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The Impact and Effects of the Italian Campaign
That Led to the Fall of Nazi Germany
By Nicholas Tarricone

The fall of Nazi Germany is linked by most historians to the successes of the Soviet army fighting on the Eastern front of Europe and the invasion of the American and British armies on the Western front of France. What goes unnoticed, however, is the importance of the Allied invasion of Italy and how it played a major part in impacting the fall of Germany. The Italian campaign was important in forcing Nazi Germany to surrender because it removed Adolf Hitler’s ally, Benito Mussolini, from power, created diversions for other Allied military attacks and opened the Mediterranean Sea as an important control point for the Allies against the Axis. After the fall of Italy, Hitler had to spread his armies across Europe and also had to fight on three different fronts ultimately leading to his defeat. Without the success of the Italian invasion, the Allies would never have been able to cripple Germany economically, politically and strategically.

When the campaign in North Africa was over, the Allies were unsure of where to begin their next assault. In Western Europe, the Russian army was able to push the Nazis back towards Germany after the important victories in Stalingrad and Kursk. Despite the victories however, the Nazis were still strongly defending Russian attacks. Italy was another problem because of its threat towards the Mediterranean Sea and North Africa. Italy was still under control of Adolf Hitler’s ally, Benito Mussolini, and had a large number of Nazi and Italian troops ready to fight the Allies. In Casablanca, Winston Churchill and Franklin Roosevelt met with the Combined Chiefs of Staff to decide on where their next attack against the Axis powers should be. After careful planning, the Allies decided to invade Italy for a multitude of reasons. One of the main reasons was to create a diversionary battle in Italy to distract Hitler and his armies from a future attack in France. The Allies believed that a British invasion of Northern France would be a great way to gain a foothold in German occupied France, while also relieving the Russians from Nazi military aggression. In addition, an invasion of France would help divide Nazi forces, pressuring them to fight on two different fronts. They also felt that the cross channel invasion would be the quickest way to reach Germany.\(^1\) The invasion of Italy would also allow the Allies to gain better control of the Mediterranean Sea and “ease their shipping problems.”\(^2\) The final reason for invading Italy was to disband the support for the Axis power within Italy. According to James Stokesbury, author of *A Short History of World War II*, Italy was “ripe for invasion and for collapse, because the Italians and their Fascist regime were reeling on the ropes.”\(^3\) Italians were unhappy with Mussolini’s power and their alliance with Hitler. They were even treated as “second-class citizens of the Axis alliance” and were “performing badly” on the battlefield.\(^4\) Unknown to the Allies, their invasion of Italy would later convert many Italians to support the Allies instead of the Axis. The aftereffects of the Allied invasion of Italy

\(^3\) Ibid.
\(^4\) Ibid., 292.
ultimately led to military mistakes made by Hitler and the fall of Nazi Germany. The Mediterranean Sea was an important control point for the Allies to conquer in order to defeat Nazi Germany. After their victory in the North African campaign, the Allies had to ensure that the Axis would not attempt to retake any African territory. The Allies hoped to conquer the large Italian island of Sicily in order to access a way to invade the Italian mainland. Before the invasion of Sicily, the only defense for the Allied territory in North Africa was the small island of Malta. Malta’s position in the Mediterranean was strategic due to its location between Sicily and the African countries of Tunisia and Libya. Malta was constantly under attack by Axis air raids because it was an Allied base that had airfields and docks. Whoever owned Malta held the center of the Mediterranean Sea. If the Axis controlled Malta, the war would have been completely different because the Nazis and Italians would have had the ability to not only take back parts of North Africa, but to also cut the Allies off from the Middle East oil fields. Additionally, a strategic wall of military force between Sicily and Malta would have been under Axis control. This, however, never happened and the Allies used Malta as a way to invade Sicily.

The Mediterranean Sea had not only many strategic military uses for the Allies, but economic as well. One of the reasons why the Allies wanted to take Sicily was to open up trade routes in the Mediterranean. Sicily stood right in the middle of the Mediterranean Sea, which made it difficult for the Allies to move supplies and equipment without being attacked. With the capture of Sicily, the Allies could not only move their troops and supplies more easily, but also control many strategic ports within Sicily. These ports would allow the Allies to supply their forces without having to use the Italian beaches. In *The Battle for Italy*, there is a chart that depicts the number of port capacities that the Allies captured in Sicily; the capacity of a port is the area of space used to move supplies. The Allies controlled 7,900 capacities on the Eastern coast of Sicily, 4,700 capacities on the Western coast and 1,400 capacities on the Southern coast. Through their successful invasion, the Allies took these ports away from the Axis and limited the number of ways in which the Axis could move their troops and supplies in the Mediterranean Sea. With the capture of Sicily, the Allies could use the Mediterranean Sea as a direct water route and send 225 merchant ships to the Middle East, Iran and the Soviet Union. Another economical reason why the Mediterranean was important to bringing down Nazi Germany was the access to the Romanian and Middle Eastern oil fields. With the control of the Mediterranean, the Allies could use the “industrial resources of the United States, and the oil reserves of the Middle East to attack a critical Axis flank.” The Romanian oil fields were the site of such an attack against the Axis. The Allies bombed Ploiesti; a site of Nazi controlled oil reserves, and took out one third of the oil used by the entire Nazi army. Cutting out this much of an integral Nazi resource would limit the number of vehicles and tanks used by them in the war.

---

5 *Mediterranean Mosaic, Victory at Sea*, directed by M. Clay Adams (Original air date: November 30th 1952; National Broadcasting Company, 2003), DVD.

7 Jackson, *The Battle for Italy*, 33.
8 Ibid.
10 Ibid., 663.
It would also severely cripple the Nazis, forcing them to be more dependent on their other oil reserves.

The increased discontent with Mussolini’s power by the Italian people was another factor that contributed to Germany’s eventually downfall. When the Allies took the two important Italian cities of Sicily and Rome, the uprising against Mussolini began to intensify. The fall of Rome was significant for both the Allies and the Axis because it was the first Axis capital to fall during the war. With the Allied takeover of Rome, the Italian people and government became more upset with the control Mussolini had over Italy. According to Luigi Villari, author of *The Liberation of Italy*, despite the fall of Rome, Mussolini thought that victory was still possible. Villari writes, “Mussolini himself was heartbroken, although he still believed in the possibility of a final victory for the Axis powers.”

Many Italians who were fighting for the Axis didn’t want to fight for a war that Hitler started. Even the Italian citizens didn’t support Hitler or the war and celebrated the Allies who were invading Italy. This reaction to the Allies can be seen in General George Patton’s diary, which talks about the Italian people and their reaction to his troops. Patton states, “The streets were full of people shouting, ‘Down with Mussolini! And Long Live America!’ Those who arrived before dark had flowers thrown on the road in front of them.”

Clearly, many of the Italian people felt that they were being liberated from the Germans. The Italian people also supported the Allied forces because they were promised food, water and gasoline.

Mussolini lost the support of the Italian people and government because the Fascists, who supported the war instead of looking out for Italy’s best interests, influenced him. Discontent with the Axis regime in Italy was important to Germany’s fall because Hitler’s lost his only major ally in Europe. Many of the Italian leaders were content with removing Mussolini from power and even joining the Allies against Hitler. Victor Emmanuel III, the king of Italy, forced Mussolini to resign and replaced him with Marshall Pietro Badoglio. Another reason for removing Mussolini from power was the fact that the Allies would not allow any of the Axis nations to surrender unless they completely gave up their military power to the Allies in the form of unconditional surrender. Mussolini’s delusion that an Axis victory was still possible forced the Allies to continue military operations in Italy until the Italian government completely surrendered. Once Mussolini was removed from office, Badoglio negotiated with the Allies to end the fighting against the Italian troops. Many of these negotiations were made in secret because Badoglio wanted to make sure that Hitler would not retaliate in reaction to the new Italian government switching sides. With Italy’s change of allegiance, Hitler was left without an ally in Europe and created a third front for the Nazis to defend against.

Hitler’s persistence and dedication to put Mussolini back into power and to keep Italy on the Axis side was another reason why Nazi Germany’s fell. Even though Italy’s military force was not as powerful as Nazi Germany’s, the Nazis still needed Italy to help fight against the Soviet, American and the British forces. This approach of keeping Italy within the Axis

---

12 Stokesbury, *Short History of World War II*, 296.
14 Stokesbury, *Short History of World War II*, 292.
16 Villari, *The Liberation of Italy*, 127.
17 Ibid., 8.
19 Ibid., 185.
20 Ibid., 296.
can be seen in *The Battle for Italy* when W. G. F. Jackson writes “There was no point in antagonizing the Italians…they could be kept as useful partners in Germany’s herculean task of wearing out, if not defeating, the Russians and Anglo-Americans.”\(^{21}\) This shows how Germany needed Italy solely for the purpose of having more troops and supplies to fight against the Allies. Again Jackson states, “If Italy left the Axis, Germany would have to hold her southern approaches alone.”\(^{22}\) Without Italy, Germany would be forced to defend two different fronts against the Allies. The West would be one of the fronts against the Soviet Union and the South against the combined forces of the Americans and British. Hitler did not want to abandon territory within Italy because of the aforementioned reason and tried to put Mussolini back into power.\(^{23}\) In Germany, a meeting was held between Hitler and Mussolini where Hitler ordered Mussolini to return to Italy and start a new Fascist state. That state would occupy Northern Italy and would be under German control.\(^{24}\) This was another way Hitler could keep control of Italy despite Italian resentment toward the Nazis.

Hitler’s involvement with Italy and the Mediterranean, however, was a fatal error because his only interest was to keep Mussolini in power and Italy on his side. Douglas Porch agrees with this idea in his book *The Path to Victory* when he writes “The Axis decision to open a theater in the Mediterranean was a critical strategic error…it forced Hitler to support operations where he had no fundamental strategic interests except to salvage the mistakes of his incompetent ally. But in doing so, he simply threw good money after bad.”\(^{25}\) Hitler’s waste of resources and troops in Italy would limit the amount of power the Nazis had in defending against the Soviets and other fronts. Porch emphasizes this point in describing how the Axis troops were limited in their defense against the Soviet Union on the Eastern Front. Porch writes “An Italian collapse would leave the Axis fifty-four divisions and 2,200 aircraft short of the minimum required to hold the balance on the Eastern Front.”\(^{26}\) Clearly, Hitler could have sent his troops to the Eastern front if he had not used a majority of them in the Mediterranean. This could be seen in 1942 when Mussolini gave a speech praising the help that Germany provided for Italy and how it prevented allied bombing on Italian cities. Mussolini stated, “I am glad to be in a position to announce that Germany will contribute to our defense a large artillery force, so that ours, together with the German, will be able to give the enemy planes the reception they deserve.”\(^{27}\) This again shows the support in supplies and equipment that Hitler provided to Italy even though it was a mistake.

The reinforcements allowed for some strong German defenses in Italy and prevented the Allies from continuing northward. One of the most formidable German defenses was the Gustav line. The Gustav line was located near Sant’ Angelo and consisted of a group of retreating German soldiers concentrated on a single defensive position. The Gustav line fought against the Allies until 1944 and prevented them from moving further north.\(^{28}\)

---

\(^{21}\) Jackson, *The Battle for Italy*, 27.

\(^{22}\) Ibid.

\(^{23}\) Ibid., 26.


\(^{25}\) Porch, *The Path to Victory*, 665.

\(^{26}\) Ibid., 417.


line, however, was the only roadblock for the Allies in their invasion of Italy. The fact that the Gustav line was one of Italy’s strongest defenses shows just how poor the German and Italian defenses were. Thin defenses could not prevent the decimation of supplies and troops suffered by the Axis. As the war progressed, the strength in the number of troops concentrated in Italy and the number of vehicles lost in the Mediterranean can be seen. Despite the commitment of twenty percent of the Luftwaffe to battles within the Mediterranean, one-third of the entire German aircraft fleet was lost in this airspace.\textsuperscript{29} Much of the support Hitler gave to Italy was misdirected, and likely could have been better utilized in other battles.

Hitler’s involvement with Italy, and the Allies’ strategic victories in the Mediterranean, helped spark the success of the D-Day invasion. This invasion eventually forced Nazi Germany to fall, supplemented by Italy’s surrender. The Italian campaign was used as a diversion in the war to help supplement an invasion in France. The Allies were able to attack both the English Channel and the Mediterranean because of their greater number of resources.\textsuperscript{30} This allowed the Allies to attack the Axis armies on many different fronts. The Italian campaign was important for setting up the Allied invasion force, Operation Overlord, because many of Hitler’s armies in the Mediterranean could not be shipped over to Normandy to help out. This is exemplified with Douglas Porch’s comments on the divisions of Axis troops stuck in the Mediterranean. He writes, “The Allies encouraged the growth and military proficiency of resistance movements that… tied down approximately twenty Axis divisions in Greece and the Balkans. This prevented Hitler from amassing a strategic reserve that might have swung the balance in Normandy in 1944.”\textsuperscript{31} Hitler sent fifty divisions to defend the Eastern Mediterranean despite the fact that he was disregarding other Axis fronts.\textsuperscript{32}

The number of troops that Hitler sent to the Mediterranean grew over time and became a huge investment. Again, Porch reiterates this point by stating that “Hitler’s Mediterranean account, opened with a relatively minor investment of German divisions…soon escalated into a major commitment, as Operation Torch forced him to dispatch seven and one-half division to Tunisia, plus significant Luftwaffe assets.”\textsuperscript{33} Hitler “[p]layed into the Allied hands” when he sent much of the Axis strength to Italy.\textsuperscript{34} When the Allies eventually launched Operation Overlord in France, Nazi Germany had lost significant territory in France due to the success of the Allied invasion. In 1944, Nazi Germany was surrounded by the Allies in the west, east and south and thus had three major fronts to defend against.\textsuperscript{35} The invasion in France would not have been successful, however, if the diversion in Italy never took place. It distracted Hitler long enough for the Allies to plan out a strategic attack that would cripple the Nazi army and ultimately lead to the Allied victory of the war. The Italian campaign also forced Hitler to focus a majority of his armies in the Mediterranean, which allowed for the Allies to have great success in other military operations such as Operation Overlord. The remaining Nazi resistance against the Allies after the invasion of France only delayed the inevitable fall of Germany.

\textsuperscript{29} Porch, The Path to Victory, 668.
\textsuperscript{30} Ibid., 461.
\textsuperscript{31} Ibid., 667.
\textsuperscript{32} Ibid., 461.
\textsuperscript{33} Ibid., 666.
\textsuperscript{34} Ibid., 461.
Ultimately, the fall of Nazi Germany during World War II can largely be attributed to the successes of the Allies in the Italian campaign. Some historians, though, argue that the Italian invasion was completely irrelevant to the war effort to bring down Germany. Historian George Marshall writes that the Italian campaign was “fundamentally unsound…that attacked no German center of gravity.” Another historian, John Keegan, states how the battle of Italy was “Marginal…where no decisive victories were to be won.” On the contrary, research has shown that the Italian campaign was important to the fall of Nazi Germany for many reasons. The control of the Mediterranean by the Allies allowed for shipping of supplies to the beaches of Sicily without being attacked by the Axis. The Italian campaign was also significant to the fall of Nazi Germany because it took Hitler’s only major European ally, Mussolini, out of power. This was important for two reasons: the Italian government, without Mussolini in power, eventually switched sides during the war and joined the Allies, and with Italy out of the Axis powers, Germany was left alone in Europe to defend against the Soviet Union, United States and Britain. The Allied invasion of Italy was a diversionary tactic to make Hitler focus on battles within the Mediterranean. Since Hitler concentrated too much of his troops in the Mediterranean, it allowed for the Allies to launch an attack in France catching Hitler off guard. Operation Overlord and its success in France would not have worked if the invasion of Italy never occurred. Despite being seen as a lesser front during World War II, the success of the Allied campaign in Italy was critical to the eventual fall of Nazi Germany.

---
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Leonardo da Vinci and Ambrogio de Predis’ Role in the Creation of Both Versions of Virgin of the Rocks
By Jeanne Einhorn

Leonardo da Vinci is considered to be one of the great art masters to have lived during the Italian Renaissance. His paintings have lasted and survived for hundreds of years, and his name has become a household one due to the success of his career. He was an apprentice and colleague to many other great artists of the time, and then continued on to teach many other painters who owe their success to his guidance. One of these painters is Ambrogio de Predis, and the two worked together and collaborated closely during the end of the fifteenth century, into the early years of the sixteenth. Two of these paintings were of the same title, Virgin of the Rocks, executed in circa 1483 and 1506. Throughout history, art historians have credited Leonardo as being the artist for both of these versions, and Ambrogio as being merely his assistant on the pieces. Under a more thorough examination of the latter version though over the years, some historians believe that Ambrogio played a bigger part in finishing the piece than he was ever credited for. While art historians may dispute over this for years to come, I believe that Ambrogio de Predis completed a majority of the second Virgin of the Rocks, while Leonardo da Vinci helped mainly with corrections and minor details.

Leonardo spent much of his time as a painter in various Italian cities, often traveling between Florence and Milan. While he was surrounded by other great masters of his time in Florence, for it is considered to be one of the art capitals of the world, he always felt a more welcoming and comforting feeling when he was living in Milan; it gave a greater meaning to the word home for him.

