk visited Stalin, and the latter outlined the Moscow controlled provisional Polish government.⁷⁰ Stalin now interpreted the Lublin Committee as the official Provisional Government of Poland.⁷¹ Stalin, moreover, desired a Polish government composed of eighteen members with an overwhelming majority of communists.⁷² With the framework of Poland's government in Stalin's favor, he decided to sacrifice pawns to avoid risks. In a reply on August 22, 1944 to Churchill and Roosevelt's attempts to open up Soviet airfields, Stalin called the Poles involved in the uprising "a handful of criminals."⁷³ To the astonishment of many, the underground resisted until they surrendered in October.⁷⁴ Under Hitler's orders, the Germans razed Warsaw to the ground and deported 350,000 Poles to Germany to perish in

camps.⁷⁵ The immediate toll of dead, wounded, and missing for the Polish insurgents amounted to 250,000.⁷⁶ This destruction, along with Stalin's motives, horrified Westerners. According to American Moscow embassy worker George F. Kennan, Stalin sent a message to the West that "[w]e intend to have Poland lock, stock, and barrel."⁷⁷ Poland's fate as a Soviet puppet state loomed.

Shortly after the Warsaw uprising ended, the Polish question resurfaced with great intensity over the Curzon Line due in small part to the Polish government-in-exile's bickering. Unfortunately, on the border question the London Poles hindered their own cause. Mikolajczyk fought for Polish borders east of the Curzon Line, but remained ready for compromise to ensure Poland's sovereignty.⁷⁸ Churchill and Roosevelt advocated this compromise. Members of the Polish government-in-exile, however, remained intransigent about restoration of Polish lands east of the Curzon Line.⁷⁹ Consequently, Mikolajczyk resigned as Prime Minister of the Polish government-in-exile on November 24, 1944.⁸⁰ This was unfortunate on account of the considerable respect each side had for Mikolajczyk. In all likelihood, had the border question been resolved Stalin would have imposed political imperialism on Poland.

Soviet reluctance to compromise, for example, occurred when Stalin initially sponsored free elections in Hungary in November 1944, but reneged.⁸¹ Similar to Poland, Hungary had a popular Peasant Party and a marginal Communist Party.⁸² Immediately after the Germans left Hungary, Stalin held a

⁶⁷ Mikolajczyk, *Rape of Poland*, 84-85. See also Deustcher, *Stalin*, 522-524.

⁶⁸ Mikolajczyk, *Rape of Poland*, 85.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, 72-73.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*

⁷² *Ibid.*, 77.

⁷³ Premier Joseph Stalin to President Franklin D. Roosevelt and Prime Minister Winston Churchill, 22 August 1944, in *Dear Mr. Stalin*, 253.

⁷⁴ Mikolajczyk, *Rape of Poland*, 89-90.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*

⁷⁷ George F. Kennan, *Memoirs: 1925-1950* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1967), 211.

⁷⁸ Mikolajczyk, *Rape of Poland*, 104-105.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*

⁸¹ W. Averell Harriman and Elie Abel, *Special Envoy to Churchill and Stalin: 1941-1946* (New York: Random House, 1975), 414.

⁸² *Ibid.*

free election.⁸³ The results showed the Peasant Party won overwhelmingly against the communists and socialists combined.⁸⁴ Stalin accordingly ended free elections and impeded the Peasant Party.⁸⁵ The same treatment applied to Poland with the exception that Stalin delayed elections for years and backed the Lublin Poles early enough to avoid another debacle.

Due to Stalin's actions in Poland, and pressure to clarify the position of the United States, on December 18, 1944 the State Department made it official policy for a sovereign Poland.⁸⁶ A press release stated that "[t]he United States Government stands unequivocally for a strong, free, and independent Polish state with the untrammelled right of the Polish people to order their internal existence as they see fit."⁸⁷ The repercussions were enormous, although this was just a press release. Now the American government, and people, expected a sovereign Poland even while Stalin pursued a Polish government dominated by the Soviet Union. Also, upon release of this statement the United States had an obligation to the Polish people. A heated confrontation between the United States and Soviet Union loomed.

Subsequently, Stalin's response to the American stance on Poland confirmed the coming showdown.⁸⁸ Stalin replied on December 27, 1944 to justify the Lublin Poles governing Poland on account of sabotage activity directed against the Red Army.⁸⁹ Also, Mikolajczyk's socialist successor, Tomasz Arciszewski, strained Soviet relations with the London Poles, which by now were restored.⁹⁰ This showed that Stalin hated leftists who broke

with the Moscow party line. Stalin distrusted other socialists, and that left, with the exception of Mikolajczyk, only his puppets to govern Poland. Further justifying Soviet policy regarding Poland, Stalin stated Soviet national security depended on Poland.⁹¹

As far as saboteurs were concerned, they reacted to harsh Stalinist policies and lack of discipline prevalent in the Red Army. Prominent scholar on the Polish question, Halik Kochanski, states that when the Red Army entered Poland, Soviet soldiers looted Polish homes and raped Polish women in large numbers.⁹² Additionally, the Lublin Poles soon enforced harsh collectivization policies similar to Stalin's efforts in Ukraine during the 1930s.⁹³ This development, coupled with Soviet occupation, precipitated mass starvation.⁹⁴ Consequently, the Lublin Poles popularity plummeted and Mikolajczyk's Peasant Party grew.⁹⁵

Two days later, Roosevelt replied to Stalin with increased frustration over the Polish question and Lublin Committee.⁹⁶ Roosevelt called the Lublin Committee unrepresentative of the Polish people.⁹⁷ He wanted Poles to choose their own government, even if this plan marginalized the London Poles.⁹⁸ Mikolajczyk's departure troubled Roosevelt because the Polish question precipitated infighting among the Poles.⁹⁹ Again, Roosevelt asked Stalin to "hold in abeyance...the formal recognition of the Lublin Committee as the government of Poland" until the "Big Three" formally met.¹⁰⁰ Evidently, Roosevelt tried to curb Soviet unilateral action

⁸³ Ibid.

⁸⁴ Ibid.

⁸⁵ Ibid.

⁸⁶ Department of State Press Release, 18 December 1944, in *Dear Mr. Stalin*, 276.

