

CRESCAT SCIENTIA

UTAH VALLEY STATE COLLEGE
JOURNAL OF HISTORY



VOLUME II
SPRING 2004

Mailed manuscripts should be sent to: *Crescat Scientia* c/o Dr. Keith Snedegar, Utah Valley State College Department of History and Political Science, 800 West University Parkway, Orem Utah 84058. Call (801) 863-8487, Fax (801) 863-7013.

Crescat Scientia is an annual publication of the UVSC Department of History and Political Science. Issues are available for distribution during the Spring semester of each academic year. To obtain subscription information or to obtain back copies of *Crescat Scientia* contact the Editor-in-Chief, or the History Department.

© 2004 Utah Valley State College Department of History and Political Science. All rights reserved.

General Guidelines for Submission

For students interested in submitting a manuscript for review and possible publication, the following guidelines provide an overview of the requirements. For more specific information, please contact the UVSC History Department or visit the History Department's web page.

To submit a manuscript: provide a complete version of the paper, including a cover sheet, with desired alterations already made. Editors will check for spelling errors and layout problems, not for substantial revision opportunities. Submissions should be written in accordance with the Turabian style of citation. The cover sheet should have a running head, author's name, permanent street address, email address, and a phone number. The body of your manuscript must have no markers which may identify the author (IE: name, class, professor etc). Submit a hard copy as well as one copy of the paper on disk. The disk version of your paper must be in Microsoft Word®. On a separate sheet of paper, provide a brief biographical sketch of yourself including things such as the degree you are working toward, previous degrees received, future plans (graduate school, work), awards the paper has won, other areas of personal interest, etc. Please deliver your paper, disk, and biographical information, sealed in a manilla envelope, to the History Department addressed to: "Editor-In-Chief, c/o History Department RE:Academic Journal Submission"

Works submitted must be thematically concentrated in the discipline of history. Length of submissions may be anywhere between 5 and 50 pages and must not previously have been published.

CRESCAT SCIENTIA
UVSC JOURNAL OF HISTORY

Editor-in-Chief

Angela Mordecai Mickiewicz

Editing Staff

Assistant Editors:

Courtney Burns
Jacquie A. Neilson
Adam Dean Smith
Erik Stuart Smith

Faculty Advisor

Dr. Keith Snedegar, History Department Chair

Published Annually for the Utah Valley State College Department of History
and Political Science

Office of the Editor-in-Chief

Utah Valley State College, Department of History and Political Science,
800 West University Parkway, MS 185, Orem, Utah 84058.
Phone: (801) 863-8487. Fax: (801) 863-7013.



Dear Reader,

I invite you to explore the pages of the Utah Valley State College Journal of History. This journal testifies to the true genius of UVSC, a spirit not emanating so much from the dry wisdom of professors and not embodied so much by the institutional architecture of the place, but a spirit galvanized by first explorations and personified by skeptical classroom audiences—that is to say this genius exists within the student writers and editors themselves.

As faculty advisor these past two years, I have had exceedingly little to do with the creation and maintenance of the UVSC Journal of History. I say this not to distance myself from the inevitable typo or historical error contained herein, but to give credit where it is plainly due. Two of our most accomplished students, Jacob Sommer and Thom Mesaros, invented the Journal and oversaw its first volume. Theirs was quite a notable achievement. This year Angela Mickiewicz has presided with single-handed heroism over volume two. I note with some satisfaction that the second issue is more historically abundant than the first. Well done, Angela!

Join me in congratulating Angela, her editorial assistants, and especially the student authors, on the publication of *Crescat Scientia*, Volume II.

Their genius is coming into its own.

With sincere regards,

Keith Snedegar



ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This journal would not have been published without three main people. Kathren Brown offered advice while pushing her students for journal submissions. Laura Coffman-Jones allowed us to impose on her countless times. The editorial staff used her space, time, and advice. Most importantly, Keith Snedegar, The Department Chair of History and Political Science offered knowledge, advice, and the financial support for the journal.

Thanks are also given to the staff and faculty of the History and Political Science Department who announced and encouraged journal submissions. The last thank you goes to the students who submitted papers, whether those papers were accepted or not. All the submissions are appreciated and I encourage all students to keep submitting paper.

Thank you.



CRESCAT SCIENTIA

UVSC JOURNAL OF HISTORY

VOLUME 2

SPRING 2004

CONTENTS

Editors Note	Angela Mickiewicz	1
The Vital Role of Soviet Industrialization In the Defeat of Nazi Germany	Michael Difabio	3
Bedroom Behavior: The Emerging Sexuality of the Roman Woman (200 B.C.E.- C.E. 250)	Michelle De la Cerda	25
Bui Doi: The Dust of Life	Erica Beus	39
Conspiracy, Murder, and Cover-up: The Mountain Meadows Massacre	Arthur A. Hatfield	47
The Bill of Rights: A Popular Victory for Liberalism in the American Founding	Ryan Vogel	55
Implications of Gracchi Violence in the Roman Republic	Shannon Drage	69
Mutilation of History: How Those Who Deny the Holocaust Malign a People and a Profession	Amber Frampton	83
Rethinking Mormon Polygamy: A Different Perspective	Breton Friel	91
The Historiography of India	Brittany A. Lassetter	109

BIOGRAPHICAL NOTES

Staff	121
Authors	124



Time present and time past

Are both perhaps present in time future,
And time future contained in time past.¹

History may be servitude,

History may be freedom.²

—*Four Quartets*, T.S. Eliot

Historical events along with present events shape and guide what happens in the future. There is a hope among most historians that in studying the past, writing about it, and creating awareness, events in the future can be improved. One often hears, “History repeats itself.” With the time that passes, one might think history is in the past and has no relevance today but if history repeats itself that is because people don’t follow the lessons of the past. History permeates thoughts and actions; guiding, influencing, and shaping everything we do.

Last years Editor’s Note tells us the title of this journal, *Crescat Scientia*, means ‘may knowledge increase.’ One of the purposes of this journal is to allow students an outlet to contribute insight, discernment, and understanding, for everyone’s benefit. Hopefully this journal will provide knowledge and an understanding of the past that can help improve the future. My hope for this journal, now and in the future, is to give students at UVSC an outlet to gain a better resume, for whatever future plans they might have. I know students write many research papers, sometimes many different ones in the same semester, and the research ends with turning the paper into a professor. I say use your papers. Submit papers to journals, to conferences, and to anything else that gives you the opportunity. Gain an edge in the competitive market facing you as you go into graduate school or the work force. “The future belongs to those who prepare for it”³ for, “He who is not ready today will be less so tomorrow.”⁴

Angela Mickiewicz

Editor-in-Chief

1 T.S. Eliot. *Four Quartets*. San Diego: Harcourt, 1943: 55.

2 Ibid., 13.

3 Ralph Waldo Emerson. *Richard Evans’ Quote Book*. Ed. Richard L. Evans. Salt Lake City: Publishers Press, 1971: 69.

4 Ovid. *Richard Evans’ Quote Book*. Ed. Richard L. Evans. Salt Lake City: Publishers Press, 1971: 61.



THE VITAL ROLE OF SOVIET INDUSTRIALIZATION IN THE DEFEAT OF NAZI GERMANY

BY: MICHAEL DIFABIO

Introduction

On June 22, 1941, buoyed by two years of success, Hitler turned his tanks to the east against the Soviet Union. The invasion, code-named Operation Barbarossa, would attempt to secure the fertile soil and bountiful resources of the Western USSR; including the Ukraine, the Donets Basin, the Caucus oil fields, Leningrad and Moscow.¹ If successful, Hitler believed, Germany would finally rise to the status of the respected and feared continental power that he had envisioned.² In short, Barbarossa was an attempt to fulfill a sort of pan-Germanic “manifest destiny,” an idea that dated back to the nineteenth century when optimistic German farmers sought out new land and established colonies in parts of the Ukraine. Ultimately, the Germans would fail and the Red Guards would storm the Reichstag in May of 1945.³ The USSR west of the Volga, central Europe and Germany lay shattered. As a result the German tri-color would fly below the red banner and Soviet troops would be quartered on German soil for forty-five years. Many reasons have been suggested as causes for the German defeat in the last 55 years, including Hitler’s bungling,⁴ the severe winters,⁵ and Soviet advantages in population and industry.⁶ While there were doubtless many causes for German failure, it was the latter, the Soviet superiority in industrial capacity, that played the greatest role in the Soviet victory. The implications of this conclusion are just as pertinent to military science and war studies today as at the end of the war and deserve a fresh assessment in light of access to new information.

1 Matthew Cooper, *The German Army 1933-1945* (Lanham: Scarborough House, 1978), 261.

2 Ibid, 259.

3 Cornelius Ryan, *The Last Battle* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1966), 502.

4 Heinz Guderian, *Panzer Leader*, trans. Constantine Fitzgibbon (New York: Da Capo Press, 1996), 413.

5 John Shaw and the editors of Time-Life Books, *Red Army Resurgent* (Alexandria: Time-Life Books, 1979), 8.

6 Charles Winchester, *Ostfront, Hitler’s War on Russia 1941-45* (Oxford: Osprey Publishing, 2000), 12.

Lenin and War Communism

The German Army that crossed the frontier into Russia in 1941 would not be facing the hollow tsarist armies that had opposed their fathers a generation earlier in 1917, an army that the Russian high command referred to as, "...simply a huge, weary, shabby, and ill-fed mob of angry men united in their common thirst for peace."⁷ Stalin would ensure through vigorous, yet sloppily implemented, plans that any foreign army attempting to influence the future of the young Soviet Union would meet the resources of a fully industrialized nation.⁸

The origins of Stalin's desire to create a modern industrial state to compete with the west lay in the origins of the Soviet Union itself. By June of 1918, less than a year removed from the October Revolution, most of the former Russian Empire's territory was not under Soviet control.⁹ The young communist state had arrayed against it hostile "white" governments supported by powerful foreign interests such as the United States.¹⁰ Lenin, Stalin's predecessor, gradually increased government control over the economy in regions controlled by the Bolsheviks in order to bring as much support as possible to his forces waging the civil war. The system he implemented, the foundation for the later rapid forced industrialization of the Soviet Union, was "War Communism."¹¹ The main thrust of "War Communism" was the forced nationalization of major industries, to include, according to renowned historian of the Bolshevik Revolution Edward H. Carr, "mining, metallurgical, textile, electrical, timber, tobacco, resin, glass and pottery, leather and cement industries, all steam-driven mills, local utilities and private railway..."¹² Lenin's, and later Stalin's, drive for industrialization can be more clearly understood within the context of what the young communist state was undergoing between 1917 and 1920. According to Nicholas V. Riasanovsky,

The rigors of War Communism on the home front largely resulted from and paralleled the bitter struggle the Soviet regime was waging with its external enemies....a score of foreign states intervened by sending some armed forces into Russia and supporting certain local movements and governments, as well as by blockading Soviet Russia from October 1919 to January 1920....it appeared that everyone was trying to strike a blow against the Communist regime.¹³

7 Robert L. O'Connell, *Of Arms and Men* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989), 267.

8 Peter Kenez, *A History of the Soviet Union from the Beginning to the End* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 89.

9 R.W. Davies, Mark Harrison and S.G. Wheatcroft eds., *The Economic Transformation of the Soviet Union, 1913-1945* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 5.

10 *Ibid.*, 5-6.

11 *Ibid.*

12 Edward H. Carr, quote found in: Nicholas V. Riasanovsky, *A History of Russia*, fourth edition (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984), 478-479.

13 *Ibid.*

Lenin realized that for his nation, the most backward of the large European powers,¹⁴ to compete and survive would require more than just nationalization of industry. Lenin wrote in 1918, of taking the state's authority to a new level, "our task is to learn state capitalism from the Germans, to take it over with all our might, and not to spare dictatorial methods in taking it over, in still greater measure than Peter hastened the taking over of westernism by barbaric Rus', not shrinking at barbaric means of fighting barbarism."¹⁵ With the death of Lenin in 1924, the way had already been made for his successor Stalin to use unopposed every ounce of the state and her people's strength in pursuit of industrialization and modernization of the Soviet Union.

Stalinist Industrialization

"We are fifty or a hundred years behind the advanced countries, we must make good this distance in ten years...or they will crush us."¹⁶ —Josef Stalin.

The first Stalin inspired five-year plan for industrialization was implemented in 1927,¹⁷ in an attempt to bring the Soviet Union up to the standards of the West. Although hampered by unrealistic expectations¹⁸ and lack of planning,¹⁹ the plan succeeded nonetheless in achieving massive industrial growth: a five year industrial growth rate of 19.2 percent was claimed.²⁰ The overwhelming emphasis of the new industrial growth lay in heavy industry that could easily be converted to military production such as tank and armaments building in wartime.²¹

In 1967 the Soviet Union maintained a numbered list of over 1,000 factories and shipyards essential to the national defense.²² The list included factories that had opened during and closed after the Second World War. The existence of the list was deemed as sensitive to the security of the USSR and was therefore declassified only as recently as 1991. It included factories of the following classifications: aerospace, armor, arma-

14 Davies, 5.

15 Robert C. Tucker, *Stalin in Power: The Revolution from above, 1928-1941* (New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 1990), 31.

16 Eric D. Weitz, *A Century of Genocide, Utopias of Race and Nation* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003), 56.

17 Kenez, 82.

18 Ibid.

19 Ibid, 90.

20 Ibid, 91.

21 Ibid.

22 Julian Cooper, Keith Dexter and Mark Harrison, *The Numbered Factories and Other Establishments of the Soviet Defense Industry, 1927-67: A Guide, Part I. Factories and Shipyards* (Birmingham: University of Birmingham Centre for Russian and East European Studies, 1999), Occasional paper no. 2, ISBN 0704485206

ment, atomic weapons, electronics, liquid fuels, munitions, and shipbuilding.²³ Astonishingly, of the roughly 1,000 factories, over 850 began operating between 1927 and 1941²⁴ during the fourteen year span between the implementation of the first five-year plan and the German invasion. The establishment of this massive industrial base would contribute significantly to Soviet production superiority over Germany during the war years, but most importantly it demonstrated the Soviet Union's awesome potential for the type of rapid industrial growth that would be required to out-produce the Germans. The overwhelming majority of the remaining 150 or so factories began operating during the war.²⁵ After the war, many of the factories were converted to aerospace, atomic, and other technologies in-order to keep pace with progress.²⁶

Red Army Doctrine Influences Industrialization

Throughout the planning and development of the twenties and thirties, Soviet industry received impetus for direction from the Red Army, an organization with an evolving doctrine that was at the center of any eventual defense of the nation. During the Russian Civil War of 1918-1921, the period of "War Communism," the Soviet commissar of military affairs, Trotsky, made extensive use of the existing railway lines to quickly move troops, reserves and supplies from front to front.²⁷ The against-the-odds success of the Red Army in this situation did not go unnoticed and would lead to massive expansion of Soviet rail under Lenin and Stalin. In the twenty year period between 1920 and 1940 the length of rail line in Soviet territories increased from 71,600²⁸ to 106,100 kilometers.²⁹ This rail later played a massive role in the evacuation of Soviet industry from areas threatened by the German invasion to safe areas east of Moscow and vitally the transportation of equipment and troops from areas in the east toward the front in the west.

The direction provided by the Red Army through doctrinal considerations to Soviet industry produced, in 1939, the T-34 tank. The preeminent proponent of armor exploitation warfare in the Soviet Union was Mikhail N. Tukhachevsky. Tukhachevsky learned from his experience as a civil war commander in the Red Army. He studied and sought a solution to the

23 Ibid, i.

24 Ibid.

25 Ibid.

26 Ibid.

27 David M. Glantz and Jonathan House, *When Titans Clashed* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1995), 5.

28 B.R. Mitchell, *International Historical Statistics, Europe 1750-1988* (New York: Stockton Press, 1992), 659.

29 Ibid, 662.

stalemate trench warfare on the western front in the First World War.³⁰ The proposed solution was deep mechanized thrusts into enemy forces which would not allow the organization of any solid defenses. This was not a completely original concept.³¹ David Glantz and Jonathan House, however, note what was unique about the doctrine within the Soviet context,

The idea of a deep, mechanized operation was unusual but not unique for its time. Military theory in all major armies evolved in the same general direction, using varying degrees of mechanization to penetrate enemy defenses and thereby defeat or avoid the stalemate of trench warfare. *What was unprecedented about the Soviet concept was the official sanction it received from the Soviet dictator I.V.Stalin, who geared a large proportion of his five-year economic development plans to provide the industrial capacity and production needed to implement that concept.*³² [Italics added]

Tuchachevsky (and tens of thousands of other competent experienced Soviet commanders) ultimately lost his life in the Stalinist purges of the Red Army between 1937 and 1939,³³ but the doctrine that he helped establish would ironically lead to the development of what was probably the single most effective tank of the war.

30 Glantz, 7.

31 Ibid, 8.

32 Ibid, 8-9.

33 Tucker, 437-440.

Figure 1: T-34 Tank at Soviet victory monument, Berlin. Photo by author.



The T-34 tank was just as much the product of Stalin's drive for industrialization on a scale never before seen as it was of evolving Red Army doctrine. The new mechanized doctrine would require of Soviet industry and designers tanks with "thicker armour and greater fire-power, but highly mobile and reliable,"³⁴ according to the memoirs of the capable Soviet Marshal G. K. Zhukov. Designed in 1939 by a team under M.I. Koshkin,³⁵ the T-34, (as will be shown in the section detailing comparative production figures), was a superb tank, doubtless the best in the world at the time of its first action in 1941. The production of the T-34 and subsequent variants represents just one example of the successes of pre-war Soviet industrialization which, if listed in detail, would include many other tank, aircraft, and artillery designs. With all but one exception, the T-34 was produced in relative 'safe' areas, that is, beyond the reach of an eventual German assault, as a result of Stalin's successful late 1930s industrial drive.

34 G. K. Zhukov, *The Memoirs of Marshal Zhukov*, translated by APN Novosti (New York: Delacorte Press, 1971), 197.

35 B. T. White, *Tanks and Other Armoured Fighting Vehicles of World War II* (London: Peerage Books, 1972), 131.

Table 1: Factories that produced T-34 and components.³⁶

Factory #(s)	Name	Location	Start of Operation
50	Frunze	Ekaterinburg	1943
75,100	Malysheva	Chelyabinsk	1941
77	Barnaultransmash	Barnaul	1941
112	Krasnoe Sormovo	Gorkii	1937
174	Voroshilova	Omsk	1941
183	(KhPZ) Kominterna	Khar'kov	1940
183	Uralvagonz-d (UVZ)	Nizhnii Tagil'	1941

As can be seen from the data in Table One, the location of all but one of the T-34 production facilities (Khar'kov) are well outside of the German occupation and all but one plant (Gorkii) out of the effective range of the Luftwaffe (German air-force). Plant 183 at Khar'kov in Ukraine was evacuated by rail to Nizhnii Tagil' west of the Urals in late 1941;³⁷ a move only made possible by the aforementioned rapid expansion of the Soviet rail system in the years preceding the war. The two main plants, 112 at Sormovo and 183 in Khar'kov, began operation during that critical time frame from the introduction of the five year plan system and before the start of the war. An important production plant for which no data was listed on the index of Soviet military industry centers was the Dzerzhinsky Tractor Works of Stalingrad (Volgograd) which remarkably continued producing tanks even as the plant found itself on the front lines, testifying to the toughness of the Soviet industrial system and its workers.³⁸

³⁶ Julian Cooper, 4-9.

³⁷ Ibid.

³⁸ William Craig, *Enemy at the Gates* (Old Saybrook: Konecky & Konecky, 1973), 36.

German Planning Failures

The massive pre-war developments in Soviet industry were not given adequate credence by the German planners of Barbarossa. In July of 1940 the duty of planning the invasion of the Soviet Union was given to General Eric Marks, the Chief of Staff at 18th Army which was at that time facing to the east.³⁹ Marks scoffed at the Soviet industry east of Moscow in the operational plan for Barbarossa. He stated, "The main centers of the Russian war economy lie in the food and raw-material producing areas of the Ukraine and Donets Basin and in the armament industries of Moscow and Leningrad. The eastern industrial regions are not yet productive enough."⁴⁰ While Marks may have been technically correct, he and his superiors failed to appreciate the potential for rapid industrial growth demonstrated by the Soviets during the nineteen-thirties.

While considering potential Soviet industrial capacity, another factor that the German planners could not possibly have anticipated was the massive evacuation of Soviet industry from the west to the east of the Urals beginning just three days after the German attack.⁴¹ This massive undertaking would have the effect of putting much of the Soviet war industry out of the reach of the attacking German forces, including their air forces, that lacked a heavy strategic bomber wing. In all, from June to November of 1941, the Soviets evacuated over 1,500⁴² heavy industrial factories and 1,300⁴³ military works, taking nearly a million⁴⁴ rail car loads from the west to just east of the Volga or as far as western Siberia: a massive feat of industry in and of itself. Nevertheless, after the first year of fighting, the natural resources and industrial base of the Soviet Union had been smashed down to just two-thirds of what it had been before the war due to German occupation and increased levels of use.⁴⁵

Hitler and his generals gambled that the conflict would last six months⁴⁶ planning for the majority of the Red Army and Air Force to be completely destroyed in the opening months. While they did inflict staggering losses that seemed nearly impossible to replace, Soviet manpower and industry proved equal to the challenge. The Soviets were dealing with decreasing resources from the outset, making their eventual production figures even more impressive. Production suffered during the first year of the war, but quickly rebounded as the industrial base established in the

39 Matthew Cooper, 260.

40 Ibid, 261.

41 Clive Pointing, *Armageddon* (New York: Random House, 1995), 126.

42 O'Connell, 287.

43 Ibid.

44 Pointing, 126.

45 Ibid.

46 Cooper, 260.

thirties slowly recovered from the damage that had been inflicted through the loss of territory and manpower. The factories that had evacuated wasted little time in getting back to full operational status, pressing workers to their human limits by forcing them to produce around the clock.⁴⁷ Additionally, not only had the basis for a massive industrial expansion been laid in the thirties, but valuable experience in the rapid expansion of industry had been gained, making that transition more efficient in wartime.⁴⁸

Some Germans were aware of the massive roll of the dice that Hitler was taking by turning his tanks to the east. Heinz Guderian, the general who developed the German doctrine for motorized warfare wrote in 1937:

Some powers may have considerable natural resources and colonial territories at their disposal, and derive therefrom a considerable degree of independence both in war and peace; others [Germany for example], who are no less viable and may, indeed, often be larger in terms of population, will possess a very restricted base of raw materials and few if any colonial territories. Because of this they live in a state of continuous economic stress and are in no position to sustain a long war.⁴⁹

Guderian later suggested a rapid form of motorized warfare leaning heavily on the tank as the answer to Germany's woes, the static interlocking trenches which took German initiative away in the First World War and led to her eventual defeat. Massed formations of tanks would be used in a narrow area of engagement with the enemy, supported by artillery and ground attack aircraft. When a breakthrough was achieved it would be rapidly exploited by a motorized advance through the breach: Blitzkrieg.⁵⁰ The campaigns that Germany would wage from necessity had to be quick, violent engagements. The Germans put Guderian's motorized warfare theories to the test first against the Poles and later against the English and French. In these arenas his doctrine stood up, the Poles were defeated in two weeks,⁵¹ the French in a month.⁵² These lightning quick victories and another in the Balkans lulled Hitler and the German high command into believing that their rapid attack motorized doctrine could conquer all foes. What Hitler and his generals failed to account for was the massive geographic size of the Soviet Union coupled with the determination of her people and, most importantly, her level of industrialization. As a result, the

47 Allan R. Millett and Williamson Murray, *A War to be Won: Fighting the Second World War* (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2000), 538.

48 Tucker, 201.

49 Heinz Guderian, *Achtung-Panzer!*, trans. Christopher Duffy (London: Cassell & Co., 1992), 23.

50 Ibid, 202.

51 Guderian, *Panzer Leader*, 82.

52 Ibid, 135.

Germans recorded losses on a scale they had not seen during the invasion of the Soviet Union. The diary of the Chief of Staff of the German Army, Franz Halder, on August 2, 1941 just six weeks after the invasion reported that "VII and IX Corps have apparently captured enough enemy vehicles at Mogilev to fill all their requirements...situation is worst in the 18th Armored Division, 30 percent are total losses!"⁵³ Armor losses had occurred that the Germans could not possibly hope to replace with captured vehicles. On the 28th of August General Buhle made a report to Halder giving vehicle status,

Deficit of motor vehicles: 38,000; 50 percent in armored forces, and 25 percent each in [general headquarters]. Troops and one-fourth of infantry divisions.

Tank Situation:

[Armored Group] 1: Average, 50 percent (16th Mot. Div. poorest)

[Armored Group] 2: 10th [Armored] Div., 83 percent 18th [Armored] Div., 57 percent All other [Armored Divisions], average 45 percent

[Armored Group] 3: 7th [Armored Division] has only 24 percent left

All other [divisions], average 45 percent...⁵⁴

German industry by comparison failed utterly to meet the challenges posed by conflict with the USSR. The German Armaments Minister, Albert Speer, complained repeatedly in his memoirs about Hitler's meddling in the realm of arms production. "Amateurishness was one of Hitler's dominant traits,"⁵⁵ Speer quipped. Speer and Guderian agreed that Hitler's preoccupation with production of new models as opposed to the production of repair parts for existing models may have reduced German tank strengths by up to 20 percent during the war.⁵⁶ Further, Hitler's request for specific specifications in German tanks, often after the fact of design, and his encouragement of competition between manufactures further hindered German industry.⁵⁷ As will be seen in the next section, most damning to the German cause was their failure as a nation to prepare their industry adequately for total war, producing a scant 247 tanks in the year they started the war in Europe.⁵⁸ German military production in fact did not peak until 1944 by which time the German armed forces could only delay the inevitable effect of the landslide of superior Soviet production.

53 Franz Halder, *The Halder War Diary*, edited by Charles Burdick and Hans-Adolf Jacobsen (Novato: Presidio Press, 1988), 493.

54 Ibid, 519.

55 Albert Speer, *Inside the Third Reich*, translated by Richard and Clara Winston (New York: Collier Books, 1970), 230.

56 Ibid, 234.

57 Ibid.

58 John Ellis, *The World War II Databook* (London: Aurum Press, 1993), 277.

Comparative Production & Supremacy of Soviet Design

“Victory in war will be won by the side that has more tanks...”⁵⁹ —Josef Stalin

In the age of motorized warfare, armor production is perhaps the most telling figure and indeed throughout the war both sides rushed to send as many capable models to the front as possible. Table 2 shows Soviet and German production figures for individual tanks and self-propelled guns for the period of 1939 to 1945. Keep in mind also that while most of the German models served in the east an appreciable amount of armor served on other fronts making the impact of higher Soviet production figures even greater. In July 1944, for example, one month after the allied D-Day landings in Normandy roughly 40% of German divisions faced the western Allies. The Germans had deployed against the Soviet Union; 20 armored divisions, 9 motorized divisions, and 108 infantry divisions. The western allies, by comparison, faced 25 German divisions on the Italian Front, including 1 armored division and 62 divisions in France, including 10 armored and 2 motorized.⁶⁰

Table 2: Soviet & German Tank and Self-Propelled Gun Production, 1939-45⁶¹

Date	1939	1940	1941	1942	1943	1944	1945	Total
USSR	2,950	2,794	6,590	24,446	24,089	28,963	15,419	105,251
Germany	247	1,643	3,790	6,180	12,063	19,002	3,932	46,857

Table 2 also does not show the general superiority of the models produced by Soviet industry when compared to their German counterparts, the T-34 medium tank (64,550⁶² produced of all variants), the development of which has been discussed, continued to remain superior to the Panzer III and IV, the most numerous produced German tanks during the war (14,644⁶³ produced of all variants). The German armor models that were technically superior to the mass produced T-34 did not occur in numbers which could seriously have impacted the end result of the war (roughly 7,000⁶⁴ Panther, Tiger I, and Tiger II produced): thus the rapid Soviet advance through Eastern Europe in 1944, despite facing superior tank designs.

59 Zhukov, 187.

60 Ellis, 164-185.

61 Ibid, 277.

62 Ibid, 303.

63 White, 295.

64 Ellis, 302.

The first model of the Panzer IV to encounter the Soviet T-34 was the IVb. The Panzer IVb had only 30 mm of poor vertical frontal armor and mounted a low velocity 75 mm cannon that could not fire armor piercing (AP) ammunition as its main armament, a distinct disadvantage against the T-34 with its sloped armor.⁶⁵ The T-34/76a that opposed the first waves of German armor by contrast was protected by 45mm frontal armor sloped at 60 degrees (better for deflection) and for the main gun used a high velocity 76mm cannon capable of firing AP rounds with great armor penetration capability.⁶⁶ O’Connell in *Of Arms and Men* does a good job of describing the first contact between these two foes.

A single strange-looking, low-slung tank emerged out of the underbrush near the Dnieper for the first time in early July, and proceeded to cut a nine-mile swath of destruction through the Seventeenth Panzer Division, proving itself all but impervious to German shells.⁶⁷

The T-34 was the masterpiece of the Soviet industrial milieu in the Second World War, starting off clumsily on the summer steppe of ‘41’, but rolling into down-town Berlin in the summer of ‘45’, having almost single handily broken the back of the German armies.

Table 3: Soviet & German Artillery Production, 1939-45⁶⁸

Date	1939	1940	1941	1942	1943	1944	1945	Total
USSR	---	---	24.7	9.7	9.3	11.7	15.9	71.3
Germany	18.5	29.5	53.3	50.6	56.2	32.6	?	240.7

Soviet artillery manufacturers also managed to better the Germans during the war years (see table 3) all the while having less iron ore and coal to work with (tables 4 & 5); an astonishing testament to the tenacity of Stalin’s industrial machine.

65 White, 154.

66 Ibid.

67 O’Connell, 287.

68 Ibid, 277.

Table 4: Annual Soviet & German Iron Ore Production, 1939-45 (millions of metric tons) ⁶⁹

Date	1939	1940	1941	1942	1943	1944	1945	Total
USSR	---	---	24.7	9.7	9.3	11.7	15.9	71.3
Germany	18.5	29.5	53.3	50.6	56.2	32.6	?	240.7

Table 5: Annual Soviet & German Coal Production, 1939-45 (millions of metric tons) ⁷⁰

Date	1939	1940	1941	1942	1943	1944	1945	Total
USSR	---	---	151.4	75.5	93.1	121.5	149.3	590.8
Germany	332.8	364.8	402.8	407.8	429	432.8	50.3	2,420.3

In fact, it was only in the production of crude oil, the one resource that could bring a motorized army to a grinding halt, that the Soviets had a great advantage (Table 6). The lack of crude oil for the production of lubricants and fuel hindered German armor and air mobility throughout the latter years of the war, their Soviet counterparts felt no such pinch.