Leonardo grew up in the Italian village of Vinci, just under an hour outside of the inner city of Florence. He spent the first part of his career as an apprentice to another Italian Renaissance artist, Verrocchio, beginning when he was only fourteen years old. Here he learned all of the foundations and techniques that would help and lead him to become one of the great masters of his time. It was under Verrocchio’s teachings; too, that Leonardo was able to create what is considered to be his first attributed painting, The Baptism of Christ, c. 1472-1475. It was supposed to be collaboration between the master Verrocchio, and his apprentice Leonardo, but it is said that even on this early piece, Leonardo’s talent and handling was much more advanced and superior to his teacher’s. The future for young Leonardo was bright.

In approximately 1482, not long after he painted The Baptism of Christ, Leonardo felt he could no longer learn much more from Verrocchio that he couldn’t learn from his own experiences as a recognized artist, and he traveled to Milan. There he began seriously working on his career as an artist and master himself, and continued to successfully make a name for himself. He remained in Milan for about twenty years, and it was there where he was commissioned to paint the c. 1483 version of Virgin of the Rocks with Ambrogio and Evangelista de Predis.

The Chapel of the Immaculate Conception, as part of the church of San Francesco Grande of Milan, sought out

---

Leonardo and his peers to paint an altarpiece for their chapel. They wanted a triptych that they would be able to put in the apse, and specifically wanted Leonardo for his Verrocchian-esque, Florentine, and simply beautifully mysterious style that he was actively becoming famous for. He was to complete this painting with the help of the de Predis brothers, Ambrogio and Evangelista. Each of the three men had a different purpose in the execution; Leonardo was the master painter in charge, Ambrogio was to help him with whatever needed attention at the time and Evangelista was to ornately decorate the wooden frame that would be provided for the altarpiece, and make sure it incorporated with the paintings done by his brother and the master. “It is a mutually useful partnership,” Nicholl says of the three men commissioned for this painting. “Leonardo is the older and artistically senior, but the de Predis have the contacts and the clientele. In the contrast, Leonardo is styled ‘master’, while Evangelista and Ambrogio appear without title.”

The discussions and meetings were set up regarding this commission, and a contract was finally signed and dated April twenty-fifth, 1483. It stated all of the necessary requirements and specifications that Leonardo and the de Predis brothers were to follow in their execution of the altarpiece.

In all the other compartments…shall be decorated like the one in the middle and the other figures are to be in the Greek style, decorated with various colours, in the Greek or modern style, all of which shall be done to perfection; similarly the buildings, mountains, soffits, flat surfaces of the said compartments – and everything done in oil. And any defective carving to be rectified.3

The above segment from the contract is surprisingly one of the most generic and less detailed sections of it. The Confraternity knew exactly the image and idea that they wanted to convey to their congregation through this altarpiece, that the details of the painting became as specific as how the placement of figures would be arranged, where gold leaf would and would not be used, and what colors were to be used for the Virgin Mary’s cloak. Overall though, the image that they had in mind was fairly simple and straightforward. The Confraternity wanted the Virgin Mary with the Christ Child surrounded by angels with two prophets accompanying them. God was to be depicted in a lunette above the majority of the painting, and there was to be a crib for the Christ Child in the bottom portion of the central panel.

Everyone had signed and was in agreement on the terms and conditions of the contract, and that it was to be completed by December eighth, 1483. This left Leonardo and his team a little less than eight months to complete the piece in full, so that it would be ready for installation in San Francesco Grande.

The contract also outlined a very detailed payment method. The artists were to be paid fully in eight hundred lire, the Old Italian currency. They were to be given one hundred lire initially to gain all of the necessary materials to complete the work, and from there forty lire a month to be able to complete the painting. To be paid the full amount would take longer than the time the artists had to finish the painting’s execution, and any bonuses would be decided upon evaluation of the finished product, and

---


whether it stood up to the church’s expectations and their happiness and satisfaction with the final creation.  

Leonardo was extremely patient with his art, and always made sure to take his time accurately depicting every aspect of his scenes to perfection. We know this because of his in-depth plant studies and analyses.

Leonardo’s well-known slowness and the small number of his works were the result not so much of a technique that required lengthy waits between applying many coats, or – at this period at least – of any unwillingness to paint, so much as of the trouble he took over the conception of each work. He never began a painting until he had thoroughly mastered the subject. He was incapable of repeating what had already been done by someone else, and only took up his brushes once a revolution in the mind had been accomplished.

There was no exception to these practices while he was working on Virgin of the Rocks. Due to his slow work and incredible attention to detail, he was unable to complete the painting by the contract’s deadline. In fact, this painting was not completed until approximately 1486, three years after it was supposed to be completed and installed in the chapel.

When the men finally did finish his piece though, to most it would seem that it was well worth the wait. Leonardo painted a mysteriously dark yet beautiful depiction of Mary and the Christ Child’s trip to Egypt accompanied by an angel, and an infant John the Baptist adoring the infant Jesus. His composition held true to the High Italian Renaissance with it’s triangular pyramidal structure, and Leonardo was able to bring the viewer into the painting more by painting Mary’s hand outstretched toward the Christ Child, instilling the illusion that it is reaching toward the viewer and extending off the canvas. He used warm, glowing colors throughout the piece, only really adding a cool shade of blue to the Virgin’s cloak and the part of the sky that we can see above the caves. The painting is also unified through the various directions of the figures’ gazes. Each figures attention is focused on another different figure in the piece, which keeps our eye moving around all areas of the figural composition, which therefore keeps us interested in the content of the painting.

Aside from the fact that we have a historical document commissioning Leonardo to paint this piece, we can also attribute it to him for the strong and extremely effective use of sfumato. This is an Italian word, primarily used in discussions about the works of Leonardo, to describe smokiness in the atmosphere of an image. It is also used to describe his soft, gentle transition from light to dark in shadows, especially around facial features such as the mouth. We can see this example most apparently in the mouth of the Virgin Mary. This painting is considered to be his introduction of sfumato to the art world, and he would only work to further develop this skill throughout his career all over Italy.

“Whatever the meaning of the painting, and whenever or wherever it was done, there is one certainty about it,” says Wallace. “It was Leonardo’s farewell to the Quattrocento; he had mastered and gone far beyond the art of the Early Renaissance.”

---


6 Theresa Watts, class discussion, August 28, 2013.
From this brief description, we already know that the men did not completely fulfill the wishes and requests of the Confraternity, for what they wanted this piece to look like. The Confraternity was so particular because it was defending a new dogma – the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary – which was at the time a matter of passionate debate. We should also try to understand Leonardo’s point of view. He respected the doctrine but wanted to translate it his own way. He had his personal contribution to make, the product of reflection, and he could think of more effective forms and symbols than those his patrons sought to impose on him.  

Inadvertently, this outlook would later cause problems for Leonardo and Ambrogio, but not for approximately another twenty years.

The central part of the altar, (the image we know today as Virgin of the Rocks), was not the only piece Leonardo and the de Predis brothers were commissioned for. The altarpiece as a whole was meant to be a triptych, with the Immaculate Conception scene to be the center part of it, with two longer and narrower side panels to go on both sides of it. These side panels “were to feature four angels each, singing or playing musical instruments.” Before the team could begin this part of their commission though, they had run out of money. The full eight hundred lire that they had been given to spend on the whole triptych had gone solely to the center Madonna and Child image. So in c. 1490, Ambrogio de Predis wrote a letter to the Confraternity on behalf of all the artists working on the piece asking for an additional 1,200 lire to complete the work.

They needed the money for materials, as well as their payment. The Confraternity responded with a negotiation of only 100 lire, because not only was the commission late, but also in their eyes 1,200 lire was an absurd amount of money. The artists told the Confraternity that if their payment needs were not met with this painting, then they had private parties interested in purchasing it, and from there the matter went to the Milan courts.  

The subject stayed in the courts for almost twenty years. Leonardo had stayed in Milan working on other commissions while the matter was being attended to, such as one of his most famous pieces, The Last Supper, and Lady with an Ermine. He also served as sort of a mentor and teacher for Ambrogio de Predis during this time, helping him to hone his on painting skills so that he could improve on his talent as well. The two became close during this time period, and Ambrogio served as the liaison between the courts and the commissioned artists.

In this time too, Ambrogio completed what would be the two side panels for Virgin of the Rocks. Instead of making them full of angels serenading other angels and people through song and various musical instruments like the church had asked for, he simplified it greatly. On the right side he painted an angel adorning a green cloak and playing the violin, and on the left side there was an angel wearing red robes, and playing what appears to be a lute.

Finally, in April 1506, the courts had reached a decision. Leonardo and the de Predis brothers would not be paid the remaining amount of lire that they had requested. The court had ruled that since the altarpiece was not only late, but did not meet all of the necessary specifications that the Confraternity had asked for, that they would
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not be appointed the money they felt they had earned.

Whereas the said altarpiece has not been finished at the said time, and is even now unfinished…the Master Leonardo and Ambrogio Preda…are bound and shall be obliged to finish…the said altarpiece on which is painted the figure of the most glorious Virgin Mary. And this shall be done within the limit of two years from now, by the hand of the said Master Leonardo.

The courts did however come to the decision that the artists could deal with and sell the first Virgin of the Rocks privately, and use those funds to recreate the altarpiece, more according to what the church had asked and paid the men for. Leonardo was to remain in Milan during this time to finish his second try at the altarpiece.

Leonardo and Ambrogio surprisingly were able to complete a majority of the painting in the given timeframe. Parts of it still only show the first layer of paint, or under-drawings of the painting, and never received the final varnishing, but it did not stop them from completing the rest of it and sending it to the Chapel as the final product. Even though the Church also saw this as incomplete and unfinished, they accepted it as the final edition and it hung in the apse of San Francesco Grande until its destruction later on in the period.

The second version of Virgin of the Rocks is nearly identical to the earlier one, yet the subtle differences make it an extremely different painting. Perhaps one of the most noticeable differences upon first glance is the color palette used in what would be known as the London version.

Unlike the first edition, the cool colors dominate this version. The blues are not only apparent on the Virgin’s cloak, but they also reflect off of the landscape cloak, and onto the hues of the flesh of the other figures. The golden-brown color on the inside of her robes too is reflected and mirrored in all of the caves and rock formations forming the background of the scene.

One thing that the artists made sure to add to please the church with this piece was the haloes on three of the four present figures. This ensures that the painting is meant to be of a religious nature, and it comes across as more appropriate for a church setting. They also added the traditional wooden cross so that St. John the Baptist would be more easily identified and distinguishable from the Christ Child.

A subtle difference in the second-go at this painting is the definition of the forms. The edges of the figures are sharper and more clearly definitive from the background of the image, and even the lines from the facial shadows are harsher than those of the earlier painting. While this can be seen as a flaw in the painting, it does help to reinforce the contrast that the artists incorporated into the piece. “The light in the painting, too, provides a contrast to reinforce the logic,” says Bramly. “Warm sunshine bathes the mouths of the cave in the golden light, while all around, the darkness deepens, the shadows become black and threatening. Here chiaroscuro finds a meaningful function.”

A major feature that was kept the same though is the outstretched hand of the Madonna over the Christ Child’s head, and in the direction of the viewers, as if she is physically trying to draw them into the artwork. This painting is a bit brighter than the original Virgin of the Rocks, so the foreshortening of her arm comes across as
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more apparent and therefore the painting as a whole, and especially the composition of it, becomes more successful than their previous attempt.

One important improvement from the Louvre to the London version of this painting is the increased strength in composition. While the size of the London version is overall a bit smaller than the first *Virgin of the Rocks*, the figures in it are larger, which makes the piece as a whole appear to be larger than Leonardo’s original painting. Not only does this help to strengthen the composition, but also the subtle changes in the figure’s gestures and postures help to unify the composition as a whole, as well. The slight change in angle that the angel and John the Baptist are at help to open up the center of the composition where the figures are. This new angle also helps us to better see their faces and the directions of their eyes; we can see more clearly where they seem to look, which helps our eye move better throughout the piece, even furthermore unifying it.

This is one of many reasons as to why art historians have, in the past, attributed this second *Virgin of the Rocks*, to Leonardo – it would successfully show his growth as an artist and his transition from his Early Renaissance peak to his High Renaissance one. “Leonardo did not teach his own students the inventive process of compositional sketching for which he is most highly revered as revolutionizing Renaissance art.” This helps to further attribute the second version to Leonardo, once more.

With all of these similarities and differences, one cannot help but notice that stylistically, the two paintings are very different. From the brushstrokes, to the portrayal of botanical features in nature, there have been a constant and indefinite debate among art historians over who actually painted a majority of the second version of *Virgin of the Rocks*, and essentially who did most of the legwork on it. Leonardo da Vinci has always been credited with this masterpiece, but upon a closer and more thorough examination, I believe that it is not he who should be attributed to this piece, but rather his apprentice throughout this whole process, Ambrogio de Predis.

In his textbook, Kenneth Clark does his own comparison of the two *Virgin of the Rocks* and is able to conclude the following:

> The types [of the National Gallery painting] have lost their gothic freshness and naturalism, but approximate more closely to an ideal. Contrary to the best critical opinion of the last fifty years I believe that Leonardo took a considerable share in the execution. Many of the details are drawn with a delicacy quite beyond a pupil, and with Leonardo’s own feeling for living tissue. Although, [while] much can be said in praise of the National Gallery *Virgin of the Rocks*, it falls far short of the Louvre picture in every kind of beauty and must be partly pupil’s work, which pupil we do not know. He is generally supposed to be Predis owing to the references to his name in the settlement.

As stated in the contracts, and from what historians can derive from letters and journals of Leonardo’s, Ambrogio was always seen as an assistant and mentee to the Italian Renaissance master, and many consider his involvement in both of the
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Virgin of the Rocks paintings as his ‘biggest claim to fame.’

It is believed, and happens to be the center of an enormous controversy in the Leonardo aspect of art history, that Ambrogio painted a far greater deal of the second London version of Virgin of the Rocks than Leonardo actually did. Ambrogio was the one to deal with all of the courts while the artists were fighting for more payment from the Confraternity to complete the first central panel, which gave Leonardo more time to focus on other paintings and commissions that he was receiving in Milan. One of these commissions was actually Lady with an Ermine, which was commissioned for Ludovico Sforza, the same man Ambrogio went to as the liaison between the artists and the Confraternity. With Leonardo experiencing other work-related distractions, both during the court dealings and even during the time that he was to be working on the re-painting of the Confraternity commission, it gave Ambrogio a chance to independently work on the revised painting, and include his own personal touch to it.

I believe one of the strongest areas where we can see Ambrogio’s influence, and Leonardo’s lack of, is in the facial features. According to Nicholl, “the faces [of the London version] have a pale, waxy sheen; it has a flatter, sadder, more reclusive beauty.” I agree with his observation. The shadows of the faces in the London version of the painting are more geometric, which takes away from the depth realism and possibilities. This also makes the faces seem more angular and based on bone structure rather than the flesh, which does not follow the past figure paintings that Leonardo has worked on. As we discussed earlier, the master painter did not attempt to convey an image in his work if he did not know the perfectly correct way to do so, and the representation of the human figure in the facial features in the second version seems to be a regression in talent from the first one. If anything, we can conclude by looking at a timeline of Leonardo’s commissioned work that he adored a soft rounded face. The way these faces are painted contradicts most of his other pieces that he has painted or been attributed with. While he did do extensive studies on the different ways he could portray a human face and head, that was to ensure that his features could look differently if he wanted them to, and they were all realistic, a bit unlike the figures in the London Virgin of the Rocks.

While it contradicts Leonardo’s style, I believe it goes along very well with how Ambrogio was known for painting, his style and use of the brush. As Ambrogio spent most of his career as an apprentice to the master, it also meant that he spent most of this time working on perfecting and continuously developing his artistic talent. In c. 1491-1495 while he was trying to sort out the legal issues of Virgin of the Rocks, he had time to himself to work on his own paintings such as Girl with the Cherries. By looking closely at her face and the face of the Madonna in the second Virgin of the Rocks painting, I believe we can find extraordinary similarities.

I find one of these particular similarities in the structure of the noses. Both female figures are depicted with long, straight, slender noses symmetrically in the middle of the face, that seem to end with the nostrils flaring out just a bit beyond the width of the bridge of the nose. The contours of this feature, as well as the shadows falling on the face from it, are also angular just as in the Virgin Mary of the London Virgin of the Rocks painting. We also see these similar structure and shadow patterns on one of the side panels for the
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original altarpiece, the angel with the green robes playing the lute.

We can take the similar facial features a step further by looking at the features both above and below the nose. In all three of these figures, the eyebrows appear to be very shaped and fairly arched and thick, and they lead directly into the shadows on either side of the bridge of the nose with barely any break in form. We do not see this in Leonardo’s paintings as much, for his eyebrows are not as apparent on his figures’ faces, if they appear on them at all. If he does make the decision to include eyebrows on his figures also, there is a clear distinction between eyebrow and shadow, something that is not so apparent in the three above mentioned Ambrogio portrait paintings.

These facial similarities are also seen below the nose in the angular, extremely shaped lips, and the shape of the chin. In all three of these female figures, the chin seems to become a little more narrow and square-shaped from the rest of the face, and through a shadow between the chin and bottom lip gives us the illusion that it is protruding a bit from the rest of the face. Leonardo’s portraits do not seem to repeat the extension of the chin, nor dominantly any of the other above mentioned traits that the Ambrogio paintings possess. We can look at the Mona Lisa and Ginevra de Benci for comparison between Leonardo’s faces and Ambrogio’s to verify these findings.