⁸⁷ Ibid.

⁸⁸ Premier Joseph Stalin to Franklin D. Roosevelt, 27 December 1944, in *Dear Mr. Stalin*, 281.

⁸⁹ Ibid.

⁹⁰ Premier Joseph Stalin to Franklin D. Roosevelt, 27 December 1944, in *Dear Mr. Stalin*, 281. See also Mikolajczyk, *Rape of Poland*, 106.

⁹¹ Premier Joseph Stalin to Franklin D. Roosevelt, 27 December 1944, in *Dear Mr. Stalin*, 281-82.

⁹² Halik Kochanski, *Eagle Unbowed: Poland and the Poles in the Second World War* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2012), 515-16.

⁹³ Ibid., 522-23.

⁹⁴ Ibid.

⁹⁵ Ibid., 522-24.

⁹⁶ President Franklin D. Roosevelt to Marshal Joseph Stalin, 29 December 1944, in *Dear Mr. Stalin*, 282-83.

⁹⁷ Ibid.

⁹⁸ Ibid.

⁹⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰⁰ Ibid.

on the Polish question. Would Stalin postpone the Polish question?

As mentioned previously, Stalin schemed to place the Lublin Poles in power. Stalin messaged Roosevelt on January 1, 1945, stating that the Soviet government argued the Lublin Committee should be Poland's provisional government.¹⁰¹ Stalin explained that he was "powerless" to postpone the Polish question because the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet had already made the decision.¹⁰² How could the totalitarian dictator Stalin be powerless? Since cooperation among the "Big Three" was necessary, Stalin deflected blame on bureaucratic inertia. Four days after Stalin messaged Roosevelt, according to Mikolajczyk, the "Soviet Union formally recognized the Lublin Committee as the Provisional Government of Poland."¹⁰³ Not long after recognition of the Polish Provisional Government, the Red Army captured Warsaw and swept across Poland.¹⁰⁴ In the words of Mikolajczyk, "[i]t was all grimly efficient."¹⁰⁵ As a result, prior to the Yalta Conference, Poland had a functioning government under Stalin's control.

At the Yalta Conference on February 4-11, 1945, the United States's policy on the Polish question remained unchanged. Still, at Yalta "Big Three" cooperation peaked based on the Polish question.¹⁰⁶ Official United States policy on the Polish question remained the same in which the Curzon Line was roughly Poland's eastern boundary with a provisional government headed by Mikolajczyk.¹⁰⁷ This provisional government was to include moderates and the existing provisional government in Poland composed entirely of Lublin Poles was unacceptable.¹⁰⁸ After the composition of

Poland's provisional government resolved itself, free elections determined Poland's permanent government.¹⁰⁹ Official Soviet policy was similar to United States policy on the eastern border question. In regard to the composition of Poland's provisional government, however, official Soviet policy called for the Lublin Poles to retain its predominance.¹¹⁰ With two opposing visions, was compromise possible? History thus far demonstrated Stalin's quest for political imperialism of Poland. Therefore it is ironic that, according to Molotov, the West attempted to "impose a bourgeois government [on Poland], which naturally would have been an agent of imperialism and hostile to the Soviet Union."¹¹¹ What about the Soviet Union's efforts to dominate Poland?

In an effort to foster cooperation among the "Big Three" Roosevelt attempted to ease Stalin's suspicions. According to Berezkhov, Roosevelt "convinced the suspicious oriental despot [Stalin] that democratic society was ready to take him into its arms."¹¹² Also, according to Gromyko, Stalin respected Roosevelt.¹¹³ Tensions between the West and Soviet Union heightened prior to Yalta, but Roosevelt received his wish for a meeting of the "Big Three." Roosevelt intended to curb the excesses of Stalin's foreign policy and incorporate the Soviet Union into the international community of nations.¹¹⁴

Despite Roosevelt's efforts, Stalin and Soviet officials remained suspicious of the West. Gromyko believed Roosevelt was friendly, but a member of the bourgeoisie.¹¹⁵ Further extrapolating Roosevelt's class standing, in the words of Molotov, "Roosevelt [was] an invertebrate imperialist."¹¹⁶ Although

¹⁰¹ Marshal Joseph Stalin to President Franklin Roosevelt, 1 January 1945, in *Dear Mr. Stalin*, 284.

¹⁰² *Ibid.*

¹⁰³ Mikolajczyk, *Rape of Poland*, 106.

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.*

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.*

¹⁰⁶ Stettinius Jr., *Roosevelt and the Russians*, 4.

¹⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, 86.

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.*

¹⁰⁹ *Ibid.*

¹¹⁰ James Francis Byrnes, *Speaking Frankly* (New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1947), 31.

¹¹¹ V. M. Molotov and Felix Chuev, *Molotov Remembers*, 54.

¹¹² Berezkhov, *At Stalin's Side*, 238.

¹¹³ Gromyko, *Memoirs*, 85.

¹¹⁴ Stettinius Jr., *Roosevelt and the Russians*, 24-26.

¹¹⁵ Gromyko, *Memoirs*, 86.

¹¹⁶ V. M. Molotov and Felix Chuev, *Molotov Remembers*, 55.

cooperation peaked at Yalta, underlying tensions surfaced.

With the Soviet position in Poland strengthening, Stalin cooperated with the West at Yalta. It was universally agreed upon that the future Polish government be cooperative and friendly toward the Soviet Union.¹¹⁷ In addition, all parties agreed Poland's eastern border should roughly be the Curzon Line.¹¹⁸ Discussion of Poland's western border precipitated some disagreement over the extent of Poland's territorial gain of German lands.¹¹⁹ Stalin wanted Poland's Western border at the Western Neisse River.¹²⁰ In contrast, Churchill argued the Poles would be unable to administer such a large area.¹²¹ Eventually Stalin conceded Churchill's point, and Poland's Western border was set at the Oder River.¹²² This was a non-issue for Stalin because he controlled Poland. Rather than concentrate on border disputes, Churchill and Roosevelt instead focused on Poland's sovereignty.

