THE LOYOLA UNIVERSITY

STUDENT HISTORICAL JOURNAL

Vol. V Nos. 1 & 2

PREFACE

This journal is the result of a joint effort of the Loyola University Student Historical Association, Phi Alpha Theta, and the Student Government Association. It is comprised of papers submitted by students of this university, and is by no means exhaustive of the works submitted.

It is the aim of the Journal to give interested students an opportunity to have their work published and to give the university community a chance to see the work these students have done.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

1. DANCE PRODUCTION IN NEW ORLEANS..... 1
   Submitted by: Martha Holoubek

2. A BRIEF EXAMINATION OF THE MEDICAL.....10
   HISTORY OF THE CONFEDERATE STATES
   OF AMERICA
   Submitted by: Kurt S. Blankenship

3. THE ARISTOCRATIC VIEWPOINT AS.....21
   REFLECTED BY HISTORIANS OF THE
   SOUTH
   Submitted by: Jane Cormack

4. THE NORMAN CONQUEST AND ITS IMPACT.....31
   ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF FEUDALISM IN
   ENGLAND
   Submitted by: Dennis O'Toole

5. A SELECTIVE ANALYSIS OF THE HISTORIOGRAPHY.....45
   OF THE IRISH EASTER REBELLION-1916
   Submitted by: Susan M. Simoneaux

DANCE PRODUCTIONS IN NEW ORLEANS, 1850-1861

Submitted by:

Martha Holoubek

The decade before the Civil War marks a period of transition for dance in New Orleans. Though in great demand as the 1850's opened, ballet suffered a gradual decline in popularity; by 1862, the entire entertainment business had been disrupted by the War between the States. The New Orleans audience met a colorful assortment of dancers at this time, from the highly gifted George Washington Smith and the notorious Lola Montes to the durable, versatile Ravel Family.

The engagement of a troop of dancers at New Orleans theaters was a recent innovation in 1850, spurred by the success of a group called the Jefferson children which had appeared in the mid-1840's.[1] Theaters shortly thereafter initiated the practice of hiring regular companies of dancers, similar to the stock company of actors. The regulars must be accomplished enough, on the one hand, to handle performances by themselves, yet nimble enough, on the other, to adapt to the temperament and eccentricities of visiting performers. This was the "star system" of the era.[2] Dance was usually limited to a grand divertissement or a "favorite dance" by the regular dancers between the major dramatic productions.

The major theaters in New Orleans at this time were the St. Charles, the American, the Orleans, and the Varieties. The regular theatrical season opened in November and closed for the summer in May of the following year. Managers often allowed stars and stock players to stage a production for their own "benefit," however, in addition to the regular engagements.

The appearance of a star at major theaters of prima awaited and well-received occasion, yet the days of prima ballerinas had largely passed. The illustrious Fanny Elssler had left the United States in 1842. Three of the four great classical ballet dancers which America produced in the nineteenth century were no longer to be seen on the New Orleans stage: Mary Ann Lee had retired in 1846, for reasons of health; Augusta Maywood had formed a touring company in Europe; and Julia Turnbull made no more Southern tours before her retirement in 1857.[3]

Only George Washington Smith, America's first native "premier danseur," was still active. Smith's career as dancer, producer, actor, and choreographer began in 1838; he was teaching at the time of his death in 1899.

> In the course of these sixty years, Smith danced in everything from grand ballet and opera to the circus...he partnered almost every great ballerina who visited this country, from Elssler on; he staged almost every one of the well-known

> romantic ballets, and choreographed many of his own; he taught social dancing, Spanish dancing, and academic ballet; he taught several pupils who became famous...[4]

A list of the artists with whom he worked reads like a Who's Who in nineteenth century American ballet--Fanny Elssler, Julia Turnbull, Mary Ann Lee, Signorina Ciocca, Senorita Soto, Lola Montes, Louise Ducy-Barre, Annetta Galetti, and Celestine Frank.

The winter of 1849 witnessed the opening of a new theater in New Orleans, an auspicious occasion in this instance for dance enthusiasts. The management of the new Varieties theater would engage no stars, but rely on a stock company recruited directly from Europe. "Particular attention was given to the engaging of an efficient corps de ballet, as it was the intention to make ballet a prominent feature for the coming season."[5] The principal dancers were Antonia Hillariot, Mlles. H. and J. Vallee, M. Bouxary, and Sr. Vegas.[6] Hattie Vallee also appeared in the American theatre company of dancers, which featured Kate Staines.[7] The Vallee sisters had performed with Elssler and with Smith in the 1840's.[8]

Mlle. Blangy, who had first appeared in his country in 1845, was the star ballerina engaged by the St. Charles for January, 1850. Noah Ludlow, one of the owners of the theater, pronounced her performance quite pleasing: "This artist gave unqualified satisfaction in all of her performances and was unquestioningly a fine pantomimist as well as a dancer."[9] Mlle. Blangy performed "La Giselle" and "La Chatte."