Table 6: Annual Soviet & German [including German synthetic] Crude Oil Production, 1939-45 (millions of metric tons) ⁷¹

Date	1939	1940	1941	1942	1943	1944	1945	Total
USSR	---	---	33	22	18	18.2	19.4	110.6
Germany	3.1[2.2]	4.8[3.2]	5.7[3.9]	6.6[4.6]	7.6[5.6]	5.6[3.9]	?	56.8

The Soviets also out-produced the Germans in fighter, ground attack, bomber, and transport aircraft.⁷² The ground attack fighter/bomber was used extensively by both sides during the conflict on the eastern front and the numbers in that category are telling the Soviets out-produced the Germans 37,549⁷³ to 12,539⁷⁴.

69 Ibid, 275.

70 Ibid.

71 Ibid.

72 Ibid, 278.

73 Ibid.

74 Ibid.

The Effect of Lend-Lease

Lend-Lease was for the Soviets no small contribution in their time of need but it must be shown in its proper context. The Soviet Union did receive a substantial amount of aid from the U.S. and Britain during the war years however, Lend-Lease never amounted to more than 4% of the weapons that the Russians would in the end themselves produce.⁷⁵ Historians in the west often have a tendency to overrate the value of the Lend-Lease program. The tanks provided by the Western Allies, like the American Sherman for example, were of inferior quality to the mass produced T-34 and only capable of equipping 10-17% of Soviet tank brigades in 1943.⁷⁶ Lend-Lease, while providing the Soviets with a much needed moral boost, probably was not significant enough to tip the scales in their balance; this was achieved through Soviet production.

Conclusions

In the end, the Germans were defeated by the blood and sweat of the Red Army, a defeat made possible by the incredible feats of Soviet industry in the years preceding and during the war. Sending his armies into the Soviet Union in the summer of 1941, cost Hitler and Germany the war as they were out-produced, leading to a slow but inevitable defeat. Guderian's motorized doctrine failed to achieve the immediate objectives of Barbarossa in the face of Soviet arms and Marks's strategic plan failed to realize the expansion potential demonstrated by Soviet industry in the 1930s.

Several factors of the Soviet and German experiences in the Second World War are especially pertinent to modern military studies. The first being the parallel development of industry driven by doctrine such as expanded the Soviet rail infrastructure and production of the T-34. In the case of the T-34, we have a tank directly produced to fulfill the requirements of the Soviet "deep operation" against enemy forces. The modern Stryker combat vehicle was similarly developed to meet the needs of a US Army doctrine undergoing changes in a new century. The US Army foresaw the need for a light combat vehicle that could be rapidly deployed, by air, in larger numbers than the mammoth M1A2 main battle tank (70 tons at full combat weight.)⁷⁷ On June 23, 1999, the Chief of Staff of the US Army General Eric Shinseki laid out the Army vision from which the Stryker would be developed, "We must provide early entry forces that can operate jointly, without access to fixed forward bases, but we still need the

75 John Erickson, "May 1945: The Soviet View," *History Today* 35 (May 1985): 10.

76 Peter G. Tsouras, *The Great Patriotic War* (London: Greenhill Books, 1992), 246.

77 Christopher F. Foss, *Jane's Tanks and Combat Vehicles Recognition Guide*, (New York: Harper Collins, 2000), 108.

power to slug it out and win decisively. Today, our heavy forces are too heavy and our light forces lack staying power. We will address those mismatches.”⁷⁸

The Stryker combat vehicle, weighing in at a spry 19 tons and capable of speeds up to 60 mph,⁷⁹ is just one piece of the new Army Brigade Combat Team concept, it is not meant to replace the M1 main battle tank or the Bradley Infantry Fighting Vehicle (30 tons)⁸⁰ but to give the military the flexibility the new doctrine required. The first so called “Stryker Brigade” was deployed from Ft. Lewis Washington to Iraq in the fall of 2003 with hopes of proving the new vehicle in combat.⁸¹ In addition to speed and stealth, other critical pieces of the new combat brigade team are; critical real time intelligence, flexible artillery support, and the nine man infantry squad that Stryker carries.⁸² The Stryker is already evolving to meet the requirements of its mission in Iraq; a special cage of armored slats had been installed 360 degrees around the vehicles to protect from rocket propelled grenades commonly used by insurgents in Iraq.⁸³ The armored slats have proven successful⁸⁴ and serve as a further example of industrial requirements being dictated by constantly evolving doctrine.

A second but equally important aspect of this study is a closer look at the overall German miscalculations in planning for the campaign; the grossest of which was that German tank production did not peak until 1944. The German generals and their “amateurish” leader truly believed that Guderian’s exploitation doctrine would deliver them a quick victory against the Soviets. The overall training and doctrine of the Germans, while superior to that of the Soviets on a one to one basis, was perhaps their undoing in that it caused them to fail to consider alternate outcomes to what they thought would be over in six months. That lesson is no less important today especially in lieu of the chaotic nature of the modern battlefield as evidenced recently by a campaign with mixed results in Iraq. The US Army has published a good deal of information on recent combat experience in Iraq which is available to today’s combat leaders in professional journals in print and on-line. The US Army today can succeed and

78 Gen. Eric Shinseki, Quote from the homepage of the Army’s “Brigade Combat Team: Project Management Office,” available online from <http://pmbct.tacom.army.mil/> accessed 15 March 2004.

79 Ann Scott Tyson, “New Army ‘Stryker’ combat vehicle nears Iraq test,” in *The Christian Science Monitor* (9 October, 2003) available online from: <http://www.csmonitor.com/2003/1009/p02s02-usmi.html> accessed on 15 March 2004.

80 Foss, 210.

81 Tyson.

82 Ibid.

83 Michael Gilbert, “Truck’s armor proves it can take a punch,” *The News Tribune* (20 February, 2004) available online from: <http://www.bctide.army.mil/news/Punch.html/> accessed on 29 March 2004.

84 Ibid.

learn lessons from past actions from the tactical level all the way up to the global strategic level able to take criticism and change to win. The German armed forces in the Second World War were, by comparison, burdened by the political oath owed to Hitler and the Nazis, which restricted the free flow of information that might lead to the evolution of successful military doctrine.



BEDROOM BEHAVIOR: THE EMERGING SEXUALITY OF THE ROMAN WOMAN (200B.C.E. - C.E.250) By: MICHELLE DE LA CERDA

Wars, economics, politics, and sex are all topics historians cover in their pursuit of understanding different cultures. Scholars have investigated each of these aspects of the late Republic and early imperial Roman society. One topic that has been greatly ignored until recently is the role of women within Roman society. Sexuality, sex, and eroticism are studied, but mostly from a male perspective. For example, upper class women's erotic and sexual nature have gone mostly unexamined by previous scholars. Sexuality is here defined as sexual interest and eroticism in the context of sexual love and sexual desire. Women are mentioned in connection with their roles as wives, mothers, or prostitutes; however, there has been minimal research in understanding feminine sexuality. Previous notions of sexism probably explain this lack of interest or inquiry into the sexual nature of women. Women of the upper class society were not as sexually repressed as former scholars have indicated. Due to the changes in Roman society during the late republic and early empire, women expressed their sexuality through their appearance and their sexual activities, despite legal and even moral laws. Archaeologists have discovered numerous works of art of an apparent erotic and sexual nature. Some of these works will be covered in this paper to help illustrate the role of feminine sexuality in Rome between 200 B.C.E and 250 C.E.¹

Defining sexuality for women in a society that allowed them few rights is a difficult task. Men have authored most textual or written sources from Rome with only a few known works by women. Using these written sources along with preserved wall art helps give us an understanding of Roman sexuality. This paper will attempt to illustrate a few of the ways sexuality could be expressed by the women of this era. However, an understanding of the laws and ideologies of this period regarding women must be made.

¹ This time period is denoted as the late republic/early empire age of Rome. Many social changes occurred increasing the rights of women.

Previous to this era of discussion, all women of the Roman Republic had to be under the protection and custody of a male, whether it be their father, husband, or another male head of family.² The jurist Domitius Ulpianus or as he is better known as Ulpian, said “guardians are appointed for males as well as for females, but only for males under puberty...for females, however, both under and over puberty, on account of the weakness of their sex as well as their ignorance of legal matters.”³ Sarah Pomeroy in her book, (*Goddesses, Whores, Wives, and Slaves: Women in Classical Antiquity*) states:

Guardianship over females was theoretically in force until the time of Diocletian [r. 285-305 C.E.], but this power was gradually diminished by legal devices and ruses and by the assertiveness of some women interested in managing their own concerns.⁴

Under the reign of Augustus, women who bore three or more children could become emancipated from their guardian, which strengthened the legal standing of women who were mothers.⁵ In essence, the laws now said that a woman who bore a certain amount of children had demonstrated her responsibility and no longer needed a guardian.⁶ Despite this law granting conditional emancipation, women who truly sought for her personal freedoms, whether legal or not, did so in many other ways.

Despite the legal maneuvers on Augustus' part in regards to emancipation, criticism concerning the guardianship of women still existed. The jurist Gaius, who wrote during the post-classical period (ca 150-180 C.E.), supported women's rights in this area and felt that an adult aged woman did not need to be under the control of a guardian. He states:

There seems, on the other hand, to have been no very worthwhile reason why women who have reached the age of maturity should be in guardianship; for the argument which is commonly believed, that because they are scatter-brained⁷ they are frequently subject to deception and that it is proper for them to be under guardians' authority, seems to be specious rather than true. For women of full age deal with their own affairs for themselves, and while in certain instances that guardian interposes his authorization for form's sake, he is often compelled by the praetor to give authorization, even against his wishes.⁸

2 Sarah B. Pomeroy, *Goddesses, Whores, Wives, and Slaves: Women in Classical Antiquity* (New York: Shoken Books, 1975), 150.

3 Ulpian, Rules 11.1, in *Women's Life in Greece and Rome: A Source Book in Translation*, Mary R. Lefkowitz and Maureen B. Fant (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins UP, 1992), 100.

4 Pomeroy, 151.

5 Suetonius, *Life of Augustus* 34 L, in Lefkowitz, 103.

6 Pomeroy, 151.

7 This term 'scatterbrained' is a reference to fact women were considered to be light minded and is referenced in his "Institutes" 1.144.

8 Gaius, *Institutes*, 1.190, in Lefkowitz, 99.

Guardianship of women continued into marriage, which was a major institution of Roman society. Marriage contracts had to be consented to by all participants, not just by the men proposing the alliance. Women, as required by law, had to give their consent.⁹ A bride had to have strong reasons or objections to refuse to marry a person selected by her father, namely, those objections had to be for immoral behavior on the part of the groom.¹⁰ However, republican women have no legal right to divorce their husband. During the era of Augustus, women obtained more rights to divorce, but they still lacked the power to divorce an adulterous husband.¹¹ Divorces largely rested in the hands of the husband and/or father. At a certain level of society, most divorces occurred for political reasons, however, some occurred as a result of adultery. But for women, whose husbands committed adultery, they had no legal recourse available. The power to divorce due to adultery remained strictly an option available to men.¹² Ovid, the great poet, noted women's lamentation regarding the inability to divorce, "Whose soft cheeks she scratches, at whom she glares with lovely, tear-filled eyes, the man she would cut out of her life, if only she could!"¹³

The actual laws regarding adultery, in the early days of the Roman Republic were scarce. A Father could, under the statutes of the law, kill his daughter and her lover, if he caught them in the act¹⁴ and only if the affair occurred in his home or that of his son's.¹⁵ However, the father had to kill them both at that moment, the law restricted him from killing only one of the offenders or killing either of them at a later time.¹⁶ A husband's rights were more restrictive. It was illegal for him to kill his wife,¹⁷ but he could kill her lover if he belonged to a lower class.¹⁸

Around 18 B.C.E., Augustus enacted the Lex Julia. This law was created when his daughter Julia had been found committing adultery.¹⁹ Augustus wanted to increase morality in society. Marriage was being delayed or avoided altogether, thus limiting the amount of children being born in the state. This greatly concerned Augustus; he needed the birth rate to remain high, especially among the upper class. In order to force morality upon his citizens, he created moral law codes called the Lex Julia,

9 Julianus, Digest, Book 16 23:1:11 in Lefkowitz, 111.

10 Ulpian, On Betrothal, 23:1:12 in Lefkowitz, 111 and Pomeroy, 157, cites Ulpian, Digest, 1:12.

11 Elaine Fantham and Others, *Women in the Classical World* (New York: Oxford UP, 1994), 305.

12 Pomeroy, 157-59.

13 Ovid, *The Art of Love*, II: 452-54.

14 Papinian, On Adultery in Digest, I:48:5:21, in Lefkowitz, 108.

15 Ibid., I:48:5:23

16 Ulpian, On Adultery in Digest, I:48:5:24:4 in Lefkowitz, 108

17 Paul, *Opinions* 2:26:4 in Lefkowitz, 104.

18 Jane F. Gardner, *Women in Roman Law and Society* (Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1995), 129-130.

19 Seneca, On Benefits 6:32:1 in Lefkowitz, 195.

named after his daughter.²⁰ These laws dictated that a woman caught in adultery could be killed or exiled, depending on the status of the man with whom she had been caught. A husband or father had a civic duty to prosecute her and could be prosecuted themselves for not doing so.²¹ The Lex Julia also dictates many other laws regarding woman and their sexual activities. This was one of Augustus' least successful reforms in Rome.²²

Despite the laws enacted by Augustus, the social mores of sexuality in the late Republic through the early imperial era of Rome are difficult at best to define. When looking at the opinions men had of women, one will find comments like "she was pleasant to talk with, and she walked with grace. She kept the house and worked with wool."²³ Or another might say a woman was the "most beautiful, worker in wool, pious, chaste, thrifty, faithful, a stayer-at-home."²⁴ These opinions do not mention women in connection to sexuality. Men's opinions of women were those of the faithful wife and mother. Some men found the increasing usage of make-up, elaborate hair and clothing styles, and adultery to be scandalous.²⁵ The older men of society voiced their disapproval regarding the increased sexuality in the late republican woman. However, infatuation among the younger men grew.²⁶ Ovid said, "shame points a finger at girls who make the first move, but agreed also, it's nice to follow a strong lead."²⁷

Rome had been greatly influenced by the social changes that had taken place in Hellenistic Greece.²⁸ Roman men often found themselves away on military or governmental excursions for great periods of time leaving women to tend not only to domestic matters but also to political matters. This increase in power, along with an infusion of wealth and indulgence in society relaxed the "tension between the ideal and the real Roman matron" and the search for sexual fulfillment had begun.²⁹ Ovid,

20 M. Cary and H.H. Scullard, *A History of Rome* (New York: Pelgrave, 1975), 283.

21 Paul, *Opinions* 2:26:8 in Lefkowitz, 104.

22 Fantham, 306.

23 Claudia, *ILLRP* 973=ILS 8403=CLE 52=CIL I2.1211=CIL VI.15346, in Lefkowitz, 16.

24 Anymone, housewife ILS 8402.L, in Lefkowitz, 17.

25 Fantham, 301.

26 *Ibid.*, 212

27 Ovid, *The Art of Love*, I:705-07.

28 Women in Greece had been greatly repressed in all of their doings. According to Cornelius Nepos, a Greek woman could not attend a party unless she was with her relatives, was only allowed to be in the interior of her home and could not accept male visitors into this section of her home unless they were her relations. He further states that a Roman husband would not hesitate to take his wife to a dinner party, was able to enter the first rooms of his home and walk around in public. The repression of Greek women lessened as they entered the Hellenistic age. *Lives*, praef. 6 as quoted in Lefkowitz, 164.

29 Pomeroy, 149.

points out that “even virgins take loving care over the impressions they make” indicating that even younger women became more outgoing.³⁰

Clothing was a means of expressing sexuality for the Roman woman.³¹ Just as legal standards changed in Rome, clothing standards did also. The types of clothing worn reflected the lifestyle and the personal values of the wearer.³² Women wore long tunics and were generally well covered up.³³ Gold and purple were the colors of choice for many women of the late republic/early empire, whereas in the early republic, colors were more subdued, mostly white and other light colors.³⁴ These richer and bolder colors signified wealth, since these dyes had to be imported from other regions and therefore were much more expensive than other dyes. Women wore other articles of clothing besides the tunic. They also wore loin-cloths, brassiere type apparatus’, and corsets.³⁵

Despite this simple description of what women wore, it is more important to understand how and why these items were worn. A figure found painted on a wall in Villa Farnesina in Rome depicts a woman pouring perfume into a small flask.³⁶ This wall painting is the perfect illustration of a woman’s sexuality. Her tunic is worn long, as was the way in which women were to wear them; for men wore them at a shorter length. It is diaphanous in several areas; her legs show allowing others to view their true length and shape. Diaphanous tunics were not uncommon and had been worn in Greece.³⁷ However, such tunics were made from a more expensive fabric, thus the wearer was generally of the upper class. The sleeves of her tunic are also short, a cap sleeve from the round of her shoulder. This allows the entire length of her arm to be exposed for others to see, although this was not an uncommon length of sleeve. Ovid included in his poem, *The Art of Love*, “wear something to enhance those shoulders” when talking about women going out in public.³⁸ The difference between a man and woman’s tunic lies in the choices of fabric and color, not the cut.³⁹

30 Ovid, *The Art of Love*, I:624.

31 Usage of woman or matron in this context refers to adult married or widowed women of the upper class unless otherwise specified. Papinian, *Adultery*, II:48:5:11, in Lefkowitz, 106.

32 J. P. Toner, *Leisure and Ancient Rome* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1995), 58.

33 Florence Dupont, *Daily Life in Ancient Rome*, trans. Christopher Woodall (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1989), 261-62.

34 Joseph Jay Deiss, *Herculaneum*, (New York: Harper and Row, 1985), 120.

35 Jerome Carcopino, *Daily Life in Ancient Rome*, trans. E.O. Lorimer (New Haven: Yale UP, 1940), 166.

36 Unknown, “Woman pouring perfume,” wall painting, Villa Farnesina, Rome ca. 20BCE, as reproduced in Nancy H Ramage and Andrew Ramage, *Roman Art: Romulus to Constantine* (New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1991) 3.28. Due to copyright issues, the work of art could not be reproduced in this article, however, please refer to the cited book for reference.

37 JaNae Brown Haas, Class Lecture at Utah Valley State College, Spring term, 2002.

38 Ovid, *The Art of Love*, I:497.

39 Carcopino, 169.

After arranging her clothing, her hair, make-up, jewels, and perfumes were the final touches to her appearance.⁴⁰ If a family kept slaves, a high probability existed that a slave hairdresser lived in the household.⁴¹ Another fresco that helps illustrate this point, found in Rome, depicts one young Roman maiden having her hair done by a household slave while the matron and another young lady observe.⁴² Carcopino, in his book (*Daily Life in Ancient Rome*), states that it was vital to the Roman matron to have a slave in order to achieve the hairstyle she sought after, since it was a very complicated style.⁴³

Having one's hair done was an essential part of the morning process. Dupont explains, "hair was a typically feminine means of seduction."⁴⁴ During the Republic, women wore their hair straight, with a part either down one side or the middle, with a knot gathering it all in the back.⁴⁵ However, during the Empire, styles changed dramatically.⁴⁶ Martial recorded the laborious task of hair dressing, "high-strung fastidious beauty...hair was done up in a high ball shaped mass, composed of ringlets kept in place by hair-pins or bodkins."⁴⁷ Hair would be curled tightly with hot irons and the curls arranged on her head. Some women applied a lotion-like substance to their hair to make it glisten.⁴⁸

The extravagant hairstyles women wore won them the attention of men. Unfortunately, this attention was not always positive. Juvenal, the satirical poet, wrote of the vanity of women, "so fierce their quest for beauty, so many the tiers and storeys, the weight of hair built up on her head."⁴⁹ His comments might not be the effect of what women were striving for, but substantiates that men did take notice of the efforts by women in enhancing their sexuality. Ovid, in his instruction poem on love, encourages men to compliment women on their new hairstyles and their display of clothing and jewels.⁵⁰ For most women, styling their hair did not signify the end of their daily routine; the application of makeup was another essential step in creating their aura of sexuality.

40 Ibid., 114.

41 Dupont, 265.

42 Unknown, "Pompeiiian Ladies With Their Slave Hairdresser," wall painting. Erich Lessing, Art Resource, NY, Microsoft Encarta Encyclopedia, [CD-ROM], 1993-2000. Another reproduction of this fresco can be found on the front cover of Elaine Fantham, et al. *Women in the Classical World*. Oxford UP.

43 Carcopino, 167.

44 Ibid., 266.

45 Carcopino, 167; Tannahill, 114.

46 As women came to have more freedoms, they became more elaborate in their clothing and hairstyles.

47 Martial, Epigrams 2.66.4.

48 Tannahill, 114.

49 Juvenal, *The Sixteen Satires* 6.501-503.

50 Ovid, *The Art of Love*, I: 295-306.

The historian Livy said, "Cosmetics and adornment are women's decorations, they delight and boast of them."⁵¹ Another part of the laborious task of their sexual expression consisted of using make-up as an enhancement to their form. Women stored their make-up in various jars and boxes, and as Ovid advises, they should be kept hidden from her husband/lovers eye.⁵² Like the cosmetics of today, each one had a particular function: eye shadows, rouges or others. The complicated process of applying make-up was necessary, for the Roman matron did not want to be seen without these items applied to her face.⁵³

Make-up was left on her face until just before bed preventing being seen by her husband or lover without it on. Martial, who was famous for his satirical poem and epigrams, once exclaimed, "you lie stored away in a hundred caskets, and your face does not sleep with you!"⁵⁴ The writer Achilles Tatius⁵⁵ made a further assessment of a woman's usage of make-up, "even if a woman appears to be beautiful, it is the laborious contrivance of make-up. Her beauty is all perfume, or hair dye, or potions."⁵⁶ These men appear to be criticizing women and the effort they took in dressing themselves up, however, these men mostly slept with the made-up woman. According to Achilles Tatius, whether their wife or another, they found the manner in which these women presented themselves to be sexually appealing and satisfactory.⁵⁷ However, despite the critique of a woman's usage of makeup, not many of these men woke up next to their wives or ever saw them without their cosmetics applied.⁵⁸ Ovid, however, praised women for using make-up and gave advice on the proper way to go about using it.⁵⁹

The final actions of the morning process consisted of applying perfumes and affixing the necessary jewels. During the hairstyling process, perfumes might have been placed in the hair or along the hairline where the curls framed the face or would be applied at the end of the entire

51 Livy, 34.7.8 in *Women in the Classical World*, Elaine Fantham and others (New York: Oxford UP, 1994), 261.

52 Ovid, *The Art of Love*, III: 206-10.

53 Ovid, *The Art of Love*, III:229-30 and Carcopino, 168.

54 Martial, IX:37 in Carcopino, 169.

55 Not much is known about the life of Achilles Tatius. His name is a combination of both Greek and Latin names. Leucippe and Clitophon is one of the only works that survive from him. This writing is neither Greek nor Roman in nature, although it was read by both groups. Simon Goldhill, "The Erotic Experience of Looking," in *Sleep of Reason: Erotic Experience and Sexual Ethics in Ancient Greece and Rome*, ed. Martha C. Nussbaum and Juha Sihvola (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002), 386-389.

56 Achilles Tatius *Leucippe and Clitophon* 38.3, in Lefkowitz, 182.

57 Ibid., 182.

58 Many upper class couples did not share the same bed or bedroom at night. Each had their own quarters where their bed chamber and personal effects were kept.

59 Ovid, *The Art of Love*, III:235-315.

dressings period.⁶⁰ Perfumes or colognes served a dual purpose in society for both men and women. The first was to mask one's offensive body odors and the other was to be appealing to others.⁶¹

Affixing jewelry to the Roman matron's wardrobe symbolized the finishing touch to the dressing period. Jewelry was the ultimate symbol of status in the woman's world. In her jewelry box or case one could find necklaces, earrings, rings of silver or gold with precious or semi-precious stones, brooches, bracelets, and anklets.⁶² She might wear one or two pieces at a time or her entire collection, depending on her desires.⁶³ Wearing jewelry would not only signify her rank in society, but would also accentuate her personal appearance, leading to a greater degree of sexuality. Ovid agreed, for he said, "the prettiest girls in the world are in Rome."⁶⁴

Reexamining the first mentioned fresco, the woman pouring perfume into a flask, the seated lady is wearing a bracelet on both wrists and earrings in her ears. Besides letting all other members of society know which class she belongs to, she is presenting herself to others as a fashionable, elegant young lady. Taking into account her entire persona, she exudes sexuality. This is not to say she is a whore or a prostitute. She simply takes the time to care for her appearance, which by doing so revealed the confidence she had in herself, part of her sexuality. This was a natural and necessary part of the normal society among the elite.⁶⁵ She went through the arduous task of dressing up each day "combined with coquetry" to "challenge the admiration of the passers-by."⁶⁶

A woman's daily ritual in her bathroom is specific evidence of the existence of feminine sexuality in Rome. Notwithstanding the desire to exhibit her own rank in society, the preparation and work associated with dress and presentation of one's self is substantiation of personal sexuality. Toner, in his book *Leisure and Ancient Rome* states clothing is "'a form of communication,' a social body-surface, to indicate social status and prestige, and increase the wearer's attractiveness."⁶⁷ Simply put, the manner of dress by women is part of their overall sexuality. Furthermore, Toner states that clothing has numerous meanings, it "superimposes on the wearer a super-

60 Tannahill, 114.

61 Dupont, 266.

62 Deiss, 3.

63 Juvenal, VI:557-59. He satirically writes that there is nothing a woman would deny herself in terms of her jewelry.

64 Ovid, *The Art of Love*, I:57.

65 Elaine Fantham and others, eds., *Women in the Classical World* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1994), 341.

66 Carcopino, 170.

67 Toner, 58. Toner quotes N. Joseph, *Uniforms and Non-uniforms: Communication through Clothing*, New York: Greenwood Press, 1986, 1.

personality, the dress possessing the properties of the state inherent within it" or that the clothing is a direct reflection of the values, whether moral or not, of the wearer.⁶⁸ In short, the way a woman dressed indicated her sexuality.

Grooming habits were not the only indication of the Roman woman's sexual persona. The style of dress only conveyed the beginning elements to their nature; lifestyle was the proof of their independent sexuality in the Roman patriarchal world. Women had opportunities to further express their individual sexuality in their relations in marriage and with others. Numerous sources have been left behind describing the lives of many Romans, men and women. For one reason or another, previous works by classical scholars have not covered female sexuality even in regards to marriage.

Until recently it appeared that sex and sexuality only exist in the man's world. Paul Veyne's essay, "Homosexuality in Ancient Rome", discusses the role of homosexuality in Rome and the difference between active and passive sexuality. He claims that a "woman was passive by definition, unless she was the sort of freak we are not concerned with here."⁶⁹ He further states that "women were there to serve men, to satisfy their desires at need..." or in other words, the woman had to be willing to satisfy her husband at any time he chose.⁷⁰ This is a rather blanket statement. Women had sexual desires and found ways to satisfy themselves, either with their spouse or a lover, for Ovid, the love poet of classical Rome stated, "Women, like men, adore secret affairs"⁷¹ and that women had a stronger sexual appetite than men.⁷²

Trying to connect marriage and sexuality is a delicate matter. Marriage in Rome occurred for and on many different levels. To clearly illustrate a woman's sense of sexuality in marriage, three different types of marriage situations will be examined. First, marriages based on political or economic reasons, second, marriages where love between the spouses existed, and finally, marriages as a result of the woman's flirtations and efforts. For the most part, the sexual lives of the Romans were private and not to be talked about, hence the appearance of sexual topics in satirical works.

68 Ibid., 58.

69 Paul Veyne, "Homosexuality in Ancient Rome", trans. Anthony Forster, in *Western Sexuality: Practice and Precept in Past and Present Times*, ed. Philippe Aries and Andre Bejin (New York: Basil Blackwell, Ltd., 1985), 30.

70 Ibid., 31.

71 Ovid, *The Art of Love*, I:278.

72 Ibid., I: 342.

Sex occurred naturally as part of the human condition, however, it was to remain private. The Roman maiden was to be chaste and virtuous.⁷³ Marriage generally transpired between twelve and fourteen years of age for girls, so it would be rare to find one who had already lost her virginity. In *Odes Book III*, Horace states, “the girl past childhood age is agog to learn Ionic dances now, she affects coy ways, and love affairs engross her thoughts till she to her fingertips tingles.”⁷⁴ In other words, marriage was essential to a woman’s chastity.

The most common type of marriage occurred for political or economic reasons rather than for love, especially in the late Republic. Pompey, who wanted to increase his political ties, divorced his wife Antistia and married Aemilia. Aemilia was already married to another at the time and pregnant. Nevertheless, the marriages were dissolved and Pompey and Aemilia were married.⁷⁵ This marriage was void of romantic love; it was strictly for political alliances and gains. Men, who sought greater success in their careers, aligned themselves with women with powerful fathers and uncles.

Marriage under these circumstances had to have “gone beyond juvenile romanticism...[and was] an institution whose aim was the reproduction of citizens.”⁷⁶ Not all citizens during the late republic chose marriage. Marriage and subsequent birthrates were low in the late republic. But under the reign of Augustus, marriage among the upper class increased, again for political and economic reasons. These marriages could be considered happy in terms of the familial alliance, but romantic love rarely existed. Reproduction, and the means thereby in marriage, was strictly an act of civil obedience.⁷⁷ Sexual fulfillment had to be obtained outside the marriage bed.

Sexual fulfillment outside marriage became easier to obtain as women became more independent from their fathers and/or husbands. With this new independence, a woman was able “to claim for herself the indulgence in sexuality of a woman of pleasure.”⁷⁸ This enabled women to chose their own lovers and not just be chosen as a lover.⁷⁹ Ovid said,

73 Suetonius, *Life of Augustus* 64:4-5 in Lefkowitz, 165. Ideally, the daughters of Rome were to be modeled directly from the way Augustus attempted to teach his own daughter, to be learn the arts of womanhood and do not disgrace themselves, i.e. the state.