Therefore, Roosevelt and Churchill attempted to save Poland from Soviet domination or, at least, relax Stalin's policies on the composition of Poland's government. They, however, were handicapped by the fact the Red Army occupied Poland under the understandable, but later overused, excuse of communication lines. Nevertheless, Roosevelt and Churchill pressured Stalin. According to Stettinius, Churchill declared that "Poland be the mistress in her own house and 'captain of her soul.'"¹²³ Stettinius said that, Stalin replied that Poland should be "strong, independent, and democratic" for the sake of Soviet national security.¹²⁴ Again, Stalin's rhetoric-laden remarks about Polish sovereignty were duplicitous and stemmed from the dictator's flexible definition of democracy.

¹¹⁷ Stettinius Jr., *Roosevelt and the Russians*, 152-53.

¹¹⁸ *Ibid.*

¹¹⁹ Byrnes, *Speaking Frankly*, 30.

¹²⁰ *Ibid.*

¹²¹ *Ibid.*

¹²² Stettinius Jr., *Roosevelt and the Russians*, 301.

¹²³ *Ibid.*, 152-53.

¹²⁴ *Ibid.*, 152-55.

Subsequently, the following day, Molotov presented the Soviet solution to the Polish question that favored the Lublin Poles.¹²⁵ This included adding *some* Polish democratic leaders from abroad to the already Lublin dominated provisional government.¹²⁶ In consequence, Churchill suggested including Polish leaders within Poland and Stalin granted this concession.¹²⁷ The "Big Three" decided to wait a few days to discuss the Polish question further.¹²⁸ Indeed, the Polish question was complex, tiresome, and troublesome.

After two days, on February 8, the British and Americans delivered similar proposals aimed to undermine the authority of the Lublin Poles.¹²⁹ According to Stettinius, Roosevelt's proposal included a "Presidential Committee of three" tasked with creating a provisional Polish government from Lublin Poles, London Poles, and other democratic leaders.¹³⁰ Then free elections determined Poland's permanent government and constitution.¹³¹ In contrast to the American proposal, Churchill excluded mention of the Lublin Poles and emphasized the democratic process being "free and unfettered."¹³² Defensively, Molotov argued the Lublin Poles were popular and enlarging the existing provisional government seemed more plausible and acceptable to the Polish people.¹³³ Was there a way to bridge the ideological divide? Seemingly so, as Roosevelt's proposal involved compromise to accept the Lublin Poles.

The following day brought greater impetus to address the Polish question and Molotov better articulated his argument on behalf of the Lublin Poles.¹³⁴ Molotov argued the Lublin Poles provided interim stability until

¹²⁵ *Ibid.*, 181-82.

¹²⁶ *Ibid.*, 182.

¹²⁷ *Ibid.*, 186.

¹²⁸ *Ibid.*, 186.

¹²⁹ *Ibid.*, 209-12.

¹³⁰ *Ibid.*, 210.

¹³¹ *Ibid.*

¹³² *Ibid.*, 210-12.

¹³³ *Ibid.*, 212-13.

¹³⁴ *Ibid.*, 228.

the creation of a permanent government.¹³⁵ This was true, but the statement also highlighted the advantageous position of the Lublin Poles whom Stalin installed into power. Additionally, Molotov demanded that the wording of the American proposal should include anti-fascist in the title of democratic parties.¹³⁶ This was, for the most part, an attempt by the Soviet Union to ensure national security well expounded by Molotov. Under the guise of national security, however, the Soviet Union desired this wording to accord with Stalinist dogma. Besides Stalinists, few political parties (or individuals) qualified as anti-fascist. Nevertheless, the Soviet Union conceded the point of including anti-fascist democratic leaders from abroad and within Poland in the provisional government.¹³⁷

As a result, Roosevelt generally agreed with Molotov's modifications, but needed reassurances.¹³⁸ Also, Roosevelt thought about Polish Americans and their desire for a sovereign Poland.¹³⁹ Roosevelt accordingly concluded free elections were the most important addition to Molotov's proposal.¹⁴⁰ According to Stettinius, Churchill concurred with Roosevelt's idea, but added "free and unfettered" along with the provisional government being "more broadly based than the present one."¹⁴¹ Although Churchill's solution to the Polish question was desirable, he remained too antithetical to the Soviet position to the extent little progress seemed possible.

Once again, Roosevelt was the idealist arbiter balancing the competing realism of Stalin and Churchill. Roosevelt combined the ideas of the "Big Three" in the "Declaration of Liberated Europe" that promised democratic, stable, interim governments in liberated countries that quickly facilitated free elections.¹⁴² The "Big Three" adopted the "Declaration of Liberated

Europe."¹⁴³ Would Stalin abide by the declaration? Most likely Stalin conceded in the spirit of cooperation.

Then, a solution to the Polish question emerged with the modification of the British proposal to include ideas of the "Big Three" and, although subject to various interpretations, a sovereign Poland seemed possible.¹⁴⁴ According to Stettinius, this plan included a "Polish Provisional Government of National Unity" composed of Lublin Poles and London Poles, along with other democratic leaders from within Poland and abroad.¹⁴⁵ Then what Stettinius calls "free and unfettered elections" determined Poland's permanent government.¹⁴⁶ Unfortunately, Molotov shelved a mechanism to enforce fair elections.¹⁴⁷

Agreements made at Yalta created vociferous debate among United States officials and later scholars. Many scholars argue that Churchill and Roosevelt appeased Stalin. Edward Rozek, for example, cites a pattern of Soviet aggression dating back to 1920 that called for a tough stance against Stalin at Yalta.¹⁴⁸ The Western leaders, and their peoples, ignored Poland and opted for cooperation with the Soviet Union based on the wartime alliance.¹⁴⁹ Churchill even blamed Polish leaders for failure to accept the Curzon Line.¹⁵⁰ Similarly to Rozek, Peter Stern argues the Soviet Union had a concrete post-war plan for Poland and United States foreign policy failed to articulate Western demands for a sovereign Poland.¹⁵¹ Roosevelt postponed the Polish question too long and over relied on the Yalta Conference for a solution.¹⁵² These arguments appeared shortly after World

¹³⁵ Ibid.

¹³⁶ Ibid., 234.

¹³⁷ Ibid.

¹³⁸ Ibid., 240.

¹³⁹ Ibid.