Another major difference between the two Virgin of the Rocks paintings is the natural landscape, and it’s accuracy and realism. As previously discussed, Leonardo was a perfectionist. He would not begin creating pieces if his idea was not clear, and would only start his artistic process after he would create dozens of sketches ensuring that he knew how to properly illustrate an image on his canvas. Since he was also considered to be a Renaissance scientist of the time, he devoted much of his time to researching the natural features of the world so he would be able to truthfully depict them in his paintings. A perfect example of this is the natural background of the first version, the Louvre version of Virgin of the Rocks.

Expert examiners have been able to look at this painting, and identify where in nature you would be able to find rock formations like the ones set in the background, and where the flowers in the bottom of the foreground would grow in real life.17 This is as real and as accurate a depiction as one will find in a piece from the High Renaissance. His perfection has reached an all-time high at this point thus far into his career, and would only continue to increase. So it does not make sense that his representational skill and talent would decline in a later painting, during the time where he is considered to have officially become one of the great masters. “It seems unlikely that Leonardo would have violated his knowledge of geology in favor of abstract representation, considering that he executed an even more geologically complex picture – the Virgin and St. Anne (c. 1510) – after he had completed the National Gallery painting.”18 The landscape and rock formations in the London version of Virgin of the Rocks seems to be briefly, almost carelessly painted on, similar to nature but not with entirely accurate precision that was so traditional of Leonardo.

Unlike the Louvre version, the flowers in the bottom-left foreground are generalized depictions of generic flowers that could be found anywhere in nature. While the placement is still naturally correct, the execution of their imaging is most certainly not. Leonardo would not

17 Watts, class discussion, August 28, 2013.
have accepted this as sufficient for his own final painting due to the extensive research he carried out in the subject, but I believe that a pupil of his, such as Ambrogio de Predis, would have found it acceptable. Since he did not put in the time or energy that Leonardo did in order to depict nature correctly, he would have used a generic landscape and simply copied from the cave formation that Leonardo used in the original *Virgin of the Rocks* and found that adequate. “The difference between the rock formations in the two paintings may not be immediately obvious,” says Pizzorusso. “Yet, given Leonardo’s passion for geology and his genius for painting, closer evaluation suggests that the Louvre rocks are Leonardo’s and the National Gallery’s are not.”

In relatively recent years, the National Gallery has been able to perform extensive research and restorations on their *Virgin of the Rocks* to hopefully find more answers to what seem to be the impossible questions. Recently they have had the opportunity to work with non-invasive imaging technology that allows an expert to look at other layers of a painting, under the top one that the naked human eye can see. This helped art historians and experts take a closer look at individual aspects of the painting, and let them further deduce that Leonardo’s studio assistants, like Ambrogio de Predis, had a great hand in the execution of this piece. “Until now, it was believed that the figures were by Leonardo and the landscape by his studio, but it is now clear that this represents an oversimplification; the sharp distinction between figures and landscape does not hold. For instance, the hair of the Virgin is only partly by the master…”

What they found past the figural differences though in one of the bottom-most layers was a much different composition sketched out, that is more repetitive of Leonardo’s other surviving art compositions. “Among the most exciting discoveries to emerge from the scientific analysis of the London painting is the existence of an entirely different composition, closely related to Leonardo’s Florentine sketches of a kneeling Virgin adoring a supine Christ Child with circling angels above, two layers beneath the executed composition.”

What does this mean though? It means that we know Leonardo had a plan for what the second try at the Immaculate Conception commission was to look like, but someone did not feel it was necessary to execute. In the analysis portion of this paper we have concluded up to this point that Ambrogio de Predis had much more to do with the completion and execution than he has ever been given credit for. So what we can hypothesize is that since Leonardo was absent for much of this execution, Ambrogio took the painting into his own hands and took the composition in a different direction. While Leonardo may have returned to the chapel where the painting was being done to help Ambrogio fix minor problems and adjustments, he was not there enough to have much control over the direction in which his apprentice was leading this piece.

Why would Ambrogio do something like this though, knowing that Leonardo’s name was to be the major one on this commission? We have information from Leonardo’s letters and journals that for a period of time he and Ambrogio were disputing and experienced conflicting opinions over the division of payment for these commissions. Ambrogio was not entirely pleased that even though he was doing a majority of the work on the pieces,
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Leonardo was receiving more of the money. The reasoning behind this is simple: Leonardo was designated master painter in the initial contract with the Confraternity, and therefore would receive more of the benefits of its outcome. “By the summer of 1507 there appears to be some tension between Leonardo and Ambrogio; the quarrel was about the apportioning of the payments. He ‘instructs’, Ambrogio ‘executes’…the inequality of their labor [and pay] precisely reflecting the inequality of their status as master and assistant.”

Despite these differences and conflicts though, both artists were paid equally 100 lire by the time they had completed the second Virgin of the Rocks in c. 1508. The Confraternity had paid them collectively the 200 lire that they were owed for the second commissioning, and from there both artists, as well as the Confraternity of the San Francesco Grande Church of Milan went their separate ways.

There are rumors that the chapel was again not happy with the second result of the commissioning, and that instead of a full payment they had the painters create a third version of this scene, but there are no records to definitively confirm nor deny this theory.

Many art historians and museum studies professionals have said that due to the age and condition of both of these paintings, it would never be possible for them to be displayed side by side, in order for one to make the most accurate analysis and form an opinion on the execution and style of the piece. From November 2011 to February 2012, the National Gallery in London held a Leonardo da Vinci exhibit that displayed a majority of his completed paintings, and hundreds of his sketches. They were able to loan the Louvre’s version of Virgin of the Rocks and hang it beside their own later version, and accomplish what many people said would never happen.

Despite the well ordered crowds, viewers have to work hard to compare the two Virgin of the Rocks (they hang opposite each other), comparisons made harder by the fact that the Louvre version groans under the burden of its heavy varnish and looks its greater age, whereas the recently restored National Gallery version positively twinkles with life and light.

While the paintings were only kept side by side for a short period of about five-and-a-half months, I have to assume that the debates revolving around the history of these pieces were at an all time high now that art historians were able to see them both at the same time, and compare them together in person, rather than one in person and one as a reproduction image.

When it comes to paintings that have more than one version created of it, Leonardo and Ambrogio’s Virgin of the Rocks must be considered to be one of the most highly debatable in terms of correct attribution. Having seen both of these works of art in person, and after conducting plenty of research and a thorough analysis for this paper, I still believe that Ambrogio de Predis has not received the credit that he deserves for his massive role in the painting of the London version of Virgin of the Rocks. Furthermore, I believe that Leonardo da Vinci was not as active in this implementation as many people believe him to be. Unfortunately, we may never know the true story of the creation of these six hundred-year-old masterpieces, but that does


not mean that we should stop researching and analyzing, or coming up with our own conclusions and hypotheses about the true artist of this work, or the real history behind it. The High Italian Renaissance was an era of profound improvements and learning in many fields of our world, and both of these artists helped to advance the art field through their works. “Curiously enough, in an age when theological questions are losing importance and when a painter is no longer expected to deliver a message, Leonardo seduces us by his hermeticism, his strangeness.” While Bramly wrote this specifically of Leonardo da Vinci, arguably it can be applied to Ambrogio de Predis as well, for the impact that they have both left on the art world, especially in reference to the High Italian Renaissance, is a great one.
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Carl Graham Fisher Through the Between-War Years
By William Murphy

If the 1920s and 1930s were a tuning fork then Carl Graham Fisher would be the vibration that ran through it. Mark S. Foster’s *Castles in the Sand: The Life and Times of Carl Graham Fisher* is the biography of a man whose life touched on the quintessential topics of the 1920’s and 1930’s. Through Foster’s biography, Carl Fisher’s life resonated the key issues of the “Red Scare”, race, labor, business, gender, shifting political party power, and the sense of community that grew nationally during the years of depression. Carl Graham Fisher was a wealthy and successful businessman for most of his adult life, but he did not always conform to the actions or practices of a typical businessman from the between-war era.

Carl Fisher’s life did not start as the heir to a great fortune. He was born in rural Indiana and his parents moved the family to Indianapolis when Carl was young. Shortly after the move, his father left his mother with three boys of which Carl was the middle child. Carl dropped out of school in the sixth grade and began working to help support his family. He went from his work in a grocery store in Indianapolis he started a bicycle shop with one of his brothers. Though the shop grew to be lucrative, he made his first large fortune in the Prest-o-lite compressed gas headlight company he co-founded. Among many other business ventures, Fisher also built Miami Beach from the ground up. On this leveled ground he developed the Miami Beach known for the Florida land boom. He amassed a fortune worth an estimated $100 million around the mid-1920s and lost it all by the end of the decade.¹ To be a successful businessman to

the tune of $100 million in the 1920s required an awareness of and interactions with marquee issues.

This awareness was never more important than during the tumultuous times immediately after World War I. Frederick Lewis Allen’s *Only Yesterday: An Informal History of the 1920s* described the temperament of postwar Americans. This postwar mood was something to be heeded and Allen presented it as full of left over aggression from the war years. Allen suggested that the nation was aggressive in the wake of all the fighting and propaganda. Similarly, Americans were inundated with during the war effort against the Axis powers. With the events of the successful Bolshevist Revolution in Russia, the Communist Red Scare loomed large. The high water mark of the Red Scare was the twelve months following the May Day attempted bombings of prominent businessmen and government officials.² In the weeks immediately following May Day it was very important to be as patriotic as possible. It took barely over a month after May Day bombings for Fisher to display his patriotic sentiment. Among many of Carl Fisher’s successes was the Indianapolis 500.

The Indianapolis 500 attracted many of the best European racers in the world. This may have looked slightly unpatriotic as Europeans tended to win. In order to remain patriotic Fisher made a critical public relations maneuver. For instance, the race had been held on Memorial Day every year since its inception. In 1919 the race ran the day after the hallowed first Memorial Day celebrations following the Armistice and May Day. This allowed Americans to pay


their respects to both those who fell in the line of duty and the surviving veterans of The Great War. Fisher’s consideration for the state of the country and the public at large paid dividends for him. In order to be a successful entrepreneur it takes many well-informed decisions. Carl Fisher had his finger on the country’s nationalistic sentiment when it mattered most. That the Indianapolis 500 is still one of the most popular American sporting events today is a case in point. Though he was skilled at appealing to the masses Fisher did not always go along with popular sentiment.

Though he was successful at playing into public sentiment with the Indianapolis 500, Fisher did not always go along with the popular consensus. Indiana in the 1920s had a very homogenous ethnic and religious make up. Kathleen Blee, in Women of the Klan: Racism and Gender in the 1920s, looked closely at the resurgence of the Ku Klux Klan in the United States and specifically in 1920s Indiana. Blee found, in Indiana, a predominantly white, racist, Protestant and anti-Catholic population. The state even had racist legislation on the books in the 1920s. Foster offers no inkling of where it came from, but Fisher stood firmly on the issue of race and racism in America. Castles in the Sand told of an African American track worker who was injured at the Indianapolis Speedway while Fisher was there one day. He personally took the worker to the hospital, but when he arrived at the hospital he was told they didn’t “treat niggers” at that hospital. Fisher left for another hospital in a tirade, but the worker succumbed to his wounds en route and died in his car. Fisher’s wife claimed he vowed to get the hospital shut down which he did. Fisher was not afraid to stand alone in his morals on hot button issues like race, which was particularly heated in Indianapolis due to the uniform make up of its population. In a homogenous population like that there was little exposure to blacks and remaining unfamiliar with blacks made racist sentiment stronger. The strength of racism came from the fear of an unknown and different race, yet Fisher was not at all concerned with the unknown or popular sentiment. Instead he was steadfast on the side of racial equality. On the other hand, Fisher was much less firm on his stance with the issues between labor and business.

As a businessman, Carl Fisher stood on the side opposed to labor on this issue. David E. Kyvig’s Daily Life in the United States, 1920-1940 looks at several major social and economic issues on the ground in the between-war years. One of the many issues Kyvig addressed was the dispute between labor and business in the postwar years. Kyvig cited the unsuccessful steelworkers strike in 1919 as detrimental for labor, especially unskilled labor. The failed strike set a precedent that would favor business until the 1930s. This trend persisted in the United States through the 1920s until the National Labor Relations Act. The National Labor Relations Act, or Wagner Act, was essential for unions and labor in America. This ended business domination of labor that had persisted from the advent of unskilled labor and the industrial revolution. The Wagner Act was the first national legislation to allow unions the freedom to organize and operate. Workers in 1920 did not have the support and benefits of legislation. In the 1920s labor had to organize the best they could without being harassed by business
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management. Then with a scared and intimidated force, organized workers had to go up against a grumbling businessman to negotiate their contracts.

Carl Fisher was one of these grumbling businessmen of 1920. Foster used Carl Fisher’s correspondence regarding his projects in Miami Beach to show his take on labor relations. An associate of Fisher’s informed him that craftsmen, particularly plumbers, were charging fifty cents more per day in Miami Beach than in Miami. This showed the difference between skilled and unskilled labor that Kyvig alluded to. While the conditions in negotiations were not much better, at least skilled workers like plumbers had a foot to stand on in negotiations. Unskilled factory workers had a much harder time in negotiations because they were easily replaced whereas skilled workers had their learned trade as a bargaining chip in negotiations. Foster continued through some of Carl Fisher’s correspondence with the governor of Louisiana to convey Fisher’s losing battle with skilled workers and his lamentations in the 1920s. In this correspondence, Fisher complained that unions in Miami held him up in court for seven months. He went further to complain that in addition to the seven months of negotiation, Fisher lost hundreds of thousands of dollars at the end of the negotiation.

Skilled labor had some power in labor negotiations and unionizing. The power of skilled labor is exactly what kept the AFL and CIO separate for many years before they combined. Successful negotiations for skilled labor kept them from seeking or accepting joint membership with industrial workers. This allowed for business to benefit in industrial endeavors, but developers like Fisher had to pay skilled craftsmen and negotiate with their unions. Though Fisher lamented unions as a whole, he sympathized with his workers personally. Foster cited Carl Fisher’s “notoriously soft touch,” when it came to workers that came to him with especially dramatic financial needs. He helped out several of his employees over the years that need a fiscal boost. Fisher’s negative perception of labor unions most likely came from restless labor organizations like the United Mine Workers who, as Allen described, pushed for nationalization in 1919. This urge for nationalization had the feel of socialism. This perceived socialism looked extreme and had gained the label of communist or red. Amidst the Red Scare, Fisher and many businessmen like him would draw on this as anti-capitalism to staunchly oppose unions. Aside from his dislike of unions, Fisher was actually a benevolent boss. Much like the issue with race, he was willing to help the everyday man out of a struggle. His childhood influence of struggle helped him to sympathize with those who had less. He also learned the gender roles he applied later in life in his childhood.

Carl Fisher exhibited these gender roles in his relationship with his wife Jane. The shaky foundations of their marriage began with Carl’s lack luster proposal to Jane. According to Mark Foster, Carl told Jane that he had to appear in court to attend a lawsuit against his company in Los Angeles and if they married quickly she could go with him. Foster went on to cite that Carl also told Jane that he had to be finished with courting her so he could get back to work. His view of marriage and gender roles came out even more clearly only a few weeks into their marriage. Carl
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planned to take Jane on a honeymoon yacht trip down the Mississippi to Florida, but instead he invited some friends to come along without Jane. Unflappable, Jane insisted she go along with them because she was initially supposed to go with Carl in the first place. Their honeymoon culminated with Carl and his friends carousing all hours of the night. Finally the party found themselves in trouble in New Orleans on Christmas Day. Jane eventually divorced Carl in the mid 1920s after seventeen years of marriage. Before their divorce, Fisher furthered these gender roles when he and Jane moved to Miami Beach. Foster gave the image of a man who felt that a wife’s duty was to her husband at the home. These gender roles Fisher embraced were in stark contrast to what fashionable women of the 1920s would consider acceptable gender roles.

A stereotypical image of women in the 1920s was of flappers in speakeasies doing the Charleston and wearing shorter and shorter skirts. While it is not proper to vilify an entire gender based on drinking, dancing, and skirt length, Allen suggested that it helped progress women’s empowerment. Allen cited that men and women drinking together brought about a new “frankness” and a change in morals. This increased awareness and discussions of sex were caused by a surge in the popularity of Freudian psychology. The combination of drinking, frankness, and Freud made men want to break out of traditional Victorian influenced gender roles. Allen went on to cite the divorce rate rose as prohibition went on. Fisher was a traditionalist, who represented the male dominated household while Jane was a fashionable woman of the 1920s. Jane Fisher was a part of the growing number of women who were seeking more than a breadwinner. These women wanted to have more than a life of household work and entertaining ahead of them. The typical gender roles were not enough for some women of the 1920s and Carl Fisher experienced this first hand.

With the stock market crash and the Great Depression around the corner gender roles were not the only change that Carl Fisher was experiencing. Fisher was a man who enjoyed the occasional libation and with prohibition came a drastic change to his lifestyle. His auto racing pursuits in Indianapolis translated well to his boat racing pursuits in Miami Beach, this also meant rum running during the 1920s. Much like auto racing in the 1920s the highest stakes in boat racing came with law enforcement in close pursuit. Foster painted Carl Fisher as a man who bootlegged for the love of the chase. Foster also noted that the hotel business in Miami Beach required alcohol to provide for guests and this was a task that Fisher took on personally. The topic of prohibition during the 1920s was a marquee issue at a national level during the between war years.