74 Horace *Odes* 3.6.21-24.

75 Plutarch, *The Lives of the Noble Grecians and Romans* “Pompey,” *Great Books of the Western World*, ed. Robert Maynard Hutchins, no. 14 (Chicago: Encyclopedia Britannica, Inc., University of Chicago Press, 1952), 503.

76 Eva Cantarella, “Marriage and Sexuality in Republican Rome” in *Sleep of Reason: Erotic Experience and Sexual Ethics in Ancient Greece and Rome*, ed. Martha C. Nussbaum and Juha Sihvola (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002), 271.

77 *Ibid.*, 274.

78 Fantham and others, eds., 280.

79 *Ibid.*, 281.

"Maybe in the days when Tatius ruled, the grubby Sabine women refused to be taken by more than one man; now Mars tries men's souls in far off wars, and Venus rules in her Aeneas' city. The lovely ladies are at play; the only chaste ones are those no one has courted."⁸⁰

Ovid clearly summarizes the shifting morals in Roman society. In the early republic and before, morals were valued. But in the late republic, with men off fighting in numerous civil wars, women had become more sexually free.⁸¹

Another example of a woman choosing her own lover, regardless of her marital status was Lesbia's affair with the late Republican poet Valerius Catullus. She knew that Catullus was in love with her. Despite being married, she chose to take him as a lover. Their affair began in secret, but then became public. Once public, they continued their liaisons until she became bored with him.⁸² The affair did not end because it was made public; it ended when she simply tired of being with him. Ovid counsels the readers of his poem on the pitfalls of lovers becoming bored.⁸³

Not all women objected to political or economical marriages. For some, it was a means to obtain greater wealth. For others it was a great way to obtain the sexual freedom they desired. Being in a marriage strictly for the political or economic gains of her family, allowed her the opportunity to fulfill her sexual needs elsewhere, with men of her choosing. Ovid instructs women on how to deceive their husbands in order to gain the sexual fulfillment they desire. However, due to his own uncertain standing in the Roman society, he down plays his advice by saying, "I had half a mind to omit an account of the various way you can outwit a crafty husband or get round his vigilant bloodhound."⁸⁴ He did not brazenly advocate adultery; he claimed to only be speaking to the freedwomen of society.⁸⁵ He says: "My theme is safe and licit love, stolen joys which women'll condone; I'll mention nothing criminal."⁸⁶ However, he urges men get to know the handmaid of the woman he is trying to seduce, so she can help sway the matron by asking, "Would it really be a sin if you gave him a taste of his own medicine and had an affair?"⁸⁷

80 Ovid, *Amores* 1.8.35-44 in Fantham, 299-300.

81 Fantham, 299.

82 *Ibid.*, 282-283.

83 Ovid, *The Art of Love*, II:437-39.

84 Ovid is exiled several years after this was published. Augustus was trying to govern with a stricter set of morals. He felt that many of Rome's problems were due the shifting moral ideologies of the time, especially concerning woman. Ovid *Art of Love* 3.610-615.

85 Ovid was aware of the impending negative reaction of his poem by political leaders, so this was his attempt to calm some of the impending fury. Ovid, *The Art of Love*, trans. James Michie (New York: Modern Library 2002), xxiii.

86 Ovid, *The Art of Love*, I: 36-37.

87 *Ibid.*, I:370-72.

Ovid's poem gives advice to men on how to entice women, but he also warns men of trappings involved with taking a lover. He warns men that women will want gifts they cannot obtain from their own spouses. He says, "every woman discovers ways of extracting loot from ravenous lovers."⁸⁸ Cato the Younger, who as Plutarch describes him, had "ill-fortune in women,"⁸⁹ is quoted in Tannahill's *Sex in History*, as saying:

When a woman's resources will stretch to something she will buy it; when she cannot, she will go to her husband for the money. Pity the poor husband, whether he gives in to her or not. For if he does not find the money, some other man will.⁹⁰

Cato implies that if a woman could not get what she needed from her spouse, she had other means of obtaining her wish, that is to say through lovers. Further more, Tannahill suggests that the process of beautification that women went through was not for their husbands but for another, namely their lover.⁹¹ These statements indicated that women openly took lovers. Tannahill further implies that the husbands of these adulterous women chose to ignore the affairs since reporting it made things more difficult for him.⁹² If reported, he had to, by law, return half of her dowry and two-thirds of her property, which could have been financially devastating for him.⁹³

These marriages of convenience gave women an opportunity to obtain a little education. Education and accomplishments, such as needlework, enriched a woman's character. Musonius Rufus, a Roman philosopher believed that women were just as capable as men of reasoning and that they should be allowed to study philosophy.⁹⁴ Pomeroy states that these "cultivated women were also enjoying sexual liberty."⁹⁵ Semppronina, an aristocratic woman is documented in Sallust's *The War with Catiline* as "had often committed many crimes of masculine daring [which is inferred to mean sexual relations]...her sexual desires were so ardent that she took the initiative with men far more frequently than they did with her."⁹⁶ In a society where the punishment for adultery was death, she took great liberties.

88 Ibid., I:420-23.

89 Plutarch, *The Lives of the Noble Grecians and Romans* "Cato the Younger," *Great Books of the Western World*, ed. Robert Maynard Hutchins, no. 14 (Chicago: Encyclopedia Britannica, Inc., University of Chicago Press, 1952), 629.

90 Cato the Younger, in Reay Tannahill, *Sex in History* (New York: Stein and Day, 1980), 110. Also, Livy quotes the same passage in *History of Rome* 34:1 in Lefkowitz, 144.

91 Tannahill, 112.

92 Ibid., 125.

93 Paul, *Opinions* 2.26.14 in Lefkowitz, 104.

94 Musonius Rufus, 3,4,13^a. G, in Lefkowitz, 50-51.

95 Pomeroy, 171.

96 Sallust, *Conspiracy of Catiline* 24:25 in Lefkowitz, 147 and Ibid., 173.

The older generation of men still considered the women sexually passive, but also passive in the means of education and discussion. Juvenal disapproved of a woman's involvement in a man's conversations of philosophy and other topics of the day; "But wisdom imposes limits, even on virtue, and if she's so determined to prove herself eloquent, learned, she should hoist her skirts and grid them above the knee" which was how the men wore their tunics.⁹⁷ In other words, Juvenal disagreed with the changing role of women in society, a woman who cannot only hold a conversation on subjects considered to be strictly for men, but also in regards to her sexuality. Between Ovid's excessive love of women and Juvenal's disdain for them, one has to read between the lines to piece together a more accurate story of the sexual woman.

Marriages that are not devoid of romantic love between the spouses, albeit uncommon, are those in the second category of marriage. Although being unfavorably looked upon, some men like Pompey and Antony expressed a romantic affection towards their wives.⁹⁸ Plutarch quotes Cato the Elder as saying, "Men usually command their wives: but we command all men, and the women command us."⁹⁹ Cato implies that with love in the marriage, women have a greater ability to exercise influence over them. Plutarch adds that "a mutual blending of bodies, property, friends, and relations" should occur in marriage to help create a harmonious environment.¹⁰⁰ This evidence supports the notion of romantic love in marriage. Even in love based marriages, divorce could still occur.

Men could divorce their wives if the marriage did not result in offspring. Carrying on the family name and legacy was very important to the Romans. One wife at the end of the first century BCE offered her husband a divorce since she failed to give him a child. Her name has been recorded as possibly being Turia. Her husband refused to divorce her, stating that he'd rather remain married to her than "perpetuate the family line."¹⁰¹ His devotion to his wife denotes that love existed in this marriage.

John Clarke, in his book *Looking at Lovemaking*, examines a wall painting that has possibly been previously misinterpreted by scholars.¹⁰² The woman in this scene had been identified as a prostitute or some other lower class woman. Earlier interpreters had discounted the possibility that she could have been the wife of the man also depicted in the scene. When

97 Juvenal 6.444-446.

98 Dupont, 115.

99 See note 59, "Marcus Cato," 280.

100 Plutarch *Moralia* .34, in Lefkowitz, 183.

101 Pomeroy, 159.

102 John R. Clarke, *Looking at Lovemaking: Constructions of Sexuality in Roman Art 100 B.C.-A.D. 250* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998)101-7.

the painting is closely examined, it is apparent that this woman belonged to the upper class and in all probability is with her husband.¹⁰³ The woman is dressed in a tunic, whereas if she were a prostitute, she would be in a toga.¹⁰⁴ The tunic is a golden-yellow, a color previously noted as a color worn by the upper class. These are strong indicators of this woman's position.

There is great importance in understanding her class in society. Being that she belonged to the upper class and involved in sexual relations with her husband is important in determining if indeed Roman women had a sense of sexuality. In this painting we see the woman being the aggressor or the initiator of sexual relations. Notions of "sexual repression of the Roman woman" are not evident in this painting.¹⁰⁵ She is clearly expressing her sexual desires, something that scholars like Veyne deny as occurring normally or naturally in Roman society.

With romantic marriages being uncommon, still more uncommon were those marriages that resulted due to a woman's flirtations. Those who married as a result of their own sexual forwardness, even if the design was the benefit of her family, overtly display feminine sexuality¹⁰⁶. Valeria, a young woman of the upper class, while at a show of gladiators, walked past Sulla and removed a piece of lint from his clothing. They exchanged a few words, she smiled, and shortly thereafter, they became engaged.¹⁰⁷

The charms of women were apparent because Ovid once said that a pretty girl only needed to look at him before he was smitten.¹⁰⁸ These women, although only a few accounts still exist, took the initiative in achieving the desires of their heart. Women, although consent was required, ultimately did not have much say in who was to be their husbands, but sometimes they married the man of their own choosing.

The women who found great happiness in marriage did not look for love elsewhere. These women still had a sense of sexuality. Many women of the late Republic and early Empire, found themselves with a greater sense of freedom and independence and searched for sexual fulfillment.¹⁰⁹ These "great ladies...paraded their sexual charms and their relationships

103 Wall paintings of this type were either used in brothels or in private homes. This particular painting is in a home, therefore, it is logical to interpret the man as her husband.

104 Prostitutes were not allowed to wear the tunic. They were restricted to wearing the toga, which is predominantly a male article of clothing. The toga also had other useful features for the prostitute, including the ability to flash customers and quickly engage in sexual activity. Jane F. Gardner *Women in Roman Law and Society* (Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1995), 129, 250-51 and Clarke, 103.

105 Eva Canarella, *Pandora's Daughters* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1987), 127.

106 Pomeroy, 157.

107 See note 59, "Sulla", 386.

108 Ovid, *Amores* 2:7:5 in Knox, 733.

109 Pomeroy, 149.

before a public both fascinated and prurient.”¹¹⁰ Some women found their sexual fulfillment within the bonds of marriage and those who did not, found it elsewhere.

Tacitus tells us about Poppaea, a woman who sought after the things she wanted. Poppaea was beautiful and rich, however, indiscriminate in her choice of lovers. It did not matter to her if they were married or single. If she wanted them, she pursued them. Although married, she fell in love with another man. “Their liaison was quickly converted into marriage.”¹¹¹ Her new husband, Otho, was a close friend of Emperor Nero and often “praised her charms and graces” to him.¹¹² Poppaea eventually tired of Otho and set her designs upon the emperor himself. He fell in love with her.

Poppaea attempted to persuade Nero into divorcing his current wife in order to marry her. This failed for reasons out of Poppaea’s hands. Nevertheless, she displayed aggressive behaviors, which per se does not always denote a sense of sexuality, in her search for lovers. However, it does indicate that as a woman, in the changing society, she could be more forward and pursue relationships, even sexual relationships, based on her own desires with little fear of persecution or legal ramifications. Women of this evolving era “could indulge in gallant adventures without serious harm to their reputation.”¹¹³

The faded wall painting located in Pompeii depicts five women after an evening meal with two male slaves off to the side.¹¹⁴ Many things can be inferred from this genre scene. First, these are women of the upper class. Their clothing, hairstyles, and household accessories are the indicators. Second, during banquets, husbands and wives often did not dine together. If they did dine together, at the conclusion of the meal, women would adjourn to another part of the house while the men frolicked with each other and lower class women.¹¹⁵

The central figure, the standing lady, appears to have a bottle in her hand. These types of bottles were used for either oil or wine. Wine drinking by women was censured. It could be used for medicinal purposes or for religious rituals, but Cato the Elder during his speech *On the Dowry*, lists offenses that women could be punished for and listed drinking wine among them.¹¹⁶ Drinking wine could lead to intoxication and subsequent lax moral judgment.

110 Fantham and others, eds., 212.

111 Tacitus, *The Annals: Death of Agrippina* in Knox 787-88.

112 Ibid., 788.

113 Cary, 303.

114 Unknown, “Entertainment after a meal,” wall painting, Pompeii, as reproduced in John Ward-Perkin and Amanda Claridge, *Pompeii AD 79* (Boston: Borzoi Book, 1978), plate 247.

115 Dupont, 284.

116 Aulus Gellius *Attic Nights* 10.23, in Lefkowitz, 97.

The final point of interest in the painting is the young slave boys peering from behind the curtain. They could have just been passing through and came upon the scene or possibly were summoned there by the matron. It is hard to know which one is the case, but the look in their eyes denotes pleasure or merriment. Without knowing the intent of the artist, it is impossible to determine the role of the young men with these women. As previously mentioned, at banquets, men engaged in sexual activity. However, we have now proven that women also had sexually active lives, therefore, it could be possible that these women were going to engage in sexual activity with these young men.

Some women had formed cults where open acts of a sexual nature occurred. Ovid describes a cult banquet scene, one that could be similar to the previous described fresco of a banquet scene in his poem "Art of Love". He writes: "Banquets give openings, too: when the tables are spread, there's more than wine to turn your head. There's love, with soft arms and flushed face, has often given the horns of Bacchus an embrace."¹¹⁷

Religious cults, known as the Bacchus cults in Rome, were another way in which women sought relief from sexual repression. These gatherings were held out in the countryside annually. When this cult began, only women were admitted, but as time went on, men were allowed to participate. All sorts of sexual liaisons occurred.¹¹⁸ Bacchus cults were not the only religious groups in Rome that allowed women to express themselves in ways they would not normally do so sexually.

Juvenal describes an annual cult gathering in the Temple of Chastity, women liberally drank wine and engaged in sexual relations with one another. Women would use manufactured phalluses on one another and then would seek out available men to continue the sexual feast.¹¹⁹ Some of these religious cults were outlawed due to the flagrant sexual misconduct under the Lex Julia. Others had regulations placed upon them as to how many members of each sex could attend.¹²⁰

At the conclusion of these festivals, women would return home and resume their normal lives. The occurrences at these religious cult gatherings were a way for a woman to be completely sexually explicit in her desires. If the women of Rome were sexually repressed, these annual gatherings were a rationalized way of sexual expression for the elitist women. It should be understood that these cult practices were extreme, and as presented earlier, women had other means of sexual expression.

117 Ovid, *The Art of Love*, I:230-234.

118 Pomeroy, 217.

119 Juvenal 6.307-334.

120 *Senatus consultum de bacchanalibus*, CIL I2.581=ILS 18=ILLRP 511 in Lefkowitz, 275.

Sexuality is personal and individualistic. In what is considered as acceptable behavior, sexuality can be constructed as a cultural element. Early Republican Rome when compared to Western societies of the twenty-first century was extremely repressive. However, the social changes during the late republic through the early empire allowed women more freedom. These freedoms were much more than just the right to make certain legal decisions without a guardian; it was the right to govern their own sexual lives. At times, living by their desires went against the moral and sometimes legal laws. Women were not ignorant to the possible consequences of their actions.

The increased rights in marriage and in other legal standings are how they gained greater control over their sexual lives. More women took lovers to obtain the necessary sexual fulfillment. These women also dressed in ways to be attractive for themselves and others. The increased wealth in society enabled women to purchase finer fabrics and jewels to enhance their personal sense of sexuality.

Women have been viewed as either harlots, the lowliest of the earth, or praised as the salt of the earth. These women found middle ground. They combined familial duty and personal pleasure, not forsaking one for the other. Indeed, the Roman woman, who for so long has been ignored, had sexuality and expressed it.



BUI DOI: THE DUST OF LIFE

BY: ERICA BEAUS

They are called Bui Doi; they are the abandoned sons and daughters of American soldiers and Vietnamese women. They represent a crucial experience of Vietnam that is often overlooked—the experience of thousands of orphans. This research investigates some of the causes of such large numbers of orphans, some actions taken to solve the problem of orphans, and the results of the actions that were taken. Through reading the following, it should become evident that the issue of orphans in Vietnam was a much bigger ordeal than is publicized and typically understood by the average citizen of the United States.

Lyrics from a song in the Broadway musical “Miss Saigon” beautifully describe whom the Bui Doi are, and the ravaged conditions in which they live. A character playing an American soldier in the Vietnam War sings the song.

These kids hit walls on every side
They don't belong in any place
Their secret they can't hide
It's printed on their face
I never thought one day I'd plead
For half breeds from a land that's torn
But then I saw a camp for children
Whose crime was being born.

Chorus:

They're called Bui Doi—the dust of life.
Conceived in Hell, and born in strife.
(We owe them fathers and a family, a loving home they never knew
Because we know deep in our hearts that they are all our children too).
They are the living reminders of all the good we failed to do.
We can't forget must not forget they are all our children too.¹

1 Claude-Michel Schönberg, *Miss Saigon* (Drury Lane Theatre, London, 20 September 1989).

As the lyrics to the musical explain, Bui Doi translates to mean the dust of life. Orphans of the war were left behind, without family or future. One author explains that they are called the dust of life because, "They live like dust on the road, wandering as the wind takes them, being swept up from time to time by the city police, having no value to anyone."²

The lyrics of the musical "Miss Saigon" also explain the source from whence Bui Doi came. A common explanation is that Vietnamese fathers would leave their wives and children behind to fight in the war. Oftentimes the fathers would not return for several years if they returned at all.³ During this time women were expected to provide for their children, but scarcely had ways of doing so. Many women turned to prostitution, with American soldiers being their largest pool of customers.⁴ Some women were fortunate enough to gain an American lover from the ordeal and would have a way to support her family for at least a year, until the soldier's call to duty was up and he went back to America. Within the time Vietnamese women spent with American soldiers, oftentimes they would get pregnant and have a child who was visibly a mix of the two, commonly called Amerasian. Thus the lyrics "We owe them fathers and a family a loving home they never knew, because we know deep in our hearts that they are all our children too"⁵ and "their secret they can't hide, it's printed on their face"⁶ describe that these children were clearly Amerasian and were the responsibility of many American soldiers.⁷

Women were often mocked for having children who were half American; not only that, but her other children would also be teased and made fun of for having an Amerasian sibling.⁸ Because of the stigma that accompanied women with Amerasian children, women would often leave their child on the doorstep to an orphanage or hospital in hopes that the child would be better taken care of there.⁹ Fifty percent of children who were abandoned in this fashion were Black Amerasians.¹⁰

As bad as White Amerasians had it, Black Amerasians had it worse. Black Amerasians are teased by the other children and called "My Den," which means Black American.¹¹ Not only were Black Amerasians segregated from the other children, but also they are treated like the "primitive

2 Betty J. Lifton, *Children of Vietnam* (New York, Atheneum, 1972), 41.

3 Gail Dolgin, *Daughter from Danang* (PBS Home Video, 2003).

4 Lifton, 63.

5 Schöenberg.

6 Ibid.

7 Lifton, 64.

8 Lisa Seidenberg, *Children of the Dust* (Carousel Film and Video, 1991).

9 Lifton, 23.

10 Ibid.

11 Lifton, 66.

dark-skinned mountain tribesmen (the Montagnards)."¹² Black Amerasians most assuredly have found it more difficult to marry and find work.¹³ Some Vietnamese women anticipated the struggles of their Amerasian children in Vietnam and so, toward the end of the war, they gave up their children in the hopes that the child would be adopted by an American and have a better future.¹⁴

Another cause for the thousands of Vietnamese orphans was battles, which often took place in villages. The consequences of such battles were the destruction of lives, families, and the resultant orphan children. A story printed in the *Reader's Digest* in 1970 described the moment wherein a police officer found a helpless child whose family had just been killed by mortar fire.¹⁵

She was lying on the edge of the pitted street, spindly legs outstretched, howling to the Asian moon, when the policeman found her. Near her were several dead Vietnamese men and women. Obviously, there had been an explosion here. The mortar attack by the Vietcong, directed at the bachelor officers' quarters down the street, had been unexpected and swift. The policeman marveled that the tiny infant was unscathed. But she was so thin and wasted that he was surprised she had the energy to cry so lustily.¹⁶

Though life would not be an easy journey for the orphans who were left behind when their parents and family members were killed in the War, it most likely was not as difficult as it would be for the children who could not hide their story—Bui Doi. All in all, the combination of different aspects of the war between the United States of America and Vietnam resulted in orphan children.

One short story titled, "A Visit to My Village," written by Ngoc Ky illustrates a physical location that was lost in the war:

Once upon a time, from this spot, one could see coconut and bamboo trees growing in a huge rice field. This was my hamlet. Now there is only bare ground. All the images of the old days have vanished...Everything had gone.

Like someone who had lost his soul, I wanted to scream out my own inability to preserve what had been left to me by my ancestors.¹⁷

Arguably, this short story is not only about the literal hamlet wherein Ngoc Ky once resided and found peace, but also symbolic of the culture, the family and the lives that were destroyed in the War. Truly, there was a time when orphanages were not so prevalent in Vietnam. This was the case because the Vietnamese culture is very family oriented. They cared for their young and if parents were not in a position to do so, then the next of

12 Lifton, 68.

13 Ibid.

14 Dolgin.

15 Frank M. Chinnock, "Kim: A Gift from Vietnam," *Reader's Digest*, spring 1970, 9.

16 Ibid.

17 Lifton, 14.

kin would step in and cover the responsibility. Unfortunately, “after so many years of a war in which many villages have been totally destroyed and whole populations forcibly removed from their ancestral lands, children have been either orphaned or separated from their kin.”¹⁸

Fortunately, some actions were attempted to try to help the orphans, and solve the orphan dilemma. Orphans were occasionally visited by loving individuals who aided them emotionally and/or physically. A particularly in tune Buddhist named Thich Nhat Hanh visited some orphan children, and of his experience he wrote the poem “I Met You at the Orphanage Yard”:

Your sad eyes
overflowed with
loneliness
and pain.
You saw me.
You turned your face away.
Your hands drew circles,
circles
on the dusty ground.
I dared not ask you
where your father
and your mother were.
I dared not open up your wounds.
I only wished to sit with you
a moment
saying a word or two.¹⁹

In a book written by Thich Nhat Hanh he said, “When you see in yourself the wish that the other person stop suffering, that is a sign of real love.”²⁰ Perhaps it was this type of love that he was feeling as he looked into the eyes of the orphan children in the “orphanage yard.”²¹

Another man who was especially caring of the orphans was Dr. Meritt Stark. This man made a trip to Vietnam wherein he fell in love with the Vietnamese people. So attached was he to these people that he later convinced his wife and daughter to travel to Vietnam with him to aid the people and especially the children in Vietnam.

Dr. Stark and his family worked excessively hard while in Vietnam. It was noted that Dr. Stark saw fifty to sixty patients daily.²² The patients that

18 Lifton, 23.

19 Lifton, 22.

20 Hanh, Thich Nhat, *Peace is Every Step: The Path of Mindfulness in Everyday Life* (New York: Bantam Books, 1991), 120.

21 Lifton, 22.

22 Meritt W. Stark, “Please Don’t Kill the Orphans” (Facsimile: Personal Collection of Dr. William Cobb), 51.

Dr. Stark saw were typically children in several different orphanages.²³ While Dr. Stark used his medicinal talents to aid the Vietnamese people, his daughter, Laurie focused on educating the children. Although Laurie was an anti-war advocate, she willingly went to Vietnam, served and fell in love with the Vietnamese people. Toward the end of the war, Laurie and one of her Vietnamese friends decided to create a school to provide a good education for the orphan children. They named the school, Peter Pan School, but unfortunately it closed down on 4 April 1975 because the American embassy requested all non-essential Americans to leave the country.²⁴

With the school closed, Laurie was now offered to accompany her father in bringing 243 orphans to the United States that very day.²⁵ She accepted. The name of this mission was Operation Babylift; it was one last push for the United States to take some responsibility and evacuate some of their own orphans out of Vietnam.

The goal of Operation Babylift was to eventually evacuate 2,000 orphan children from Vietnam and into the United States and Canada within the year 1975, and before the war was over.²⁶ The particular mission Dr. Stark and Laurie were on had the objective of loading a Galaxy C-5A with 243 orphans, and flying the orphans from Saigon to the United States.²⁷ Upon arrival to the United States, most of the children would have adoptive parents waiting for them. This is explained a little more clearly in "The Fall of Saigon" where it is written, "The great majority of the children who were put on the flights passed through one of seven adoption agencies operating in Vietnam and had adopting parents waiting for them in the U.S." ²⁸

Dr. Stark and Laurie had decided that Laurie should stay down in the cargo section of the plane to take care of the children who did not need specific attention. Dr. Stark would stay on the upper deck with the children who had greater medical problems and help them on the way to San Francisco.²⁹

Sadly, "about eighteen minutes after take-off, the rear cargo door blew out." ³⁰ The plane turned around and eventually hit the ground, but then it was up in the air again. Multiple times the plane bounced from the ground into the air, until its final landing in some rice fields just two miles

23 Ibid, 130.

24 Stark, 41.

25 David Butler, *The Fall of Saigon: Scenes from the Sudden End of a Long War* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1985), 223.

26 Hector Tobar, "Vietnam War Orphans Plan Journey of Self-Discovery," *Los Angeles Times*, 10 June 1996, p.1.

27 Butler, —221.

28 Ibid, 220.

29 Butler, 223.

30 Stark, 41.

from the Ton Son Nhut Airport in Saigon. Ironically, this U.S. mission to take responsibility and help evacuate at least 2,000 Bui Doi was done so irresponsibly that it resulted in the deaths of 135 people. Apparently it was known ahead of time that C-5A's have a "notorious history of cargo-door blowouts."³¹ Had this mission been performed responsibly, the children and adults (including Laurie Stark) "would still be alive today."³² Instead, "So shattered were their bodies" that it required time and eventually Laurie's dental films to identify her devastated body and pronounce her dead.³³ Dr. Stark, however, survived the crash and was able to safely evacuate the remaining children from the Galaxy C-5A.³⁴

Although this crash was a dreadful thing to have taken place, the results of other Operation Babylift missions, as an effort to solve the problem of such large numbers of orphans, was a success in numerous cases. Many children were adopted by American parents who fed them as they had never been fed, and cared for them as they had never been cared for.³⁵ Children received an education and were given an opportunity to succeed in life, whereas in Vietnam they would only be looked down upon and taunted by pure Vietnamese who had homes and families.

On the other hand, some Amerasian children grew up in the United States feeling displaced. They did not look like their new family, and felt they would never know their parents. One Amerasian orphan in the United States, named Hiep, became curious about her Vietnamese family and decided to try to find her roots in Vietnam.³⁶ Her search was a success, but the results were different from what she had anticipated. After meeting her long lost Vietnamese family, they petitioned her to take their mother back to the United States with her and care for her there. Hiep was devastated by the request because she had thought that going to Vietnam would just be a good experience for her to learn about her heritage and she did not expect to return to the United States with such grand responsibilities, consequently, she refused. Two years after departing from Vietnam, Hiep explained that she had not had contact with her Vietnamese family since the trip that she made there. She said, "I've closed the door but it's not locked."³⁷ Hiep's mother still cries because she feels as though she has lost her daughter all over again.³⁸

31 Butler, 229.

32 Ibid.

33 Stark, 41.

34 Butler, 220.

35 Chinnock, 64.

36 Dolgin.

37 Ibid.

38 Ibid.

While Operation Babylift did help some of the orphans to have better care and a better future, there is, of course a flip side. Hiep, like many other orphans placed into American homes will never feel connected with a family of her own; the war has torn families and lives apart. Results are devastating, but apparently this is just one of the components of war. Of the atrocities forced upon Vietnamese children a poet writes, "If only the children could have had the stars, the flowers and the butterflies, instead of the war." ³⁹

Through investigating some of the causes of such large numbers of orphans, some actions taken to solve the problem of orphans, and the results of the actions that were taken it becomes evident that the experience of orphans in Vietnam is a much greater ordeal than most citizens of the United States are aware. Perhaps a greater awareness of the helpless orphans would have made the Vietnam War even more unpopular than it was already becoming. Nevertheless, these children have suffered, "if only they could have had the stars..." ⁴⁰

³⁹ Lifton, 40.

⁴⁰ Ibid.



CONSPIRACY, MURDER, AND COVER-UP THE MOUNTAIN MEADOWS MASSACRE

BY: ARTHUR A. HATFIELD

The Mountain Meadows Massacre, one of the great unsolved mysteries of history, was the earliest massacre of white Americans by white Americans in the nation's history. Though it occurred over one hundred fifty years ago on September 11, 1857, the facts are often misrepresented, even to this day, and have yet to be generally understood. However, evidence supports a scandalous theory that the massacre was part of a conspiracy by the early Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints in an effort to prevent interaction by the "saints" with outside, or gentile, influences. Essentially, based on the Mormon Church's actions regarding the event, the church should openly accept responsibility for the atrocities of the Mountain Meadows Massacre, instead of trying to cover up their actions by blaming innocent Paiute Indians for the attack.

The LDS church still vehemently denies any direct responsibility for the massacre. Officially little has changed since October 26, 1884, when Charles W. Penrose, serving as a general authority for the LDS church, delivered a speech denying responsibility for the massacre, stating that:

If it can be shown that the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints teaches the people to commit murder; if it can be shown that the Church, as a religious body, ordered that massacre, or, after it occurred, condoned it, palliated it, or agreed that it was right, considered it was proper, then we may lay this crime on the church and claim that the church is responsible for it.¹

These criteria establish a means which, according to at least one LDS spokesperson, should allow one to determine where guilt lies. It logically follows that if the conditions set forth by Elder Penrose can be met, one can readily establish the level of direct responsibility the Mormon Church should be assigned in the events leading to and resulting in the massacre.