¹⁴⁰ Ibid.

¹⁴¹ Ibid.

¹⁴² Ibid., 243, 342-43.

¹⁴³ Ibid., 342-43.

¹⁴⁴ Ibid., 240, 247-48.

¹⁴⁵ Ibid., 248.

¹⁴⁶ Ibid.

¹⁴⁷ Ibid.

¹⁴⁸ Edward J. Rozek, *Allied Wartime Diplomacy: A Pattern in Poland* (New York: John Wiley and Sons Inc., 1958), 438-446.

¹⁴⁹ Ibid., 444.

¹⁵⁰ Ibid., 445.

¹⁵¹ Peter Stern, *The Struggle for Poland* (Washington D.C.: Public Affairs Press, 1953), 62.

¹⁵² Ibid.

War II with a lack of critical distance during the height of the Cold War in the 1950s.

Consider the following Cold War biases. Rozek, to take one example, fails to flesh out the differences between Lenin and Stalin over Poland. Naturally, in the 1950s, most Westerners viewed the Soviet Union as an evil empire created by Vladimir Lenin and passed down to Stalin. Although evidence pointed to a Soviet effort to dominate Poland during Stalin's reign, the war preoccupied the Allied leaders until its conclusion was inevitable. Perhaps there were opportunities to denounce Soviet actions and change American policy, but they remain hypotheticals. Even so, Roosevelt in his communiques with Stalin cogently argued on behalf of Poland's sovereignty. To be sure, Roosevelt postponed details of the Polish question until Yalta, but he realized the necessity of formal negotiation among the "Big Three" rather than private talks. The Polish question was troublesome because Stalin sought imperial expansion and the London Poles contributed a great deal to sow discord, especially over the Curzon Line. The war was bloody until the end in both theatres and Roosevelt, first and foremost, needed to save American lives. This required negotiating Soviet entry into the Pacific theatre for Japanese islands and cooperation in Eastern Europe. As Stettinius says, "the Soviet Union made greater concessions at Yalta."¹⁵³ Roosevelt did well in spite of Stalin's powerful position in Eastern Europe.

Thanks to revisionist perspective, early Cold War scholarship has a greater appreciation of Roosevelt's idealism of cooperation with the Soviet Union at Yalta. Denna Frank Fleming argues Roosevelt negotiated well at Yalta and the "Big Three" reached agreements based on compromise.¹⁵⁴ At Yalta, Roosevelt and Churchill never condoned Stalin's free rein in Poland, but sought to improve relations.¹⁵⁵

¹⁵³ Stettinius Jr., *Roosevelt and the Russians*, 295.

¹⁵⁴ D.F. Fleming, *The Cold War and its Origins: 1917-1960*, vol. one (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1961), 205-07.

¹⁵⁵ *Ibid.*

Likewise, Oliver Stone and Peter Kuznick argue the Yalta Conference exemplified cooperation among the "Big Three."¹⁵⁶ Scholarship benefits greatly from sustained counter-arguments against the established paradigm.

In regard to the Polish question, revisionists generally rely on individuals, such as United States Secretary of Commerce Henry Wallace, as evidence of Cold War critics. Wallace criticized Truman's hard line against the Soviet Union and American hypocrisy regarding spheres of influence. In a diary entry dated October 26, 1945, Wallace stated what the Soviet Union did in Eastern Europe was similar to American policy toward Mexico and Cuba.¹⁵⁷ After all, in Mexico and Cuba the United States interfered to prevent revolutions.¹⁵⁸ Wallace reiterated this argument in a diary entry dated January 1, 1946, in which he stated the Soviet Union desired a friendly government on its border similar to America's position regarding Mexico.¹⁵⁹ Unfortunately, Wallace never seriously analyzed America's foreign policy, and upon realizing the truth of Stalin's horrific regime changed his position to support Truman.¹⁶⁰

Nevertheless, the hero in Oliver Stone and Peter Kuznick's revisionist work is Wallace, and these scholars argue the Soviet Union deserved a sphere of influence in Eastern Europe.¹⁶¹ The Soviet Union's destruction by the Germans justified Stalin's quest for national security.¹⁶² Then, with security from Germany assured, reconstruction began.¹⁶³ Further evidence to support Stone and Kuznick comes

¹⁵⁶ Stone and Kuznick, *The Untold History*, 114-17.

¹⁵⁷ Wallace, *Price of Vision*, 503.

¹⁵⁸ *Ibid.*

¹⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 537.

¹⁶⁰ Ronald Radosh and Leonard P. Liggio, "Henry A. Wallace and the Open Door," in *Cold War Critics: Alternatives to American Foreign Policy in the Truman Years*, ed. Thomas G. Paterson (Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1971), 105-06.

¹⁶¹ Stone and Kuznick, *The Untold History*, 114-23.

See also Fleming, *Cold War and its Origins*, vol. one, 265.

¹⁶² Stone and Kuznick, *The Untold History*, 114-23.

¹⁶³ *Ibid.*

from World War II Yugoslav partisan, Milovan Djilas, who recalls Stalin mentioning that “[t]he war shall soon be over [and] [w]e shall recover in fifteen or twenty years, and then we’ll have another go at it [with Germany].”¹⁶⁴ Stalin mentioned this observation to numerous people and, to a certain extent justifiably so, since Germany had risen from the ashes of war once before. From this observation, Stone and Kuznick defend Stalin’s actions in Eastern Europe as genuine efforts to protect Soviet borders.¹⁶⁵ Stalin, they say, attempted to install governments in Eastern Europe based on “broader democratic coalitions.”¹⁶⁶ This development abided by the spirit of cooperation among the “Big Three.”¹⁶⁷

Accordingly, revisionists blame Truman for initiating the Cold War. They generally argue Truman was inexperienced and his foreign policy contrasted sharply from Roosevelt. Stone and Kuznick argue Truman followed the advice of hardliners, such as his advisor James Byrnes and the Secretary of Navy, James Forrestal.¹⁶⁸ Due to this, Truman berated Molotov on April 23 on the erroneous belief the Soviet Union violated the Yalta agreement regarding Poland.¹⁶⁹ According to Stone and Kuznick, “Truman, true to form, tried to mask his limited understanding of the issues with bluster and bravado.”¹⁷⁰ This statement illustrates revisionist attempts to portray Truman as a cowboy.