Originally prohibition was so controversial that both Republicans and Democrats mutually avoided it as presidential election issue in national politics. Then in 1928, Al Smith came out as the Democratic candidate who was anti-prohibition. This was an issue capable of dividing both parties based on individual values and this was the case for Fisher. As a wealthy businessman it would have benefited Fisher to align himself with the pro-business Republican Party and until 1928 he did. Then, with Al Smith’s openly wet candidacy, came a shift in party support for Carl Fisher. Through Fisher’s correspondence and a donation to an anti-prohibition group, Mark Foster was able to track the election during which Fisher
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shifted his support to the Democratic Party in 1928.\textsuperscript{16} Carl Fisher was ahead of the curve because most of those who switched party loyalty did not do so until the 1932 election. The shift in the party of Presidential and Congressional power was a trend that persisted through several presidencies.

Though Fisher shifted his party orientation, prohibition was not the issue that caused the buildup of FDR’s Democratic Party and the New Deal Coalition. The issue that ousted the Republicans and left Hoover as one of the most infamous Presidents of all time was the Great Depression. The 1920s ended with a flop in 1929 with the stock market crash, a continued bad state of agriculture, and rampant over-production. Robert S. McElvaine’s \textit{The Great Depression: America 1929-1941} addresses the Great Depression, its causes, the efforts of the New Deal, and the state of the country’s conscience throughout the Depression years. McElvaine looked at the issue between labor and business to justify the party shift in American politics. Voters viewed the Republicans and big business as the causes of the Great Depression. Most Americans blamed greedy businessmen and the government under Hoover for the Great Depression. Herbert Hoover was caught in the middle of the Depression issue along with his Republican party.\textsuperscript{17} Bearing the blame for the Great Depression was the downfall for the Republican Party, which allowed for a Democratic majority to form in Congress. The Republican Party had not only lost the Presidency for what would be an entire Democratic Presidential era, but they lost the Republican majority in Congress.

The shift of which party was in power was affirmed by the Democratic Party’s success in the midterm elections of 1934. This was the first time the party in the Presidency was able to gain more seats in Congress during a non-Presidential election year. With this majority FDR was able to push legislation through Congress to implement reform. Without this Democratic majority the Wagner Act and many parts of the New Deal may never have been passed. The Wagner Act is one of the long time legacies of the New Deal and it is still the cornerstone of unionized labor today. With the Wagner Act unskilled labor was able to unionize and was legally protected against interference from business. With the government’s hand in a lot of Americans’ daily lives people were given a lot of help from their government. Though they were progressive the relief programs of the 1930s did not reach everyone in the country. While relief was not universal McElvaine noticed a sense of community forming in the nation at large.

McElvaine referenced that Western Civilization had lost its sense of community over the last several centuries and had become individually self-focused. He referenced the 1930’s as a unique resurgence of a sense of community in the nation. McElvaine proposed that the sense of community came from men taking attitudes traditionally held by women. He attributed this to the fact that many men had fallen down to the bottom of social hierarchy where women had always been. While at the bottom of society, McElvaine argued that men were exhibiting the community values women typically held.\textsuperscript{18} This sense of community was linked to the down and out of the Depression. The people who gave what they could tended to be those who had very little. While McElvaine made no connection to the sense of community in the

\textsuperscript{16} Ibid., 193.
\textsuperscript{18} Ibid., xxxvii.
upper echelons of society Fisher’s biography shows that this sense of community was also felt by the upper classes. The depression did not solely affect the lower classes, and stockbrokers were not the only businessmen to feel the wrath of the Depression. After sustaining losses in the costly 1926 Florida hurricane and overextending himself with investments in other real estate ventures Fisher was belly up by the end of 1932. He had to let his new real estate developments in Montauk Long Island slip away into the bank’s hands. His long time business associates in Miami Beach noticed he was belly up and could not sustain himself. The Collins and Pancoast families of Florida’s real estate scene gave Carl Fisher an office and a, “stipend to provide for his basic needs,” to sustain himself until his death in 1939 when he succumbed to diabetic complications. Carl Fisher’s loss of a one hundred million dollar fortune exhibited the sense of community McElvaine outlined during the Depression. It was not simply the poor helping one another in times of need with small things they could spare. This sense of community was also exhibited by the upper crust helping friends in need that fell with the Depression.

Through several themes of the between war years Carl Fisher emerges as a man who embodied many of them. Fisher’s sense of the nation’s sentiment in the post war years looked at his calculated reaction to the Red Scare. Through his business ventures the tumultuous relationship between labor and business emerged. He also showed his true colors in the face of his racist home state of Indiana when it came to civil rights and the issue of racism. While he was progressive in terms of race, his failed marriage showed a more traditionalist side to Fisher that pushed his wife to divorce him. His views on prohibition and his party shift brought the change of the party in power for American national politics into view. Finally the sentiment of the country in the Depression years showed a sense of community that Fisher himself experienced after his fall from success in the 1920s. Carl Fisher was a prominent man in an era that saw a lot of issues and changes. Through Mark Foster’s biography of Fisher his life story can be used to see the marquis issues the nation faced through the between war years in the United States.

---

20 Ibid., 278.
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An Emerging Détente: 
Nikita Khrushchev, John F. Kennedy, and the Test Ban Treaty of 1963 
By Eric Martell

The date was the seventh of October 1963. The scene was the newly redecorated Treaty Room within the White House. It was a memorable moment in an extraordinary time. It was here that President John F. Kennedy signed the Limited Nuclear Test Ban Treaty. As the President’s Special Assistant Theodore Sorensen remembers, “No other single accomplishment in the White House ever gave him [JFK] greater satisfaction.” Kennedy signed this accord in that specific room at that specific moment “…because it enabled him to have the pleasure of signing it on a desk belonging to him personally.”

The treaty was a breakthrough in Soviet-American relations and represented the beginning of an emerging détente. It was the culmination of nearly twenty years of negotiations and the final result of a developing partnership between President Kennedy and Premier Nikita Khrushchev of the Soviet Union. Finally, it was emblematic of an emerging détente between the Cold War adversaries and opened the possibility for a long and stable peace.

Détente can be described as the relaxing of geopolitical relations between two hegemonic rivals. In the context of history, détente is identifiable as the ‘thawing’ of relations in the Cold War between the Soviet Union and the United States during the 1970s under President Richard Nixon and Soviet Premier Leonid Brezhnev. Formalized détente arguably arose after the negotiations of SALT I and the Helsinki Accords in 1972 and 1975 respectively. After the two nations pushed the world to the brink of nuclear catastrophe with the ‘missiles of October’ in 1962, they actively sought to reduce tensions. The accomplishment of the Test Ban Treaty in 1963 and various other tension-reducing agreements between Kennedy and Khrushchev have unfortunately become little more than a footnote to history. Moreover, their mutual efforts have been overshadowed by the grand overtures of the Kissinger-Dobrynin diplomacy.

In the historiographical debate on the intimations of détente in 1963, scholars like Theodore C. Sorensen, Arthur M. Schlesinger and Glen T. Seaborg hail the efforts of Kennedy and Khrushchev as groundbreaking but not fundamental. At the time of the President’s death, Sorensen and Schlesinger argued that a true détente had not yet materialized, but also stated that the two leaders were taking tangible steps to formulate a proto-détente. Consequently, they did not attempt to speculate as to what could have been had Kennedy and Khrushchev been allowed a full eight years together (assuming a Kennedy re-election in 1964). While I do not suggest that détente fully existed in 1963 as it did in 1975, I do argue that a proto-détente began to emerge as a result of Kennedy and Khrushchev’s

_____________________________
2 SALT I (commonly known as Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty) was both a series of discussions on limiting strategic arms between 1969 and 1972 that eventually ended in a formal treaty and also produced the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty in 1972. The Helsinki Accords were signed during the summer months of 1975 after deliberations within the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe concluded with act to ease tensions between Western Europe and the Eastern Bloc.
3 Henry Kissinger served as the National Security Assistant to President Nixon from 1969 to 1975, and also served as the Secretary of State from 1973 to 1977; Anatoly F. Dobrynin, was the Soviet Ambassador to the United States from 1962 to 1986.
efforts toward relaxation of geo-political tension. These efforts were not only groundbreaking, they were fundamental to the Cold War’s trajectory and they were personal; both men became empathetic of the other and were deeply invested into reaching a series of deals to reduce the chance of conflict. Cold War Historian Vojtech Mastny, however, does not see the 1963 treaty or any of their effects as the beginning of a détente; rather, he suggests it is a failure by President Kennedy and Premier Khrushchev to achieve a comprehensive ban on nuclear weapons and to seriously engender true tension reduction.

Examination of the Kennedy-Khrushchev correspondence reveals the development of trust and commonality between the two leaders in a time of harsh domestic criticism and a chimerical international sphere. The exchange of letters facilitated the emerging détente and is imperative to understanding the rapport between the two men. In this way, through personal and meaningful dialogue, the two leaders did sow the seeds for détente and opened the door for a fruitful harvest for years to come. The story of their relationship demonstrates four important points often lost in history. The first is that Kennedy and Khrushchev shared a similar vision of world peace. The second is that the two leaders operated under similar circumstances and pressures from their constituents, military establishments and bureaucracies. Third, Kennedy and Khrushchev together were the necessary prerequisite to achieving a test ban on nuclear weapons. Finally, their combined efforts with the ban and in other fields laid the foundation for détente that Kissinger and Nixon would complete with Brezhnev a decade later.

The Limited Test Ban Treaty signing was a special moment that represented a breakthrough in Soviet-American relations in the postwar era; it represented one of the first of many steps toward decreasing geopolitical tension. The test ban was both a means to seventeen years of improving relations and also a culmination of eighteen years of negotiations. In a larger sense, it was part and parcel of a process that John Kennedy and Nikita Khrushchev started, which Richard Nixon, Brezhnev, Kissinger, and Dobrynin would later complete. The ban represented the breakthrough of nearly two-decades of intense debate regarding the use, proliferation, and testing of weapons so dangerous that human history could be reversed by a simple miscalculation or misunderstanding. The key development that permitted the test ban to materialize and détente to emerge was the evolution of Kennedy and Khrushchev together and their progression toward personal trust – the prerequisite to successful embarkation of peace.

This story of détente begins with the Nixon Presidency and will work backward. In August, 1975 the ‘Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe’ ended with the signing of the Helsinki Accords. For thirty years following the end of the Second World War the nations of Europe sought, in vain, to find a resolution to the security dilemma that emerged out of the war’s turmoil. Within those thirty years, the Cold War waxed and waned in intensity. When Richard Nixon won the Presidency in 1968 he sought, with Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, to attain an acceptable relaxation of tension and to stabilize the geo-political international sphere away from the precept of anarchy and to convince the Soviets to accept the geopolitical status quo.

Nixon and Henry came into office in 1969 and envisioned a ‘grand design’ of foreign policy that would achieve détente

---

through treaties, negotiations, and large overt gestures. This design included three basic premises: (1) the acceptance of a tripolar configuration now including China; (2) the development of a moderate international system supported by the tripolarity; and (3) the desire to halt the spread of communism while avoiding direct confrontation with the USSR. Taking these premises into account, Kissinger and Nixon designed this grand strategy for reducing international tension, seeking conciliatory policies toward the Eastern Bloc, and building the basis for the president’s famous overture in his trip to China in 1972.

By including China into a tri-polar configuration, Nixon and Kissinger hoped to achieve greater stability in Southeast Asia with the hope that it would allow the United States to successfully leave the jungles of Vietnam. In this way, the creation of formalized détente hinged, partly, on the success of an overture with China and extracting US forces from Southeast Asia. Additionally, the problems over German reunification would eventually become front-and-center issues for the Nixon/Brezhnev years. The German question, as well as the labyrinthine tribulations of SALT, hardened into the other critical hinges of détente. If the relaxation of the Cold War was to be truly achieved, each of these four issues would have to be resolved.

A few short months into his presidency Nixon declared the window was now open for ‘Strategic Arms Limitation Talks’ (SALT) with the Soviet Union, which formally began on 17 November 1969 and would represent the climactic moment for a formal détente during Nixon’s presidency.

At the same time, Andrei Gromyko, one of the greatest statesmen of his time and the Soviet Minister for foreign affairs, had proposed that the superpowers meet to begin deliberating the issue of Berlin. The formation of true-détente had to struggle with two discouraging areas of contention; the issues over Berlin and arms limitations were indelibly linked and needed to be solved together or not at all. Beginning in March 1970 and lasting throughout the summer, the United States, the Soviet Union, France, Great Britain and the two German states worked out a deal to solidify the status quo with regards to Berlin and the divided nation. President Nixon then accepted the Soviet offer to visit Moscow, and did so in May 1972.

At this historic Summit, the United States and Soviet Union signed many agreements promoting peace and formalizing détente after the decade-long traverse toward achieving it. The most advantageous development from the Moscow Summit was the signing of the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty. Additionally, offensive weapons systems were limited with the signing of the SALT I agreement. Finally, the Soviet Union and United States signed the “Basic Principles of Relations,” which established international rules of enhanced cooperation to which both nations assented. One year later, the Nixon Administration and the Brezhnev government signed an “Agreement on the Prevention of Nuclear War” intended to decrease the chance of thermonuclear miscalculation. By 1973, significant progress had been made regarding nuclear détente of the Kennedy-Khrushchev era. The latter was the precursor to the former.

---

6 It is important to distinguish between a formal détente of the Nixon-Brezhnev era and an emerging détente of the Kennedy-Khrushchev era. The latter was the precursor to the former.
8 Ibid., 112.
weapons, and talks were continuing between the agents of change within each nation.

Much can be said with regards to the relationship that materialized between Kissinger and Andrei Gromyko, the agents of change, insomuch as it was this partnership that precipitated a breakthrough in the 1970s in détente negotiations. This relationship, as well as Kissinger’s rapport with Anatoly Dobrynin, was one of the more significant developments that engendered détente in the 1970s. Of Gromyko, Kissinger stated, “He became the indispensable drive-wheel of Soviet foreign policy, the consummate Soviet diplomat, well-briefed, confident, and tenacious.”

Continuing, Kissinger said, “Without doubt, Gromyko was one of the ablest diplomats with whom I dealt.”

Significant breakthroughs in negotiations between the Soviet Union and the United States either succeeded or failed primarily on whether or not the diplomatic parties could prove sincerity and establish trust. Certainly, this was the case between Kissinger, Dobrynin and Gromyko. “Withal, I grew to like and respect Gromyko. Within the framework imposed by the system he represented he was honorable. He was a man of his word,” Kissinger remarked. This is the fundamental point of achieving breakthroughs in negotiations; they are precipitated due to emerging trust, mutual admiration, and honesty amongst the diplomatic parties. This is what happened between Kissinger and Gromyko/Dobrynin resulting in the official formulation of détente.

Two other men deserve credit for the establishment for détente—Nikita Khrushchev and John F. Kennedy. Nine years prior to the SALT treaties, these two men were attempting to create an atmosphere of cordiality and peace. Khrushchev and Kennedy began the journey toward détente through many vehicles; these included: the establishment of a ‘hot-line’ between Moscow and Washington, the Limited Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, a wheat deal between the two nations,13 the invitation for cooperation in space and technological exploration, and the agreements over Berlin and Laos. The two men developed an analogous relationship to that of Kissinger and Dobrynin/Gromyko—one that possessed the ability to engender a positive change in the anarchic dialectic that was the Cold War. Therefore, when examining the roots of détente, it is necessary to understand the relationship between Kennedy and Khrushchev from 1960 to 1963 and then to examine the products of their rapport, namely their agreements, treaties, and overtures.

The Presidency of John F. Kennedy and his relationship with Premier Khrushchev can be seen as a process of evolution. Given that the presidency does not come with an instruction manual, every man ascending to its office must learn how it serves him, and how he serves it. Being the youngest man ever elected, and with no prior executive experience, Kennedy’s learning curve was a bit longer and incurred larger peaks and valleys along the way. The President evolved into a much stronger president and a more passionate proponent of a peace-agenda by 1963. This internal conversion coalesced with the transformation in his relationship with Nikita Khrushchev. Kennedy and Khrushchev’s connection was at times tumultuous, at times destructive, and eventually it was what staved off nuclear
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11 Ibid., 792.
12 Ibid., 790.
13 In October 1963, after the test ban’s ratification, President Kennedy sold $250 million in surplus American wheat to the Soviet Union as yet another step to prove America’s sincerity in pursuing peace.
annihilation paving the way for the beginnings of détente.