1 Charles Penrose, Mountain Meadows Massacre, (Salt Lake City: The Deseret News, 1906), 13.

In order to introduce murder as a doctrine being taught by the LDS Church at the time, one must go back to the controversial principle of “Blood Atonement,” as taught by President Brigham Young. Under the principle of “Blood Atonement,” according to John D. Lee, who was convicted for the massacre, it was:

Believed by the people that the Priesthood [leaders] were inspired and, therefore, could not give a wrong order. It was the belief of all that [Lee] ever heard talk of these things... that the authority that ordered a murder committed, was the only responsible party, that the man that did the killing was only an *instrument*”²

This man was thus not technically responsible for the act. This neatly packaged guarantee of innocence to the obedient church members absolved them of the consequences of guilt and damnation, and proved a ready and effective tool to insure their dedication to any morally offensive action they were commanded to commit. The LDS Reformation created the opportunity for church leaders to measure and test this.

Beginning in early 1856, Brigham Young and other high ranking church officials “felt the Saints had lost their commitment to righteousness and to the kingdom”.³ Attempting to get the church members commitment level raised, Young called for severe measures. Jedediah Grant, the second counselor to Brigham Young, “created a catechism to quantify the sinfulness of the Saints”.⁴ Grant’s catechism raised a list of eighteen questions designed to let one know if they needed to reform their actions for proper obedience to the church’s strict principles. Church members suddenly had to fight to prove their worthiness of salvation, and fear of losing one’s standing in the church, and therefore heaven, was high. According to one account:

Every bishop had the ‘cue’ given to him,” Hannah King wrote, “and he rose up and lashed the people as with a cat-o-nine tails. The people shrunk, wept, groaned like whipped children....The whole people seemed to mourn for all more or less came ‘under the rod.’⁵

Suspicion of apostasy and evil was high among the early Saints. Almost daily during this troubled period of Utah history members were being re-baptized, confessing in public, and fervently revamping their lives to follow the church’s every command to the letter, as close as they could. As part of this fear, Brigham Young insured the doctrine of ‘Blood Atonement’ was brought to the forefront. In one address regarding Blood Atonement, Brigham Young said that if someone wanted to obtain salvation, and it was

2 John D. Lee, *Mormonism Unveiled; or The Life and Confessions of the Late Mormon Bishop John D. Lee; (Written by Himself)* (St. Louis: Bryan, Brand, and Company, 1877), 279.

3 Will Bagley, *Blood of the Prophets: Brigham Young and the Mountain Meadows Massacre* (Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 2002), 49

4 Bagley, 50.

5 Bagley, 50.

“necessary to spill his blood on the earth in order that he might be saved, spill it.”⁶ On another occasion, regarding Mormons who committed sins of unpardonable magnitude, he asked, “will you love that man or woman well enough to shed their blood?”⁷ Under the iron-fisted rule of Young, there was much fear among the saints that if they disobeyed the commands of their church leaders, they could possibly end up being killed as apostates, and would certainly end up in hell for eternity. The reins were tightened, and the church members faithfully followed every command, even to shed the blood of man, without questioning the motives or morality of the act. This level of faith was required of all, and the Mormon people obliged, without regard for worldly consequences.

With the doctrine of Blood Atonement as a basis, the next step in establishing guilt is to prove that “the Church, as a religious body, ordered that massacre”.⁸ According to John D. Lee, convicted of the crime 20 years after it occurred, the church did, indeed, give the order for the massacre. He asserted, not without contempt, “I am now cut off from the Church for obeying the orders of my superiors, and doing so without asking questions - for doing as my religion and religious teachers had taught me to do”.⁹

Although the Mormon Church attempted to blame responsibility for the massacre on Paiute Indians, it cannot be denied that the local white church leaders were involved in planning and organizing the attack. Because the leaders of the church were also the military and political leaders, to establish proof it is imperative to show that the act of conspiracy was performed under a religious pretense, and not that of a political nature. This is demonstrated by the fact that conspirators used official church functions, such as priesthood meetings called by the Stake High Council, as their forum.¹⁰ According to an account by John D. Lee, John Higbee used the church’s authority to deliver the order of death, saying:

Why brethren, there is not a drop of innocent blood In that entire camp of Gentile outlaws; they are a set of cut-throats, robbers, and assassins... who aided to shed the blood of our Prophets, Joseph and Hyrum, and it is our orders from all in authority (*italics added*), to get the emigrants from their stronghold, and help the Indians kill them.¹¹

Following this damning remark, the council “formed a prayer circle and invoked the spirit of God to direct them in the matter.”¹²

6 Bagley, 51.

7 Bagley, 50.

8 Penrose 13.

9 John D. Lee, *Writings of John D. Lee*. Ed. Samuel N. Henrie, (Tucson, AZ: Fenestra Books, 2002), 207.

10 Juanita Brooks, *The Mountain Meadows Massacre*. (Norman, OK : University of Oklahoma Press, 1964), 53.

11 Bagley 2002, 141.

12 Bagley 2002, 141.

Another important assurance of the religious conspiracy is evidenced in the enforcement of the principle of "Blood Atonement" on some local church members who were found among the dead. In a journal entry of a descendant of one of the military men sent to bury the dead, it states, "some of the people he helped bury were Mormons who were well known to him. When their dead bodies were found, after the massacre, it is said they were clothed in their endowment shirts".¹³ This evidence points the futility of the accusation of the Indians in the affair. Had Indians been responsible, is it not likely that they would have taken care of local apostates at the same time.

In his confessions, convicted scapegoat John D. Lee implicates the Mormon Church further. He insisted, "I know *all* were acting under the orders and by the command of their church leaders; and I firmly believe that the most of those who took part in the proceedings, considered it a religious duty to unquestioningly obey the orders which they had received."¹⁴

In order to prove that after the massacre the Mormon Church "condoned it, palliated it, or agreed that it was right, considered it was proper,"¹⁵ it should suffice to show that the event was conscientiously covered up by Mormon leaders. Brigham Young, realizing that the event would bring the heavy hand of the US Government to the territory, did all he could to cover up the incident. "By maneuvering politically with the backstage help of a figure who would be the Mormons most important defender [Thomas L. Kane], Young managed to stave off a federal investigation of the matter for years."¹⁶ According to John D. Lee, Brigham Young was aware of the tragedy, and after it was over, supported the Mormon's involvement: "I will state here that Brigham Young honored me in many ways after the affair at Mountain Meadows was fully reported to him by me".¹⁷ Lee's word, verified by a journal entry by Wilford Woodruff stating that there was no innocent blood shed, proves that church officials, specifically Brigham Young, were made aware of the incident shortly after it occurred.¹⁸ Woodruff's knowledge and concern inadvertently give the true LDS position away, for "If the Indians alone were guilty, there would have been no need for concern over the shedding of innocent blood,"¹⁹

13 Bagley 2002, 141.

14 Lee 2002, 205.

15 Penrose 1906, 18.

16 Sally Denton, "What Happened at Mountain Meadows?" American Heritage Magazine, (October 2001. Retrieved 26 May 2003

<http://mazeministry.com/mormonism/mm1.htm>).

17 Lee 2002, 210.

18 Brooks 1964, 165.

19 David L. Bigler, *Forgotten Kingdom: The Mormon Theocracy in the American West*, (Logan, UT: Utah State University Press, 1998), 175.

Apostle George A. Smith was the first to make an official report of the incident in the church's behalf, in July, 1858. Today it is well known that, at a minimum, the church was aware of their own members' involvement in the killings. However, referring to Higbee, Haight, Smith, and other local leaders, Smith claims in his report that when the Mormon officials arrived at the massacre sight, the emigrants were already slain.²⁰ This certainly reinforces John D. Lee's account of a cover-up. When Lee reported the incident to Young shortly after it had occurred, Young cautioned him, and "commanded [Lee] to keep the whole thing as a sacred secret, and again told [Lee] to write the report as Indian Farmer, laying the blame on the Indians,"²¹

Next in this chain of murder, mayhem, and lies, came the justification of the events, and the exonerations of the local Mormon leaders involved. In an apostolic inquiry on August 5, 1858, George A. Smith, Amasa Lyman, Erastus Snow, and Charles Rich (all members of the church's elite) questioned John D. Lee, Isaac Haight, and Philip Klingensmith about their involvement in the massacre. Their collective conclusion was that the charges against Lee were "founded on 'blind prejudice only.'" ²² They then "reproved the local authorities for unwise policies, but took no other action."²³ At this point, it appeared that there would be no repercussion imposed or taken by the Mormon Church against any participant in the massacre. One would expect no less of someone condoning the actions they had been made well aware of.

This self-serving position didn't last long. Judge John Cradlebaugh, a non-Mormon, began another, objective, investigation in 1859 that threw the leaders of the church and the massacre participants into an uproar. He convened a grand jury in Provo, and had the audacity to take testimony from witnesses, generating a political battle between the government and the Mormons. Seth Blair, the Mormon territorial attorney general, impeded Cradlebaugh's progress by trying to prevent him from prosecuting the cases. The prosecuting attorney, Alexander Wilson, was accused by a non-Mormon journalist of being council for the defense. Although the grand jury was plagued from the start by uncooperativeness, Cradlebaugh's investigation uncovered sufficient proof to issue bench warrants for several of those involved that sent many of the Mormon participants into hiding as fugitives.²⁴

20 Brooks 1964, 166.

21 Lee 1877, 244.

22 Bagley 2002, 213.

23 Bagley 2002, 213.

24 Bigler 1998, 217.

Finally, things reached a point where someone had to be held accountable for the event. Still far away from revealing the carefully buried truth, a scapegoat was selected. The person chosen was John D. Lee, who had been a fugitive in hiding from a warrant. Brigham Young chose to sell out John D. Lee, hoping the offering of a sacrificial 'fall guy' would take the pressure off the church, himself, and other high ranking church leaders. At Lee's first trial, the prosecutor was unable to obtain a conviction. It is common knowledge that Brigham Young controlled the juries, and the jurors responded to Young's desire to have Lee acquitted. However, by the second trial, pressure on the church was immense, and Young felt it was imperative that Lee be convicted. Affidavits denying the church's involvement were read at Lee's second trial, and they were enough to convict him of murder for his actions in the heinous massacre. "By the time the prosecution rested, Lee knew he had been betrayed. In despair, he ordered his attorneys to present no defense."²⁵ On March 23, 1877, John D. Lee was executed for his involvement in the massacre. His death marked the end of the federal investigation in the matter. The cover-up worked, and one man paid the price for many. This action by the church, in line with their beliefs, is supported by an often quoted Book of Mormon scripture, which reads: "Behold the Lord slayeth the wicked to bring forth his righteous purposes. It is better that one man should perish than that a nation should dwindle and perish in unbelief."²⁶

Although the federal inquiry was over, the Federal Government still was not convinced. According to Secretary of War John B. Floyd in his 1860 Congressional Report, he was resolved that the attackers at Mountain Meadows, as well as other 'Indian' conflicts, were white men disguised as Indians and furthermore he was convinced that these white men were indeed LDS members, "sanctioned, if not directed by the authority of, the Mormon Church."²⁷

As a result of the mystery surrounding the Mountain Meadows Massacre, the court of popular opinion is still in session today. In 1999, excavators found a mass grave with 28 bodies of massacred victims. After examination by forensic scientists, it was determined that many of the women, and at least one child, were shot between the eyes, execution style. Not surprisingly, this contradicts reports that the women and children were killed by Indians while running away. Further examination of the evidence proves that John D. Lee could not have acted without help.

²⁵ Bagley 2002, 305.

²⁶ The Book of Mormon. (Salt Lake City, UT: The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, 1981), 1 Nephi 4:13.

²⁷ U.S. Congress, Senate, "Report of the Secretary of War, 1860, serial 1024". In The Shoshoni Frontier and the Bear River Massacre Vol. 1, Brigham D. Madsen and Charles S. Peterson, (Salt Lake City, UT: The University of Utah Press, 1985), 99. <www.questia.com>

The same evidence supports the Paiute oral histories which tell a different story of the attack, and clears the Paiutes of much of the blame placed on them by Brigham Young and his cover-up tactics. Shockingly, however, before the examination could be completed, Utah Governor Mike Leavitt, a Mormon whose ancestor, Dudley Leavitt, participated in the massacre, ordered the bones reburied. No viable reason was ever given for the order.²⁸

Responsibility for the massacre, as established by the Penrose's, and thus the LDS Church's, guidelines is deservedly found to rest on the LDS Church. Through teachings that authorize people to commit murder in the name of God, participants who, acting in their positions as religious leaders and as a religious body, ordered the massacre, and then conspired to cover up the attack, the known facts in evidence establish compelling proof of the LDS Church's responsibility. There is little question that the Mormon church was aware of their member's actions at Mountain Meadows, that they condoned their involvement in the planning and execution of massacre, or that they tried to cover up their responsibility for their actions, after the fact, by blaming innocent Paiute Indians for the attack.

28 Denton 2001.



THE BILL OF RIGHTS: A POPULAR VICTORY FOR LIBERALISM IN THE AMERICAN FOUNDING

BY: RYAN VOGEL

Many times in historical discussions complexity is sacrificed for simplistic renderings of progression and inevitability. The American Revolution and Founding, true to form, has been clouded in myth and simplicity in regard to the utter precariousness, unpredictability, and experimentalism of the liberal democratic framework of the United States. Evaluation of the Founding documents, particularly the Bill of Rights requires a more contextual and analytical survey to acquire an enriched understanding and appreciation for the governmental origins and development of rights in the United States. Jack Rakove, in his American documentary study entitled *Declaring Rights*, observes, “The passage through Congress of the amendments that we now know as the Bill of Rights was . . . a more complicated story than many textbooks suggest. From our vantage point, the proposal of these amendments seems a fitting capstone and culmination to the deliberations of the preceding two years. . . But at the time, many congressmen and observers ‘out-of-doors’ had good reason to adopt a more modest view”¹ The complexity results in large part from the diversity of interests among Americans, clashing and competing principles and ideologies among Framers, and ultimately a demand from “the People” to extol liberal rights in the face of republican virtue. Further, the proposed Constitution renewed many fears of aristocratic conspiracies and possibilities to the general public, which complicates the political and socio-historical picture even more. The Bill of Rights was hardly an inevitability or form of manifest destiny.

More than anything else, the Bill of Rights was a symbol of American reverence for the concept of rights. In his essay on rights and liberties in early America, Dick Howard writes that “renewed apprehension about the security of these rights under the constitution drafted in Philadelphia in 1787 would lead to the addition of the Bill of Rights to the Constitution in

1 Jack N. Rakove, *Declaring Rights: A Brief History with Documents* (New York: Bedford Books, 1998), 167.

1791.”² Americans familiar with the rhetoric of freedom, liberty, and protected rights from the Revolution, epitomized by the Preamble to the Declaration of Independence, did not want to see a reversal of form only ten years later in the form of an elitist and aristocratic government separated from the people. Consequently, near consensus was reached by most Americans in support of what Ellis Sandoz designates in his work, *Government of Laws*, as “liberty and essential political rights, but not . . . a powerful national government at the expense of the states’ autonomy.”³ While the newly created national government under the Constitution seemed uneasily distant from the governed, state and local authorities and representatives were much easier for the people to trust and monitor. Additionally, “seven of the states had bills of rights protecting fundamental liberties from government infringement” which served as valuable and “powerful symbols.”⁴ Thus, to Fred Barbash, author of *The Founding*, “The omission of a bill of rights sparked the loudest protest of all, and was the single greatest asset of the Constitution’s opponents.”⁵ Put simply, a bill of rights was an absolute demand on the part of “common” Americans, albeit represented by an intellectual vocal elite, as a liberal check to the republican Constitution.

The problem, then, was how to reassert the liberal principles of the Revolution, namely individual freedom, liberty and protection of natural and fundamental rights, while maintaining a republican form of government, and instilling order and authority to a centralized government, all simultaneously. The classical liberalism of the Declaration of Independence, which asserts “that the people are in fact capable of instituting forms of government that will secure their safety and happiness,”⁶ seemed in jeopardy with ratification of the republican Constitution, but a bill of rights was a logical step to many in reasserting the principle of liberalism and fundamental rights in the Founding. But, far from being a natural appendage to the Constitution by the Framers, the Bill of Rights served as a liberal reaffirmation of rights in response to popular demand. Examining the historical moment and context of the Bill of Rights, reviewing the debates on the Amendments by the elite from the Constitutional Convention and by the public in the ratification process, and evaluating

2 Dick A.E. Howard, “Rights in Passage: English Liberties in Early America,” *The Bill of Rights and the States* (Madison: Madison House, 1992), 14.

3 Ellis Sandoz, *A Government of Laws: Political Theory, Religion, and the American Founding* (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2001), 203.

4 Fred Barbash, *The Founding: A Dramatic Account of the Writing of the Constitution* (New York: Linden Press, 1987), 194.

5 *Ibid.*, 210.

6 Gary Rosen, *American Compact: James Madison and the Problem of Founding* (Lawrence: UP of Kansas, 1999), 15.

the resultant compromise in the form of the first ten amendments to the Constitution convincingly portrays the Bill of rights as a popular victory for the principle of liberalism and rights as a reaction to the implementation of the republican Constitution by the American elite.

Historical Moment

To understand the role of classical liberalism, and thus the emphasis on rights, on the American psyche, familiarity with the key philosophers and ideologies of the Enlightenment is crucial. Americans generally, and the educated elite specifically, were well versed in the writings of Hobbes, Montesquieu, Rousseau, Locke, Hume, Mill, and Paine. Samuel Rudolph states in his introduction to *The Philosophy of Freedom* that it is from "the British and French political philosophers of the Enlightenment in Europe . . . that we inherit the philosophical bearings of a newborn nation with a written . . . Bill of Rights."⁷ Americans responded resoundingly and nearly unanimously in favor of Enlightenment tenets, with its emphasis on individual rights and self interest. As Frank W. Fox writes in his analysis on American liberalism, "America represented the 'liberal society' of the Enlightenment, and . . . the American character was the very epitome of self-interest."⁸ A relatively high number of Americans were familiar with liberal ideas and nearly all Americans believed in the implications that the philosophy espoused. John Locke in particular was highly regarded among Americans, especially the Framers, for his discourses on government. Rudolph writes summarily of Locke's premises on government, "It was the essential purpose of government, for Locke, to safeguard, to protect and defend the natural rights of each . . . Its central role is just the protection of such natural civil and political rights, the adjudication of disputes regarding those rights, and the securing of a general respect for the natural rights of the individual."⁹ The focus on securing rights and promoting the public good became the primary objective of the Revolution for many Americans and found an attentive audience in America.

In addition to the adherence to Enlightenment philosophy, and often times in coordination with it, popular democratic leanings among the public at large began to emerge. Calvinistic religion served as an inspiration and model for many states, as Donald S. Lutz writes in his contextual analysis of the Bill of Rights: "Most of the examples taken from state bills of rights thus far exemplify either the Protestant covenantal view, or a complete blending of that view with Lockean rationalism."¹⁰ Further, "The

7 Samuel B. Rudolph, *The Philosophy of Freedom: Ideological Origins of the Bill of Rights* (New York: UP of America, 1993), xvi.

8 Frank W. Fox and Clayne L. Pope, *America: A Study in Heritage* (Iowa: Kendall/ Hunt Publishing, 1993), 51.

9 Rudolph, 4.

10 Donald S. Lutz, "The U.S. Bill of Rights in Historical Perspective," *Contexts of the Bill of Rights* (New York: New York State Commission on the Bicentennial of the US Constitution, 1990), 11.

communitarian, popular-consent approach to rights was initially derived from dissenting Protestant theology as it was applied to the design of political institutions in the circumstances of seventeenth and eighteenth-century North America.”¹¹ Religion and Enlightenment ideas thus combined to create a people socially, culturally, and politically distinct from the rest of the world. Gordon S. Wood states in his comprehensive study on the implications of the Revolution on American society, *The Radicalism of the American Revolution*, “In no country in the world did public opinion become more awesome and powerful than it did in democratic America.”¹² A critical public felt entitled to protected, fundamental rights, and thus, “the vast array of rights secured by law compose the texture of free government and emanate from the personalities of the individuals who collectively make up the *People* is a fundamental conviction in America.”¹³ Insistence on rights produced the very fabric of American ideology, was a principal reason for Revolution, and became a major issue in the creation of the government and Constitution.

Perhaps the most important precursor to the Bill of Rights was the Declaration of Independence. In terms of historically contextual value the Declaration was a tremendous strike for rights and liberty. Following the Stamp Act crisis, debates over the power to tax and right to representation, and ultimately parliamentary sovereignty over the colonies, the Declaration, with its defense of “inalienable rights” defined the American belief in natural rights. Jefferson outlines these rights, as Locke wrote in his *Second Treatise*, as “Life, Liberty, and [property, for Locke] the pursuit of Happiness.”¹⁴ The impact these lines had on the American psyche is immeasurable. Americans in support of the Revolution embraced this concept of rights religiously and guarded against any possibility of encroachment with vigor. For this reason, the federal Constitution was viewed with extreme suspicion, suggesting that the anti-Britain movement was only tenuously and conditionally a pro-United States government movement. Steven L. Schechter and Richard B. Bernstein writes, “The federal Bill of Rights was a catalogue of rights which had been infringed by both colonial governments and by the British government, both in the British Isles and in America.”¹⁵ Americans were mindful of the history of tyranny and oppression and the potential of a strong, centralized government – even a

11 Ibid., 10.

12 Gordon S. Wood, *The Radicalism of the American Revolution* (New York: Vintage Books, 1991), 364.

13 Sandoz, 209.

14 Thomas Jefferson, “Declaration of Independence,” Paine and Jefferson on Liberty (New York: Frederick Ungar, 1988), 63.

15 Stephen L. Schechter and Richard B. Bernstein, *Contexts of the Bill of Rights* (New York: New York State Commission on the Bicentennial of the US Constitution, 1990), xvi.

republican and popularly elected one – was disconcerting. “Thus,” Schechter and Bernstein state, “the demand for a federal bill of rights was as much a demand for certain basic restraints on this untried system’s potential to invade the sphere of state authority and the limits on that authority as a demand to protect individual rights.”¹⁶

The historical context of the Bill of Rights is a complicated but focused one. Religious self-determination, liberal belief in and insistence on rights, political suspicion resulting from British tyranny, and democratic undercurrents all contributed to an environment demanding of a bill of rights. State constitutions containing bills of rights set the precedent for a federal bill, as nine had some form of a declaration of rights in their prefixes to their constitutions.¹⁷ In a letter to James Madison during the constitutional process and responding to his distaste for bills of rights, Thomas Jefferson expressed the sentiment of the people, when he wrote, “a bill of rights is what the people are entitled to against any government on earth, general or particular, and what no government should refuse, or rest on inference.”¹⁸ Moreover, in answer to the inadequacy of enumeration, Jefferson writes, “Half a loaf is better than no bread. If we cannot secure all our rights, let us secure what we can.”¹⁹ The socio-political context, therefore, in effect set up the debates over the necessity and desirability for a bill of rights as a compact between the American elite and American public.

Fear from the Elite: The Framers’ Intent

The democratizing effect of the Revolution was certainly significant to the direction of the newly formed United States, and a sense of egalitarianism and participation was prevalent in the new republic. Outside of the proponents of the crown, however, the leadership remained essentially the same after the Revolution and before the creation of the Bill of Rights. The leaders were, as Wood describes them, “still aristocrats, natural aristocrats, aristocrats of virtue and talent no doubt, but aristocrats nonetheless. They were still men of leisure, graceful without foppishness, polite without arrogance, tasteful without ostentation, and natural without vulgarity.”²⁰ They were representatives of all that the Enlightenment and principle of republican virtue embodied. The Framers believed firmly in the concept of republicanism, with the focus on civic virtue and pretenses to elitist leadership it entailed. However, Richard Vetterli and Gary Bryner argue that “the

16 Ibid., xvii.

17 Ronald M. Peters, Jr., “The Written Constitution,” *Founding Principles of American Government*. (London: Indiana UP, 1977), 173.

18 Schechter, xi.

19 Michael Kammen, *The Origins of the American Constitution: A Documentary History*. (New York: Penguin, 1986), 377.

20 Wood, 196.

Founders attempted to, and were ultimately successful, in responding to both traditions [republicanism and liberalism]. They believed that republican virtue and liberal individualism . . . are compatible and interdependent.”²¹ The distinction is that while they believed in both republicanism and liberalism, it was the former that offered more order, control, and social regulation. Gary Rosen writes, “As Madison so amply demonstrated, even liberalism, with its unblinking realism about the selfish tendencies of humankind and its narrow focus on mundane goods like security, prosperity, and peace, must look to certain human excellences if it is to create political regimes that can endure.”²² Thus, in the Constitutional Convention concerns over too much freedom curtailed a discussion on guaranteed rights.

For all the rhetoric to the contrary, the Framers were advocates of top-down leadership, or rule by the best of the society. Certainly, all believed in participation and civic activity, but the attitude at the Founding was one of reining in rather than branching out. Wood asserts that many “questioned the capacity of most ordinary people to rise above self-interest, particularly those dependent on” others, masses who were “incapable of disinterestedness.”²³ Wood elaborates, “Although republicanism compared to monarchy rested on a magnanimous view of common people, it retained a traditional patrician bias in regard to officeholding . . . They [the common people] were not to be the leaders of the society.”²⁴ The unquestioned deference to rights by the elite, then, only extended so far as could be controlled and maintained. The very fact that the Confederation failed to provide that security, evidenced in particular by the Shays’ Rebellion, frightened the Framers into action. McDonald observes that the Framers at the Convention were “anxious to check the excess of democracy in the state governments by strengthening the central authority.”²⁵ Fear of democracy and the extension of or obsession with rights made the Framers wary of a bill of rights promulgating the principle further. Gary C. Bryner relates that “their opposition to a bill of rights came from the fear that too much discussion of rights, too much emphasis on individual, natural rights would be fatal to the development of effective government.”²⁶ Clearly, the Framers’ misgivings and reservations with the development of democratic

21 Richard Vetterli and Gary Bryner, *In Search of the Republic: Public Virtue and the Roots of American Government* (New Jersey: Rowman and Littlefield, 1987), 8.

22 Rosen, 5.

23 Wood, 106.

24 *Ibid.*, 106.

25 Forrest McDonald, *Novus Ordo Seclorum: The Intellectual Origins of the Constitution* (Lawrence: Kansas UP, 1985), 202.

26 Gary C. Bryner, “Constitutionalism and the Politics of Rights,” *Constitutionalism and Rights*. (Provo, UT: Brigham Young UP, 1987), 15.

demands shaped their position to a bill of rights in the Constitutional Convention. As Wood put it, "The founding fathers . . . found it difficult to accept the democratic fact that their fate now rested on the opinions and votes of small-souled and largely unreflective ordinary people."²⁷ Indeed, even Thomas Jefferson, long the defender of democratic liberalism, "hated the new democratic world he saw emerging in America."²⁸ To the Framers and American elite, democracy meant the beginning and possibility of a dangerous, disorderly anarchy and mob rule.

Fear from the American elite of the failure of the republican experiment they took so much pride in was a driving force in the Convention and in the dismissal of a bill of rights. John P. Kaminski and Richard B. Bernstein writes of the focus of the Convention, "The delegates believed that their primary tasks were to strengthen the general government and to limit the powers of the state governments. Because the delegates focused on these goals, it is not surprising that the Constitutional Convention failed to propose a federal bill of rights."²⁹ In fact, the Framers were so concerned with establishing an orderly, efficient, republican government that they disregarded discussion on a bill for the most part and ultimately voted unanimously against one.³⁰ It is important to note that for the most part exclusion of a declaration of guaranteed rights in the Constitution was not so much a conscious disregard as it was a concentration on other aspects of the government. Madison argues that rights were already implicitly contained within the Constitution and that enumeration was an even greater danger than no bill at all. Federalists, who constituted most of the Framers, frankly dismissed the importance of guaranteed rights in a representative republic. "Bills of rights were necessary against kings," Schechter argues, "but not in republics where the people could elect new representatives, senators, and even a new president if these government officials threatened liberties. Parchment barriers, Federalists asserted, provided no protections. Only the people, ever watchful over their government, could guarantee their liberties."³¹ Thus, the elite failed to understand the importance of the symbolic and political reassurance a bill of rights would provide the general public, and the people, in order to "guarantee their liberties," demanded just that.

27 Wood, 367.

28 Ibid., 367.

29 John P. Kaminski and Richard B. Bernstein, "The Bill of Rights," *Roots of the Republic: American Founding Documents Interpreted* (Madison: Madison House, 1990), 425.

30 Barbash, 195.

31 Schechter 425

Popular Response: The Peoples' Position

The response to the absence of a bill of rights in the newly written Constitution by the states and people was loud and immediate. Clouded in secrecy, the results of the Convention seemed ominously suspicious and conspiratorial. Schechter writes, "Opponents of the Constitution . . . used the omission of a bill of rights as proof that a conspiracy was afoot to subvert the principles of the Revolution and deprive Americans of their dear-bought rights."³² Liberalism and fundamental rights seemed under attack by an elite group paranoid of "excessive democracy." In reaction, at the conclusion of essay two to the citizens of the State of New York, "Brutus" writes, "Ought not a government, vested with such extensive and indefinite authority, to have been restricted by a declaration of rights? It certainly ought."³³ And those who thought otherwise, he declares, were clearly being lead into a "state of vassalage."³⁴ As evidenced earlier, the Framers did in fact wish to subdue the passions and spirits of the masses with a stronger government but they severely underestimated the resolve of the people and their closely connected local representatives.

Following the Convention, countless letters, pamphlets, and editorials flooded the states with arguments for and against the ratification of the Constitution. One such letter, from "A Friend of Liberty and Union" addressed to the "Freeman of Philadelphia," states the shock he experienced upon reading the proposed constitution: "Another defect in the federal constitution is equally alarming. No security is provided for the rights of individuals: no bill of rights is framed, nor is any privilege of freemen secured from the invasion of the government."³⁵ In Letter IV, the "Federal Farmer" concurs, writing further that a bill of rights would undeniably serve as a requisite "fundamental compact between the people of the United States and their federal rulers." In addition to the influence of interstate correspondence and debate on the issue in the press, the state ratifying conventions provided a compelling forum for debate and demands. For example, the debate in New York ended in ratification only because of assurances by proponents of the document of a bill of rights for the people immediately under the newly formed government. Milton M. Klein writes in his essay "Liberty as Nature's Gift: The Colonial Origins of the Bill of Rights in New York," "New York's insistence on a bill of rights in the new federal Constitution stemmed from a century of experience in recognizing, defining, proclaiming, and defending the personal freedoms without which

³² Ibid., 425.