To what extent did Truman deviate from Roosevelt? After Yalta, Roosevelt conveyed optimism for the post-war world. He gave a speech to Congress on March 1, 1945 that outlined his idealism.¹⁷¹ In the words of Roosevelt, the agreements reached at Yalta

¹⁶⁴ Milovan Djilas, *Conversations with Stalin*, trans. Michael B. Petrovich (New York: Harcourt Brace and World Inc., 1962), 114-15.

¹⁶⁵ Stone and Kuznick, *The Untold History*, 114-23.

¹⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 128.

¹⁶⁷ *Ibid.*

¹⁶⁸ Stone and Kuznick, *The Untold History*, 119-22. See also: Fleming, *Cold War and its Origins*, vol. one, 265-268.

¹⁶⁹ Stone and Kuznick, *The Untold History*, 122-23.

¹⁷⁰ *Ibid.*

¹⁷¹ Stettinius Jr., *Roosevelt and the Russians*, 323.

“spells—and it ought to spell—the end of the system of unilateral action, exclusive alliances and spheres of influence, and balances of power and all the other expedients which have been tried for centuries and have always failed.”¹⁷²

This profound statement was antithetical to Soviet actions in Eastern Europe. This speech, furthermore, showed Roosevelt’s position against Soviet buffer states controlled by Moscow. Was Roosevelt totally ignorant of Soviet designs for Eastern Europe? Roosevelt understood the system Stalin created in the Soviet Union and sought to spread into Europe.

Specifically, Stalin’s interpretation of the Polish question at Yalta angered Roosevelt and American policy-makers. Roosevelt messaged Stalin on March 31, 1945 to outline Soviet violations of the Yalta agreement.¹⁷³

According to Roosevelt, the Polish commission, composed of representatives of the “Big Three” created at Yalta to oversee the transition of a provisional Polish government to a permanent one, stalled on account of Stalin’s interpretation of the Yalta agreement.¹⁷⁴ Soviet policy supported the predominance of the Lublin Poles in the provisional government.¹⁷⁵ In the words of Roosevelt, the “new Polish Provisional Government of National Unity which we agreed should be formed should be a little more than a continuation of the present Warsaw Government [Lublin Poles].”¹⁷⁶ Also, according to Roosevelt, if the current provisional government became Poland’s permanent government as a solution to the Polish question the American people would “regard the Yalta agreement as a fraud [sic].”¹⁷⁷ Roosevelt concluded that “this Polish question be settled fairly and speedily.”¹⁷⁸ Accordingly, Roosevelt realized Stalin attempted to unilaterally impose a Moscow backed government on Poland through duplicity that

¹⁷² *Ibid.*

¹⁷³ President Franklin D. Roosevelt to Marshal Joseph Stalin, 31 March 1945, in *Dear Mr. Stalin*, 310-12.

¹⁷⁴ *Ibid.*

¹⁷⁵ *Ibid.*

¹⁷⁶ *Ibid.*

¹⁷⁷ *Ibid.*

¹⁷⁸ *Ibid.*

precipitated an impasse. Equally important, Roosevelt abided by official United States policy for a sovereign Poland. In this respect, continuity between Roosevelt and Truman remained. As a result of Stalin's actions on the Polish question, early Cold War tensions surfaced.

Unfortunately, Stalin ignored Roosevelt's call for a just solution to the Polish question. On April 7, 1945, Stalin replied that the Polish question "reached a dead end."¹⁷⁹ Stalin blamed the impasse on efforts by the United States and Great Britain to oust the Lublin Poles from leadership.¹⁸⁰ Based on the history of Stalin's desire to impose political imperialism on Poland, this excuse was tenuous. At the Potsdam Conference the "Big Three" bickered over the Polish question to a deadlock, but Stalin on April 7, 1945, sealed Poland's fate as a Soviet puppet state.¹⁸¹

On account of Stalin's intransigence regarding the Polish question, a crisis emerged among United States officials; but Roosevelt stressed cooperation, albeit with caution. On April 2, 1945, the United States Secretaries of State, War, and Navy discussed the crisis.¹⁸² All agreed that Soviet-American relations deteriorated over the Polish question and Stalin's attempt to include the Lublin Poles in discussions at the upcoming San Francisco Conference meant Western acceptance of the current Polish provisional government.¹⁸³ On April 4 and 6, 1945, the United States Ambassador to the Soviet Union, Averell Harriman, concluded the Soviet Union sought the "[c]reation of a security ring through domination of the border countries."¹⁸⁴ Shortly before Roosevelt passed away, he sent a message to Churchill on April 1, 1945 that

¹⁷⁹ Marshal Joseph Stalin to President Franklin D. Roosevelt, 7 April 1945, in *Dear Mr. Stalin*, 318.

¹⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, 318-20.

¹⁸¹ *Ibid.*, 318.

¹⁸² James Forrestal, *The Forrestal Diaries*, eds. Walter Millis and E.S. Duffield (New York: Viking Press, 1951), 38-39.

¹⁸³ *Ibid.*

¹⁸⁴ Stettinius Jr., *Roosevelt and the Russians*, 314-15.

mentioned problems with the Soviet Union resolved quickly and, therefore, cooperation remained important.¹⁸⁵ Yet Roosevelt acknowledged "[w]e must be firm, however, and our course thus far is correct."¹⁸⁶ Consequently, when Roosevelt died, a dichotomy emerged between cooperation and an impossible solution to the Polish question.

As a result, when Harry Truman became President, he immediately decided the course of United States foreign policy over the Polish question. It is important to note Truman's personality differed from Roosevelt. In the words of historian David Fromkin, Truman was a "short, combative, folksy blend of simplicity and shrewdness."¹⁸⁷ This guided Truman's decision-making process. On April 20, 1945, Truman held an important meeting to discuss American foreign policy toward the Soviet Union.¹⁸⁸ Based on observations during the Roosevelt administration, Harriman told Truman the Soviet Union intended to dominate Eastern Europe.¹⁸⁹ Nearly half of Europe began developing police states with Stalinist ideologies.¹⁹⁰ Specifically, the Polish question concerned American officials.¹⁹¹ Shortly after Roosevelt died, his advisor, Harry Hopkins, sought the advice of Kennan on the Polish question.¹⁹² Kennan argued the United States should not endorse Soviet policy in Poland because the Lublin Poles were Stalin's repressive minority puppet government.¹⁹³ Truman hoped for cooperation with the Soviet Union in the belief Stalin would back down.¹⁹⁴ This was a painful dilemma for Truman.