Additionally, Kennedy had significant idiosyncrasies including his ability to compartmentalize problems, his collegial ruling style (which tended toward groupthink\(^{14}\)), and his personal dichotomy between his public hawkishness and his private dovish pursuit of peace. This personal paradox is exemplified in his pre-election publication *The Strategy of Peace*. Of disarmament Kennedy wrote, “Peace may come through a combination of such beginnings [he references small successive agreements], each small and insufficient in itself but together enough to provide the new momentum.” Kennedy also stated, “No sane society chooses to commit national suicide. Yet that is the fate which the arms race has in store for us – unless we can find a way to stop it.”\(^{15}\) As a Senator preparing for his own Presidential campaign he berated the Eisenhower administration for its “sorry performance” and stated, “For there is little question that should any Latin country [reference to Cuba and Castro] be driven by repression into the arms of the Communists, our attitudes on nonintervention would change overnight.”\(^ {16}\) The Senator’s words seem paradoxical, yet exhibit a consistency with his personal ambiguities when it comes to Cuba and whether to be a dove or a hawk. By the summer of 1963, the President was feeling safe in his own skin as a dove and powerful enough to press for the pursuit of peace. Unfortunately in 1961 and 1962, Kennedy did not exhibit such strength or confidence. This lack of strength and confidence precipitated the approval of the Bay of Pigs invasion, his poor performance in Vienna in June 1961, and finally the questionable policies that led to the missile crisis. These three situations provided the basis for a transformation within himself that allowed the President to strengthen his nation’s resolve for peace and aided the evolution of the Kennedy-Khrushchev relationship.

Less than three months into his term, Kennedy approved the infamous Bay of Pigs invasion to unseat Fidel Castro and his Communist-leaning government that led to a tear in the early relationship between himself and Khrushchev. From the seventeenth to the twentieth of April 1961, Cuban exiles trained and equipped by Central Intelligence were mercilessly beaten back by Castro’s national forces and would be the largest blunder of JFK’s presidency. Khrushchev immediately wrote Kennedy saying that the president had taken the world into an “hour of alarm, fraught with danger for the peace of the whole world.” The Premier went on to say that it was no secret the US was behind the invasion and that Soviet people were prepared to defend their Cuban brothers.\(^ {17}\) In a far more scathing letter to President Kennedy five days later, the Premier lambasted and harangued the American leader for the crime against Cuba. To be sure, the goodwill accrued by Kennedy at his inauguration was subsequently squandered by the decision to land at the Bay of Pigs. In the eyes of the Kremlin, Kennedy had violated international law, affirmed his administration as a continuation of Eisenhower’s legacy of illegal clandestine operations, and proved to be yet another imperialist crony shrouded in typical American rhetoric.

The Kennedy-Khrushchev relationship took another impressive step backward only two months later, in June

\(^{14}\) Irving Janis’s 1982 work “Victims of Groupthink” provides excellent analysis of intra-governmental decision making in some of America’s greatest foreign policy failures and successes.


\(^{16}\) Ibid., 173.

\(^{17}\) Khrushchev to Kennedy, 18 April 1961, approx. 2:00 p.m., FRUS, VI, 7-8.
1961 in the Austrian capitol. Presidential Aides Theodore Sorensen and Arthur Schlesinger have argued that the meeting in Vienna “…was neither a victory nor a defeat for either side.” Kennedy-romanticists have often downplayed the June meeting between Kennedy and Khrushchev. Their version of the meeting does not adequately present the meeting for what it was – a humiliating experience for the President. Proclaiming the inevitable historical triumph of socialism and victory in the wars for liberation being fought in Southeast Asia, Africa, and Latin America, the Premier belittled American foreign policy and capitalism’s expansionary nature. Upon returning to Washington, the President seemed shocked at the hostile and Khrushchev’s belligerent and uncompromising position. Vice-President Lyndon Johnson remarked, “Khrushchev scared the poor little fellow [JFK] dead.”

There existed no trust, mutual antagonism, and continual haranguing by Khrushchev of the young inexperienced leader. The situation was an unmitigated step backward in their relationship.

The Cuban Missile Crisis has been one of the most studied events in American history and was perhaps the gravest moment of the Cold War, leaving an incontrovertible mark on the development of Kennedy and Khrushchev’s personal and professional relationship. The Missile Crisis was the watershed moment that forced the two men to the bargaining table under enormous pressure to find a mutually acceptable way out of a rapidly destabilizing situation. The story of the crisis is well known; yet its impact on the relationship between Kennedy and Khrushchev is rather obscure. The Soviet Government had for months denied reports by the American press that offensive weapons were being installed in Cuba. Khrushchev, Dobrynin, and Gromyko continually denied such accusations from the Kennedy administration. According to Sorensen and Schlesinger, the missiles began arriving in Cuba in July 1962, and by the end of August the US intelligence apparatus began to report construction of significant military installations. The intense ‘thirteen days’ began on 16 October and lasted through the twenty-ninth and brought the world to the brink of thermonuclear holocaust.

The crisis challenged their abilities, tested their resolve, and forced each man to find solace in the other’s humanity and was also the crisis that laid the foundation for the Kennedy-Khrushchev correspondence so crucial to the emergence of détente a year later. It is safe to say that the crisis demonstrated to John Kennedy and Nikita Khrushchev that the other was not a fallible lunatic, but rather was someone who, through overtures of cooperation, could be swayed into pursuing an agenda of peaceful coexistence. In the final chapter of his book Thirteen Days, Attorney General Robert Kennedy wrote: “The President believed from the start that the Soviet Chairman was a rational, intelligent man who, if given sufficient time and shown our determination, would alter his position.” Robert Kennedy also believed the most important lesson of the missile crisis was “…placing ourselves in the other country’s shoes.” This very point was precisely what the Kennedy-

---

10 Sorensen, *Kennedy*, 543.
15 Ibid., 95.
Khrushchev correspondence began to build upon.

The crisis ended with an agreement by Khrushchev to dismantle Soviet missiles in Cuba in exchange for Kennedy’s promise never to invade Cuba and a secret agreement to remove American missiles in Turkey and Italy. The first post-crisis correspondence between the two men came on 30 October. In the premier’s words, “Our systems are different and my role was simpler than yours because there were no people around me who wanted to unleash war.”24 John Kennedy had, for those perilous thirteen days, repeatedly stated the importance of putting oneself in the opponent’s shoes and to see the crisis from the Soviet perspective. In this way, the premier was offering the very same token. In his essay “How my Father and President Kennedy Saved the World,” Sergei Khrushchev wrote of this very point. On the very day Khrushchev ordered his government to accept the American offer to cease hostilities and stave off an impending American invasion of Cuba he spoke to his advisers, “If the President announces there will be an invasion, he won’t be able to reverse himself. We have to let Kennedy know that we want to help him.” When he paused to think the Premier reiterated the need to “yes, help” the President against the forces within the American government pushing the President to launch a preemptive strike against the Cuban mainland.25

In the aftermath of near-catastrophe and after intense domestic and international scrutiny Khrushchev opted to extend his desire for peace in his 30 October letter thereby opening up an old dialogue with new passionate content. He believed that the

conditions were “ripe for finalizing the agreement on signing a treaty on cessation of tests of thermonuclear weapons.” He did, however, lecture Kennedy that the USSR would never accept a treaty that included inspections. “We shall not accept inspection, this I say to you unequivocally and frankly,” Khrushchev wrote.26 This was the major sticking point that seemed irresolvable between the United States and the Soviet Union during 1962 and 1963 in talks over a test ban – a stalemate that was overcome because of the trust emerging between the two men.

On 11 November and again on 14 November, Khrushchev continued to raise his concerns and desire for a ban showing his resolve for striking an accord with the President. The most influential letter setting the stage for the emerging détente came from the Premier to the President, dated 19 December 1962. He began, “It seems to me, Mr. President, that time has come now to put an end once and for all to nuclear tests, to draw a line through such tests. The moment for this is very, very appropriate...a certain relaxation of international tension [Khrushchev’s proposal for détente] which has emerged now should, in my view, facilitate this.”27 In a clear example of an evolving partnership, the Premier personally offered to President Kennedy that the USSR and US should pursue a strategy of peaceful coexistence.

Khrushchev went on in the letter to say: “The Soviet Union does not need war. I think that war does no promise bright prospects for the United States either...To prevent this we must, on the basis of complete equality and with just regard for each other’s interests, develop between ourselves peaceful relations and solve all issues through negotiations and mutual mutual
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24 Khrushchev to Kennedy, 30 October 1962, FRUS, VI, 192.
26 Ibid., 192
27 Khrushchev to Kennedy, 19 December 1962, FRUS, VI, 234.
concessions [emphasis added by author].” Kennedy responded on 28 December by saying, “There appear to be no differences between your views and mine regarding the need for eliminating war in this nuclear age. Perhaps only those who have the responsibility for controlling these weapons fully realize the awful devastation their use would bring.” After nearly causing nuclear war, Khrushchev and Kennedy were achieving a breakthrough in their personal relationship – the perquisite for the creation of détente. When the discussion between Kennedy and Khrushchev began to turn toward the intricacies of an agreement, Khrushchev offered this: “Well, if this is the only difficulty on the way to agreement [on-site inspections, which Kennedy was willing to be flexible on as stated in his 28 December reply], then for the noble and humane goal of ceasing nuclear weapons tests we are ready to meet you halfway in this question.”

In the New Year, Khrushchev responded to Kennedy after JFK had sent representatives to Moscow to convey the President’s desires to reach a deal on the number of on-site inspections (the only major element preventing a treaty at that point). Kennedy instructed his representative to offer eight to ten per year. Khrushchev desired no inspections but was willing to accept two or three. After the meeting in Moscow, Khrushchev was under the impression that two or three annual inspections were indeed the American offer; unfortunately, it was not. In Kennedy’s response months later on 11 April, the President personally apologized for the “honest misunderstanding” and asked the Premier for this understanding.

Reaching a deal with a nation’s ultimate adversary is a domestically dangerous and potentially costly move, yet Kennedy and Khrushchev continued to press for a deal even through hardships and misunderstandings against the wishes of their respective military establishments. Khrushchev responded days later with a sincere, but firm reply with regards to the confusion over what constituted the American offer. In terms of attaining a treaty he said, “Everything which proceeds to the advantage of mutual understanding and trust between our countries and between us personally will always meet on my part a most favorable response.” He went on to say, “I think you share my certainty that such a beneficial turning-point in Soviet-American relations [alluding to the emerging détente], and government officials who knew how to bring it about, would be applauded not only the Soviet and American peoples, but by all to whom peace on our planet is dear.”

In developing a relationship based on mutual trust in which each man could implicitly believe the other was going to personally assure concessions, agreements, and future cooperation, the two men continued to work for a test ban. On 8 May, the Premier wrote the President, “...we stand for the cessation of all tests for all time, wherever they may be carried out: in the atmosphere, the cosmos, underground, and under water. We take such a position first of all because the question regarding the cessation of nuclear weapons tests has indisputable significance from the moral and humane viewpoint.” Thereafter the Premier lectured President Kennedy profusely about the languishing progress of the test ban negotiations and the lack of

28 Ibid.
29 Kennedy to Khrushchev, 28 December 1962, FRUS, VI, 238.
30 Khrushchev to Kennedy, 19 December 1962, FRUS, VI, 235.
31 Khrushchev to Kennedy, 23 April 1963, FRUS, VI, 271.
32 Khrushchev to Kennedy, 8 May 1963, FRUS, VI, 279.
American alacrity. He lamented, “The Soviet Union sincerely desires to reach an agreement for the cessation of nuclear tests, but it cannot and will not approach an understanding on the conditions proposed by the Western powers.”

Khrushchev wrote Kennedy again on 8 June expressing his discontent with the proceedings and the lack of American virtue after the slowdown of progression in negotiations. The premier wrote, “…we have recently become more and more convinced that those with whom we are negotiating [the Americans and the British] are not inclined to conduct negotiations by proceeding from the principle of equality of parties, and still want to receive from us some kind of bonus for the cessation of nuclear-weapons tests.” Lecturing the President, he went on to say that the West refused to accept the Soviet offer that had “met them halfway.”

Evidently the trust that had developed between the two men was not yet powerful enough to overcome these problems and to prove to one another the seriousness of their intentions. Equally evident was that any trust that had accrued was chimerical in nature and fairly typical of preceding leaders – empty rhetoric. This last letter arrived on the Resolute Desk in the Oval Office on 8 June 1963 demonstrating to JFK that if he truly cared about a test ban he would have to do something grand in order to break through the stalemate. Kennedy did just that at American University two days later. On 10 June 1963, the President gave perhaps his greatest speech in which he proved his resolve for a treaty, his desire for détente, and his desire to save the relationship with Khrushchev. The speech has been lionized by historians, and for good reason – it proved to Khrushchev that Kennedy was serious about achieving these ends. The speech solidified unequivocal trust between the two men and saved the Limited Nuclear Test Ban Treaty and therefore was the moment that ushered in the true beginning of détente.

The study of US-USSR relations after the Second World War on the issue of nuclear weapons demonstrates that the treaty of 1963 rightfully deserves its place in history as the first fundamental building block of détente. It took seventeen years to achieve a breakthrough in negotiations over nuclear weapons, and in that time the Cold War had intensified into a geo-political predicament based off an ideological dialectic and an increasingly dangerous arms race. It also makes clear that the breakthrough of 1963 was a result of developed trust between Khrushchev and Kennedy and that the two men together were the missing prerequisites for success.

At the end of the Second World War, the United States, already in possession of an atomic weapon, and the Soviet Union, moving toward nuclear capability, began to prepare their respective nations for the possibility of nuclear war setting the stage for an arms race. In 1946, the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission developed the “Baruch” plan, in which the ability to manufacture nuclear weapons was to cease and all existing weapons destroyed. This plan was quickly abandoned after the United States and the Soviet Union could not reach an agreement over post-war proliferation of nuclear weapons. After eight years of limited discussion of this topic, the French and British governments brought forth a 1954 resolution arguing for sharp reductions in forces and conventional arms, as well as, the prohibition of nuclear
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weapons; ultimately this was abrogated by both the Soviet Union and the United States. Throughout the rest of the 1950s, the debates raged inside the United Nations between the US and the USSR over moratoriums and inspections that produced no tangible results.

On 1 July, 1958, a United Nations conference for the suspension of nuclear testing began in Geneva, Switzerland in which the members of the Security Council met to negotiate possible solutions to the nuclear question. President Eisenhower was pleased with the conference’s progress and asked the Soviet Union to meet in October with the US and further negotiations, offering a significant incentive – to stop American testing for a year if the USSR agreed to meet.

Starting on the 31 October, 1958, and lasting until after the American election in 1960, the Geneva Conference on the Discontinuance of Nuclear Weapons tests featured many intense debates with modest progress toward reaching a deal. In almost every case the two opposing nations agreed upon the ends (preventing proliferation and stopping tests), but the two very rarely agreed upon the means (number of annual inspection, and national composition of inspectors...etc.). Unfortunately, the talks did not produce the desired result and were eventually abandoned. A salient decline in negotiations followed the U-2 incident in May 1960, which sparked controversy and hardened the Soviet bargaining position, which then plagued Eisenhower’s final year.

Upon taking office, Kennedy was given time by the UN and the Soviet Union to develop his policy for negotiations after the late-term blunders of Eisenhower. He named John McCloy as his special assistant on disarmament with the task to understand the Soviet Union’s reservations and proposals when it came to negotiating. Additionally, Kennedy charged McCloy with investigating what concessions the US could make without hurting its own national security. After the disastrous Bay of Pigs and the infamous Vienna Conference in the spring of 1961, the two nations, their two leaders, and their efforts to achieve a nuclear testing deal became quite estranged; it would not be until March 1962, and again in February 1963, that any serious deliberations on nuclear disarmament would resume in Geneva.

Most historians have argued that it was the Missile Crisis that forced Khrushchev and Kennedy to make a serious personal and public commitment to disarmament instead of simple rhetoric or half-hearted initiatives. Vojtech Mastny concludes differently; Khrushchev accepted the idea of a Limited Test Ban after months of deliberate stalling after the relations with China had broken down beyond “the point of no return,” according to Mastny. I argue, however, that the lessons of the missile crisis, the American University speech, and the Kennedy-Khrushchev correspondence were the major influencing reasons for the signing of the test ban. Kennedy’s speech deserves its place as one of the single most important speeches in the twentieth century and was indeed the crucial factor in pushing forward a solution, but does not complete the picture. Rather, the trust built by Kennedy and Khrushchev through their three-year correspondence laid the foundation for the meaning behind JFK’s speech. Kennedy’s speech convinced Khrushchev to seek a resolution of their differences over nuclear weapons. The
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statements made at American University, supported in their correspondence, proved to both leaders that the desire to sign a treaty was not just wishful thinking, but a personal vested interest to achieve a world of peace.

Mastny misses the point in his analysis; he downplays the importance of Kennedy’s speech and how it was received in Russia. While Khrushchev’s problem with the Chinese surely factored into his frustration and desire to achieve some sort of tangible success to quiet his doubters, this reason alone cannot, and does not, complete the picture.

Although remembered for his inaugural address and his challenge to his countrymen with his famous quote “Ask not...” John F. Kennedy’s greatest speech was his address at American University’s commencement address because it transcended borders and time. It was here that Kennedy admitted his own nation’s faults, praised the Soviet Union and its achievements, called for an end to nuclear weapons. With eloquence and beauty, idealism and rationalism, the President proclaimed:

> What kind of peace do I mean? And, what kind of peace do we seek? Not a Pax-Americana enforced on the world by American weapons of war... I am talking about genuine peace – the kind of peace that makes life on Earth worth living...not merely peace in our time, but peace for all time.”