³³ "Essays of 'Brutus' to the Citizens of the State of New York," *The Origins of the American Constitution: A Documentary History* (New York: Penguin, 1986), 318.

³⁴ Ibid., 319.

³⁵ Joseph A. Melusky and Whitman H. Ridgway, *The Bill of Rights: Our Written Legacy* (Florida: Krieger, 1993), 10.

New Yorkers believed they would degenerate to a condition of abject vassalage.”³⁶ Thus, Klein continues, “The new Bill of Rights, even if only a ‘parchment barrier,’ provided some assurance that the trust would not be breeched by succeeding generations.”³⁷ In North Carolina the story was much the same. In late July of 1788, “Samuel Spencer of Anson County pointedly remarked: ‘The expression, “We the People of the United States,” shews that this government is intended for individuals; there ought to be a bill of rights’ . . . I know it is said that what is not given up to the United States will be retained by the states . . . I know it ought to be so, and should be so understood; but sir, it is not *declared* to be so.”³⁸ Essentially, the effort to amend the Constitution with a bill of rights was a local one, inspired by the people who knew the benefits it would afford. Lutz writes summarily, “The American view of rights . . . was essentially developed in the local political arena, and codified at the colony-wide level . . . It should not surprise us, then, to learn that it was state and local leaders, not national political leaders, who insisted upon a national bill of rights.”³⁹ The question of whether or not the principle of liberal rights could survive without a national bill was answered by the people with a resounding no; consequently, the public and their local leaders worked tirelessly to ensure protection for their fundamental rights in the ratification process.

In the end, support for the Bill of Rights became an ideological struggle for the protection of the people from both the federal government and the majority. Sandoz declares, “The universal purpose of bills of rights is to place certain liberties beyond the reach of the majorities on the premise that deprivation of certain rights diminishes the civil standing and very humanity of persons so affected.”⁴⁰ Amendments to the Constitution in the form of a bill of rights would make a powerful statement of emphasis on the individual and fundamental rights on the part of the government in the new republic. For this reason, Jefferson, a strong proponent of the addition of a bill and states rights, wrote that he “would advocate it [the Constitution] warmly till nine [states] should have adopted, & then as warmly take the other side to convince the remaining four that they ought not to come into it till the declaration of rights is annexed to it.”⁴¹ The point being made was that the people would necessarily consent to a centralized, orderly, powerful government on the condition that individualism

36 Milton M. Klein, “Liberty as Nature’s Gift,” *The Bill of Rights and the States* (Madison: Madison House, 1992), 243.

37 *Ibid.*, 243.

38 William S. Price, Jr., “There Ought to Be a Bill of Rights: North Carolina Enters a New Nation,” *The Bill of Rights and the States* (Madison: Madison House, 1992), 424.

39 Lutz, 12.

40 Sandoz, 215.

41 Barbash, 210.

and rights were not sacrificed. With the Federal Constitution's impressive, and to some ominous power, the "numerous articles which emphasized the sovereignty of the people"⁴² was an absolute must for the political and social symbolism of a bill of rights. Finally, as Madison wrote Jefferson, "The people expect the Congress to amend the Constitution so it will 'expressly declare the great rights of mankind secured under this constitution.' This is not unreasonable to do since 'all power is subject to abuse.' It is proper 'to satisfy the public mind that their liberties will be perpetual, and this without endangering any part of the constitution, which is considered as essential to the existence of the government by those who promoted its adoption.'" ⁴³ Thus, the compromise was set up. The Framers insisted on the republican form of government manifest in the Constitution while the states demanded a check in the form of a bill of rights. The test now was to see if both sides were willing and, if so, how it could be done.

Compromise

Probably the most interesting character in the process of the creation and ratification of the Bill of Rights is James Madison. Primary author of both the Constitution and Bill of Rights, he was adamantly against a bill in the Convention and then became its principal supporter in the first Congress. The question is appropriately asked, why the change? Madison's conversion is representative of the entire process of compromise and indicative of the politics of the Founding in general. First, Madison wrote, "I have never thought the omission as a material defect, nor been anxious to supply it even by subsequent amendment, for any other reason than that it is anxiously desired by others. I have favored it because I supposed it might be of some use, and if properly executed could not be of disservice."⁴⁴ Clearly, then, Madison's conversion is not purely an ideological one but predominantly a political one. Not surprisingly, "James Madison promised at a critical point in the national debate that if the Constitution were ratified he personally would see that a bill of rights was added,"⁴⁵ but notably "only amendments to safeguard 'essential rights.'"⁴⁶ However, he then lauds the proposed amendments as the "great rights of mankind" in his speech to Congress.⁴⁷ Madison's intent was explicit: to ratify the Constitution even at the expense of amending it to include a bill of rights which he deems unnecessary, but not especially harmful. Thus, "for Madison, the Bill of Rights sufficiently satisfied the demand to provide

⁴² Peters, 174.

⁴³ Sandoz, 206.

⁴⁴ Melusky, 17.

⁴⁵ Lutz, 13.

⁴⁶ Kenneth R. Bowling, "A Tub to the Whale," *The Bill of Rights and the States* (Madison: Madison House, 1992), 49.

⁴⁷ Sandoz 189.

more directly for individual rights without compromising the Constitution itself.”⁴⁸ Moreover, “it was only under such reasonable restrictions that it became possible to proclaim popular sovereignty as a public principle.”⁴⁹ Madison’s willingness to compromise was reflective of the influence popular opinion and politics had on the Founding and his absolute devotion to ratification of the Federal Constitution.

Because the Constitution did require ratification at the hands of the states, the local leaders and the people exerted a huge bargaining chip to ensure the protection of their rights. Political strategy became critical as Anti-federalists endeavored to capture some of the key aspects they lost at the Convention with a federal bill of rights. In the state conventions, “several states proposed amendments, including guarantees which eventually formed the Bill of Rights.”⁵⁰ Eventually, eleven states did ratify the Constitution, but only “under the tacit understanding that suitable amendments would be forthcoming from the First Congress.”⁵¹ So why were both the people and the “natural aristocracy” able to compromise on such important issues? It is important to note that while Madison and others would “have refused to support structural alterations” because the demand was low, it was precisely because “the mass of the people had been concerned with . . . encroachments on their liberties” that a bill of rights was possible.⁵² For this reason and this reason only were amendments proposed and passed that “would not alter the structure of the federal government but would protect ‘the characteristic rights of freemen,’ and,” significantly, “restore public harmony.”⁵³ Kammen writes summarily of the compromise needed for ratification of the two founding documents: “The point, ultimately, is that promulgation of the U.S. Constitution [and Bill of Rights] required two sets of compromises rather than one: those that took place among the delegates to the Convention, and the subsequent sense that support for ratification would be rewarded by the explicit enumeration of broad civil liberties.”⁵⁴ Additionally, it took a tremendous and significant compromise between the people and the elite to complete the founding of the United States. Both sides seem to have thought they were getting a big concession, and in the end both were correct.

48 Bryner 15.

49 Rosen, 135.

50 Valerie A. Earle, “The Federal Structure,” *Founding Principles of American Government* (London: Indiana UP, 1977), 156.

51 Sandoz, 204.

52 Bowling, 50.

53 Schechter, 426.

54 Kammen, xix.

Conclusion

The Bill of Rights was a monumental victory for the declaration and assertion of rights for the American people. The principle of classical liberalism, arguably under fire after the Revolution ended, was reaffirmed through ratification of the first Ten Amendments after efforts and compromises made truly by the people. Thus, as Bryner writes, “participation of the people . . . set limits on the power of the majority” and proved through “popular ratification of the Constitution, Bill of Rights, and other constitutional amendments . . . that only the people can make the kinds of choices implicit in the creation of new rights.”⁵⁵ More importantly, as Richards paraphrases the “Federal Farmer,” a bill of rights serves as “a way of preserving these values and of reminding each generation of the arguments of principle through which they acknowledge one another as free and equal members of a cooperative community.”⁵⁶ This allowed for the ideological clashes of aristocratic republicanism and liberal individualism to be resolved – through the compromise and discussion-inspired debates of the ratification of both the Constitution and Bill of Rights. And through small changes in wording, from the insistence of the public, “recommended rights had become guaranteed rights, a subtle but significant change.”⁵⁷ The Bill of Rights and the discourse surrounding its ratification thus substantially redirected the philosophical course of the United States to a direction firmly by the people, for the people, and of the people.

55 Bryner, 23.

56 Ibid., 222.

57 Kammen, xiii.



IMPLICATIONS OF GRACCHI VIOLENCE IN THE ROMAN REPUBLIC

BY: SHANNON DRAGE

The Gracchan period is a violent and complicated web of legal, social, and moral issues, but is a crucial time in Roman history. Tiberius and Gaius Gracchus entered the political scene in the second century B.C. Their legislation, combined with their methods, put them in direct opposition to the Senate. Tensions between the Gracchi and the Senate increased, leading to the assassination of Tiberius in 133 B.C. His brother, Gaius, met the same fate just twelve years later. During the struggle, both sides resorted to the use of violence to gain political control. This violence undermined the *sacrosanctitas* of tribunes, weakened the tradition of *provocatio*, and led to the creation of the *senatus consultum ultimum*, all of which marked the beginning of the revolution that destroyed the Republic and led to the rise of the Roman Empire.

When the Roman Republic was founded in 500 B.C., it was essentially an oligarchy. Patricians, those of high standing and noble birth, controlled all aspects of the government. The common people, known as plebeians, had virtually no representation in the government. In an effort to change this, the plebeians fought the system for nearly two hundred years (390-272 B.C.) in a bloodless revolution called the Conflict of the Orders.¹ The result was a government based on a system of checks and balances and separation of powers. Polybius describes it as a combination between a monarchy, an oligarchy, and a democracy.²

The office of consul represented the monarchical portion of the government. Every year, two consuls (one plebeian and one patrician) were elected to serve one year terms. Their responsibilities included leading the armies into battle, execution of law, and being ambassadors for the

1 M. Cary and H.H. Scullard, *A History of Rome Down to the Reign of Constantine*, 2d ed. (New York: St Martin's, 1975), 75-83.

2 Polybius, *The Histories*, trans. Mortimer Chambers (New York: Twayne, 1966), 223. Polybius was a Roman historian who lived around 200 B.C. Exact dates of his birth and death are unknown. He writes extensively on the Roman constitution.

Republic. After serving their term of office, former consuls entered into the body of the Senate. This oligarchical branch of the state controlled the treasury.³ By controlling the treasury, the Senate had influence over almost all aspects of Roman society. Anyone who ever needed money or support for a project was dependent upon the good will of the Senate. Polybius states, "Therefore, since all citizens are bound to the Senate by ties of clientship and are apprehensive about some unknown situation in which they may need the Senate's help, they avoid carefully any obstruction or opposition to the Senate's decrees."⁴ The citizens represented the democratic element. They elected officials, voted on legislation, and had the last say in matters of peace and war.⁵

The Conflict of the Orders also gave rise to the office of tribune. This unofficial arm of the government was extremely important in maintaining balance in the Republic. During the Conflict of the Orders, plebeians realized the need to have someone protect them against actions of the Senate and the Consuls. The plebeians, therefore, elected tribunes who were sacrosanct, or those who were under protection of the gods.⁶ These tribunes represented the will of the people. When the Senate brought up matters that were displeasing or contrary to the will of the people, the tribune declared his veto.⁷ Polybius tells us, "If one of the tribunes interposes his veto, the Senate cannot bring any matter under discussion to a decision and indeed cannot meet or assemble at all."⁸ Eventually, tribunes became those who proposed laws before the people.

These different elements of government were formed into a system similar to that of the current system of the United States. Each branch of government had the ability to influence or hinder the activities of the other. This new and refined government had been born of a rational struggle among men. As a result, the Conflict of the Orders was a source of pride among Romans. There is no question that the reality of the struggle was far less ideal than Roman tradition held, yet it represented for them their ability to use good sense and compromise in order to restore prosperity and harmony to the Republic without a civil war.⁹ They had reason to be proud; the Republic remained a stable and effective government for almost four hundred years.

3 Ibid., 228.

4 Ibid., 222-229.

5 Citizens were men over the age of eighteen who fought in the military. Women, children, and slaves were all excluded.

6 Livy, *The Rise of Rome: Books One to Five*, trans. T.J. Luce (Oxford: Oxford, 1998), 104. Killing a sacrosanct person was a very serious offense against the gods.

7 Veto is a Latin word meaning "I forbid."

8 Polybius, *The Histories*, 227-228. Ignoring a veto resulted in a general strike of the people, meaning all business transaction ceased until the wishes of the plebeians were met.

9 Cary, *History of Rome*, 83; Livy, *The Rise of Rome*.

The stability created by this system of government allowed Rome to increase its territory. During the second and third centuries B.C., Rome expanded its borders to encompass all of present day Italy, parts of northern Africa, and much of western Europe. By the middle of the second century, Rome was the dominating force in the Mediterranean. This rapid growth brought with it social and economic strain.¹⁰ The additional soldiers needed on the battlefield required large numbers of lower and middle-class men to leave behind their small farms with no one to work them. The *nobilitas*, or Roman elite, absorbed these lands into larger farms called *latifundia*. The lands obtained through expansion were supposed to be allotted to the poor, but the *nobilitas* took these lands as well, and added them to the *latifundia*. The consequence was an increasing number of landless Romans. These landless poor often remained unemployed because the wealthy used slaves acquired in conquest to work the *latifundia*. There existed a law that placed a limit on the amount of land that one person could hold, but the law was disregarded.¹¹ The rich gained wealth very quickly while the poor slid further and further behind.

The Roman Republic was not a utopia. The government had its share of corruption, greed, and inadequacies. The Senate was much too powerful and dominated the other branches of government through its control of the purse strings. Class distinctions were sharp and rigid. The battle with Carthage for control of the Mediterranean during the Punic Wars had been long and exhaustive. The Romans, however, survived all of these obstacles and the Republic remained strong. In 134 B.C., there was no reason to believe the Republic could not handle a new agrarian crisis.

Tiberius Gracchus was one of the *nobilitas*, and despite what his opposition claimed, was not a radical politician, nor was he an anomaly of his time. On the contrary, his background was typical of Roman politicians. His father, Tiberius Sempronius Gracchus, was a well respected man who accomplished many great deeds in battle, and had a great political career.¹² Tiberius' mother, Cornelia, was also a woman of high repute; she was the daughter of Scipio Africanus, a man beloved of the Roman people for conquering Hannibal. Tiberius, with such strong roots in nobility, was one of the Roman elite.¹³ When he was elected to the office of tribune in

10 For a different opinion on the agrarian crisis see Henry C. Boren, "The Urban Side of the Gracchan Economic Crisis," *The American Historical Review* 63, no. 4 (Jul. 1958) 890-902. He argues that the real economic crisis came from a depression in Rome caused by a decrease in government spending just prior to 133 B.C.

11 Appian, *The Civil Wars*, trans. John Carter (London: Penguin, 1996), 4-5; Plutarch. *Makers of Rome*, trans. Ian Scott-Kilvert (London: Penguin, 1965), 159-160.

12 Aulus Gellius, *The Attic Nights*, trans. John Rolfe, vol 3 (London: William Heinemann, 1927), 89-90; Plutarch. *Makers of Rome*, 153-155.

13 Appian, *The Civil Wars*, 4-5; Plutarch, *Makers of Rome*, 156

133 B.C., it seemed just another step in what would have been a glorious career.

Tiberius immediately gained the favor of the masses, and simultaneously alienated most of the *nobilitas*, by proposing an agrarian reform bill. As was previously mentioned, Rome had always been split between plebeian and patrician. However, following the Conflict of the Orders, there had been a truce. The agrarian crisis weakened this truce, and Tiberius shattered it by introducing his agrarian bill. It called for the formation of a committee to confiscate land that was being held beyond the legal limit, and then distribute it among the poor.¹⁴ Tiberius' motives in drafting such a bill are unknown, but the information available suggests he wanted to do something memorable to outshine his rivals. It is possible that in addition to achieving fame, Tiberius wanted to correct injustices he perceived in the Republic.

Again, his bill was extremely popular among the people of Rome. The Senate, on the other hand, was very angry at this new bill. They represented the elite who held the land that would be confiscated and redistributed. The anger of the *nobilitas* should not be considered merely a sign of patrician greed. Many of the lands being illegally occupied had been held by the families for generations. They had no insurance that their homes, including sacred family grounds, would not be part of the land reclaimed by this new law. Unfortunately for the Senators, those who favored the bill strongly outnumbered those who did not, and there was no problem in getting the necessary votes. The only way to impede the process was to convince one of the other tribunes to veto the bill.¹⁵ For this purpose, they employed the help of Marcus Octavius.

When the bill was to be read, Octavius ordered the clerk to remain silent. When words did not persuade Octavius or the Senate to allow a vote to be taken on the bill, Tiberius concluded that Octavius had to be removed from office.¹⁶ A vote was held, and the people supported his removal. The constitutionality of this maneuver was highly questionable.¹⁷ A tribune had never before been removed from office in that manner. Tiberius, however, had solid reasoning for this request.¹⁸ According to Polybius, "The tribunes...are supposed to do whatever the people resolve

14 Appian, *The Civil Wars*, 6-7; Livy, *Summaries, Fragments, and Obsequens*, XIV, trans. Alfred C. Schlesinger (Cambridge: Harvard, 1959), 61-63; Plutarch, *Makers of Rome*, 160-162.

15 Appian, *The Civil Wars*, 6-7; Plutarch, *Makers of Rome*, 160-162.

16 Appian, *The Civil Wars*, 8; Livy, *Summaries, Fragments, and Obsequens*, XIV, 63; Plutarch, *Makers of Rome*, 162-165.

17 Livy calls this removal of Octavius a moment of insanity on the part of Tiberius. Livy, *Summaries, Fragments, and Obsequens*, XIV, 63.

18 Stockton, David. *The Gracchi* (Oxford: Oxford, 1939), 83.

and to make a special attempt to conform to their will.”¹⁹ The land bill was clearly the will of the people, and opposing the bill to protect landowners was not in the spirit of the office of tribune.

At this point, sources split on what happened next. Appian, whose account is brief, states that Octavius was voted out of office and “slipped away unnoticed.”²⁰ Plutarch, who gives a longer and more dramatic account, states that Octavius was attacked by the masses while being escorted out by Tiberius’ body guards, only to be saved by intervention of members of the nobilitas.²¹ Either way, the event was important. The Senate began to fear Tiberius. The agrarian bill was harmful for the elite, but even more ominous was Tiberius’ display of power in Octavius’ removal. The Senate, accustomed to having control of the tribunes and the people, did not like this man who threatened their power and position.

Tiberius received warnings from friends that his life was in danger. As a tribune, he was sacrosanct. Once his term in office was over, he would be vulnerable as a regular citizen again, and lose the protection of the gods. Reelection time was approaching and Tiberius again announced his candidacy for office of tribune in an effort to remain sacrosanct.²² In 180 B.C., the *lex villa annalis* forbade the same officials from holding office in consecutive years.²³ Technically, the office of tribune was outside of the standard makeup of the Republic and so it is not clear if the law applied to Tiberius. Because of the *lex villa annalis*, and because Tiberius was too powerful, the Senate sent people to disrupt the voting through both verbal and physical intimidation.²⁴ During the chaos, one of Tiberius’ supporters informed him that the Senate was plotting to kill him.²⁵

Here it is important to note some critical aspects of Roman law and culture. Up to this point, the Romans prided themselves on the fact that there had not been “civil strife in Rome, which ended in the bloodshed and death of citizens, since the expulsion of the kings.”²⁶ Andrew Lintott has written extensively on violence and the Roman Republic. According to him:

19 Polybius, *The Histories*, 228.

20 Appian, *The Civil Wars*, 8.

21 Plutarch, *Makers of Rome*, 165.

22 Appian, *Civil Wars*, 9; Livy, *Summaries, Fragments, and Obsequens*, XIV, 63; Plutarch, *Makers of Rome*, 169.

23 Appian, *Civil Wars*, 9; Lintott, Andrew. *The Constitution of the Roman Republic* (Oxford: Oxford, 1999), 181.

24 There is some speculation as to whether or not the Senate tried to veto the election, see Keith Richardson, *Daggers in the Forum: The Revolutionary Lives and Violent Deaths of the Gracchus Brothers* (London: Cassell, 1976), 93.

25 Plutarch, *Makers of Rome*, 169.

26 *Ibid.*, 172.

at the time when Tiberius Gracchus was elected tribune, the majority of Romans would not have regarded political violence as a mere primitive barbarism. Rather it was a recognized political weapon, which in recent years had been used rarely, but was nevertheless a necessary sanction, should law and its associated physical power prove inadequate. Violence had always played a considerable part in the settling of private disputes, where it had been ritualized into legal process but also remained in its natural form of extra-legal self help.²⁷

Lintott asserts the violence that broke out in 133 B.C. was not a spontaneous break from tradition, but rather an outgrowth of Roman culture. However, while Roman society in general had no aversion to the use of illegal violence, until 133 B.C., the laws had been sufficient to maintain order.

The laws themselves had been reluctant to allow violence as a form of justice. Cicero, along with modern scholars like Lintott, suggests the Twelve Tables (the founding laws of the Roman Republic dating back to the 6th century B.C.) included phrases which protected citizens through the right of *provocatio*.²⁸ *Provocatio*, in theory, is a citizen's right to call on the people to support them against the aggression of magistrates. In practice, it was the right to a trial by jury. This right was renewed c. 300 B.C. with the *lex Valeria*, and again in 195 B.C. with the *lex Porcia*. All of these laws served not only to ensure fair trial, but to discourage the execution of Roman citizens. By 150 B.C., the use of capital punishment was rare. Those convicted were often given time to escape, making the punishment banishment rather than death.²⁹ From the beginning of the Republic until 133 B.C., the execution of a Roman citizen was regarded as a last resort to be used only with the support of the people.

As Tiberius, his supporters, and his opposition gathered at the Capitol, the situation intensified. Tiberius indicated to his followers a specific sign he would give. The sign included a raise of his arm toward his head. Plutarch says it was a sign he would give if his life was in danger. Appian claims it was a sign to be given "if it was necessary to fight."³⁰ There is a great deal of debate about whether Tiberius intended to act only in self-defense, or to act in defense of the people's right to vote. Whatever the case, Tiberius gave the sign. When he did, the opposition claimed that by raising his arm to his head, he was asking for a crown, and thereby proving

27 Andrew Lintott, *Violence in Republican Rome* (Oxford: Oxford, 1968), 175.

28 Cicero, *De Republica*; *De Legibus*, trans. by Clinton Walker Keyes (Cambridge: Harvard, 2000), 165; Lintott, *The Constitution of the Roman Republic*, 154. Lintott is arguing against the earlier work of Wolfgang Kunkel who suggested that there is no reference to *provocatio* in the Twelve Tables. See Wolfgang Kunkel, *An Introduction to Roman Legal and Constitutional History*, 2d. ed, trans. by J.M. Kelley (London: Oxford, 1973), 16.

29 Cary, *A History of Rome*, 182; Cicero, *De Republica*; *De Legibus*, 154.

30 Plutarch, *Makers of Rome*, 171; Appian, *The Civil Wars*, 9.

his intention of becoming a tyrant and threatening the Republic. Tiberius' supporters chased the opposition out of the Capitol. The Senate immediately gathered to decide what should be done about Tiberius.

It was at this critical juncture when the most could have been done to maintain law and order within the boundaries of the Roman constitution. Appian suggests that it would have been a proper time to appoint a dictator. This was a perfectly constitutional way to deal with a state of emergency in the Republic, and it had been successful in the past.³¹ According to Plutarch, the consul, Scaevola, ruled that the Senate should deal with Tiberius within the bounds of the law, and that he "would put no citizen to death without a regular trial."³² If this was indeed his ruling, it was ignored. Nasica, one of the senators, issued a call that would be repeated by many others before the fall of the Republic. He asked all those who wished to protect the state to follow him.³³ Instead of upholding the Republican tradition of law and order, the senators relied on the less sophisticated, but more pervasive tradition of self-help and extra-legal violence.

The senators and their followers armed themselves with clubs, some of which were pieces of broken stools and benches. Nasica led the way with the hem of his toga pulled up over his head.³⁴ This was probably a religious sign indicating the events to come were a sacrifice dedicated to the gods.³⁵ The Gracchan followers, prepared to fight opposition from normal citizens like themselves, were shocked into submission by the appearance of senators at the Capitol.³⁶ This point is crucial in understanding the importance of senatorial participation in the assassination. Had the senators merely sent people to kill Tiberius, the affair would have seemed like nothing more than a lawless riot. Instead, the senators, through their open involvement, and by distinguishing themselves in dress, made the event appear to be an official act of the state.

31 Appian, *The Civil Wars*, 10. A dictator could be appointed for a period of up to six months and given complete authority over the state to resolve a crisis facing the Republic. He replaced the two consuls who would voluntarily step aside.

32 Plutarch, *Makers of Rome*, 171. It should be noted that Scaevola supported many of the reforms Tiberius introduced. He was strongly in favor of reforms for the people. This may explain his reluctance to order Tiberius' assassination. Livy does not mention the decision of Scaevola, but does mention a speech given against Tiberius by Tulus Anniius. See Livy, *Summaries, Fragments, and Obsequens*, XIV, 63.

33 Appian, *The Civil Wars*, 10; Livy, *Summaries, Fragments, and Obsequens*, XIV, 63; Plutarch, *Makers of Rome*, 171.

34 Livy, *Summaries, Fragments, and Obsequens*, XIV, 63; Plutarch, *Makers of Rome*, 171-172.

35 Bernstein, Alvin. *Tiberius Sempronius Gracchus: Tradition in Apostasy* (London: Cornell, 1978), 223.

36 Appian, *The Civil Wars*, 10; Livy, *Summaries, Fragments, and Obsequens*, XIV, 63; Plutarch, *Makers of Rome*, 171.

The majority of Gracchan followers fled at the sight of senators. Those who did not flee, did not attack. The senators, on the other hand, clubbed Tiberius and 300 of his followers to death.³⁷ Others were later banished or arrested and executed without public trial. Not only was this kind of violence unprecedented in the Republic, it was also illegal. Even if Tiberius, through the gesture towards his head, was guilty of treason, Roman law gave him and his followers the right to a trial by the people through *provocatio*.³⁸ The Consuls and the Senate, however, gave their tacit consent to the assassination by refusing all request to impeach Nasica or any of the other participants. They also allowed the illegal banishment, arrest, and execution of the other Gracchan followers.

Their actions could not have been more destructive to the integrity of the Republic. First of all, they had set a precedent for sanctioned lawlessness in even the highest levels of government. Second, they undermined fundamental tenants of the Republican constitution, including a citizen's right to trial, and the guarantee that a tribune was *sacrosanct*. Finally, they alienated the masses irrevocably. By fiercely opposing a leader so beloved as Tiberius, the *nobilitas* showed it cared only for its own interests, and cared nothing for the needs of the plebeians. This manifestation rekindled the ancient animosity between the plebeians and patricians. Two distinct factions rose out of this new struggle, the *populares*, those who favored protecting the interests of the people, and the *optimates*, those who favored protecting the interests of the aristocracy.

Gaius Gracchus, Tiberius' brother, stayed out of the political forefront for several years. He had been appointed by his brother to serve on the land commission. He fully supported Tiberius' reforms, but had no part in the chaos surrounding the election. Gaius was one of the greatest orators in Roman history. Like Cicero, who followed shortly after him, the methods and techniques of Gaius' speeches were models for study.³⁹ Like his brother, he was one of the shining elite in Rome. It was only a matter of time before he became politically active. Already a favorite among the people, and "since many of the senators thought little of him, he put himself

37 Appian, *The Civil Wars*, 10; Plutarch, *Makers of Rome*, 172-173. The bodies of those killed were thrown into the Tiber river, even after Gaius Gracchus requested his brother's body be preserved for burial. This persuaded many supporter of the malicious nature of the Senate's actions.

38 Polybius, *The Histories*, 225-226; Appian, *The Civil Wars*, 10; Plutarch, *Makers of Rome*, 172-173.

39 Marcus Tullius Cicero, *On the Good Life* trans. Michael Grant (London: Penguin, 1971), 249; Aulus Gellius, *The Attic Nights*, trans. John Rolfe, vol 1 (London: William Heinemann, 1927), 57; Livy, *Summaries, Fragments, and Obseques*, XIV, 71; Plutarch, *The Makers of Rome*, 154-155. Cicero was the greatest orator in Roman history and an influential politician.

forward for election as a tribune.”⁴⁰ He was elected in 124 B.C. by a large majority, and as a part of the *populares*, he immediately began alienating the *optimates* through his proposed legislation.

Many, starting with Cicero, have speculated that Gaius’ motive for entering the political spotlight centered on his need to avenge his brother.⁴¹ There can be no doubt that the death of Tiberius was influential in his later career. However, there is no evidence that he was seeking revenge. It is more likely that he was trying to carry on the work that his brother had started, not punish those who were responsible for his death. The events surrounding Tiberius’ term made the abuses of the Senate and the shortcomings of the Republic apparent. His legislative measures suggest that, like Tiberius, he was set on curbing the abuses of the Senate and ensuring they were subject to the laws. He was trying to return stability to the Republic.

One of his first measures was to pass the *lex Sempronia*. This law allowed the people the right to try any magistrate who banished or killed a citizen without a trial.⁴² Like the *lex Valeria* and the *lex Porcia*, it reaffirmed *provocatio*. This is most definitely a reaction to the killing of Tiberius, but not necessarily vindication for Gaius. *Provocatio* was an important principle for the masses in Rome, and seeing it tossed aside through the killing of a Roman citizen upset more than just Gaius. The *lex Sempronia* was meant to strengthen the Republic. He continued his reform by overhauling the judicial system that dealt with extortion and abuses of those governing provinces. The jury, which was made up of 300 senators, was suspected of accepting bribes and other corruptions. Gaius added to this body 300 men of the equestrian class.⁴³ One group would then be able to enforce the honesty of the other.

He also sought to stabilize the Republic by continuing the agrarian reform that Tiberius started. Like before, this included the confiscation and redistribution of land among the poor. He passed reforms that provided food for the poor, lessened the burdens of military service, and improved the roads in Rome. He passed a bill that prohibited a deposed leader from

40 Appian, *The Civil Wars*, 13. While there is little evidence of his actions before his election to office of tribune, it is clear that he had done enough to win the favor of the people, and anger the Senate. Plutarch suggests he provided supplies to needy troops who had been cut off by the state, see Plutarch, *Makers of Rome*, 176.