¹⁸⁵ Byrnes, *Speaking Frankly*, 59.

¹⁸⁶ *Ibid.*

¹⁸⁷ David Fromkin, *In the Time of the Americans: The Generation That Changed America's Role in the World* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1995), 488.

¹⁸⁸ Harry S. Truman, *Memoirs: Year of Decisions*, vol. one (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1955), 70.

¹⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, 70-71.

¹⁹⁰ *Ibid.*

¹⁹¹ *Ibid.*, 71-72.

¹⁹² Kennan, *Memoirs*, 212.

¹⁹³ *Ibid.*, 212-14.

¹⁹⁴ Truman, *Memoirs*, vol. one, 76.

In consequence, Truman opted, for the most part, on a tough stance against the Soviet Union with few dissenters. In the words of Truman, “our agreements with the Soviet Union had so far been a one-way street and this could not continue.”¹⁹⁵ Nearly everyone close to Truman backed this decision, but there were dissenters. As mentioned previously, Wallace disapproved of Truman’s decision. In addition to Wallace, Secretary of War Henry Stimson dissented. Stimson favored a tough stance against the Soviet Union on small issues, such as the treatment of American prisoners-of-war behind Russian lines.¹⁹⁶ In regard to the Polish question, however, Stimson argued Poland was in the Soviet sphere of influence and nothing could be done to change that fact.¹⁹⁷ In addition, Eastern European governments generally do not understand free elections and why force the issue due to the vagueness of the Yalta agreement.¹⁹⁸

Different interpretations of the Yalta agreement confronted Truman. At Yalta, Admiral William Leahy remarked to Roosevelt that the Yalta agreement on the Polish question was “so elastic that the Russians can stretch it all the way from Yalta to Washington without ever technically breaking it.”¹⁹⁹ Yet Leahy supported Truman’s tough stance.²⁰⁰ Likewise, Stettinius Jr. argued the Yalta agreement clearly states free elections for Poland.²⁰¹ Truman concurred with Stettinius Jr. and relied on Roosevelt’s correspondence to Stalin on March 31, 1945 as evidence.²⁰² Equally important was that the official policy of the United States supported a

sovereign Poland that dated back to December 18, 1944.²⁰³

Due to official United States policy on Poland and Roosevelt’s correspondences to Stalin, Truman berated Molotov about Soviet policy on the Polish question that was an unofficial declaration of the Cold War. Truman’s decision was justified, although the way he delivered his message remains debatable. Nevertheless, the Polish question necessitated a firm stance against the Soviet Union and Truman gave Molotov the Missouri straight talk. Truman squarely told Molotov to “carry out the Crimea [Yalta] decision on Poland.”²⁰⁴ As if on loop, Truman bluntly repeated this statement to Molotov.²⁰⁵ Incredulously, Molotov stated “I have never been talked to like that in my life.”²⁰⁶ Truman told Molotov to “carry out your agreements and you won’t get talked to like that.”²⁰⁷ United States foreign policy toward the Soviet Union shifted, albeit not as sharply as revisionists argue since Roosevelt’s dichotomy necessitated a decision by Truman.

As a result of Truman’s talk with Molotov, Soviet policy adopted a firmer stance against the United States. In the word of Molotov, Truman “wanted to show who was boss.”²⁰⁸ Also, Molotov noted he attempted this with “such an imperious tone!”²⁰⁹ Molotov concluded “he had a very anti-Soviet mindset.”²¹⁰ According to one of Stalin’s interpreters, Zoya Zarubina, “Truman’s anti-Communist, anti-Soviet attitude changed relations drastically.”²¹¹ Truman’s attitude, in effect, started the Cold War.²¹² Due to the new United States president, Stalin adjusted Soviet policy to confront, what he felt, was Truman’s

¹⁹⁵ Ibid., 77.

¹⁹⁶ Henry L. Stimson and McGeorge Bundy, *On Active Service in Peace and War* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1948), 608-09.

¹⁹⁷ Ibid., 608-11.

¹⁹⁸ Ibid.

¹⁹⁹ William Leahy, *I Was There: The Personal Story of the Chief of Staff to Presidents Roosevelt and Truman Based on his Notes and Diaries Made at the Time* (New York: Whittlesey House, 1950), 315-16.

²⁰⁰ Ibid., 350, 351.

²⁰¹ Truman, *Memoirs*, vol. one, 78-79.

²⁰² Ibid., 80.

²⁰³ Department of State Press Release, 18 December 1944, in *Dear Mr. Stalin*, 276.

²⁰⁴ Truman, *Memoirs*, vol. one, 81.

²⁰⁵ Ibid., 82.

²⁰⁶ Ibid.

²⁰⁷ Ibid.

²⁰⁸ Molotov and Chuev, *Molotov Remembers*, 55.

²⁰⁹ Ibid.

²¹⁰ Ibid.

²¹¹ Inez Cope Jeffrey, *The Life and Times of Zoya Zarubina* (Austin, TX: Eakin Press, 1999), 14-15.

²¹² Ibid.

abandonment of Roosevelt's course of cooperation. Instead of relaxed control over Eastern Europe, in particular Poland, Stalin clung to the idea that Soviet national security necessitated the formation of buffer states.