Kennedy continued on to speak with passion and vigor, “total war makes no sense in an age when great powers can maintain large and relatively invulnerable nuclear forces and refuse to surrender without resort to those forces.” He spoke “…I also believe that we must re-examine our own attitude...

[that] our problems are manmade, therefore they can be solved by man...No problem of human destiny is beyond human beings.”

In one of the most amazing utterances by an American politician in the height of the Cold War, Kennedy said of the Soviet Union: “No government or social system is so evil that its people must be considered as lacking in virtue...we can still hail the Russian people for their many achievements in science and space, in economic and industrial growth, in culture and in acts of courage.” He then humanized the Russians by arguing that they were really no different than Americans, “our basic and common link is that we all inhabit this plant. We all breathe the same air. We all cherish our children’s futures. And we are all mortal.”

Khrushchev called the speech “the greatest speech by any American president since Roosevelt.” Khrushchev viewed the speech so positively that he ordered the full text of the speech published in the Soviet press for the citizens to read. Additionally, the speech was aired over Voice of America, and was broadcasted uninterrupted to the Russian populous (which went against fifteen years of jamming American broadcasts).

Arthur Schlesinger notes that in the hours following Kennedy’s speech, an American named Harold Wilson quoted Khrushchev as saying that “If the western powers now accept this proposal, the question of inspection no longer arises.” In other words, Khrushchev was willing to drop the Soviet Union’s biggest reservation with the negotiations if the United States continued to show that it was willing to compromise seriously. The importance of
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these two gestures is impossible to
understate; Sociologist Amitai Etzioni, in his
article *The Kennedy Experiment*, discusses
how Kennedy’s speech was a small gesture
with large psychological impacts for the
Soviet Union and Khrushchev personally.
As he hypothesized, “The essence of the
theory [Psychological theory of International
Relations] is that psychological gestures
initiated by one nation will be reciprocated
by others with the effects of reducing
international tensions.”¹⁴⁷ He also states that
the speech at American University was the
necessary context needed for “unilateral
initiatives to follow.” With the speech, the
President announced that the US would stop
all atmospheric testing and would not restart
unless other nations did, offering the first
unilateral initiative – proving the sincerity
and seriousness of his words.⁴⁸
Psychologically, this provided the Soviet
Union and Khrushchev with some optimism
that the Americans were, at last, ready to
seriously negotiate with parity with the
Soviets. Kennedy then sent Undersecretary
of State Averell Harriman to Russia to once
again show his resolve. According to a
member of the Soviet embassy in
Washington, after hearing of Harriman’s
appointment, “As soon as I heard that
Harriman was going, I knew you were
serious.”⁴⁹

Kennedy and Khrushchev agreed to
a *limited* treaty as opposed to a
*comprehensive* one due to each side’s
trepidation that a full comprehensive bill
could not survive the bureaucratic (and
legislative) institutions within their
respective governments; it was therefore up
to the negotiators in Moscow to deliver an
agreement that could survive the debates and
inquiries within each government –

something powerful, yet limited in nature.
The deliberations began on 25 July 1963
with an inauspicious start; from the onset
there were numerous negative rhetorical
statements by both sides in an attempt to
soundly affirm their positions. Finally, on 5
August 1963 (hours before the eighteenth
anniversary of the atomic explosion over
Hiroshima), Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei
Gromyko and American Secretary of State
Dean Rusk formally signed the Limited
Nuclear Test Ban treaty.

This event, more so than any
moment preceding it, was a single step
forward, as Kennedy and Khrushchev
argued, to a new international order of
cooperation and peaceful coexistence. This
test ban, albeit not comprehensive, was the
breakthrough moment for US-USSR
relations necessary to cement an emerging
détente. The agreement carried much
optimism in an era of uncertainty, unlike any
preceding agreements in the first twenty
years of the Cold War. The treaty was a step
in the right direction, albeit a small step,
toward achieving the nonproliferation of
nuclear weapons (to come), the banning of
their uses instead of the constant threat of
immediate global nuclear holocaust.

The general relaxation of geo-
political tensions in the Cold War, popularly
known as détente, has historically attributed
to the Presidency of Richard Nixon and the
agents of change within the Soviet and
American governments between 1968 and
1975. Until the Reagan presidency, this
détente brought the world away from the
dangerous arms races of the 1950s and early
1960s. In many ways the *first* Cold War
came to an end by 1975 due to détente. The
*second*, of course, arose from the unraveling
of détente, the end of the Carter presidency,
the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, and the
election of Ronald Reagan to the White
House.

¹⁴⁷ Amitai Etzioni, “The Kennedy Experiment,” *The
Western Political Quarterly* 20 (June 1967): 361.
¹⁴⁸ Ibid., 365.
Détente, therefore, holds an important position in American history, as well as, the history of foreign policy; it was an era of reconciliation, cooperation, and rational attempts to control the anarchy of the international bipolar system; in this time leaders began to learn from the mistakes of the 1950s and early 1960s; and finally, it was an era that ended perhaps the most perilous decade of the twentieth century, due in large part to an irrepressible nuclear arms race.

To gain an appreciation for the roots of détente it is necessary to look beyond the Nixon/Kissinger years back to the first perilous moments after the 1962 missile crisis. It is also equally important to examine the relationship between the two leaders of the time – John F. Kennedy and Nikita Khrushchev to understand how and why the roots of détente began to emerge as early as 1963.

After a tough beginning in their relationship, including the Bay of Pigs invasion, the failure to reach a nuclear test ban treaty, and the torturous Vienna conference, Kennedy and Khrushchev went into the fall of 1962 with a bleak outlook for the future. The Cuban Missile Crisis was perhaps the spark needed for détente to emerge. The deliberations within the White House and Kremlin in ‘the eleventh hour’ to stave-off a thermonuclear war forced the two leaders to evaluate their positions and mandated one another to step into the unknown and trust the other. Again, the Premier’s son, Sergei Khrushchev, can shed some light on this. As the crisis was reaching its apex and Soviet intelligence was claiming that Kennedy was being pushed by the military establishment for a full-scale invasion of Cuba, Khrushchev returned “...constantly to the premise that Kennedy’s word should be trusted and that he would be in the White House for at least two – perhaps even six – more years. A great deal could be accomplished in that time.”50 The situation demanded that each take a remarkable step to have faith the other not to make an irrational move to either fire the missiles or to launch a preemptive strike to take out the missiles. It took personal understanding that the other wanted a way out of the crisis and would accept the ultimately agreed-upon deal. The crisis created a trust that had never existed previously, but would continue for the following year.

Immediately after the conclusion of the crisis Kennedy and Khrushchev embarked on a mutually serious mission to deliver a test ban treaty. The treaty had languished for seventeen years in deliberations in New York, Moscow, and Geneva with no tangible results – just rhetoric and failure. With the impetus of the missile crisis, the two leaders forged a new attempt to complete a treaty and begin the conclusion of peace. After months of deliberation and after nearly two decades of waiting, the two nations (as well as the UK) formally signed the treaty in August 1963. This moment, as well as the Presidential signing post-ratification in October, was the emblem of the emerging détente in 1963. It was symbolic of the new pursuit of peace, and represented optimism for the future.

This monumental breakthrough, and its subsequent symbolism as a building block for future détente, could not have been done without the development of a close and sincere relationship between Kennedy and Khrushchev. More importantly however, the correspondence between the two leaders was the key to creating personal trust and admiration; this was what made the Kennedy-Khrushchev relationship unique. Of the uniqueness Sergei Khrushchev explained, “Father said, more than once, ‘We differ from Kennedy in every respect. He defended his capitalist belief, his world,

50 Sergei Khrushchev, 11.
and we defended ours, our concept of justice. We had one thing in common: Both he and I did everything we could to preserve peace on Earth.” This distinctive association can be concluded as the necessary prerequisite to emerging détente. Kennedy and Khrushchev were the missing pieces and the two of them together, after forming a deeply trusting relationship paved the way for the treaty and for a larger relaxation of geo-political tension.

Lastly, there are four points that history has largely forgotten after the horrific death of the President and the replacement of the Premier in 1963 and 1964, respectively. Through their personal correspondence, the men who nearly killed hundreds of millions in the fall of 1962 came to realize and respect their mutual visions of world peace. First, they no longer saw massive stores of nuclear weapons with frequent testing as a necessity for ‘winning’ the Cold War. Secondly, both men faced intense pressure and scrutiny from their military establishment (as proof of their generalized opposition to the test ban treaty) but nevertheless put impressive amounts of personal sacrifice into achieving the cessation of tests. Thirdly, the two men together were the missing ingredient that was been lacking for nearly twenty years in achieving a test ban. Fourth, and finally, the test ban should be heralded not only for what it prevented, but more importantly for what it represented – the necessary small first step toward greater world peace; it represented the first important step toward a lasting détente between the two superpowers of the bipolar world.
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Between the Old, the New, and the Few:
Sicilian and Puerto Rican Immigration in New York
By: Christopher Sanchez

Throughout New York history, the movement and migrations of peoples have altered the social landscape of the state. The Iroquois confederation was destroyed by these changes and a new order was established with different values. The physical landscape was also modified by the destruction of ancient woodlands to make way for European-style agriculture and canals were hewn across the land. Small settlements became vast cities and engulfed entire regions with a trade and industrial-based economy. Economic patterns became exceedingly important with the arrival of the second wave of European settlers that arrived after 1900. Many of these immigrants were seeking a new way of life, but the prime impetus was to improve fiscally. Eastern European Jews also came to reap economic improvement while escaping persecution during this time. Class and ethnicity were key factors in New York’s transformation with class paramount. Economic opportunities molded changes in society and the economic standing of the immigrant. The Sicilian and Puerto Rican immigrant experience clearly demonstrates how two different ethnic groups interacted in New York and had vastly different outcomes in regards to class because of economics outside their control. Ultimately, fiscal fluctuations shaped the Sicilian and Puerto Rican experience in vastly dissimilar ways. Both of these groups added to the New York immigrant experience and were fundamentally changed by it.

The Sicilian and Puerto Rican immigrants shared much in common. Both groups spoke languages that were initially unfamiliar to older settlers. Each group sought to escape poverty on an island with very diverse ethnic backgrounds. Both shared a common religion, and by necessity first lived in urban areas in New York. Coincidentally, both the Puerto Ricans and the Sicilians were escaping a primarily agricultural/fishing based economy for a more technologically advanced manufacturing environment. Jerre Mangione chronicled the Sicilian immigrant experience, in his memoir Mount Allegro, which spanned his family’s experience from around 1914 to approximately 1960. The Puerto Rican experience of the 1960s and 1970s, with its more politicized nature, is explored by Johanna Fernandez in her paper “Between Social Service Reform and Revolutionary Politics: The Young Lords, Late Sixties Radicalism, and Community Organizing in New York City.” The rapid changes that came post-World War II are presented by the PBS documentary “New York, 1945-2000: The City and the World,” which was directed by Ric Burns. Sicilians began to arrive in large numbers to New York approximately in 1900, while the Puerto Rican experience began roughly in 1945. Key differences between these two groups emerged in how they were integrated in society as a result of industrial evolution in New York State.

1 Jerre Mangione, Mount Allegro: A Memoir of Italian American Life (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1981): 1
Jerre Mangione described the Rochester, New York of his childhood as an industrial workshop in the years prior to World War I:

Scattered through Mount Allegro was the buzzing and whirring of several tailor factories. From some of them I lugged home half finished coats and suits for my mother to sew on. “You aren’t strong enough to work in a factory,” the doctor had said. So my mother worked at home. The blackest smoke of all came from the direction of the New York Central Station – a five-minute walk from our house.⁴

This new urban atmosphere allowed parents to work at home if they were unable to work in factories; children were also part of this industrial economy. These manufacturing industries and the transportation network that serviced them, were indicative of the great modern base that attracted scores Sicilian and other Southern and Eastern Europeans to urban New York in the early twentieth century. Many of Jerre Mangione’s relatives and friends came to America with a marketable skill in masonry and bricklaying.⁵ Entry-level labor jobs were plentiful in the rapidly expanding economy. Although Mangione’s father had been trained as a pastry chef in Sicily and was unable to make his cannoli profitable in America, he was regularly able to find employment (and re-employment) despite the language barrier.⁶ Ironically, the little English that Jerre Mangione’s father Peppino had learned in the factory was used to talk back to his Irish-American “Bosso,” who eventually fired him!⁷ Even when the boom of the 1920’s became the collapse of the Great Depression, Mount Allegro was able to survive despite job losses and home foreclosures. The residents of this neighborhood had faith in “Destino” and elections and found work in government projects.⁸ Culture was strong but ultimately was influenced by currents in employment. Mount Allegro as an ethnic expression survived because there was a means to earn a living and a reason to stay.

Maintaining a distinct ethnicity was important to the first wave of Sicilian immigrants and aided them psychologically. Mangione’s mother attempted to keep ethnic identity alive through exclusive use of the Sicilian dialect at home but also found no need to learn English while working with her co-workers in the Rochester tailoring industry.⁹ Language formed a bridge between the old world and the industrial world. The sense of a distinct community provided a social buffer against which the trials and tribulations of urban life. The cultural activities, such as the St. Joseph’s Festival and the large family gatherings, provided a sense of order and meaning to a sometimes-difficult situation.¹⁰ The neighborhood was an organic entity that helped give purpose to new immigrants and their children. Culture was glue that kept a small ethnic enclave alive through difficult times.

The first generation children were able to develop two distinct identities in an effort to confront the New York urban industrial experience. The author’s playmates and classmates were a reflection of a more cosmopolitan atmosphere in which Sicilians were another minority rather than the dominant culture.¹¹ The outside world considered the children of immigrants to be either completely Italian or American.

⁴ Mangione, Mount Allegro, 39-40.
⁵ Ibid., Mount Allegro, 45.
⁶ Ibid., Mount Allegro, 128-130.
⁷ Ibid., Mount Allegro, 49, 56.
⁸ Ibid., Mount Allegro, 229-230.
⁹ Ibid., Mount Allegro, 56.
¹⁰ Ibid., Mount Allegro, 90-93.
but their parents considered their children to be “half and half” and this resulted in a blended identity.\textsuperscript{12} The role of this youthful blending cannot be underestimated and contributed to the decline of the community as a unique entity. Whereas Jerre Amaroso’s immigrant parents and friends would look up to Garibaldi and other Italianized figures such as “Darro” (Clarence Darrow), his own heroes were found on the silver screen.\textsuperscript{13} This hybrid culture continued until the dissolution of Mount Allegro as a distinct community on the heels of urban renewal. Only when the bonds of the ethnic community were destroyed through postwar economic and social change then the people of this community became fully “American.”

Mount Allegro died with the birth of the suburbs and the death of its own specific raison d’être which was precipitated by postwar changes. Mangione describes this process eloquently: The neighborhood began declining in the early fifties with the demise of its oldest residents, the immigrants. The houses of the immigrants, passed down to their children fared no better. Unwilling to inhabit a neighborhood that was rapidly becoming a black and Puerto Rican ghetto where acts of arson and vandalism were common occurrences, the children hastily disposed of their properties to slum landlords, or became slum landlords themselves by renting them, and retreated to the suburbs. By the mid-sixties, the neighborhood had deteriorated into a dreary scene of dilapidated buildings and rampant weeds, dead ripe for a race riot and, eventually for the false promise of urban renewal.\textsuperscript{14}

The culture had begun dying through assimilation and the passing of the old gatekeepers of tradition, the immigrants. The first American-born generation had begun the inexorable march to conformity and began to lose aspects their unique culture. Besides Rochester’s Mount Allegro, there were other indicators of trouble in urban New York; ethnic tensions between African-Americans and Italian-Americans erupted in a brawl at the Crystal Lake Resort on Memorial Day, 1956.\textsuperscript{15} Urban pressures and violence further pushed divisions between different groups of immigrants and hastened suburbanization and urban decay. The Puerto Rican urban experience would be substantially different than the Sicilian because of external factors. The old immigrant enclaves became vast ghettos for internal migrants during the postwar era.

The Puerto Rican experience was vastly different than the Sicilian because of socio-economic changes. Puerto Rican immigrants arrived in New York with the distinct advantage of already being US citizens.\textsuperscript{16} America and New York City in particular was a beacon to many after the successful conclusion of World War Two; it was the fiscal nexus of the “Arsenal of Democracy.”\textsuperscript{17} These conditions facilitated an easier naturalization process but also created false hopes. While earlier generations of immigrants came to America and found some measure of success, the Puerto Ricans arrived as the urban economy began to collapse. The postwar technological advances coupled with the
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shift in the manufacturing base to the South and West caused a sharp decline in the numbers of entry-level unskilled labor jobs.\(^{18}\)

The Caribbean migrants faced an existential crisis in which they could not earn enough money to “make it” in the city. Changes in shipping technology also eliminated the need for longshoremen and led to the rise of New Jersey-based enterprises.\(^{19}\) The previous generations of immigrants generally were able to find entry-level work because of the centralization of industry in urban areas and the need for vast amounts of workers. The lack of local industry led to chronic joblessness and increased systemic poverty. Historian Johanna Fernandez in her paper, “Between Social Service Reform and Revolutionary Politics” uncovers a grim statistic: “In 1966, 47% of Puerto Ricans in New York were either unemployed, underemployed, or permanently out of the labor force for lack of success in finding employment.”\(^{20}\) This early economic stagnation was a significant development in the Puerto Rican experience because it set the stage for future conflict and changes within the urban setting.