41 Charles Oman, *Seven Roman Statesman of the Later Republic* (London: Edward Arnold, 1957), 55-56.

42 Appian, *The Civil Wars*, 13-14; Diodorus. Diodorus of Sicily: In Twelve Volumes, trans. Francis Walton, vol. 7 (Cambridge: Harvard, 1967), 113-115; Plutarch, *Makers of Rome*, 178-181.

43 Equestrians, or knights as they are sometimes called are the business middle class in Rome. Appian, *The Civil Wars*, 13-14; Diodorus. Diodorus of Sicily: In Twelve Volumes, 113-115; Plutarch, *Makers of Rome*, 178-181. Livy says that the law added 600 equestrians to the Senate of 300 men. See Livy, *Summaries, Fragments, and Obsequens*, XIV, 71.

holding office in the future. This law turned Tiberius' unfounded removal of Octavius into a legitimate precedent that could not be undone.⁴⁴ Gaius seemed committed to helping the people of Rome by working within the framework of the Republic. While he posed a threat to the status quo, he did so without resorting to violence.

Gaius Gracchus' great success in passing reform laws made him a very powerful man. Those who wanted to protect the interest of the elites quickly sought to strip him of this power. Livius Drusus, also a tribune, was one of their most useful tools. He often vetoed Gaius' proposals with no explanation, and then he himself would propose similar ideas. The Senate, for its part, opposed everything Gaius did, but supported the measures of Livius. This tactic was highly effective and Gaius lost popularity rapidly. His popularity declined so far that he lost his bid for reelection in 122 B.C. and decided to go to Africa to help establish a colony. Upon his return, he found the Senate had decided to repeal the law authorizing the founding of the colony. An assembly was held to decide the fate of the colony.⁴⁵

To this point, both Gaius and his opposition acted without resorting to violence or threats of physical harm. Gaius, however, was now desperate. He was no longer the popular and powerful man he had been in the past. He gathered a bodyguard of armed sympathizers and headed for the Capitol to disrupt the assembly regarding the colony.⁴⁶ It is unclear what his intentions were. He may have planned an armed attack against his opponents, but there is not evidence enough to confirm that.⁴⁷ Violence ensued after one of Gaius' men drew his dagger and killed a man in the assembly, claiming Gaius had motioned him to do so.⁴⁸ The whole event certainly looked like treason.

Whatever Gaius' purpose was, it was a clear break from his previous tactics. For years he had fought within the bounds of the constitution without violence to reform, strengthen, and stabilize the Republic. In 122 B.C., he stood in defiance of the Republic surrounded by a small army

44 Appian, *The Civil Wars*, 13; Paulus Orosius, *The Seven Books of History Against the Pagans*, trans. by Roy Deferrari (Washington D.C.: Catholic University, 1964), 194; Plutarch, *Makers of Rome*, 179-181.

45 Appian, *The Civil Wars*, 14-15; Livy, *Summaries, Fragments, and Obsequens*, XIV, 63; Plutarch, *Makers of Rome*, 188-189. Like expansion in the United States, colonizing was always a very political issue in Rome. It is not unusual that Gaius' efforts met with opposition.

46 Appian, *The Civil Wars*, 16; Diodorus, 119-121; Orosius, *The Seven Books of History Against the Pagans*, 194-195; Plutarch, *Makers of Rome*, 187-188.

47 Diodorus, 119. He makes the case that it was a planned attack. Other sources are ambiguous on this point.

48 Appian, *The Civil Wars*, 16; Diodorus, 119-121; Orosius, *The Seven Books of History Against the Pagans*, 194-195; Plutarch, *Makers of Rome*, 187-188.

poised to fight. Gaius refused to answer the summons of the Senate to appear and defend the incident at the Capitol. Instead, he and his armed force “called the slaves to freedom” seizing the temple of Diana on Aventine Hill. The “slaves” ignored his call and stayed home.⁴⁹

The Senate, repeating the call by Nasica during the crisis with Tiberius, issued a decree asking senators “to preserve the safety of the state and to put down tyrants.”⁵⁰ This decree became known as *senatus consultum ultimum*, and was an unofficial suggestion issued by the Senate. Lintott describes the decree stating, “magistrates were urged to save the *res publica* by ignoring strict legality.”⁵¹ Opimius, one of the consuls, led this force up to Aventine Hill. Gaius and three hundred other men were killed on the spot. More than three thousand were later put to death without a trial. The outcome was a near mimicry of what happened in 133 B.C.⁵²

Importantly, Opimius was later brought to trial for the death of Gaius in what was essentially a test of the *senatus consultum ultimum*. He was found innocent of any wrong doing because he had only been fulfilling the recommendations of the Senate.⁵³ The ruling determined the decree of the Senate supreme even to a citizen’s fundamental right to trial.

The events surrounding Tiberius Gracchus had been a shock to the Roman Republic, but the events surrounding Gaius Gracchus damaged it beyond repair. Ronald Syme, one of the leading scholars on the fall of the Roman Republic, stated that after the Gracchi, “all elements of Roman culture broke loose.”⁵⁴ While Gaius had lost much of his popularity, he was still loved by many Roman citizens. Moreover, the brutality in which the Senate dealt with Gaius and his followers aroused a great deal of sympathy for his cause. The locations where the two brothers died were declared by their supporters to be sacred grounds and places of worship.⁵⁵ In death they were martyrs, and the rift between the *optimates* and *populares* grew even larger.

Politics in Rome were never again the same. The acts of Tiberius, and especially Gaius, who had taken up arms against the state, had tarnished the respectability of the office of tribune in the eyes of the Senate. This kind of representation did nothing to help build a case for the plebeians among the *nobilitas*. It appeared the people were willing to follow anyone who promised them land, even if they were treasonous villains.

49 Appian, *The Civil Wars*, 16; Orsius, 194-195.

50 Livy, *Summaries, Fragments, and Obsequens*, XIV, 63; Plutarch, *Makers of Rome*, 188-189.

51 Lintott, *The Constitution of the Roman Republic*, 92.

52 Appian, *The Civil Wars*, 16; Orosius, *Seven Books Against the Pagans*, 195; Plutarch, *Makers of Rome*, 188-191.

53 Cicero, *De Oratore: Books I-II*, trans. by E.W. Sutton (Cambridge, Harvard, 2001), 277-279.

54 Ronald Syme, *The Roman Revolution* (Oxford: Oxford, 1939), 16.

55 Plutarch, *Makers of Rome*, 192.

Tribunes, instead of pawns used by the Senate, were seen as potential troublemakers and enemies. By killing Tiberius, the Senate had violated the *sacrosanctitas* of the tribune, a long and important tradition of the people. Thus, a crucial part of maintaining balance in the Republic was no longer reliable.

In addition, the Senate took this new power of the *senatus consultum ultimum*. It destroyed the long tradition of *provocatio* meant to protect citizens from the whims of the Senate. As Andrew Lintott asserts, this decree was an outgrowth of Roman culture that could be traced all the way back to the founding, but the fact remains it was outside the previous bounds of the Senate's authority under the constitution, and it further alienated the people from the *nobilitas*. Tribunes, also had to fear the Senate. They could not rely on their own *sacrosanctitas* as they had in the past, but turned rather to the use of force. Later tribunes took on a more active, if not volatile, role in government. They ceased to be mediators between the Senate and the people and instead became instigators.⁵⁶

In 103 B.C., a tribune named Appuleius Saturnius attempted to carry on in the tradition of the Gracchi. He proposed agrarian and judicial reforms, playing on the people's increasing resentment towards the Senate to gain their support. He, however, is less known for his reforms, than for the violent manner he used to push them through.⁵⁷ During his first tribuneship he strong armed at least two different tribunes who tried to veto his legislation and had his competition for re-election murdered. C. Memmius attempted to run against one of Saturnius' friends in the consular elections of 99 B.C. Saturnius again ordered his mob of supporters to kill the opposition. In fear of retribution, he and his supporters seized Capitoline Hill. The Senate issued the *senatus consultum ultimum* and Saturnius, along with many others, including a *sacrosanct* tribune, were killed by mob violence.⁵⁸

In 91 B.C., Livius Drusus, son of Gaius Gracchus' opponent, became tribune. He too tried to carry on in the spirit of Gracchan reformers. He pushed through land reform bills and proposed judicial reform that angered both the Senate and the equestrian class.⁵⁹ He used the sheer number of his supporters, and the threat of violence to secure passage of his laws. The *nobilitas* arranged for his death, and his laws were declared unconstitutional because he had used force to carry them through. In reaction, a committee was formed to conduct a modern day McCarthy-like

56 Lintott, The Constitution of the Roman Republic, 208.

57 Cary, A History of Rome, 223.

58 Appian, The Civil Wars, 16-17.

59 He was seeking to improve upon the judicial reforms of Gaius Gracchus which had come to do more harm than good. Appian, The Civil Wars, 21.

search for anyone suspected of supporting Drusus. The founder of this committee, Varius, was convicted under his own law.⁶⁰

The years following the Gracchi, and leading up to the fall of the Republic, were marked by many examples of similar strife between the Senate and the tribunes. Both the Tribunes and the Senate recruited the support of generals and their armies to fight one another. The famous military dictator Sulla tried to destroy the office of tribune by restricting its powers severely in 88 B.C. Citizens of every rank, position, and status fell victim to execution without trials. Eventually, Octavius Caesar used the office of tribune as a way to secure his place as the first emperor of the Roman Empire.

The Gracchi marked the beginning of a new era in Roman history. They did not set out to overthrow the government, yet they started a chain reaction that changed Rome irrevocably. Tiberius and Gaius broke existing traditions and challenged the status quo, but it was the use of violence that was ultimately most destructive to the Republic. It destroyed safeguards of the constitution, including the tradition of *provocatio*, and *sacrosanctitas* of tribunes. It also set the precedent of *senatus consultum ultimum* that allowed the Senate to conduct unrestricted warfare against anyone it labeled as a threat to the government. With the destruction of such important protections, and the setting of such harmful precedents, the door was open to a violent end of the Republic.

60 Appian, *The Civil Wars*, 20-21; Cary, *A History of Rome*, 222-223.



MUTILATION OF HISTORY: HOW THOSE WHO DENY THE HOLOCAUST MALIGN A PEOPLE AND A PROFESSION

By: AMBER FRAMPTON

On the low end, estimations of 4.5 million and on the high end, estimations of 6.2 million.¹ Represent the death toll of Jewish people massacred in the Nazi death camps. These numbers do not take into account the countless other victims of the fascist empire, the Gypsies, those who posed a threat in some form to the Nazi party, the deformed, and the mentally ill. Yet, there are those who believe these facts on Jewish losses to be exaggerations. These people believe that the so called "holocaust" of the Jewish people to be nothing more than a myth. They see no evidence in the existence of gas chambers, no proof that Hitler organized the systematic deaths of the Jewish people, and call those who claim to have survived the death camps liars. These people proclaim themselves to be "Historical Revisionists," revising history to its "true" form. Those in the historical profession who see these people as they really are give them a more fitting label: *Holocaust Deniers*. Perhaps what they say is worth listening to, or perhaps there is some truth to what they say. Then again, perhaps reality is a lie.

'Historical Revisionists' of the Holocaust have tried to discredit the survivors of the Nazi death camps and have ignored the masses of dead that cry silently from their graves for justice. They have brought shame to a profession they claim to be part of while preying upon those they hope to be ignorant enough of historical fact to believe them. In their attempts, they have also forced those in and out of the historical profession to question whether what we consider to be historical fact is fact, or a *revision* of the facts. These so-called scholars have plunged a giant rock into the historical pool, jostling what used to be known as truth, causing historians to re-evaluate and solidify facts to keep them from being displaced by the unsettling ripple.

1 Michael Shermer and Alex Grobman. Denying History (Berkeley & Los Angeles CA: University of California Press, 2000), 177.

Towards the end of World War II as the Soviet army began taking over German-held lands and liberating those held captive, some unsettling information began to float across to the United States. The general public at first did not believe what they heard because it seemed so far-fetched. As more and more Nazi occupied areas were liberated, stories of atrocities surfaced and those far-fetched rumors began to be reality. Massive concentration camps abandoned by the Nazis were found at various places: Auschwitz (the largest and most notorious), Treblinka, Belzec, Sobibor, Chelmno, and Majdanek, to name a few.² Within these camps, the Soviets found unbelievable things. When the Russians liberated Auschwitz on January 27, 1945, in what remained of the storage facilities they found 348,820 men's suits, 836,255 women's garments...7 tons of human hair, and yet only 5800 sick prisoners remained.³ The emaciated captors had a horrific tale to tell.

Insurmountable evidence of what Hitler had planned to do began to trickle in the forms of documentation. During the Nuremberg trials for war crimes, even Nazi leaders would testify of what had been planned for the Jewish people as part of the "final solution." Statistics were incomprehensible. "Of 8.5 million Jews in Europe 1939, fewer than 3 million were left alive. Thousands had died in uniform, a few hundred thousand managed to escape...but the vast majority, between five and six million civilians-men, women, and children-had been murdered by the Nazis in their effort to eliminate European Jewry." ⁴ A stunned and horrified world listened as the Nazi war criminals were brought to justice.

Years later, especially during the 1960's, a new form of thought began to take place. What used to be seen as irrefutable fact was being challenged. Considered to be the "father of Historical Revisionism," George Lincoln Rockwell (also a staunch member and founder of the American Nazi Party) would be one of the first to claim the Holocaust to be a lie.⁵ "The endurance of the myths Rockwell fostered and popularized in the early 1960's speaks to his influence on the racist right, which recognized him as the father of American Holocaust denial." ⁶ According to the book *American Feuehr* by Frederick J. Simonelli, Rockwell had prepared an article for *Playboy* in the 1960's in which he (Rockwell) denied any proof that the Jews were systematically killed by the Nazis, said that there were

2 Michael Shermer and Alex Grobman, *Denying History* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press, 2000), 128.

3 D. D. Guttenplan, *The Holocaust on Trial* (New York, NY: W.W. Norton & Company, 2001), 3.

4 D. D. Guttenplan, *The Holocaust On Trial* (New York, NY: W.W. Norton & Company, 2001), 4.

5 Frederick J. Simonelli, *American Feuehr: George Lincoln Rockwell and the American Nazi Party* (Chicago, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1999), 113.

6 Ibid.

no gas chambers, no extermination, and no atrocities committed.⁷ This twisted, bitter man was later killed by a member of his own party.

This would be the beginning of this kind of thought in America, but it would not end here. Robert Faurisson, a former professor at the University of Lyon II would find himself in court various times for libel from his publications stating that it was impossible for gas chambers to have been used at Auschwitz and other death camps, that Hitler never ordered the extermination of the Jews because no document exists stating such, the numbers of the Jewish dead are extreme in amounts, and that the Jews hold some of the responsibility for World War II.⁸

David Irving, a British "pseudohistorian,"⁹ who will be addressed in further detail later, was banned from Canada, Germany and Australia for being identified with neo-Nazi groups and his beliefs of Hitler not ordering the genocide of the Jewish people due to lack of evidence. Irving, even though he has published various works and has a great command of the German language is not as educated as some of his other comrades. "... curiously, this self-styled historian holds no academic degree whatsoever beyond the equivalent of a United States high school diploma."¹⁰

Ernst Nolte, a German historian and philosopher is not as extreme as some of the other "revisionists." He argues that the "excesses of the Third Reich are not singularly unique"¹¹ in that the French and Russian revolutions committed many atrocities to pattern after. Nolte also believes that Hitler used Josef Stalin as a role model for behavior. He believed that in viewing all past events as "bad" would be disastrous for not only scholarship, but politics as well. Nolte basically found that the Holocaust was not historically unique in itself.¹²

An unlikely revisionist is found in Paul Rassinier who was himself interned by the Nazis for resistance to the movement. Rassinier claimed that the gas chambers were not part of an annihilation program for the Jews¹³ and that the Communists were responsible for spreading "lies" of extermination camps.¹⁴ He also found the accuracy of witness testimonies suspect including the testimony of Rudolph Hüss. He felt that the written

7 Ibid., 112-113.

8 Stephen L. Jacobs, "Historical Revisionism Versus Holocaust Denial," *Encyclopedia of Genocide I* (1999), 182.

9 Ibid., 184.

10 Ibid.

11 Qtd. in Stephen L. Jacobs, "Historical Revisionism Versus Holocaust Denial," *Encyclopedia of Genocide I* (1999), 184.

12 Stephen L. Jacobs, "Historical Revisionism Versus Holocaust Denial," *Encyclopedia of Genocide I* (1999), 185.

13 Ibid.

14 Ibid., 171.

accounts of the holocaust were flawed because the authors of the works were Jewish.¹⁵

Bradley Smith, an American and co-director of Committee for Open Debate on the Holocaust (CODOH) is more well known for attempting to distribute his ideas amongst college and university campuses. He is an author of a pamphlet on the subject of his committee and regularly submits full-page articles to colleges and universities for publication in the United States. While many refuse his entries, some run them with a disclaimer as it is part of Smith's 'freedom of speech' to offer his opinions for submission.¹⁶

Finally, one of the other well-known revisionists is Ernst Zundel. He emigrated to Canada from Germany shortly after World War II. While he was granted permanent residence, he has been repeatedly denied citizenship due to his outspoken views. He moved to Toronto where he became a supplier, publisher and distributor of anti-semitic and Holocaust denial literature. Zundel became involved in these activities after becoming a follower of Canada's leading fascist, Adrien Arcand. Zundel has been brought to trial several times because of the nature of his publications.¹⁷

Revisionism would take on some very basic principles that almost all deniers of the Holocaust would embrace. The "final solution" was not the extermination of the Jews but a relocation, no gas chambers existed, the number of Jewish dead was much smaller than what is claimed, Hitler did not authorize any systematic killing of the Jews, Germany does not bear responsibility for World War II and in many cases the Jews are to blame, the enemy of the human race was not Nazi Germany but the Stalinist Soviet Union, and that genocide is the invention of Allied propaganda.¹⁸

Due to the views of these Holocaust Revisionists, many of what they have said and published have come to the attention of the professional world. In one major case, an American professor, Deborah Lipstadt chose to take on the views of these extremists and expose them for what they are. In her book, *Denying the Holocaust*, she particularly singles out David Irving's research and exposes him as an "ultranationalist who believes that Britain has been on a steady path of decline accelerated by its misguided decision to launch a war against Nazi Germany."¹⁹

In her book, Lipstadt confronts many of the issues surrounding revisionist theories, including their name:

15 Ibid.

16 Ibid., 186.

17 Ibid., 186-187.

18 Pierre Vidal-Naquet, *Assassins of Memory*, Translated by Jeffrey Mehlman (New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 1992), 18-19.

19 Deborah E. Lipstadt, *Denying the Holocaust* (New York, NY: The Free Press, 1993), 161.

"...I abjure the term *revisionist* because on some level revisionism is what all legitimate historians engage in. . . Each one tries to glean some new insight or understanding from a story already known, seeking some new way of interpreting the past to help us better understand the present. . .By its very nature the business of interpretation cannot be purely objective. But it is built upon a certain body of irrefutable evidence: slavery happened; so did the Black Plague and the Holocaust." ²⁰

Lipstadt will refer to these people as "Holocaust deniers" throughout her book, no doubt at great irritation to Irving who is later heard to remark at his trial by stating that the term "Holocaust denier" is a term akin to "wife beater" or "pedophile" in nature.²¹

Lipstadt fills a large amount of space in the middle of her book remarking on the character of Irving. "His work has been described as "closer to theology or mythology than to history," and he has been accused of skewing documents and misrepresenting data in order to reach historically untenable conclusions particularly those that exonerate Hitler." ²² She further exposes Irving as an admirer of Hitler and other members of the Nazi party.

While Lipstadt's conclusions about Irving would prove correct, it would take a major trial to do so. Irving, humiliated by Lipstadt's comments about him and his work, sued her for libel in Great Britain. Unlike lawsuits in the United States where Irving would have to prove Lipstadt was wrong, Lipstadt would have to prove she was right - basically she would have to prove that the Holocaust happened and that Irving knowingly ignored historical facts or misrepresented them to prove a personal agenda.

Three months and three million dollars after the trial's beginning, Lipstadt emerged a victor and Irving's reputation was permanently ruined. Irving was found not only guilty of misrepresentation of fact, and to have knowingly skewed information to fit his own personal agendas but he was also found by the judge to be anti-semitic and racist.²³

Why a person would choose to deliberately twist an almost indisputable fact to prove an idea is incomprehensible. In the case of David Irving, his motivation for denying the Holocaust seems to have at first stemmed from monetary gain and recognition. Irving had been previously sued for libel himself. In 1970, he was fined 25,000 pounds in "exemplary damages" which can only be awarded when the defendant is shown to be guilty of a deliberate wrong committed with the *object of making*

20 Ibid., 121.

21 Holocaust On Trial, Leslie Woodhead, director, Daniel Kern, producer, 60 min. (NOVA/WGBH Boston Video, 2000), videocassette.

22 Deborah E. Lipstadt, *Denying the Holocaust* (New York, NY: The Free Press, 1993), 161.

23 D. D. Guttenplan, *The Holocaust On Trial* (New York, NY: W.W. Norton & Company, 2001), 281.

money.²⁴ In Irving's own book *Hitler's War*, he quotes a saying in the first line of his introduction: "To historians is granted a talent that even the gods are denied-to alter what has already happened!"²⁵ This seems to be the basis of Irving's power and he knows it.

Thirsting to be seen as a great historian, what better way to have yourself placed on the map of academia than to attempt the unpopular course of action and actually prove it? The historical profession welcomes original thought with open arms and excitement. Something that can be contributed that is different, that causes reflection on a subject in a different way is seen as brilliance.

When Irving took the chance of trying to prove something that is seen so irrefutably as fact as the Holocaust and tried to prove that it did not happen, there is not much further along the lines of originality that a person can get. With power of original thought in history comes money from publication. Original ideas are more likely to be published. After all, seventy books all in agreement on the cause of the American Civil War can blend together, but the one that shows that the war was caused by something else tends to stand out. Irving succeeded in being both noticed and published. However, in doing so he did this at peril to his reputation - he lied.

Irving is not the only one to twist these facts into trying to prove that the Holocaust did not happen as seen above in the list of men given. But not all these men would necessarily have the same motivation. Two other possible reasons for denying the Holocaust: hatred for the Jewish people and to attempt to revive fascism.

Throughout history there are numerous examples of hatred for the Jewish people. The Christians tend to hate them because they are the killers of Christ. The Jewish people have been seen as having a knack for business and as a result are seen as the evil moneylenders (such as in Shakespeare's character, Shylock). In the 1940's the Jewish people were hated even in the United States because they represented communism. The Bolsheviks and their promotion of a better way of life for them was communism. This was a terrible situation to be in when much of the world is seeing communism as one of the roots of all evil.

Romania would become a seat of revisionism because of the Communist regime that would strangle their country following World War II. The Romanians would blame the Jews for bringing communism in and would feel that they suffered more than the Jews did during the war. The Romanian people would feel that they had suffered the "real Holocaust"

²⁴ Richard J. Evans, *Lying About Hitler: History, Holocaust, and the David Irving Trial* (New York, NY: Basic Books, 2001), 13.

²⁵ David Irving, *Hitler's War* (New York, NY: The Viking Press, 1977), xi.

rather than the Jews in the "20 million 'psychic victims of communism' ...victims of a doctrine brought to Romania by the Jews." ²⁶

There are always those who are going to try anything to get what they want. This is the case of those who would falsify history to have a better chance at reviving a seemingly dead ideology. Those who embrace fascism remain a minority, mostly due to the evils that sprung from Nazism. Those who want desperately to revive the fascist movement would go much farther if they could prove the Holocaust to have been a hoax. The Holocaust is the one enormous roadblock in keeping fascism from re-emerging. If it could be proven never to have happened, those who are more moderate would be much more easily convinced to join the fascist party.

Despite the reasons given for falsifying historical fact, a slaughter of history was made. A "destruction of a general awareness of the truth" ²⁷ happened. By attempting to discredit the experiences of a people a mockery was made of a profession. Reputation in a profession or, rather as a profession, is a valuable thing. When those within a profession use their abilities to prove their own agendas, they bring shame to the profession. Because of a select few who openly distorted evidence, it makes it seem all the more likely that perhaps others may have incorrectly interpreted historical data - and not just from the Holocaust.

How many other documents have been tampered with in their interpretation? Is it possible to ever really know what happened in the past? And what of future events? Can current and future events be entrusted to the same group of people who misrepresented the facts before? These are going to be some very viable questions raised due to the ignorance of a select few who had power, money, and other things on their mind rather than truth. Corruption occurs within any profession, but it is possibly more dangerous within a profession that has a hold of the past in one hand and thus the future in the other.

26 Randolph L. Braham, *Romanian Nationalists and the Holocaust: The Political Exploitation of Unfounded Rescue Accounts* (New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 1998), 89-90.

27 Pierre Vidal-Naquet *Assassins of Memory*, Translated by Jeffrey Mehlman (New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 1992), xxiii.



RETHINKING MORMON POLYGAMY: A DIFFERENT PERSPECTIVE

BY: BRETON FRIEL

Many people are rightly sympathetic toward the plight of women in early Mormon polygamous families. However, these same people often mistakenly assume polygamy to be the fulfillment of every husband's fantasy. For example, one critic of polygamy reflected a common view when he claimed, "Mormonism spells polygamy, and polygamy means the enslavement of women."¹ This critical perspective is what gave polygamy and slavery the nickname "twin relics of barbarism"—a nickname started by the rising Republican Party in 1856.²

Despite the critical view of polygamy held by many non-polygamists, some polygamous men found the practice to be difficult. Obeying a commandment out of religious obligation, these Mormon men endured difficulties such as contention among jealous wives, financial burdens, loneliness, and time in prison for polygamy. In contrast, some wives preferred the lifestyle of polygamy. They enjoyed aspects such as the free time, the moral support of their husband's other wives, and the availability of good husbands polygamy provided. Although Mormon polygamy was a difficult lifestyle for many women, the purpose of this paper is to give a different perspective of its practice by contrasting the difficulties polygamous life had for some men with the positive experiences of several polygamous women. This in turn will show that Mormon polygamy was an arrangement that was difficult for some men and preferred by some women. This paper will specifically focus on polygamists who lived during the time period of Brigham Young's leadership of the Church, 1847-1877, using journals and other information available from the Brigham Young University library.

1 C. Sheridan Jones, *The Truth About Mormons: Secrets of Salt Lake City* (London: William Rider & Son L.T.D., 1920), ix.

2 David L. Bigler, *Forgotten Kingdom: The Mormon Theocracy in the American West 1847-1896* (Logan, Utah: Utah State University Press, 1998), 322.

Although Joseph Smith first introduced polygamy into the Church, its practice during his life was fairly secretive and limited to a few selected men. Polygamy first started in the Church in April of 1841, with the marriage of Joseph Smith to Louisa Beeman.³ Its practice continued within the Church after Smith's death in 1844, becoming more commonly practiced and more widely known, but still denied publicly until 1852. Some people have ignorantly criticized this secretive practice as a means of sexual indulgence for the men. For example, in his book, *The Truth About the Mormons*, Sheridan Jones claimed, "only to the coarser grained and the most sensual, was the revelation permitted."⁴

Despite such accusations, from the time it was introduced by Joseph Smith to the time it was ended, the practice of polygamy was never intended for anyone but those who lived high standards of righteous living. Brigham Young made this clear in November of 1855, when he taught, "This law was never given of the Lord for any but his faithful children; it is not for the ungodly at all; no man has a right to a wife, or wives, unless he honors his priesthood and magnifies his calling before God."⁵

On August 29, 1852, under Brigham Young's counsel, Orson Pratt publicly announced the practice of polygamy among Mormons. In this discourse, Pratt stated that plural marriage is "...an essential doctrine to glory and exaltation, to our fullness of happiness in the world to come."⁶ There are several other instances where Brigham Young made known the position of the Church on polygamy. For example, in November of 1855, Brigham Young gave an address to all Mormons saying,

I foresaw, when Joseph first made known this doctrine, that it would be a trial, and a source of great care and anxiety to the bretheren, and what of that? We are to gird up our loins and fulfill this, just as we would any other duty. ...If any of you will deny the plurality of wives, and continue to do so, I promise that you will be damned.⁷

Under Brigham Young's leadership, the practice of polygamy became a doctrine that all men within the Church were commanded to become worthy of and practice. Since prophets are regarded as the oracles of God, many felt duty-bound to practice polygamy. For example, in an interview with Jessie Embry, a professor at Brigham Young University, Asenath Walser told why her father began practicing polygamy. "It was from the authorities. It was a commandment and they had been told to do that."⁸ Walser's

3 Stanley Ivins, "Notes on Mormon Polygamy," *Western Humanities Review*, Vol. X, No 3 (Summer 1956): 229.

4 Jones, 47.

5 Deseret News, 14 November, 1855.

6 Orson Pratt, "Celestial Marriage," *Journal of Discourses* 1 (1855): 54.

7 Deseret News, 14 November, 1855.

8 Asenath S. Walser, Interviewed by Jessie Embry, 26 May 1976. Interview 112, transcript. LDS Polygamy Oral History Project, Harold B. Lee Library, Brigham Young University Provo, Ut.

parents reflected an attitude common among many Mormon polygamists: a commandment from the Lord's Prophet is the same as a commandment from the Lord himself.

Adam Winthrop is an example of a man who felt duty bound to practice polygamy. In an account told by Winthrop's third wife, Brigham Young asked him personally to take another wife, to which Winthrop responded, "Brother Brigham, I don't want to get married and I don't feel that I should. It's only been a year since I married Lillian [the second wife] and I don't know what it will be like in the new country."⁹ Brigham Young then told Winthrop, "That's just why you need another wife. You will need your family there. And it's a commandment that has been put upon us and we must obey. I know it will be hard but you marry and the way will be opened before you..."¹⁰

Apostle John Taylor—who later became the President of the Church—described his feelings about his introduction to the practice as follows. "I had always entertained strict ideas of virtue, and I felt as a married man that this was... an appalling thing to do...It was a thing calculated to stir up feelings from the innermost depths of the human soul. We seemed to put off, as far as we could, what might be termed the evil day."¹¹ Despite his reluctance, Taylor, like many others, made his religious obligations his first priority and obeyed the commandment of plural marriage.