Once Stalin repulsed the Germans from Soviet territory, he resumed a policy of expansion. According to Deutscher, Stalin embarked on a policy of "socialism in one zone" through a mixture of conquest and revolution.²¹³ This mixture, of course, depended on the country. In regard to Poland it was more conquest than revolution since Stalin placed the Lublin Poles in charge, but other countries had stronger communist movements. Nonetheless, Deutscher agrees with Churchill that Stalin created the "iron curtain" across Europe.²¹⁴ One major problem occurred in Soviet plans for Eastern Europe and that was, in the words of Deutscher, that "Stalin staked everything on revolutionizing the whole of the Russian zone of influence."²¹⁵ In other words, Stalin desired countries in Eastern Europe to welcome Soviet-style socialism, but that failed to materialize.²¹⁶ So Stalin, in effect, lost the moral high ground as a result of using force to create buffer states. Unfortunately, the Soviet Union failed to achieve a worker's paradise and, instead, turned into Stalin's totalitarian system that he subsequently exported into Eastern Europe. Stalin needed Western acceptance of his sphere of influence that was impossible to obtain.²¹⁷

Accordingly, Stalin's foreign policy of expansion turned disastrous in that it formed the basis for the Cold War. Thus, to sum it up in the words of Bereztkov, the start of the Cold War "is attributable to Stalin's suspiciousness, his tendency to think in terms of the past war, his preoccupation with creating around the Soviet Union a zone of buffer states with regimes he could totally rely on."²¹⁸ Consequently, the United States and Britain followed correct

policies toward the Soviet Union.²¹⁹ After the devastation of World War II, the Soviet Union faced a new enemy. Although Stalin intended to dominate Eastern Europe, he constrained himself to this area. It must be emphasized, however, that Poland resided in this zone and official United States policy firmly identified with a sovereign post-war Poland. Yet in 1947, Stalin fully Sovietized Poland and Roosevelt's favorite Polish leader, Mikolajczyk, barely escaped Poland with his life thereby ending the Polish question.²²⁰

The Polish question precipitated tremendous tension between the West and Soviet Union during and after World War II. The Hitler-Stalin Pact demonstrated Soviet expansion rather than national security interests. Evidence surfaced about the brutal machinations of Stalin's regime toward Poland when the Germans discovered the Katyn Massacre in 1943. Stalin ordered the executions of Polish officers in 1940, for the reason they might threaten his iron grip on Poland. Western leaders were unsure of its authenticity at the time and Stalin used the Katyn Massacre as an excuse to cut off communications with the Polish government-in-exile.²²¹ The Polish government-in-exile also refused to recognize the Curzon Line.²²² This angered Stalin and added complexity to the Polish question. At the Tehran Conference, the "Big Three" agreed on the Curzon Line as Poland's border.²²³ Unfortunately, the London Poles' bickering over the Curzon Line helped ruin their chances for leadership in Poland as their rivalry with the Lublin Poles increased in 1944.

Yet Stalin intended to impose political imperialism on Poland. Stalin backed the Lublin Poles and positioned them to ascend to power. At this point, Stalin created proposals for a Soviet-style socialist dominated post-war Poland. This became apparent during the Warsaw uprising when Stalin waited to advance

²¹³ Deutscher, *Stalin*, 552-54.

²¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 563-64.

²¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 564-65.

²¹⁶ *Ibid.*

²¹⁷ *Ibid.*

²¹⁸ Bereztkov, *At Stalin's Side*, 345.

²¹⁹ *Ibid.*

²²⁰ Mikolajczyk, *Rape of Poland*, 230.

²²¹ *Ibid.*, 29-33.

²²² *Ibid.*, 104-05.

²²³ Bereztkov, *At Stalin's Side*, 301.

the Red Army until the Germans crushed the Polish resistance sympathetic to the London Poles. This enabled the Lublin Poles to march into Warsaw and set up a provisional government and form the basis for a permanent one.

In late 1944, Roosevelt wanted to postpone the Polish question until Yalta, but worried about Stalin's actions in Poland. Therefore, Roosevelt sent correspondences to Stalin and expressed his view that the "Big Three" should formally discuss the Polish question and not act unilaterally beforehand.²²⁴ What concerned Roosevelt was the advantageous position of the unpopular Lublin Poles and the fact that Stalin maneuvered them into power.²²⁵ In December 1944, Roosevelt and Stettinius Jr. outlined official United States policy to support a sovereign post-war Poland.²²⁶

As a result, the Soviet Union and United States were at odds over Poland that appeared at the Yalta Conference in February 1945. The Polish question featured prominently at the Yalta Conference, and Churchill and Roosevelt debated Stalin as to the future of Poland. Basically, the West wanted an inclusive provisional government with free elections to determine the permanent government.²²⁷ Stalin, on the other hand, desired a provisional government controlled by the Lublin Poles and, of course, free elections based on the Western definition never occurred. Many scholars argue Roosevelt appeased Stalin at Yalta. Yet the "Big Three" came to a general consensus on other issues, such as military matters and the German question. Seemingly, the West guaranteed Poland's sovereign future. This excited Roosevelt, but his exuberance faded.

Tensions somewhat present at Yalta surfaced afterward over the Polish question. Roosevelt expressed anger to Stalin over violations of the Yalta agreement concerning

Poland in March 1945.²²⁸ Again, the predominance of Lublin Poles in the provisional government upset Roosevelt.²²⁹ Roosevelt, furthermore, felt Americans invested heavily in a sovereign Poland.²³⁰ Stalin expressed indifference over Western concerns about the Polish question. Roosevelt desired cooperation with the Soviet Union on the Polish question, but they were at odds over the fate of Poland.

Consequently, Truman immediately dealt with the Polish crisis. Many revisionists blame Truman for the Cold War and argue he reversed Roosevelt's policy of cooperation with the Soviet Union. Based on Roosevelt's prior correspondences, this was not the case. Truman adopted a firm stance with the Soviet Union over the Polish question. In April 1945, Truman issued an unofficial declaration of the Cold War when he berated Molotov over violations of the Yalta agreement regarding Poland. Admittedly, the Yalta agreements on Poland were vague, but Truman followed United States policy for a sovereign Poland.²³¹ Revisionists concede Eastern Europe as buffer states to the Soviet Union after its World War II losses. History, however, showed Soviet expansion into Eastern Europe in any event. It is important to bear in mind that World War II in Europe began in Poland, and six million Poles died during the war that amounted to a population loss of fourteen percent.²³² This population loss as a percentage of population was roughly equal to Soviet war deaths. On account of this, why was Poland's sovereignty after World War II denied? The Soviet Union *initiated* Cold War tensions because of its policy to politically dominate Poland as World War II ended.