Federal policies applied on the municipal level helped to erode urban communities and their economic base. Title 1 of the Housing Act of 1949 allowed for eminent domain abuse by a camarilla consisting of New York City real estate developers, major lenders and the city planner Robert Moses.\(^{21}\) This law, wielded by Moses, allowed many socially stable but politically weak neighborhoods to be plowed under to create highways and newer real estate developments. The intent of the Housing Act was to eliminate slums but in essence destroyed the natural order of communities through physical isolation, division and legalized banishment.\(^{22}\) Local small employers and small neighborhood factories were also annihilated in this process. The focus on highways transformed the great city to a place to escape from; preferably in a new Ford, Buick or Chevrolet. The new Bauhaus and Le Corbusier-inspired urban housing was intended for the working class but in essence became urban middle class living areas.\(^{23}\) The only housing available to the new migrants such as Southern Blacks and Puerto Ricans was found in the wreckage of Title 1. Neighborhoods without social structure and employment greatly worsened conditions and lead to open combat coinciding with the general chaos of the 1960s. The neighborhood was no longer to bulwark of stability that it had once been prior to “urban renewal.”

The rapid suburbanization led to problems for urban New Yorkers that were unforeseen by “urban renewal” advocates. Title 2 of the Housing Act of 1949, which gave generous mortgage guarantees to banks to develop suburban housing projects, aided the suburban “white flight.”\(^{24}\) Banks lent money to people who met the necessary prerequisites to purchase low cost suburban housing.\(^{25}\) This automatically excluded recent migrants with little collateral or capital such as southern Blacks and Puerto Ricans. Banks would often use prejudicial screening processes to eliminate minorities from taking advantage of these fiscal incentives.\(^{26}\) Had the bulk of the Sicilians had arrived to New York at this time, it may

\(^{18}\) Fernandez, “Between Social Service Reform and Revolutionary Politics,” 259.
\(^{19}\) New York, 1945-2000.
have been possible that economic and policy factors would have confined them to the urban ghettos along with other minorities. This resulted in a rapid erosion of the municipal tax base that led poorer quality schools and city services such as sanitation and trash removal. Unlike the Sicilians, the newer immigrants attacked these issues through political activism.

Ethnicity was an important for the Puerto Rican immigrants and was expressed with a vocal nationalist political movement rooted in revolutionary socialist radicalism. Unlike the many of the Sicilians at Mount Allegro who were indifferent or fatalist in their views of politics, many Puerto Ricans were inclined to use radicalism to help their communities. The most successful ethnically based political organization in this regard was the Young Lords Organization/Party. This organization was influenced two main currents, the emergence of the New Left and a renewed sense of Puerto Rican identity in opposition to US policy.

The 1960s were period of great politicization in the Puerto Rican community and this was a function of trends in American society and the urban experience. The Young Lords Organization essentially began as Puerto Rican street gang that was influenced by the Black Panther Party via jailhouse cross-pollination of ideas. Jose “Cha Cha” Jimenez, the leader of the Chicago Young Lords, had served time with Black Panther, Fred Hampton, and resolved to change his organization into a Puerto Rican Social-Nationalist organization. This trend spread to other Young Lords affiliates in the Puerto Rican Diaspora and firmly took hold in New York City by 1969. This link between street organizations to politics was not without recent precedent; La Cosa Nostra was part of the Greenwich Village Alliance that had stymied Robert Moses in 1962-64. Unlike the Mafia, the Young Lords worked outside of the established political system because they sought to confront, transform and potentially destroy it.

The Young Lords Organization in New York became a separate party in 1970 and was infused with leftist nationalist students from Puerto Rican student unions, and from the ‘Students for a Democratic Society’ organization in Colombia University. The Vietnam conflict had caused a reaction against American military power and many students of Puerto Rican background protested against it in New York and at the University of Puerto Rico. Many of these students were influenced by Marxist dialectics and the reassessment of Latin American revolutionaries such a Ché Guevara and Fidel Castro. This pool of young Puerto Ricans would form a “revolutionary vanguard” to wage war against key urban problems. This rapid politicization/radicalization of youth was not a major factor of the Sicilian immigrant experience and is the most significant difference between these two groups.

As both a nationalist and revolutionary movement, the Young Lords Party took to community organizing as the means to confront problems of sanitation and health:

We want community control of our institutions and land. We want control of our communities by our people and programs to guarantee that all institutions serve the needs of our people. People’s control of police,
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health services, churches, schools, housing, transportation and welfare are needed. We want an end to attacks on our land by urban removal, highway destruction, universities and corporations.

Land Belongs To All The People!34

The Young Lords Party manifesto clearly outlined their political and ethno-national goals. The East Harlem “Trash Offensive” of 1969 was successful because it forced the New York mayoral race to make municipal sanitation an issue.35 Prior to this, there was no great public outcry on this issue among minority groups. This radical power was an interesting combination in Alinskyite initiative, traditional Puerto Rican mores, and revolutionary Maoist ideals.36 Fernandez, in her paper on the Young Lords Party, argues that the traditional sense of Puerto Rican values were important for the leaders of this organization. “Radicals who seemed for the first time to leave behind the poverty and inequity in which they grew up, felt compelled to return home and organize against social injustice.”37 Obligation to family and community were a moral force for improvement. This strong sense of family is a trait that they shared with the Sicilians. These young idealists first confronted this problem with brooms and shovels and then with blockades and riots against the existing political order and succeeded. Publicity was ultimately their strongest means to exact change.

The struggle for better living conditions was expressed politically via the

“Lead Offensive” of November 1969. The Young Lords were more ambitious in this effort because they were able to unite hospital workers at Metropolitan Hospital with their organization and the community to address lead poisoning.38 This issue was a reflection of the dire state of urban New York because of the high numbers of children affected by crumbling infrastructure and loose enforcement of code. Fernandez notes that: “public health reports estimated between 25,000 and 35,000 children were afflicted with the disease [lead poisoning] each year.”39 The YLP was able to work with health care professionals to conduct a door-to-door local campaign to test for lead. This brought the issue to the attention of the media via the New York Times because it linked the ethnicity of the victims with the disease and city policy.40 Eventually, this wide publicity forced New York City to tackle the issue with changes to code, an emergency repair program and the Bureau of Lead Control which finally helped end this problem.41 This success was important because it brought to light a community issue and expressed the unique dynamism of the Young Lords. Politics was a useful tool to help the Puerto Rican immigrant population in the absence of economic opportunity. If these migrants could not leave the slums, they would instead transform them to be a better place for their families and children.

The new order that arose after World War II benefited earlier waves of immigrants who had begun the process of redefining themselves by class and ethnicity while there were economic opportunities. Feminist Betty Friedan described the new suburban order in her essay, “The Way We Were- 1949,” as “a comfortable small world
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you could really do something about, politically: the children’s homework, even the new math, compared to the atomic bomb.”\(^{42}\) In essence, this was a tacit rejection of urban life that typified Mount Allegro and working class New York. The new values were rooted in a nouveau middle class ethic, which gradually stripped many of the earlier immigrant’s radical connections. The growing affluence amongst urban whites such as Betty Friedan decidedly had removed them from their radical urban adolescence the “dangerous politics of world revolution whose vanguard we used to fancy ourselves.”\(^{43}\)

Paradoxically, fear, comfort and conformity, were the zeitgeist of the un-ethnic and un-ideological suburbs. In escaping the cities, new nightmares were created in the collapsing urban ghettos and plasticized cookie-cutter suburbs. Those that migrated to urban areas during “urban renewal” were profoundly impacted by this economic collapse and used radical politics to confront this inequity.

The Sicilian and Puerto Rican immigrant experience were fundamentally dissimilar because of key external factors. The economic patterns of the 20\(^{th}\) century along with socio-cultural trends greatly influenced both groups. They both were able to contribute to the panorama of New York history, politics and culture because of their commonalities and differences. The great upheavals of immigration, industrialization, “urban renewal” and the 1960s counter-culture would not be the same without these two groups. Both of these groups sought the same thing in New York and were able to carve a new identity via very different tools. The Sicilians redefined themselves via suburbanization that led to greater assimilation and Puerto Ricans via radical politics that led to urban reform.

---
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Consuming the Ideal:
A Study of Women as Model Consumers During the Interwar Era
By Alana Coulum

The incredible rate of growth during the Meiji era was a source of national pride for Japan. Under the rallying cry of “Prosperous Nation, Strong Military,” Japan rapidly industrialized to catch up to the West. The overwhelming success of the Sino-Japanese War was felt in the Rokumeikan dance hall and traveled down to the new Japanese public, liberated from the former four-class system of Edo. The new middle class emerged during the Taisho Era and by consuming modernity as an ideal, they became the definition of what is modern. The transformation from Edokko (translates as “child of Edo”) to Tokyoite during the Taisho era (1912-1926) was formed by the new class system, which crushed former social barriers. It became less exclusive to take part in leisure activities, as well as consuming modern goods from all around the globe. The more socially liberated the new Tokyoites became, the more freedom they had to consume goods, in the context of a new class-consciousness. All of Japan looked to Tokyo for the newest trends in fashion and taste, which elevated them into becoming the experts in everything modern. Women at this time became empowered by their purchasing power in the market, as well as having full control over the domestic sphere for the first time. This paper will focus on women as a model consumer: one that is in between the political ambitions of the New Woman and the flashy ambiguity of the modern girl.

The result of modernization in Japan was the advent of the new middle class. Generally, the standard of living in Tokyo was raised for all parties during the Taisho era. With expendable income, the new middle class sought to spend their hard-earned money via their salary (a modern concept) by purchasing modern goods. Most of these goods could be found at the department store, which was an important
addition to the daily life of Tokyoites. At this time, the middle class was interested in a new concept of leisure that was not related to religious pilgrimage, which had been the case in earlier times. Department stores were filled with exhibitions, family restaurants, gardens on the roof, and even amusement parks for children. On Sundays, families would head to the parks to relax: Ueno Park housed the country’s first zoo and Hibiya Park had western style fountains and sports lawns for children to play on.¹

Not all of Japan enjoyed the leisure and expendable income of the Tokyo middle class however; Japan began to experience pitfalls of rapid industrialization during the twenties. The economy was drained after the Sino-Japanese and the Russo-Japanese wars, paired with an intense demand for exported western goods. Around this time the Great Kanto Earthquake destroyed 60 percent of homes and factories and financial districts in Tokyo and Yokohama.² Even though Japan’s standard of living rose gradually for rural dwellers, it was still disastrous for a farm family to have a bad harvest. Consumers began to import their rice from the new colonies because of the price until the government raised tariffs. They began to notice the wealth gap between the rural and the urban, which sparked the labor movement. Unions began to form and strikes occurred demanding better wages, safer working conditions, and better living conditions in the factory dormitories.³

At this time unions carried the connotation of socialism, which also saw a rise in popularity. Some socialists argued that union reforms did not go far enough, and called for “political power to the whole body of the populace.”⁴ The capstone of socialist efforts was the High Treason Incident, which was a failed attempt to assassinate the Emperor. This was a highly publicized event that swept through the nation and a major factor that led to the promulgation of the Peace Preservation Laws, which essentially allowed heavy censorship of what was shown in print, or was said over the radio airwaves. Marxist intellectuals also criticized the new bourgeois culture of consumerism, which they attributed to lengthening the gap between the rich and the poor. This all would set the stage for the chaotic modern transformation of Tokyo.⁵

Many scholars have examined the relationship between women and consumerism in the Taisho era. Barbara Sato’s The New Japanese Woman: Modernity, Media, and Women in Interwar Japan chronicles the changing opinion of women during a boom of consumerism. Sato collects many intellectual’s opinions, as well as literature, advertisements, and personal accounts about women. As industrial Japan became faster and faster, so did the women inhabiting it: fashions changed from week to week, women could look forward to the newest issue of their favorite magazine, and plan their next trip to see Clara Bow in theaters. Sato boils down the modern woman into three archetypes: the modern girl or “moga,” the housewife, and the professional working woman.⁶ These new women challenged the previous notion of a yamato nadeshiko, a term that was quickly gaining nostalgia from older men.

Miriam Silverberg and her book Erotic Grotesque Nonsense takes a different approach to analyzing the interwar period. She creates a montage of archetypes that
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were popular, and expands on them individually. Silverberg analyzes language or what she calls code switching, to see if the words *kindai* (the domestic word for modern) or *modan* (the English loan word) were used. It is important to differentiate between these two terms when trying to prove whether Japanese modernism was completely a product of Americanization, or a natural evolution of domestic culture. Silverberg argues the latter conclusion. She also argues that the modern lifestyle was not only targeted towards the white-collar middle class, but towards the working class as well. Because of the department store breaking down social barriers, and because the general literacy and standard of living increased, that working class was exposed to the glitzy modern life. Examples are the café girls, famed for their sexual exploits in magazine literature, who tended to be working class. They bought the same magazines that targeted well to do housewives. The middle class had the salary to consume these new goods, and keep them in their home sphere as opposed to the *shitamachi* (downtown) artisans who lived on the other side of the Sumida River.

Louise Young states that the department store and everything it represented was the only form of modernism that the public could see. The new middle class of white-collar workers was the target for modern consumerism. She focuses a lot on the suburbs created by the new train stations surrounding Tokyo. The department store was one of the few early modern institutions that the public could see, so they are highlighted in literature quite a few times. Young comments that historians have attributed the modern class system to the political and social movements of the time, while ignoring literary evidence in terms of mass culture.

This paper will focus on the women of the middle class who do not necessarily fit the archetypes that Sato and Silverberg present. They were neither the “moga,” the “working women,” nor the café girl who found empowerment in their positions of employment or in how they spend their leisure time. Taisho era literature gives evidence of how the concept of modernity elevated the position of women, especially in terms of class and of being a Tokyoiite.

Tanizaki Junichi’s *Naomi* tells the story of a man’s obsession with a Eurasian looking café waitress named Naomi. He takes her under her wing and vows to raise her as a proper Western wife, only to have this backfire on him in the end. Joji cannot help but be attracted, and eventually ensnared by her flashy allure. Tanizaki himself said the characters from contemporary writer Natsume Soseki were “like characters from a Western novel.” Joji tries his best in buying into a new modern way of life: he buys a “culture home” or a Western style house with a single *tatami* room, buys Naomi expensive western clothes and modern designed muslin kimonos, and gives her English and Western music lessons. No matter how much Joji invests in a western lifestyle, he is held back by the language barrier. It is ironic that Joji’s English is grammatically perfect, but is marred by his accent, while Naomi’s lack of accent allows her to be confident in front of Westerners even though she cannot string a sentence correctly. This metaphor represents the desire of Japan to become
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Western, but there is always something holding them back from becoming fully accepted in their eyes.

In Joji’s case, he is originally from the country and is not a Tokyoite as opposed to Naomi. There is a connotation that people born and bred in Tokyo have a natural affinity to become more modern than their countrymen that live outside of the city. There is a strong pride that runs in the urbanites, Naomi herself even makes fun of Joji for not being from Tokyo. She declares that she is “pure Tokyoite,” and uses this as an excuse to get Joji to buy her new sandals. A reason that Tokyoites feel like they are more suited for adapting a Western lifestyle is because they completely buy into the concept of being modern. Despite Naomi’s poor upbringing and former reputation as a café girl, she can “pass” as a member of the sophisticated new middle class. This is possible because of Naomi’s participation in modern consumer culture and of her natural “Eurasian” appearance, in which she takes pride. This is another example that middle class women were not the only ones who took part in shaping Tokyo culture. She is up to date on the latest kimono patterns and dresses in a way that will make her stand out at each social event she attends. She is also proud of her Eurasian looks: she scoffs at others who fail to imitate a western aesthetic. The pride of the former Edokko may also be linked with national identity itself. Carol Gluck writes that the nostalgia for Edo was created during the Meiji period, and is credited for protecting Japan from Western conquest. The areas of Tokyo that used to be the cultural hotspots of Edo were palaces the

Edokko could relax. Nagai Kafu was a popular novelist who dearly missed the shitamachi culture of old. The writer was frequently critical of the new culture that sprang out of Ginza, criticizing the café girls and western fashions that were past the mode. He was concerned with preserving Edo culture at this risk of becoming too westernized. A way to preserve this is to increase reverence for the Emperor (something inherently Japanese), by mobilizing popular culture to familiarize the Japanese with his new public persona. The Emperor during the Edo period was a mysterious figure, without a public face as opposed to the Shogun who ruled Japan for 250 years. Edo art such as Ukiyo-e paintings were thrust back into vogue appearing side by side with Ginza’s modern girl. Since the center of culture was moved to modern Tokyo, this added another layer of superiority to Tokyoite women.

While Joji participates in doing modern things (such as wearing western clothes to work and going to dance halls) there is a sense of Japanese traditionalism he does not want to give up. In fact, when he is angry with Naomi, he wants to move out of their fairy tale home, and into a traditional Japanese home. He hopes that this would inspire Naomi to take on the role of a traditional housewife, which of course, never happens. The middle class buys into the concept of modernity and develops a kind of class-consciousness. In a way, Naomi is not free because of the higher education Joji gives her, but is trapped to repeatedly buy new patterns for kimono to pass as a middle class woman. Eventually she begins to buy and wear more Western clothes after the move to the Yokohama mansion to appease her Western

---

12 Ibid., 74.
13 Ibid., 71.
14 Ibid., 87.
18 Tanizaki, Naomi, 169.
companions. Joji at this point, lets her do whatever she pleases, fully realizing that she has him wrapped around his finger.