In contrast to the accounts of Winthrop and Taylor, some women were quite willing to become plural wives. One example of this is Elizabeth Street.

In the fall... Job [her husband] concluded to take another wife as it was counseled. I was quite willing. We all went to Conference and on the ninth of November, Sister Stella Hoskins was sealed to him. I was there. Eliza R. Snow asked me if I was willing. I said "yes." Then she asked me if I thought I could live in that Principle. I answered that I was quite willing to try, that my mother and sister lived in it and I thought I could do as much, and besides I wanted my husband to go into the Principle before I was too old, that I thought was right. She said my reward would be great because I was willing and that I would never get old.¹²

This account shows not only the willingness of Elizabeth Street to begin the practice, but also the support of polygamy by a woman with years of experience as a plural wife, Eliza R. Snow.

9 Kimball Young, *Isn't One Wife Enough?* (USA: Henry Holt and Company, 1954), 109.

10 Ibid.

11 Samuël W. Taylor, *The Last Pioneer: John Taylor, a Mormon Prophet* (Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 1976), 81.

12 Young, 108.

In addition to duty, some polygamists also obeyed the commandment to achieve a greater level of glory. Brigham Young explained how more wives meant more glory when he claimed,

I know quite a number of men in this church who will not take any more women, because they do not wish to take care of them...I have also known some...who have said that they did not desire to have their wives bear any children, and some even take measures to prevent it...When I see a man in this church with those feelings and hear him say, 'I do not wish to enlarge my family, because it will bring care upon me,' I conclude that...he does not understand the glory of the celestial kingdom. ...We understand that we are to be made kings and priests unto God, now if I be made the king and lawgiver to my family, and if I have many sons, I shall become a father of many fathers; for they will have sons, and their sons will have sons, and so on, from generation, to generation...¹³

The Church's doctrine on marriage was then, as it is now, that the fullness of salvation cannot be reached except by those married for eternity by someone with the authority—known as priesthood—to act in the name of God. In other words, regardless whether a man had one wife or several, no man can reach eternal salvation in its entirety without a woman, nor can a woman without a man. The Church also taught then, as it does now, that having children and teaching them to live by the commandments of God is the primary reason for marriage, and children of eternal marriages are also eternally united with their parents. As Brigham Young mentioned it was considered more glorious for a man to have multiple wives because it would link him to a greater posterity.

Practicing plural marriage to achieve a greater glory was not a concept believed only by polygamous men. For example, for two years, the wife of Dennis Gallagher pled with him to take on another wife. Believing her eternal glory was at stake by her husband's refusal to practice polygamy, she finally divorced Gallagher and married a polygamist man.¹⁴

Despite the invitation for all Mormons to become worthy of and practice polygamy, polygamists still found themselves far outnumbered even within Mormon communities. Stanley Ivins, a scholar on Mormon History, noted that, "...there were always many of these Latter-day Saints who refused to go along with the doctrine of 'plurality of wives.'" ¹⁵ Polygamist James Horace Nelson noted that "there were a great many of the people who belonged to the Church, of Jesus Christ, of Latter-day saints, who did not...believe in the revelation on Patriarchal [plural] marriage." ¹⁶

13 Deseret News, 14 November, 1855.

14 Young, 108.

15 Ivins, 229.

16 James H. Nelson, *Autobiography of James Horace Nelson, Senior* (Portland: Press of Kilham Stationery & Printing Co., 1944), 46.

In support of these claims made by Ivins and Nelson, one study of Mormon polygamy in the latter half of the nineteenth century showed that only between two and twenty percent of all Mormons were polygamists.¹⁷ If polygamy had been such a desirable way of life for men, more of them would have participated in its practice. Another study of Mormon polygamy in the second half of the nineteenth century revealed that out of 6,000 families, between 15 and 20 percent were polygamous. This study also evaluated 1,784 polygamist men, finding that 66.3 percent had two wives, 21.2 percent had three, 6.7 percent had four, and only 5.8 percent had five or more wives.¹⁸ This evidence suggests that many men were reluctant to practice polygamy. It is apparent that the majority of Mormon polygamists made the minimum possible effort to obey the commandment by only marrying one more wife. If the men were so excited about the idea of polygamy, the majority would have likely maintained marriages to more than two wives since they were free to do so.

A man by the name of Mr. Brown is an example of one man who was dissatisfied with polygamous life. When Brown's daughter wanted to get married to a polygamist, he refused to allow her.¹⁹ When the polygamist man inquired of Brown why he objected, he replied that he "had no persona[l] objections...but wanted no more Polygamy for himself or family."²⁰ The account did not tell why he did not want any more polygamous relations within the family. However, his polygamous experience must not have been very happy since he refused to have any more of it for himself or within his entire family.

Contention and jealousy among wives may have caused difficulties for polygamous women; however, men caught in the middle of these conflicts also suffered a great deal. In a letter from a woman in Utah to a friend in Ohio, she wrote for several pages about a polygamist's difficulty in dealing with several wives. Her name is not known, but she is apparently a credible source on the subject because she starts her letter claiming to have been in "all the settlements of the territory excepting one."²¹ This woman claimed that no matter how hard a man might try, he could never treat each of his wives equally, because each wife is in a different situation. Each has different habits, traditions, and cultures; a different level of education; and different quantities of children. In addition, wives may vary in age and experience, leaving some with a greater need for assis-

17 Stanley B. Kimball, Heber C. Kimball: Mormon Patriarch and Pioneer, (Champaign: University of Illinois Press, 1981), 237.

18 Ivans, 233.

19 L. John Nuttall, *Diary of L. John Nuttall* Vol. 1, (Provo, Utah: BYU Press, 1948), 235.

20 Ibid.

21 Joseph R. Buchanan, *Buchanan's Journal of Man*, Vol. IV (Cincinnati: Joseph Buchanan, 1854), 17.

tance. The result of his unequal distribution is bickering and nagging wives.²² She then gives an example in a fictional scenario.

...The piece of meat purchased on Saturday night must be divided into four pieces, and even Shylock's balance would be insufficient to give each their due proportion of fat, lean and bone; and at the same time take into the account the difference of children in each house, together with the allowance for the time he intends to board with each during the week. With knife in hand he may puzzle himself for hours, and turn it over and over again, and fail to mete out justice at last. If he takes up one baby, there are three more to be taken; and if he walks to church with one wife on the Sabbath, he must take number two the next, and number three the next time...²³

Situations such as those described in this letter often left the man in a predicament; regardless of how he responded to the situation, one—if not more—of the wives involved would resent his decision. Harriet Hakes, the second wife of polygamist Benjamin Johnson, apparently had come to this same conclusion about polygamy when she claimed, “Polygamy is harder on the man. He has to put up with two women and when he does anything, he has two pairs of eyes watching him and two people to account to.”²⁴

Despite the impossibility of it, some wives did demand an equal portion of everything their husband did for his other wives. The John Emmet family provides an excellent example. Eileen, the first wife of John Emmet, told the following story about her husband's plural wife, Bertha: “Bertha was two years older than I was and she was determined to have things. She told me once, not long after they were married, that I had had John alone for five years and that she would have the same number of years with him.”²⁵ A neighbor of the Emmet family explained the difficulties Bertha brought upon her husband.

The first wife was deeply in love with her husband and affection would do marvels for her, while the second wife, while liking affection, wants more substantial demonstration. The husband makes every effort not only to be fair and just about material things but also he's very careful to keep the confidences which he gets from one wife or the other. He is fully aware of the difficulty with Bertha, as illustrated when his first wife occasionally gets upset and expresses the same fact to him. He's very likely to say, “Don't you get upon your ear. I've got all I can stand with Bertha, and I can't have you cross or complaining.”²⁶

22 Ibid., 19.

23 Ibid.

24 Jessie L. Embry, *Mormon Polygamous Families: Life in the Principle* (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1987), 190.

25 Young, 202.

26 Ibid.

Although some polygamist men had wives who got along well, this sometimes proved to be a difficult, rather than a positive, experience for the husbands. Heber C. Kimball, an early apostle in the Church, advised his son-in-law Horace Whitney to follow the commandment given by Young and marry a second wife. Whitney followed this advice. After his second wife, Lucy, died a short while later, Horace married Mary Cravath. Helen and Mary apparently became very close and got along with each other extremely well because the two of them often teamed up against their husband. In speaking of Mary, Helen said, "...if I thought that he [Horace] appeared the least cool & caused her any unhappiness I have never failed to reprove him telling him that I could not feel happy & know that she was not."²⁷ Although having contentious wives may have been a difficult task for many polygamists, considering the example of Horace Whitney, one might argue it to be more difficult to have wives who got along well.

Polygamous men often suffered a great deal from the financial and emotional difficulties of providing for multiple families. Mary Jane Tanner, who had been a polygamous wife for sixteen years at the time, wrote a letter to her aunt Mary explaining the difficult responsibilities of polygamous men. She writes:

I fear Uncle would not make a good Mormon if he loves women but does not honor them, for any dereliction in that line is not countenanced among us. A man who would take to his bosom a second woman...must place himself under every obligation that a husband should be placed, and support her and her family. Do you suppose any man simply for self gratification when he could do as the world does would take such obligations on himself.²⁸

Tanner makes a strong argument. If the Mormon men were simply after sex, they could have accomplished that goal much easier by avoiding the financial, and other responsibilities associated with marriage.

One might argue that many of these men simply needed the socially and religiously accepted institution of plural marriage to feel justified in having multiple mates. However, if this is the case, it still required a commandment they believed to be from God to get them to practice polygamy, and they were still required to carry the burden of supporting their families. The responsibility of providing for multiple wives clearly scared many men away from polygamy. Otherwise, Brigham Young would not have been able to say, "I know quite a number of men in this church who will not take any more women, because they do not wish to take care of them."²⁹

27 Todd Compton, *In Sacred Loneliness: The Plural Wives of Joseph Smith* (Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 1997), 513.

28 Mary Jane Mount Tanner, *A Fragment: The Autobiography of Mary Jane Mount Tanner* (Salt Lake City: Tanner Trust Fund: University of Utah Library, 1980), 168.

29 *Deseret News*, 14 November, 1855.

To realize how difficult a task it can be to support multiple families, one can consider the size of families such as Heber C. Kimball's. Between those who came west with him, and those he married and had children with in Utah after his arrival in 1847, Heber C. Kimball had a total of 43 wives and 65 children. Notably, Kimball did not have all 43 wives at once—two died at winter quarters on their way west, two stayed at winter quarters, and sixteen eventually left him.³⁰ Even after losing so many, Kimball still maintained a large number of wives. Apparently Kimball did not provide full financial support for all of his families; however, he did provide the majority of the financial income for twelve of them, and partially with what he could to the other families.³¹ Most polygamists only had two wives; however, even supporting one family could be an extremely difficult task.

Because a polygamous husband had to spread his time between at least two families, loneliness would likely be one of the greatest difficulties for some polygamous wives. However, polygamous men also had reason to be lonely. In a monogamous marriage, a man typically spends the majority of his free time with one wife, allowing him the chance to develop a deep connection with her. In a plural marriage, a man may have the company of several wives, but some writings suggest that these relationships often lacked the closeness and deep bonding involved in monogamous marriages. This was especially true for some polygamous marriages that seemed to be based on religious obligation alone. In a letter to his first wife Helen, Horace Whitney wrote his feelings about marrying his second wife, Lucy.

...The love that I bear towards you is founded upon a deep respect & knowledge of your worth...and consequently will endure when the latter shall have passed into oblivion...if I thought there was no other way of securing the continuance of your affection, I would quietly, nay even cheerfully, give her up.³²

In Horace Whitney's case, his second marriage lacked a deep connection because the marriage was based only on religious obligation.

In addition to religious obligation, some polygamous marriages lacked romance because the husband's time had to be dispersed among several wives. Heber C. Kimball, a reluctant polygamist in the beginning, apparently sorrowed at the amount of time polygamy forced him away from his first wife. Joseph Smith commanded Kimball three times to take on a plural wife before he finally agreed to do so.³³ According to Kimball's daughter, Helen Whitney, polygamy continually caused Kimball

30 Kimball, 228.

31 Ibid., 229.

32 Compton, 512.

33 Kimball, 95.

“heart-aching sorrow, as I know he did for the wife of his youth, who with him in that early day yielded obedience to a principle that required life-long sacrifice and self-denial.”³⁴ Kimball and his first wife Vilate had such a deep love for each other that the thought of taking on a new wife horrified him. In fact, Kimball finally began practicing polygamy only because he believed Joseph Smith to be a prophet of God.³⁵

When reading Kimball’s letters written to his first wife Vilate, for whom he had such a deep love, it becomes clear why the practice of polygamy was so disturbing to him. He loved his first wife so much that he despised anything—including polygamy—that would force him to spend time away from her. For example, Kimball had been commanded to serve a mission in Illinois leaving his wife behind. From Illinois he penned his wife saying, “My heart aches for you and sometimes I can hardly speak without weeping and that before my bretheren; for I have a broken heart and my head is a fountain of tears.”³⁶ In a later letter to Vilate, Kimball pleads to God in regards to he and his wife, “Father, thou knowest our sorrow; be pleased to look upon thy poor servant and handmaid and grant us the privilege of living the same length of time that one may not go before the other for thou knowest that we desire this with all our hearts.”³⁷

Much like Heber C. Kimball, many Mormon polygamists received a commandment from Brigham Young to leave their families for several years to serve a mission, which further added to their loneliness. This loneliness can be clearly seen in a letter from Apostle Charles C. Rich to his family. In the early 1850’s, Rich was sent to San Bernardino, California, to watch over the growing new settlement. On June 1, 1856, he wrote a letter to his wife Eliza. In this letter, Rich, seems not only lonely from being away from his family, but also apparently feeling that polygamy had distanced his wives from him. “I have all of two letters from you since I left home. It has been so long ago I have forgotten the date or time of receipt. I think if I had only one or two more wives, I would never hear from home at all.”³⁸ Rich then adds a note to his daughter Mary. “Can’t you write or why do you not drop a few lines to me.”³⁹

In 1860, Rich was sent to preside over the British and European missions. He again wrote to Eliza—this time from Liverpool, England—saying,

34 Helen Mar Whitney, *A Woman’s View: Helen Mar Whitney’s Reminiscences of Early Church History*, edited by Jeni Broberg Holzapfel and Richard Neitzel Holzapfel (Provo: Religious Studies Center, Brigham Young University, 1997), 193.

35 Truman G. Madsen, *Joseph Smith the Prophet* (Bookcraft, Inc. 1989) 94.

36 Whitney, 194.

37 *Ibid.*, 195.

38 Charles C. Rich, “Letters of Charles C. Rich and Sarah D. Rich August 1, 1853-January 11, 1863” Copied by the Virginia Lee and Floyd L. Eisenhour Historical Records Survey Project of Works Progress Administration, March 3, 1937, Ogden, Utah, 1.

39 *Ibid.*, 2.

"I suppose you all think I have but little anxiety about home but there is nothing that would be more congenial to my feelings than to be quietly placed in the midst of my domestic affairs in Salt Lake Valley."⁴⁰ Add the responsibility of serving several multi-year missions to the responsibility of fathering several families, and one may begin to understand some of the difficulties of being an early Mormon polygamist. As he demonstrated in the following letter, Charles C. Rich took both of these responsibilities very seriously.

As in regards to the time of our return I can say nothing. You seem to think we will be home next fall. I can only say I came to do the will of God. When he is satisfied and willing for me to return home I shall esteem it a great blessing, one that I shall prize whether anyone else can or not.⁴¹

Anyone who believes that Mormon men were polygamists to gratify their lusts can read Mark Twain's account of his adventure to Utah for a humorous testimony to the contrary.

I was feverish to plunge in headlong and achieve a great reform here—until I saw the Mormon women. Then I was touched. My heart was wiser than my head. It warmed toward these poor, ungainly and pathetically "homely" creatures, and as I turned to hide the generous moisture in my eyes, I said, "No—the man that marries one of them has done an act of Christian charity which entitles him to the kindly applause of mankind, not their harsh censure—and the man that marries sixty of them has done a deed of open handed generosity so sublime that the nations should stand uncovered in his presence and worship in silence."⁴²

Although Twain's statement was simply designed for comic relief, a statement from one lady in Utah, who sympathized with the men in polygamous relationships, offers some support to his claim. She described a typical conscientious polygamist saying, "To prove his sincerity and render it apparent to all, he passes by all the pretty young girls and selects some maiden lady well advanced in years, or some widow with or without a family of children, thus burdening himself with their support. You must remember it is a conscientious man I am describing."⁴³

The federal government's prosecution of polygamists caused a great number of difficulties for polygamist men. Obviously, removing fathers and husbands from polygamous families caused a great deal of suffering for women and children. However, the men had to do the time. Mormon polygamist James Horace Nelson described the government's brutal crack-down on polygamy: "...in the year 1885, a persecution began, which lasted

⁴⁰ Ibid., 4.

⁴¹ Ibid., 20.

⁴² Mark Twain, *The Works of Mark Twain*, edited by Harriet Elinor Smith and Marquess Branch, *Roughing It* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993), 98.

⁴³ Buchanan, 18.

for ten years that caused untold suffering among those living in plural marriage.”⁴⁴ Polygamist men faced “six months in prison and \$300.00 fine” for each count of polygamy charged against them.⁴⁵

The United States government imprisoned many polygamists if they did not promise to abandon their practice of polygamy. In some ways, abandonment would have actually been a far easier option for polygamist men. Although doing so would have been emotionally difficult for many polygamists, by abandoning their families they could have avoided jail time and been freed from many of their responsibilities as husbands and fathers. Charles W. Elliot, former president of Harvard University, offered his support to polygamist B. H. Roberts when he claimed, “If Mr. Roberts was a polygamist before polygamy became illegal in the territory, I think he was absolutely right in continuing to maintain his wives and their children if there were any...In my judgement, that was the only proper thing for a Mormon to do.”⁴⁶ In addition to prison sentences, “many...were compelled to flee to Mexico for safety from prosecution under the Edmunds Law.”⁴⁷

Not only did some Mormon men dislike polygamy, but there were also many Mormon women who seemed to prefer polygamous life. For example, even after the Church issued the forbidding manifesto in 1890 stating that all of its members must now obey federal law by no longer practicing polygamy, Brigham Young’s daughter, Susa Young Gates, still felt so strongly about polygamy that she told many young girls, “...do not forget polygamy: you cannot practice it now, but keep it alive in your hearts.”⁴⁸

Another polygamous wife who was happy with her married life was Martha Hughes Cannon, a plural wife of Angus Cannon. Speaking of polygamous life, Martha stated the following: “Jealousy, unhappiness? Not half so much of it among plural wives as there is among single wives. Plural wives look upon marriage as a sacred duty and not as a means of self-seeking vanity.”⁴⁹

Cannon was not the only woman who believed that polygamous women were less jealous. The second wife in the Gilmore family gave an argument that supported Cannon’s claim. “I felt that I was living the holy Principle and that I must conform my life to it. Polygamy makes people

44 Nelson, 53.

45 Ibid., 67.

46 B. H. Roberts, *The Autobiography of B. H. Roberts*, (Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 1990), 215.

47 Joseph W. Smith, *Journal of Joseph West Smith: The Life Story of an Arizona Pioneer 1859-1944* (Harold B. Lee Library, Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah), 45.

48 Susa Y. Gates, *How a Daughter of Brigham Young Teaches Polygamy and Defends her Polygamous People* (Sanford: Microfilming Corporation of America, 1983) Text-fiche.

49 Annie Laurie Black, “Our Woman Senator,” *San Francisco Examiner*, 8 November 1896, reprinted in the *Salt Lake Herald*, 11 November 1896, 5.

more tolerant, more understanding, and more unselfish.”⁵⁰ Although not all polygamous wives were as optimistic about polygamy, the accounts of Martha Cannon and Mrs. Gilmore clearly show that it was not such a hard way of life for some women.

Martha Hughes Cannon also enjoyed the free personal time of a polygamous wife. Regarding this matter, Cannon enthusiastically stated the following: “A plural wife is not half as much a slave as a single wife...If her husband has four wives she has three weeks of freedom every single month... A plural wife has more time to herself and more independence in every way than a single one.”⁵¹ Although Cannon was a very busy and independent woman who enjoyed her careers as a Utah senator and a medical doctor, perhaps she was not the only woman who enjoyed the freedom and personal time of polygamous life.

In addition to the free time, many polygamous wives enjoyed the company and moral support of each other. In a letter to a lady in New Hampshire, polygamist wife Belinda Marden Pratt penned the following:

...my husband has seven other living wives, and one who has departed to a better world. He has in all upward of twenty-five children. All these mothers and children are endeared to me by kindred ties, by mutual affection, by acquaintance and association; and the mother in particular by mutual and long-continued exercises of toil, patience, long-suffering, and sisterly kindness.⁵²

Deep bonding among fellow wives actually happened fairly often. When someone asked Apostle Joseph F Smith's last surviving wife, Mary Taylor Swartz, whom she most wanted to see after her death, she replied, “I want to embrace the other mamas, and then papa.”⁵³ Considering that they were the first people that she wanted to see, even before her husband, Mary had obviously developed a deep friendship with her husband's other wives.

Another polygamous wife by the name of Mrs. McDiarmid shared similar feelings about the moral support of plural wives. Elizabeth Kane once asked McDiarmid if she thought that “the women would be willing to abandon Polygamy...”⁵⁴ McDiarmid responded saying, “No! Not the good women! Of course there were women here as elsewhere who were dissatisfied with the existing state of things, and who would be dissatisfied with any state in life.”⁵⁵ Kane then asked her, “Were women generally happier

⁵⁰ Young, 215.

⁵¹ Black, 5.

⁵² Richard F. Burton, *The City of the Saints and Across the Rocky Mountains to California*, (New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1862), 439.

⁵³ Truman G. Madsen, *The Presidents of the Church: Insights into the life and teachings of each Church President*, Bookcraft Inc., 1999, cassette.

⁵⁴ Elizabeth Kane, *A Gentile Account of Life in Utah's Dixie, 1872-73*: Elizabeth Kane's *St. George Journal*, (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Tanner Trust Fund, 1995), 119.

⁵⁵ Ibid.

where all the wives lived together in one house or each by herself?"⁵⁶ McDiarmid's response was, "If a man governed his wives according to the Gospel, and they tried to live up their religion, they were *far* happier together" [author's emphasis].⁵⁷ When Kane asked her about the possible difficulties of one wife interfering with the discipline of a child of another wife, McDiarmid responded saying, "Well: that wife if she was a sensible woman would remember: it may be my child interfering with hers tomorrow, and she would act accordingly; dealing as she would wish to be dealt by."⁵⁸

There are other reasons why some women supported polygamy. One polygamous wife claimed that she was grateful for polygamy because it gave her the chance to marry a righteous man that would have otherwise been unavailable. The following is a conversation that took place between newly wed Julia Snow, a plural wife of Erastus Snow, and her husband's daughter Sarah.

Sarah: "Julia, how could you make up your mind to marry according to the Patriarchal Order rather than a young man of your own age?"

Julia: "Well, to tell you the honest truth, Sarah, I would rather have your father become the father of my children than any other man I have ever seen, even though it does mean I will have little opportunity of being wooed and loved and fussed over less as I might be if I wed a single person..."⁵⁹

Although Julia had only been married for less than a month, her willingness to enter polygamous life is clear. She later commented about her husband saying, "It is impossible to compare him with the common run of men, he stands so far above them. When I stood at the altar and heard the marvelous ceremony performed and knew that I was his wife for all eternity, I felt more humbled and grateful than I thought it possible to feel."⁶⁰

There are numerous women who have written of their support for and desire to continue living polygamous life without giving their reasons why. One plural wife claimed, "They talked about liberating the 'slaves,' the women—'Mormon' women, of course. Until the 'Mormon' women acknowledge this position and assume the attitude of slaves, pleading deliverance, such sentiments are a gross insult to our womanhood, and we decidedly resent it."⁶¹ Another polygamous wife wrote, "If some of us are

⁵⁶ Ibid.

⁵⁷ Ibid.

⁵⁸ Ibid, 120.

⁵⁹ Theresa A. Snow, *Life and Times of Erastus Snow: Historical Novel* (St. George, Utah: CFP Books, 1996), 188.

⁶⁰ Ibid., 189.

⁶¹ Daniela Johnson-Bennion, "Comparing Themes of Polygamy in Mormon Women's Public and Personal Writings as Found in the Women's Exponent and Their Diaries During the Edmunds Act, the Edmunds-Tucker Act, and the Manifesto" (Masters Thesis, Utah State University, 2000), 48.

willing that our husbands should marry more wives and provide for them and their offspring, I cannot see whose business it is but *our own*" [authors emphasis].⁶² Eliza Lyman, plural wife of the Apostle Amasa Lyman and former plural wife of the Prophet Joseph Smith, gave perhaps an even more interesting female defense of polygamy, describing it as a holy practice.

The Polygamous Ladies of Utah are the honorable wives of honorable men, and have no desire for anyone to interfere in their affairs. We are happy with our husbands and children, and do not need the sympathy of the outside world, nor do we thank them for it...It is now about 36 years since the prophet Joseph Smith taught me the principles of Celestial Marriage. I was then married by that order, and have raised a family of both sons and daughters in what is called polygamy, and I am not afraid to say that it is one of the most pure and holy principles that has every been revealed to the Latter-day Saints...Our enemies say if we will drop polygamy we shall have equal rights and privileges with them. Can they tell why they persecuted us before there was any plurality of wives known in the Church?"⁶³

In the letters of Marinda Bateman to her polygamist husband Samuel, she actually encouraged her husband to come home and find more wives quickly before the good ones get taken. Samuel Bateman had left his home and family temporarily to serve a mission in the Eastern United States. On February 5, 1869, Marinda Bateman wrote her husband saying, "They are preaching upon polygamy very strong all the time so you and John better hurry home as soon as you can so as to get some of the girls in the notion to have you before you start back again."⁶⁴ Bateman wrote her husband again on February 28, saying,

Byron and Catherine are going to the city today to get married tomorrow. I have heard that Wm Bills is going to take two sisters, Danish girls...I think some of you missionaries had ought to have stayed home to [have] filled your first mission, but I guess when the right time comes you will get as many wives as you want. There are as good fish in the sea as ever was caught.⁶⁵

The autobiography of Hannah Simmons Gibb provides examples of three different women who were in favor of polygamy. When Gibb was twenty-one years old, she and a friend of hers were asked to take care of an old widow in the area. This widow had been a plural wife of Joseph Smith. Gibb described having a very interesting experience helping the old widow one day. The widow had lain still for so long that Gibb thought

62 Whitney, 63.

63 Eliza Maria Lyman, *The 1846-1885 Diary of Eliza Maria (Partridge) Lyman*, Special Collections, Harold B. Lee Library, Brigham Young University, Provo.

64 Samuel Bateman, *Letters To and From Samuel Bateman 1869-1909*, typescript, copied by the Brigham Young University Library, 1945, Special Collections, Harold B. Lee Library, Brigham Young University, Provo, 449.

65 Ibid., 458.

she had died. Suddenly, the woman sat up and looked at Gibb saying, "The Lord has chosen and called you to go into plural marriage."⁶⁶ Hannah responded by saying, "Not me," to which the old widow replied, "Yes, you, and you ought to be thankful for the privilege of living the highest law of marriage."⁶⁷

According to Gibb, she would have never married a man who was unwilling to practice polygamy, but she wanted to be the first wife. However, her next-door neighbor of two years and his wife really liked Gibb. She wrote about this experience saying,

He and his wife wanted me to marry him, but I refused, as I had always said I would never marry a shoemaker or an Englishman. I was ready to leave for Salt Lake City to stay, intending to go the next morning. That night, I was awakened, hearing a voice calling me. I answered and the voice said, "You are called to go into plural marriage and, if you know the good work you have to perform in a short time you would not put it off any longer." I decided then, if it were the Lord's will, I had better marry this man. Early the next morning our neighbor and his wife came over, saying that during the night they had a manifestation that they should get their endowments and take me with them.⁶⁸

In this account, Gibb, her next-door neighbor's wife, and the old widow were all in favor of polygamy. Although Gibb wanted to be the first wife, she clearly mentioned that she would never marry a man who "would not live plural marriage."⁶⁹

One thing that the writings of each of these women have in common is that they all reject a common view of Mormon polygamy being barbaric and forced upon women. A late nineteenth century critic of Mormon polygamy wrote,

What chance has the young girl immigrant, newly arrived in Utah, friendless and a stranger, what chance has she of holding out against the numberless officials, who control her life at every point? There is something irresistibly pathetic in the struggle of such a girl to resist the ceaseless, daily pressure directed upon her by the Mormon hierarchy.⁷⁰

What makes this quote so interesting is that a woman in Utah used nearly the same arguments to describe how the men were pressured into polygamy. In speaking specifically of timid, self-conscious men, she wrote, "I have come to the conclusion that *the men* and not *the women* of Utah Territory, *a re to be pitied* [authors emphasis]. After you have finished your oh's and ah's and after you [you] have lifted your hands in astonishment long enough, I will tell you my tell."⁷¹

66 Hannah Simmons Gibb, *Hannah: An Autobiography* (Edmonton, Canada: Fisher House Publishers, 1995), 14.

67 Ibid.

68 Ibid, 15.

69 Ibid.

70 Jones, ix.

71 Buchanan, 17.

This woman then proceeded to describe the horrible ridicule that a man trying to live monogamy in Utah typically endured. She claimed that he is considered a heretic, and endures persecutions as “loud and deep as those showered upon the women who oppose the doctrine...” until “he begins to examine the reasons which have been urged upon him.”⁷² Eventually the man had to give in, and then “comes the winter of his discontent; but he must choke down his regrets as best he may for there is no shirking the responsibilities he has voluntarily assumed...If, however, they [the women] are dissatisfied, they can readily get a divorce without suffering in the opinion of the public.”⁷³

In conclusion, many have criticized the practice of polygamy by the Mormons in the late nineteenth century, calling it barbaric, enslaving to women, and designed to fulfill men's lusts. However, the Mormons were commanded to practice polygamy by Brigham Young, whom they firmly believed spoke for God. Many Mormons obeyed this commandment out of religious obligation. As a result, some polygamous men endured many difficulties from polygamy, such as contention between jealous wives, financial burdens, loneliness, and time in prison. In contrast, some women seemed to prefer polygamous life to monogamy. They enjoyed aspects such as the friendship and support of other wives, the free time, and the availability of righteous husbands polygamous life provided. Clearly, polygamy was neither a barbaric, degrading system that enslaved women, nor a fulfillment of every husband's fantasy.