²²⁴ President Franklin D. Roosevelt to Marshal Joseph Stalin, 16 December 1944, in *Dear Mr. Stalin*, 275.

²²⁵ *Ibid.*

²²⁶ Department of State Press Release, 18 December 1944, in *Dear Mr. Stalin*, 276.

²²⁷ Stettinius Jr., *Roosevelt and the Russians*, 210-12.

²²⁸ President Franklin D. Roosevelt to Marshal Joseph Stalin, 31 March 1945, in *Dear Mr. Stalin*, 310-12.

²²⁹ *Ibid.*

²³⁰ *Ibid.*

²³¹ Department of State Press Release, 18 December 1944, in *Dear Mr. Stalin*, 276.

²³² Mikolajczyk, *Rape of Poland*, 122-23.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alperovitz, Gar. *Atomic Diplomacy: Hiroshima and Potsdam: The Use of the Atomic Bomb and the American Confrontation with Soviet Power*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1965.
- Berezhkov, M. Valentin. *At Stalin's Side: His Interpreter's Memoirs from the October Revolution to the Fall of the Dictator's Empire*. Translated by Sergei V. Mikheyev. New York: Carol Publishing Group, 1994.
- Butler, Susan, ed. *My Dear Mr. Stalin: The Complete Correspondence of Franklin D. Roosevelt and Joseph V. Stalin*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2006..
- Byrnes, James Francis. *Speaking Frankly*. New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1947.
- Campbell, Craig and Sergey Radchenko. *The Atomic Bomb and the Origins and of the Cold War*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2008..
- Crapol, Edward. "Some Reflections on the Historiography of the Cold War." *The History Teacher* 20, no. 2 (1987): 251-262. JSTOR.
- Cowell, Alan and Andrew Roth. "Ruling on Katyn Killings Highlights Russia-Poland Rift," *New York Times*. October 21, 2013.
- Deutscher, Isaac. *Stalin: A Political Biography*. 2nd ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 1967.
- Dimitrov, Georgi. *The Diary of Georgi Dimitrov, 1933-1949*. Edited by Ivo Banac. Translated by Jane T. Hedges, Timothy D. Sergay, and Irina Faion. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2003.
- Djilas, Milovan. *Conversations with Stalin*. Translated by Michael B. Petrovich. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1962.
- Fleming, Denna Frank. *The Cold War and its Origins: 1917-1960*. Volume One. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1961.
- Forrestal, James. *The Forrestal Diaries*. Edited by Walter Millis and E.S. Duffield. New York: Viking Press, 1951.
- Fromkin, David. *In the Time of the Americans: The Generation That Changed America's Role in the World*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1995.
- Gaddis, Lewis John. *The United States and the Origins of the Cold War, 1941-1947*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1972.
- Gardner, C. Lloyd. *Architects of Illusion: Men and Ideas in American Foreign Policy 1941-1949*. Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1970.
- Gromyko, Andrei. *Memoirs*. Translated by Harold Shukman. New York: Doubleday, 1990.
- Harriman, W. Averell, and Elie Abel, *Special Envoy to Churchill and Stalin: 1941-1946*. New York: Random House, 1975.
- Jeffery, Inez Cope. *Inside Russia: The Life and Times of Zoya Zarubina*. Austin, TX: Eakin Press, 1999.
- Kennan, F. George. *Memoirs: 1925-1950*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1967.
- Kochanski, Halik. *Eagle Unbowed: Poland and the Poles in the Second World War*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2012.

- Leahy, William. *I Was There: The Personal Story of the Chief of Staff to Presidents Roosevelt and Truman Based on his Notes and Diaries Made at the Time*. New York: Whittlesey House, 1950.
- Leonhard, Wolfgang. *Betrayal: The Hitler-Stalin Pact of 1939*. Translated by Richard D. Bosley. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1986.
- Mikolajczyk, Stanislaw. *The Rape of Poland: Pattern of Soviet Aggression*. New York: Whittlesey House, 1948.
- Molotov, V.M and Felix Chuev. *Molotov Remembers: Inside Kremlin Politics: Conversations with Felix Chuev*. Edited by Albert Resis. Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 1993.
- Paterson, G. Thomas. Introduction to *Problems in American Civilization: The Origins of the Cold War*. Lexington, MA: D.D. Heath and Company, 1970. vii-x.
- Radosh, Ronald, and Leonard P. Liggio. "Henry A. Wallace and the Open Door." In *Cold War Critics: Alternatives to American Foreign Policy in the Truman Years*, edited by Thomas G. Paterson, 76-113. Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1971.
- Rozek, Edward J. *Allied Wartime Diplomacy: A Pattern in Poland*. New York: John Wiley and Sons Inc., 1958.
- Schlesinger, Arthur, Jr. "Origins of the Cold War." In *The Origins of the Cold War*. Edited by Joseph J. Huthmacher and Susan I. Warren, 41-77. Waltham, MA: Ginn and Company, 1970.
- Stern, Peter. *The Struggle for Poland*. Washington D.C.: Public Affairs Press, 1953.
- Stettinius, Edward, Jr. *Roosevelt and the Russians: The Yalta Conference*. Edited by Walter Johnson. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1949.
- Stimson, Henry L. and McGeorge Bundy. *On Active Service in Peace and War*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1948.
- Stone, Oliver and Peter Kuznick. *The Untold History of the United States*. New York: Gallery Books, a division of Simon and Schuster, Inc., 2012.
- Trotsky, Leon. *Writings of Leon Trotsky: 1939-1940*. Edited by Naomi Allen and George Breitman. New York: Pathfinder Press, 1973.
- Truman, Harry S. *Memoirs: Year of Decisions*. Vol. One. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1955.
- Wallace, Henry A. *The Price of Vision: The Diary of Henry A. Wallace*. Edited by John Morton Blum. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1973.
- Zubok, M. Vladislav. *A Failed Empire: The Soviet Union in the Cold War from Stalin to Gorbachev*. Edited by John Lewis Gaddis. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 2007.

About the Author: Jacob Pauling is a senior with a History Major. He will be graduating in May 2015. He is considering pursuing graduate work at either SUNY Potsdam or SUNY Buffalo.