Natsume Soseki’s Sanshiro has a lot in common with Naomi. Readers are introduced to the titular character who is a Kyushu born graduate student looking forward to his time at Tokyo University. There is a strong connection between Sanshiro and Joji since they are both men from the country who are interested in the modern amenities of the middle class. We get the impression that Sanshiro is anxious to live among modern Tokyoites, and lacks confidence, especially around women. His encounter with the dark-skinned mother from Kyushu is our first look at Sanshiro’s inexperience with women, and his inability to realize that mothers are women. The woman even calls him a coward the morning after they slept in the same room together (as Sanshiro had made no move to become intimate with her).¹⁹ This is another facet of Sanshiro’s inexperience and anxiety of moving to Tokyo. There is an important point Soseki makes by pointing out the Kyushu woman’s skin color. Both Soseki and Tanizaki idolize white skin on a woman, which implies they are not performing hard labor, working out in the fields. This becomes an issue of class, as well as gender, when these writers are describing the ideal modern woman.

Both Joji and Sanshiro idealize the woman that they love. Joji desires for Naomi to blossom into a perfect modern woman, and spoils her rotten to achieve that dream. Sanshiro places Mineko (a woman he meets during his first day at the university) so far up a pedestal that it is impossible for him to perceive her as human. Whenever Sanshiro looks at Mineko, he compares her to a beautiful inanimate object, such as a doll or a painting. When they first meet, he was entranced by her: “the sight gave him an impression of pretty colors, nothing more. A country boy, he could not have explained what was pretty about them.”²⁰ It should be noted that the only thing Sanshiro could describe are her clothes, specifically the colors of her kimono and the pattern of her obi. Another time, Sanshiro sees an advertisement for the Mitsukoshi department store, which features a model that resembles Mineko. The only thing that distinguishes the model from Mineko was her eyes and her teeth.²¹ Mineko’s eyes have a special importance in the text: they are what startle Sanshiro out of his infatuation with her. Her dark eyes reminds him of his insecurities around modern women, and he runs away, even though Mineko makes it known that she is interested in him. She goes as far as trying to incite jealousy by paying his friend, Ninomiya an exaggerated amount of attention.

The women of Tokyo perceived by county men are the peak of modernity and sophistication. Soseki makes this point clear when Sanshiro discovers that Mineko is to be wed: “…she has no intention of marrying a man she can’t respect.”²² They are savants of the new modern consumer cultures, and this makes men (Sanshiro in particular) feel inferior to the women they want to court. Although more and more women were starting to receive education past the compulsory level at the time these books were written, these men represented in literature are very intelligent, which in the end, makes them appear even more helpless in front of the women of their affections.

Of course, Tokyo women writers had a different opinion of themselves, which developed out of the concept of joryu or feminine writing. Women authors were frequently frustrated that their personal lives...
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would gain more attention over their work. Higuchi Ichiyo is noted for her opposition of the westernization of her country. She criticized her contemporaries for being too focused on profit rather than the aesthetic quality of literature. Her diary entries give insight on her opinions of contemporary literature and daily worries of trying to support a family of three on her writing. Since Higuchi is opposed to writing for profit, her diary entries are filled with guilt. She is also disheartened that critics consider her a novelty because of her gender and not on the basis of her work. She defends women’s suffrage in an interesting way: since all Japanese were born in Japan, everyone is equally indebted to the Emperor. This was written during the Meiji period and reflects the intense Emperor worship that was introduced after the fall of the Shogunate. She continues to criticize the modernization of her country, that people have become too compliant with borrowing from the west. The Japanese are too comfortable with European extravagance, and they are forgetting the country’s old traditions. It can be extrapolated that Higuchi was not in favor of consumerism. Through the selection of diary entries, Higuchi does not mention the modern styles of kimono, or the grandiose displays of department stores. This is also because she was not part of the middle class that started emerging from the later half of the Meiji Era. Women writers in the Taisho Era were more concerned with the modern, fast-paced lifestyle that emerged from Tokyo as opposed to preserving the classical sense of Japanese beauty.

Tamura Toshiko’s work emerged from the latter half of the Meiji Era. Her tone in writing is reflected in her aspirations to be independent and her many tumultuous relationships with men. One of her most popular stories is Ikichi, which is translated as Lifeblood. This is an account of the psychological scars of a woman losing her virginity, which relies on some symbolism in the form of clothing. The main character, Yuko, looks at the mirror and studies her kimono. She connects the dark red under layer of her clothes to her purity, and laments over that it is something that she can never retrieve. Later, Yuko notices her lover eyeing a young maiko or apprentice geisha dressed in a furisode kimono. Yuko envies the length of her sleeves, since this marks the status of a single, unmarried woman. There is a greater emphasis on clothing in Tamura’s literature, but it should be noted that Japanese clothing was still what the majority of women wore. Since Yuko identifies herself as not being able to wear a furisode kimono, most women were still abiding by older traditions despite the heavy presence in advertising of the café girl, and the risqué modern girl.

Sata Ineko’s Elegy gives a fictional account of life in the Nihombashi district based on her experiences working at the Maruzen bookstore during the twenties. Nihombashi was the center of commercial life during the Edo period, and was home to Tokyo’s first department stores before the great earthquake in 1923. The first growing pains for modernization appeared there with the addition of The First National Bank. Since Nihombashi was so popular
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during the Edo period, trends tended to be more conservative than Ginza or Asakusa, which were quickly becoming the new playgrounds of Taisho Japan. Sata was proud of her profession, as she describes the shop employees as career women who “you could identify them at a glance” when describing the department store employee’s uniform. She elaborates that store giants, such as Mitsukoshi and Matsuzakaya had started a new trend in employing a great number of female clerks. This boom of employing women was mostly due to the post war economy’s successes after World War I causing a desire to increase the standard of living. At the center of this need to consume was the emerging middle class, which included the working woman. Although she was a clear minority in the labor force, the working woman was a major target for consumption by advertisers and magazines, especially for those few who balanced childrearing and professional careers. The new middle class was expected to update their home with modern amenities, and to partake in leisure activities, all of which can be done at the local department store.

As with most women at this time (save for the flashy modern girl), the working woman still wore traditional Japanese garb with modern patterns. They were usually made out of *meisen* because they were cheaper to produce. Department stores would often commission designers to create modern patterns, to attract customers in buying unique items. Mitsukoshi started this practice as far back as 1895, and catered toward seasonal preferences.

As a result of this mixture of dress, department stores changed their policy of wearing shoes. Traditionally, one would remove their shoes before entering a dwelling, a custom still followed today. In the Edo period, customers would take off their *geta* or wooden sandals before entering the store, and a clerk would check them in. During the Taisho Era, western street shoes became more popular with men, and department stores allowed them to keep their shoes on inside. This is evidence of the blending of cultures through fashion, as well as the changes of industrialization, due to Tokyo’s newly clean paved streets. The department store also represented social expansionism by gradually abolishing customers checking in their shoes.
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destroyed an old social barrier to entry since window shoppers who were poor would feel too embarrassed to check in their dirty and tattered sandals.  

Enter the department store, and the senses are attacked with the grandeur of the modern art deco architecture, with large marble columns, stained glass, nods to Western cultures (the Mitsukoshi lions were modeled after Trafalgar Square) and event hall on the roof of the store. In Mitsukoshi’s case, this style of architecture was a far cry from the former Edo style buildings that were designed solely for the selling and appraising of kimono. The modern department store had multiple levels to house the sheer amount of goods they imported, as well as installing glass panels to allow window shoppers to peruse. Previously, there would be a seated attendant (usually male) to wait on each customer to pitch different patterns of kimono for sale. This position was phased out because of the new layout of the department store and the general switch to appeal a mass-market economy. The seated kimono attendant found new life as the department store clerk.

As for the goods themselves, one group of items that held influence over an upper middle class family was furniture. As mentioned before, Mitsukoshi hired many designers and intellectuals to create floor plans for their exhibits. These were essentially museums since none of these items were for sale. The designers struggled with how to perceive traditional Japanese interior design, as a boring blank slate, or the culmination of traditional minimalist design. This is an example of the middle class looking toward the department store, to see what is currently in vogue. At this point in time, there was not much expression of individual taste. Much like the practicality of men’s suits, furniture appealed to the same dynamic of getting the work done. No one at the office sits on the floor during work, so neither should the salary man when he brings some work home.  

Another example of Mitsukoshi influencing home life is the dowry. The wedding dowry is the only moveable object in the woman’s domain of the home; she will keep this for the rest of her life until it will be passed down to her children in the future, and, in case of an emergency, it can be moved. During the twenties, modernization entered the domestic sphere by urbanizing the process of ordering a dowry, by ordering from a Mitsukoshi catalog that had advertisements from small companies. As more people ordered from the catalog, the dowry became more streamlined and urbanized, eventually becoming known as a style that is inherently Tokyo. This is an example of the influence Mitsukoshi had over style not only towards middle-class consumers, but the entirety of Japan as well.

Modernism also began pitching a new way to spend time with family, specifically at the dinner table. Traditionally, the family would use their individual trays and utensils, while sitting on the ground. If a family were to eat at the dinner table, it suggests that everyone is eating the same meal from the same surface, and would end a feudal custom of the husband as the master of the household. This stops an aspect of the chain of inferiority below the husband, and somewhat empowers the wife, at least in her domain of the home. In The River Ki by Ariyoshi Sawako there is a small example of
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dinnertime mannerisms changing through generations, and between husband and wife. Hana, the wife is irked at her husband Keisuke because he picked up a pickled radish from the center of the table, and placed it directly into his mouth instead of placing it on his individual dish. Hana chalks this up to be that her original clan is higher up than the one she unfortunately married into.\textsuperscript{37}

The novel as a whole traces the female lineage through the Matani clan and documents the changing interests of a woman from the Meiji to Showa eras. Hana, who is the matriarch, exemplifies the attributes of a \textit{yamato nadeshiko}. She is proficient in classical Japanese arts such as reciting traditional poetry and is demanding of her children. Her daughter Fumio however, puts all of her effort into being modern, as opposed to being a perfect wife. Fumio is an avid reader of magazines, is adamant about studying in Tokyo, and eventually chooses her own lover, as opposed to a traditional arranged marriage. Hana is desperate to keep the 19th century traditions alive because she connects these traditions to the wellbeing of her family.

These examples show the influence that Tokyo held over perceptions about national style, and modern living conditions. General conditions in Tokyo also allowed for a set family time on Sundays. Families would go for walks or have a picnic in parks, or spend their time in the play areas designed for children in a department store. This movement was somewhat inspired by the new wave of athleticism in American Victorianism, and by the new modern institutions set up in Tokyo.\textsuperscript{38}

Women found power in consumerism, as it was one of the few places in which they could make decisions. More women in the city were heading to the department store unknowingly challenging previous concerns of frugality (which was a quality praised and institutionalized by the Meiji government).\textsuperscript{39} Department stores and advertising companies took advantage of this influx of profit, to feature trendy, modern, women in catalogs and billboards. Eventually the modern girl, or “moga” for short, would appear from this group of fashion-conscious, leisure class women. These magazines would have tips for cooking and cleaning around the house, or may have some scandalous articles that may serve as a form of escapism. The moga would cut their hair, and dress themselves in western style, while intellectuals would attempt to discover their ulterior motives and try to decipher any political message from them.

The poster girl of the interwar period was the modern girl, who was a visually striking product of consumer culture and an immediate object of public attention. It is no wonder then, why advertisers chose to plaster the modern girl as an eye-catching ad. Most urban dwellers had an opinion about them. Intellectuals were baffled; they struggled to define their purpose. Most intellectuals assumed they were an extension of the New Woman, and because of this, they were expected to take political or social action. Instead they did no such thing; the “moga” were just girls who wanted to have fun. They were nurtured by the bourgeois society of modern Japan, and the heavy American influence in the media. In fact, Hiratsuka Raicho (editor of the feminist \textit{Seito} magazine) heavily criticized
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the “moga” as she did not see them having the correct mindset to be considered modern.

Popular writers of this era also projected their own view of what a modern girl should be. They fueled the negativity surrounding the “moga”, by continuously picturing them as pleasure seekers. Gossip spread like wildfire from cheap magazines, and the police would go as far as to staking out nightclubs, bars, and hotels, to see if they can catch a liaison. Even American cinema swayed public opinion; these films would focus on the immoral, imagined “moga.” As a result of this, more women began questioning traditional arranged marriages. Some materials being published for women would have short stories and advice columns on sex and love. This new public image of the imagined modern girl began to influence the women of Japan, and this terrified the older public, although most of these advertisements seem to be targeted more toward men. Advertisements for cafés, hotels, and clubs were more provocative in content as opposed to ones targeted for women. For example, an ad for Café Madam displays a topless woman holding a wine glass. The “moga” was a tool to advertise to leisure class women and men, while unknowingly creating a gap between what is modern to normal women, and what is the ideal picture of modernity.

Of course, the modern girl represented a fragment of Taisho society that promoted an extravagant consumer lifestyle. Generally, scholars see the Taisho period as a break from former Meiji state management, but this does not mean that the state’s presence was completely lost. New campaigns sprung up promoting thrift and the prevention of wasting goods. To be modern, it was not enough to nearly to consume frivolously, but to be conscientious and mindful of what you buy. This attracted women because this new freedom empowered them with having full control over the domestic sphere. The unions and pro-frugality groups that appeared during the twenties were largely democratic institutions, some having a heavy Christian influence from missionaries that were popular in the previous decade.

Most housewives at this time were avid readers of Shufu no tomo (Housewife’s Friend), which, featured advice columns on how to live a conservative and frugal life, as well as addressing employment concerns and women’s suffrage issues. The magazine’s founder was Hani Mokoto, who urged readers to pursue individual career goals, talents, and hobbies, while focusing on the well being of the family. She stressed the importance of balancing the career and home, while underlining how women should be free to make their own decisions. Shufu no tomo also housed advertising space, which displayed and recommended yukata and other types of kimono for sale. These advertisements targeted the housewife, who was not considered modern in the definition held by intellectuals who were too busy chasing after the modern girl. Rather, they were armed with new modern tools to complete their domestic errands, all while wearing traditional clothing. It should be noted that the covers of early issues of Shufu no tomo did not have images of a bijin (beauty). They used symbols such as flowers to represent the magazine focused on femininity, but without limiting what a
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consumer’s image of femininity should be based on the cover. This is reflected in the magazine’s publishing style, by embracing modern print making techniques and commissioning painters to create covers. This is not unlike department stores commissioning artists and designers for exhibits and kimono designs. *Shufu no tomo* was a compilation of practical knowledge for the housewife, utilizing modern techniques to print Hani Mokoto’s image of what a modern woman is.

The newspaper *Yomiuri* would have articles that were also targeted towards housewives, providing helpful tips on how to prepare food, what to wear in certain situations, and much more. In the June issue of *Yomiuri katei shiori* (*yomiuri household pamphlet*) there is an article suggesting what footwear salary men should wear on a rainy day. Since June is the month of the *tsuyu* (rainy season) it makes sense that there would be an article on seasonal outerwear. The article recommends that you should wear “overshoes” (which was written in *katakana*, a written syllabary used to specifically write foreign loan words) when you are running errands on a rainy day. It is especially important to remind your husband to bring his umbrella to work. Wearing these “overshoes” that cover the entire foot would be more comfortable in the rain as opposed to traditional *geta* sandals. The article also recommends drying wet shoes in your *kutsubako* (the shoebox you will find at the entrance of a Japanese home). This article is catered to the wives of husbands who wear western clothes to work, meaning the emerging middle class.

Another article in *Yomiuri katei shiori* during the December issue is about applying *setsuyaku* (frugality) during the end of year gift giving season (*oseibo*). The article suggests avoid buying “wasteful” gifts by spending too much money. Instead, think of a thoughtful gift to give from your heart (*kokoro bakari*). The article also lists other ways to be frugal during the holiday season, such as reducing the amount of coal used to warm the house or apartment. By focusing on a frugal lifestyle, these articles are meant for the middle class who has the ability to consciously track how much they consume. This is an idea that developed during the interwar period that redefined a Tokyoite as one who integrates modern concepts of thrift into their lifestyle as opposed to the monetary concerns of an Edokko.

As the former traditions of the Edo period begin to crumble, the Edokko never forgot where they came from, especially the women who for the most part, maintained the older style of living. For those few who decided to break away from tradition, they were flung into the new high paced life of modern living, and were closely survived by intellectuals and authors. For most women who were urban dwellers, the transformation of modernism was gradual and practical, as advocated by popular magazines targeted for women. Some were newly empowered by their new class standing, and gained total control over the domestic sphere. As the oligarchic control of the Meiji state morphed into the Taisho democracy, Tokyoites found themselves with new social freedoms and leisure that the Edokko could not afford. New institutions such as department stores, bars, and clubs would become the definition of being modern, as the rest of Japan looked toward the commissioned works of Tokyo designers, elevating the superiority of Tokyoite culture. The beginnings of the modern middle class housewife were
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humble and practical. She practiced thrift while shopping with her family in her kimono, and supported her suit-wearing husband with a modern lifestyle that can only be obtained by living in Tokyo.
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