72 Ibid.

73 Ibid., 19.



THE HISTORIOGRAPHY OF INDIA¹

BY: BRITTANY A. LASSETTER

In a memoir, published in 1908, Ramaswami Naidoo reflected upon the historiography of India with the following words:

It is true, as all Europeans imagine, that we Indians, do not possess any recorded histories of our ancient civil and political matters but all that we have, are religious traits [tracts], mixed with political institutions, it must indeed be a matter of curiosity to the European world, as our books treat upon facts that occurred many thousand years before the Christian system of Chronology, under which, they believe that the world is aged only above five thousand years.²

This comment indicates the Western belief during the writer's time that India lacked a history, and the belief by Indians that their history existed but in a format that was different and possibly older (and thus superior) to the idea of history that pervaded Western thinking. Through a discussion of Indian historiography in ancient, medieval, colonial, and post-colonial times I will argue that regardless of whether or not India's historiography is better than Western historiography, it does exist, and in fact consists of more than just the ancient Vedas and later British accounts. India's historiography has in fact undergone a complex transformation that has assimilated many different cultures and ideologies.

Indian history is generally thought to have begun around 2500 B.C. with the Indus Valley (or Harappan) civilization. Not much is known about this civilization due to the inability of scholars to decipher the language of

1 It is important to note that the "time periods" that I use in this article are divisions reflecting the Western perspective of history. As you will see later in this article, India encompasses many different perspectives of history ranging from the local view which sees history as consisting of repeating cycles of four periods to the more complex Ghandian view of history in which history can be molded and where the lines between past and present are not as defined as in the Western perspective. Due to the fact that the majority of my audience consists of readers with a Western perspective as well as to make my argument more explicit, I have decided to use the Western "time divisions" in this article.

2 Qtd. in Eugene F. Irschick, *Dialogue and History: Constructing South India, 1795-1895* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994), 71.

the civilization; however, it is known that it was fairly urbanized and advanced, with sophisticated drainage systems, multi-story houses, and a thriving trading network. Scholars have yet to discover why this civilization disappeared, or exactly when it disappeared, but by 1500 B.C., when the Aryans invaded, the civilization had been gone for a long while. The “invasion” of the Aryans was not a military invasion per se, but rather a succession of migrations of people designated Aryans. With the Aryans came the first prominent historical documents in Indian history: the Vedas (which contained hymns, prayers, and ritual formulas), the Brahmanas (these and the Upanishads contained philosophical works and critiques on the Vedas), the Upanishads, and the Puranas (contained “traditional mythic-historical works”).³

Of these documents, the Vedas are considered the most controversial. According to Jawaharlal Nehru, the former Prime Minister of India, “the Vedas...were simply meant to be a collection of the existing knowledge of the day; they are a jumble of many things: hymns, prayers, ritual for sacrifice, magic, magnificent nature poetry.”⁴ On the other hand, according to the Sri Aurobindo theory, “the hymns [the Vedas] are concerned outwardly with gods and sacrifices but inwardly with the attainment of divine knowledge and bliss. Their language is deliberately equivocal, having at the same time a ritual and spiritual significance.”⁵ In between these two extremes are a variety of opinions regarding the historical and spiritual value of the Vedas, for example critical scholars during the post-colonial period thought that the Vedas were of great historical value, but of little literary or philosophical value.⁶

In short, the Vedas represent an important part of Indian historiography because they are the first historical records to appear in India. They are almost entirely religious in content, but even this has helped later scholars determine what the Aryans were like and what cultural and religious customs they brought to India. For example, the beginnings of the caste system are present in the Vedas, and a historian is able to see it begin to mature as the number of castes increased with the rising influence of the Aryans in India. It has been interpreted that there were originally three castes—Brahman (priest), Kshatriya (warrior), and Vaishya (peasant)—but as Aryan influence spread a new class, the Shudra (servant), was formed,

3 James Heitzman and Robert L. Worden, eds. *India: A Country Study*, 5th ed. (Washington, DC: Federal Research Division, Library of Congress, 1996), 5.

4 Jawaharlal Nehru, *The Discovery of India* (Garden City, New York: Anchor Books, 1960), 42.

5 Peter Heehs, “Shades of Orientalism: Paradoxes and Problems in Indian Historiography,” *History and Theory* 42, no. 2 (2003): 169-196, available from Academic Search Elite, <<http://search.epnet.com/direct.asp?an=9491987&db=afh>> (accessed 1 November 2003), 181.

6 *Ibid.*, 182.

and outcaste people made up yet another caste.⁷ The Vedas are an excellent example of how India began to absorb new cultures and customs which would later become defining attributes of its country.

The next period of importance in Indian historiography came during the medieval period with the establishment of the Delhi Sultanate in 1206 A.D., by Muslims from Arabia. During this period a wide variety of histories were written. Some examples would be the poetic chronicle *Rajatarangini* by Kalhana during the early medieval period, the *Rehla* of Ibn Battuta (a book that narrates his travels through India), and the historical discourses of Maulana Ziyauddin Barani.⁸ Also, Muslim historians began to add to Indian historiography during this period. Using the above historians let us evaluate the state of Indian historiography during the period.

First, there is the *Rajatarangini* by Kalhana. This historical work is a poetic chronicle of the kings of Kashmir (a northern province of India). This work reflects the difference from Western chronicles, in that his chronicle is not a narrative, but written in verse. It contains the religious sentiments of the period, in that it presents the ideas of karma (the totality of actions of a person which determine their fate) as well as other Hindu beliefs and principles (Kalhana was himself a Brahman).⁹ An interesting note about Kalhana, is that he believed that 'fate' shapes history, which is related to the Hindu idea of Karma.¹⁰ In all, Kalhana is an important historian, because he presents some of the aspects of Indian historiography which make it unique (i.e. his beliefs in Karma and 'fate'), and also because he is considered to be a fairly impartial historian and his works are generally reliable (except in terms of chronology, which was not very accurate).¹¹

The *Rehla* of Ibn Battuta is the next medieval work that I will discuss. This work is considered one of the most extensive sources of history during the period 1334-47 A.D. Ibn Battuta discusses the historical, social, political, religious, and military aspects of India in this document.¹² As a foreigner, his narrative has a reliability that would generally be found lacking in a comparable narrative by an Indian. Despite this accuracy, he was not an Indian and therefore he could not 'connect' with common Indians in the same way that a native would be able to, and his journals were not written with the purpose of having accurate chronology and topography.¹³ However, Ibn Battuta serves as an example of the increasing number of

7 Heitzman, 7.

8 Bhanwarlal Nathuram Luniya, *Some Historians of Medieval India* (Agra: Lakshmi Narain Agarwal, 1969), 3, 47, 58.

9 *Ibid.*, 4-5.

10 *Ibid.*, 4.

11 *Ibid.*, 7, 10.

12 *Ibid.*, 58.

13 *Ibid.*, 77.

cultural views that were entering into Indian historiography, and his travel writings presented yet another medium of historical writing.

Maulana Ziyauddin Barani is a particularly great example of medieval Indian historiography, because in his writings he begins to work out the 'nature' of history and what methods should be used by historians in recording it. In the introduction of his historical book *Ta'rikh-i-Firozshahi*, Barani writes down his thoughts concerning historiography.¹⁴ In this chapter Barani states his belief that history is as important a subject as theological studies (during the Sultanate, Muslims considered the study of *Hadith*¹⁵ more important than history), he advocated the use of impartiality and "adherence to the truth," and believed that if a historian was unable to record facts "openly" they should use implication instead to maintain the accuracy of their work.¹⁶ This is interesting, because some of the bastions of Enlightenment thinking in Europe were based on these same ideas. Though Barani had several defects as a historian, including lack of impartiality, unequal coverage of historical events, and an inaccurate chronological order of events, his analysis of history was something uncommon in historical writing of the time. In fact, the purpose of Muslim historians at the time was to "depict successive events, anecdotes and achievements, military expeditions and victories of the great and powerful Muslim rulers, nobles and officials."¹⁷

The second half of the medieval period in India was characterized by the Mughal Empire, which was ruled also by Muslims. During this period chronicles were still the primary medium of historiography (which were usually biased by the political ambitions of the authors), and philosophy of history was almost non-existent.¹⁸ Moreover, the chronicles contained only political histories, to the detriment of the social, constitutional, and religious aspects of Indian history.¹⁹ The writing was mainly on an individual basis with the assumption that history was controlled by the hand of God (or some other unseen force), and so the primary historical works other than chronicles, took the form of biographies, which had slanted views due once again to the political, religious, and/or social ambitions of the authors.²⁰

14 Ibid., 46.

15 Hadith was "a report of what the Prophet, his Companions and followers would have said or done if they had been obliged to do so." William Theodore De Bary, Stephen N. Hay, Royal Weiler, and Andrew Yarrow, eds. *Sources of Indian Tradition*, 4th ed. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1964), 373.

16 Ibid., 46, 126.

17 Ibid., 127.

18 Ibid., 133.

19 Ibid.

20 Ibid., 134.

In evaluating this era of Indian historiography, I will discuss Babur (who incidentally established the Mughal Empire and was its first ruler) and his great work *Baburnamah*, and a Muslim Indian Abdul Qadir Badauni and his thoughts concerning history. It is believed that the *Baburnamah* was composed after the invasion of India, but exactly when it was begun is not known.²¹ Babur's memoirs are considered an important document in Indian historiography because of the detail and objectivity that characterized them.²² Babur's memoirs are somewhat like the travels of Ibn Battuta, in that both of these men, due to their being foreigners, were able to provide relatively reliable accounts of Indian history. Moreover, the talent for detail that both had makes for an expansive view of India, further heightening their places in the hierarchy of Indian historiography.

Abdul Quadir Badauni is a great example from this period because he, like Barani during the Delhi Sultanate, made some enquiries into what historiography was. In fact, in the following passage note the reference Badauni makes to history being a science. The reason I point this out is that until the Enlightenment Europe did not consider history a science, but an art.

The science of history is essentially a lofty science and an elegant branch of learning, because, it is the fountain-head of the learning of the experienced and the source of the experience of the learned and discriminating, and the writers of stories and biographies, from the time of Adam to this present time in which we live, have completed reliable compositions and comprehensive works, and have proved the excellence thereof by proofs and demonstrations.²³

You will notice also in this quote that Badauni considered the writings of his contemporaries and those historians before him. Though his interpretations were not entirely accurate, as seen from the review of historiography during this period in the preceding paragraphs, it provides a glimpse at what historians during this period thought of their work and the works of other historians.

Overall, the historiography of medieval India was not by any means focused on accuracy, or the meanings of specific events in terms of their long term effects on history. Nor was it defined by variety or ingenuity. However, there were great writers during this period that provided historical accounts in forms other than chronicles, and that showed how other cultures and faiths (such as Islam) influenced historical writing. Medieval historiography is a great example of how India absorbed other civilizations and how these same civilizations contributed to its transformation into what it is today.

21 Ibid., 136.

22 Ibid., 137.

23 Qtd. in Ibid., 165.

The third period of importance in Indian historiography is the colonial period, in which India came under the rule of first the East India Company (1757-1857) and then the British government, or British Raj (1858-1947). During this time Peter Heehs saw three major movements of Indian historiography, and I will use his model in evaluating the period.²⁴ The first movement was that of Patronizing/Patronized literature, which began around 1750 and continued past the liberation of India in 1947. The authors of this movement many times showed genuine interest towards Indian culture and history, but everything about India was seen through an imperial lens. A good example, which is given by Peter Heehs, is that of Governor-General Warren Hasting's introductory remarks to an English translation of the *Bhagavad Gita*:

"Every accumulation of knowledge, and especially such as is obtained by social communication with people over whom we exercise dominion founded on the right of conquest, is useful to the state."²⁵

A theory that would most likely fit into this category, but was not discussed by Peter Heehs, was that of a Utopian past and future. This theory asserted that long ago Indians had been a great civilization, but due to the influences of Muslim and European conquerors they had been debased, and so it was the responsibility of the British conquerors to restore Indian civilization to its former 'golden years.'²⁶ In formulating this theory, the historical views of commoners in India were taken into consideration. The part of the theory concerning the idea of a former period of greatness followed by decay was taken from the Indian belief that there were four *yugas* (divisions of history) that began with a *yuga* of greatness, which gradually moved into *yugas* of greater and greater "impiety, discontent, and immorality," with the final *yuga* called the Dark Age or *kali yuga*.²⁷ This theory was used by British officials to "sedentarize" the Indian populations and create a positive vision for the future which would support their efforts in colonizing India.²⁸ Thus, we have an example of one of the forms of historiography that began to appear during this period, one in which the goals of the East India Company (who was in control of India during the time this theory was formulated) were placed higher than accuracy and honesty in historical accounts.

The next movement during the colonial period, was that of Romantic historiography. This movement began around 1800, and was promoted primarily by German scholars.²⁹ In this movement, German Indian studies

²⁴ Heehs, 173-175.

²⁵ Ibid., 173.

²⁶ Irschick, 72-73.

²⁷ Ibid., 71.

²⁸ Ibid., 78.

²⁹ Heehs, 174.

produced positive accounts of Indian culture and history, which were in direct opposition to the generally negative accounts emanating from British scholarship. Indian scholars gladly accepted this praise and imitated it in their writings. An example given by Heehs comes from the Indian scholar Har Bilas Sarda who writes that “The Vedas are universally admitted to be not only by far the most important work in the Sanskrit language but the greatest work in all literature.”³⁰

The final movement was that of Nationalism, in which Indian historians believed that India could only, and should only, be judged by Indians, and which started around 1850. A nationalist that was considered “moderate,” in that he saw benefits from British colonization, but also saw areas in which it was detrimental to India, was Dadabhai Naoroji. In a memorandum regarding “The Moral Impoverishment of India,” he wrote:

Europeans occupy almost all the higher places in every department of government, directly or indirectly under its control. While in India they acquire India's money, experience, and wisdom, and when they go, they carry both away with them, leaving India so much poorer in material and moral wealth. Thus India is left without, and cannot have, those elders in wisdom and experience, who in every country are the natural guides of the rising generations in their national and social conduct and of the destinies of their country—and a sad, sad loss this is!³¹

This statement, though it does not discuss history specifically, gives one an idea of what nationalism encompassed. We can see here that the author appreciates the new institutions but does not appreciate their being used primarily for the benefit of the British. He shows the growing feeling that India should not be seen as a springboard for the careers of British officials, but should be considered as a country with an identity and needs that should be considered and addressed appropriately.

Another example which has closer ties to history would be the writings of the ‘extreme nationalist’ Bankim Chandra Chatterjee. He was considered part of the extremist movement because he used Hindu ideology and methods of gathering mass support for nationalism. He wrote historical fiction, and he used the ‘language of the people’ in his writing. A work that I would like to note specifically is his *Anandamath* (*The Abbey of Bliss*) which contains a poem translated from Sanskrit by another nationalist Aurobindo Ghose. This poem, “Bande Mataram” (“The Mother”), uses the Hindu idea of a mother deity and applies this to India. In other words, he brings together Hindu beliefs and nationalistic goals, and arrives at the concept of a “divine Motherland.” This idea would lead to the use of the

³⁰ Ibid.

³¹ Dadabhai Naoroji. “The Moral Impoverishment of India.” Sources of Indian Tradition, eds. William Theodore De Bary, Steven N. Hay, Royal Weller, and Andrew Yarrow, 4th ed. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1964), 671.

poem as the anthem of the nationalist movement.³² This is yet another example of the transformation of Indian historiography and its use in Indian history. Here historiography is seen not just as a record of the past, but as a means through which the future can be made and a country united. This period of historiography is drastically different from Indian historiography in the medieval period which were mainly chronicles, and the early colonial (Patronizing) period by the British government.

A final example of nationalist literature, one which was interpreted through a Patronizing lens, is seen in the treatment of the nationalist Ghandi. The British saw India as a country in its "childhood" which needed to attain the "maturity" and "adulthood" of Britain.³³ Moreover, the methods, writings, and speeches of Ghandi were labeled "infantile," "immature," and "juvenile." Ghandi, through his belief that the nature of history is "shifting, amorphous, and amenable to intervention" attacked the idea of a rigid, unchangeable past which is the Western view.³⁴ Thus, we see how Indian historiography was beginning to accommodate multifarious forms of recording and interpreting history, for we have an 'anti-historical' view of history in Ghandi and a 'pro-historical' view of history in the British, both of which must coexist in India. Moreover, we have the nationalist literature of Ghandi in opposition with the Patronizing/Patronized literature of British scholars. This last example is particularly notable because it shows how the different movements that I have been describing interacted with one another, which gives one a more realistic view of Indian historiography during the colonial period. It shows that transitions in historical thinking were not clean-cut and uncontroversial, that in fact they were many times just the opposite.

At this point we come to the fourth and (so far) final period of Indian historiography, and this period brings us to the present. It is called the post-colonial period, and once again using the model of Peter Heehs, it is divided into three movements which I will assess individually with added comments on each.

The first movement of the post-colonial period was the Critical movement, which was a time when Indian historians with Western education studied Indian history from a Western perspective. In other words, empirical methods were used to write Indian history.³⁵ Also during this period historiography itself became an object of analysis, but it was from a Western rather than a traditional perspective. A better summary of this

32 De Bary, 708.

33 Ashis Nandy, *The Intimate Enemy: Loss and Recovery of Self under Colonialism* (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1983), 55.

34 Ibid., 56-58.

35 Heehs, 175.

period is found in an essay by Bernhard S. Cohn, in which he says that in order to legitimize history, Indians began to use the Western methods of studying history.³⁶ It is interesting to note that history in Europe during this time was trying to legitimize itself as a field of study by adopting the methods of the natural sciences. Bernhard goes further than Heehs, in that he says that not only was history studied empirically, but other forms of historical documents that were accepted by Western historical thought as 'historical' were found, and put forth as evidence that India did have a "sense of history":

European and Indian historians of early India have struggled in the twentieth century with these assumptions [that India has no sense of history] and sought means to construct a chronological framework by demythologizing the Puranas and the epics, by establishing genealogies of kings and other personages, and by collecting inscriptions for which rough dates could be established paleographically. The struggle for a chronology was part of a larger struggle for and by Indians to establish a political history, from which emerge Indian republics, empires, great rulers, great battles, rich and powerful merchants, declines and falls, bureaucracies, revolution, and even nascent capitalism.³⁷

This passage reflects the idea that India did not have a history unless they had in their past events similar to the events that made up the pasts of Western countries. In other words, this period was characterized by a movement to "fit in" as a sovereign nation among the Western elites.

The second movement of the post-colonial period was the Reduction movement (ca 1978 to present) in which scholars wanted to move away from the British perspectives of history and general Eurocentrism by restoring everything the British had taken from Indian culture.³⁸ The problem with this idea, was that those cultural and historical ideas attributed to the British led to the enhancement of Eurocentrism, rather than its diminishment.³⁹

The final movement was the Reactionary movement which began around 1980 and continues today. This movement is composed of scholars that have degrees in science, but not in history, and who are rewriting Indian history.⁴⁰ This is almost a form of the Nationalist movement, but the difference is that all forms of Western historical thought are rejected in order to "restore India to its ancient glory" which was disinherited by the British and their colonial rule.⁴¹ I believe one of the best examples of this

36 Bernhard S. Cohn. "Anthropology and History in the 1980s." *An Anthropologist among Historians and Other Essays* (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1987), 68.

37 Ibid.

38 Heehs, 175.

39 Ibid.

40 Ibid.

41 Ibid.

movement comes from the Indian writer Ashis Nandy (whose field of study is culture and psychology), who believes that the Enlightenment views of objectivity and truth, which were at the core of Western historical thinking, pushed aside all other thinking as ahistorical and labeled those cultures that embraced this thinking as having no sense of the past.⁴² Ashis Nandy provides some very insightful views of Indian history and historical thinking on the "commoner" level. He tells people what the every day people of India think about the past, not what the politicians think. Moreover, he compares these thoughts with Western (or Enlightenment thinking). According to Nandy:

Traditional India not only lacks the Enlightenment's concept of history; it is doubtful that it finds objective, hard history a reliable, ethical, or reasonable way of constructing the past...the Indian attitude of time—including the sequencing of the past, the present, and the future—is not given or pre-formatted...[it] is an open-ended enterprise.⁴³

Ashis Nandy and other Reactionaries hope through their efforts to not just bring India the glory 'it deserves,' but to legitimize other forms of historical thinking, and not be labeled as ahistorical because their view of the past is not accepted by the scholars of primarily Western schools of thought.

The post-colonial period was a period characterized by the political, economic, and cultural struggles of a newly sovereign nation. With this period came the cultivation of yet new breeds of historical thinking, which had to assimilate themselves into the already present schools of thought. Thus historical struggles were present in this period as they were in the previous. The difference between this period and the previous, was a greater variety of thinking about history itself. The situation was not just the British imperial view of superiority in conflict with the Nationalist view of Indian superiority, it in a way transcended this to arrive at a position in which it is not a matter of one view of historical thinking being better than another, but the recognition of myriad views of the past existing.

India not only has a history, but a historiography that is indeed complex, and as we have seen above, consists of viewpoints that complement each other and that oppose each other co-existing and producing a unique school of thought. Due to the variety found in India, it has much to add to the 'conversation' of history. Moreover, the ideas coming from India's rich historiography may be helpful to the conflicts of such a respected and

42 Ashis Nandy, "History's Forgotten Doubles," *History and Theory* 34, no. 2 (1995): 44-67, available from Academic Search Elite, <<http://search.epnet.com/direct.asp?an=9506203789&db=afh>> (accessed 1 November 2003), 46.

43 Ibid., 63.

widespread school of thought as the Western tradition. Stanley Wolpert said it best, however, when he wrote:

The ineffable fascination of modern India is a product of the complexity of its many ages of coexistent reality. Nothing is ever totally forgotten in the land of reincarnation...Every where we look in India we can see the rebirth of ancient forms, arts, crafts, customs, and institutions—the living archive of ethnohistory that daily presents itself for inspection in village hovels, timeless tools and carts, pots painted with ancient folk art, cloth woven to antiquity's traditional patterns. History is alive throughout India.⁴⁴

44 Stanley Wolpert, *India* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991), 23 and 25.



JOURNAL STAFF

Courtney Burns

Courtney Burns was born in Gettysburg, Pennsylvania as the oldest of five girls. After moving several times around the United States, the family moved to Orem, Utah, where Courtney graduated from Mountain View High School. After graduation, Courtney worked locally in Utah before moving to Boston, Massachusetts for several years. Upon returning to Utah, Courtney enrolled at Utah Valley State College. Because of interests in history, political science, and religion, Courtney is pursuing an Integrated Studies degree with emphases in social science and religious studies. Courtney's main interest in these areas is the connection between religion and violence and her thesis will examine religion and violence in Northern Ireland. On completion of her Bachelor's Degree, Courtney plans on joining the Peace Corps before attending grad school. On completion of grad school, Courtney hopes to work internationally with aid or conflict resolution groups in regions of conflict.

Angela Mordecai Mickiewicz

Angela Mickiewicz published a paper in this journal last year and the editing staff liked it so much they made her editor of the journal this year. When she finally graduates from UVSC she will leave with an AS in Behavioral Science and a BA in both History and English. She likes many different topics but centers her studies on military history, and literary criticism using Whiteness Theory. Angela would like to continue school, focusing on American racial oppression from slavery to present as seen in literature. She received two Service Awards and an Outstanding Student Award. She is the Vice President of Phi Alpha Theta and is also a member of the History Club. Angela has two children who constantly remind her how much she has to learn. She spends what little free time she has coming to terms with being over a quarter of a century old, playing with her children, reading novels, comics, and military history books, watching movies, and dreaming of places she will go one day.

Jacquie Nielson

Jacquie is a senior at UVSC and will be graduating with a BA in History. She will then begin graduate school in Fall 2004. She has formerly completed an A.S. in Social and Political Science. Jacquie's interest in history and political science began when she lived in the D.C. area, where she grew to believe that history embodies all aspects of life. In addition, although she has had the opportunity to study in many academic fields, she enjoys her endeavors into the classics of ancient history the most. Jacquie has been involved in leadership positions in the community including the P.T.A. and the Girl Scouts of America, as well as local government councils, and currently serves as the Secretary of Phi Alpha Theta. Last year she was Vice President. Jacquie is originally from Montana, but has lived in Guatemala, Ecuador, and Washington D.C. While living in our nation's capitol, she had the opportunity to be involved with former President Bush's Inaugural Gala. Jacquie currently resides in Spanish Fork, Utah with her husband and five children.

Adam Dean Smith

Adam D. Smith was born in Provo, Utah, and has lived most of his life in Orem. He graduated from Park Rose High School in Portland, Oregon. Prior to beginning his studies at UVSC, Adam enjoyed teaching the youth in his community the martial arts. Adam's passion for history began with his 8th grade history teacher who was able to bring life to the events of the past. His focus in history is primarily the events surrounding the Revolutionary War and the development of the United States Constitution along with the men who were involved through it all. Adam is currently a junior at UVSC, and is enrolled in the Elementary Education program, and is also a member of the Phi Theta Kappa Honors society. He will graduate in April of 2005 with his baccalaureate degree. Adam Currently lives in Eagle Mountain, Utah, with his wife and 3 sons. He intends to continue his education until he has achieved his Ph.D. in History.

Erik Stuart Smith

Erik Smith was born in Payson, Utah and raised in Port Angeles, Washington. Erik lived in Honduras for a couple years where he fell in love with the place and the people. This influenced his studies in college. A junior at UVSC, Erik has been pursuing a BA in History with the majority of personal study dedicated to Latin American History spanning pre-Columbia times to present. Erik is currently the Treasurer for Phi Alpha Theta and will continue being in the presidency of Phi Alpha Theta next year. When not absorbed in his studies, Erik takes to the field as a member of the college lacrosse team. His future goals include post-graduate work in Central American studies and extensive traveling.

Dr. Keith Snedegar

Dr. Keith Snedegar has been at UVSC since 1994. He is now an associate professor of history and serves as chair of the History and Political Science Department. Keith studied engineering and history at the University of Michigan, medieval languages at the University of Edinburgh, and modern history at Oxford University. He has also been a postdoctoral fellow at the University of Cape Town in South Africa. His research field might be described as cultural astronomy, the study of how different cultures have expressed their relationship with the sky. At UVSC, he teaches courses in the Nature of History, Medieval Europe, Modern Britain, and the history of South Africa. Keith's significant other is Linda Potter, an accountant in Grand Rapids, Michigan. They enjoy visiting cemeteries together. His favorite film is *Fast, Cheap, and Out of Control*.

MANUSCRIPT AUTHORS

Erica Beus

Erica Beus is in her senior year at Utah Valley State College, and will graduate in April 2004. She has presented some of her other work at the Martin Luther King Jr. Commemoration (UVSC, 2004) and at the Phi Alpha Theta Regional Conference (BYU, 2004). Erica has a passion for genealogy and learning in general. Upon graduation, Erica plans to do free-lance genealogy; however her greatest hope is to never lose her title as “student.”

Michelle De La Cerda

Michelle is from Southern California and has been living in Orem for the past 5 years. She is graduating from USVC with her BA in History. She plans to attend graduate school and pursue the study of history. She was active in founding UVSC's chapter of Phi Alpha Theta and is a member of Phi Theta Kappa. She is also a member of the History Club. She enjoys spending time with family and friends when not being a nerd.

Michael Difabio

Michael is from Los Angeles, California. He served ten years in the Army, in Korea, Germany, and Washington State. He will graduate in April 2004 with a BA in Integrated Studies with emphases in History and Military Science. He will then return to the Army as a Second Lieutenant.

Shannon Drage

Shannon is a senior, graduating this year with a B.A. in History. Her future plans include graduate school and a great deal of traveling. Her main interests lie in Ancient History and scuba diving. She is from Utah originally but plans to relocate after graduation.

Amber Frampton

Amber Frampton is a student at UVSC working on her Bachelor of Arts degree in History. She was raised in Pleasant Grove and currently resides there. Amber plans to graduate in the spring of 2005 from UVSC and continue on to graduate school in History. Her areas of emphasis in History are Latter-Day Saint History, United States History, and Ancient Britain. She has been affiliated with several organizations including Phi Alpha Theta (Historian) and the UV Leader organization (UV Leader).

Breton Friel

Breton Friel completed a two-year service mission in Pittsburgh Pennsylvania for The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. He then completed his Associates Degree from UVSC in the Fall of 2002, and will graduate in August of 2004 with a BA in History. He is a member of Phi Alpha Theta. After graduation, he plans to attend graduate school for a Masters in either International Relations or Library Science. He and his wife are currently expecting their first child, she is due to arrive in August.

Arthur A. Hatfield

Art Hatfield is an English Literature major. He will graduate this year with a BS degree. He has already received an AS degree in Business Management from UVSC in 1999 and in 1997 he received an AS degree in Electronics Technology from Barstow College, California. Art composes and performs music under Ferenczy. He is signed to Pyрге Records. His new Album "Black Coffee, Cheap Cigarettes" will be released in July 2004.

Brittany A. Lassetter

Brittany is currently working toward her Bachelor of Arts degree with and emphasis in History. She is looking forward to obtaining her Master's degree in History at the University of Utah. She hopes to then pursue her Doctorate at UCLA, Stanford, Yale, or Oxford. Her area of interest is Latin American history, specifically Mayan astrology and calendrics. She eventually hopes to teach at a university, and/or work on-site at one of a variety if Mayan cities that interest her. She has many hobbies including singing, fencing, ballroom dancing, theatre acting, bowling, Red Cross training for Infant and Child CPR, and babysitting. She also enjoys scuba diving, kayaking, rock climbing, and other outdoor activities. Brittany likes to read, especially Ernest Hemingway and Fyodor Dostoevsky, run, draw, and play the clarinet. She says, "I do not come close to achieving the skill of Benny Goodman, but I try!"

Ryan Vogel

Ryan Vogel, from Springville, Utah, is a senior majoring in Integrated Studies, with emphasis in Social Science and English. He has published several papers on historical and political topics as an undergraduate in institutional and national academic journals, as well as having his art featured in journals and local publications. While at UVSC, Ryan served as Inter Club Council President, Student Body President, and Executive Vice President of the Utah Student Association. He currently works at UVSC as the Ombudsman and plans to attend law school, specializing in International and Human Rights Law, this fall.