The American and the Varieties theaters renewed the contracts of their respective company of dancers for the next theatrical season. In February, 1851, the St. Charles offered the two-week engagement of Mlle, Celestine Frank's Ballet Troupe, with Celestine and Victorine, Miss Le Baron, and M. Espinosa. Although the dance troupe was welcomed and the "... performances of the Miss Franks [sic] in particular were received with great applause..."[10] the engagement was, at best, a qualified success. A simultaneous attraction at the theater was Jenny Lind, the "Swedish Nightingale," whom P. T. Barnum had brought to America on tour in 1850; the Frank Ballet Company performed on nights alternate to those on which Miss Lind appeared. The Frank sisters were connected with other dance companies in later years, including the Ravel Family. In fact, when the Ravels fulfilled a commitment at the St. Charles the next month, the Mlles. Frank were part of the ballet troupe. Their selections included "Diana," "La Fortuna," and "Pas Styrien."

When the Ravels first appeared on the American stage, in 1832, their act was billed as "Rope Dancing, Herculean Feats, and Pantomime Ballet." They soon became connected with Niblo's Garden in New York; it was from this theater that most of their Southern tours originated.[11] The original company multiplied and divided as new performers attached themselves to the group and old members set out on their own. This rather amorphous grouping--numbering among its sometime members the Martinettis, the Marqettis, the Blondins, the Franks, Paul Brillant, Mlle. Francis, and Yrca

Mathias--offered an acrobatic and dance extravaganza.

The Varieties Theater engaged the Monplaisir Ballet Troupe for the entire season of 1851-1852; the company was headed by Madame Monplaisir and featured the local favorite, Hattie Vallee. Their productions ranged from the comic pantomime ballet "Mons. Deschalumeaux" to the operatic "La Bayadere" to the classical "Judgment of Paris." The Picayune termed opening night "a most elegant and graceful performance," and Mme. Monplaisir "a perfect witchery of motion."[12] The Bateman children, Kate and Ellen, played a brief engagement at the same theater in the spring. The Bateman sisters had been appearing on stage since 1849, at the ages of four and six respectively. Drama was their forte, but this season they executed pas under the direction of Mlle. Ducy-Barre. Louise Ducy-Barre, who had studied and performed in Paris, made her American debut with G. W. Smith at New York in 1851.

The Rousset sisters, a French ballet troupe, appeared at the St. Charles theater in December, 1851. Although quite charming and accomplished, Caroline, Adelaide, Theresine, and Clementine Rousset were greeted with but little enthusiasm. Their refinement, perhaps, was unsuited to the taste of the audience:

> The style of these young ladies was marked with elegance, grace, and modesty...not generally admired by those who usually went to the theater to see how high a lady could elevate her toes, and expose her person in a pirouette.[13]

The following season, 1852-1853, the Varieties theater offered no regular dance troupe, and Hattie Vallee danced between acts at the St. Charles Theater. The highlight of the season was the appearance of Lola Montes. Her engagement at the Varieties in December of 1852 was for a series of plays and solo divertissements--"El Olé, the "Spider Dance," and the "Sailor's Dance." At one point during the season, the fiery beauty took offense at something the prompter of the theater said to her, slapped him, and was sued for assault and battery![14]

Lola Montes, née Marie Delores Elize Rosanna Gilbert, was born in Ireland in 1818. As an entertainer, she assumed her mother's nationality --Spanish, and maiden name--Montes. Her notoriety across Europe was related more to her succession of affairs (with Franz Liszt, for example), than to her abilities. As the mistress of the elderly King Louis I of Bavaria, Lola was dubbed Countess of Lansfeldt. Her manipulation of Bavarian state affairs is said to have precipitated the Revolution of 1848.[15] The "Countess" came to this country as a dancer and

> ...of course was greeted with immense audiences, in which hardly a woman was to be seen. She proved conclusively... that scandal does not necessarily create a dancer.[16]

George Washington Smith had the dubious privilege of directing the ballets that were to introduce Lola Montes to the American public. Despite her physical charms, the Countess exhibited serious flaws as a dancer. Smith staged for her several simple and lovely dances, among them being the "Spider Dance," an adaptation of the Tarantella. Smith

had to deal as well with the Countess' lack of the slightest sense of rhythm!

> Matters actually came to the point where the manager had to give special orders to the conductor of the orchestra: "When you play to the Countess, follow her precisely. When she stops, you also stop, no matter whether or not the music is finished."[17]

During the 1853-1854 season Virginia Foulkrod and Ada Edminston were regular performers at the Varieties; their repertoire included "La Tarantella," "La Cracovienne," and "La Manola." The Bateman children appeared at the same theater in December. Hattie Vallee was joined at the St. Charles by a Mlle, Therese, and Messieurs Schmidt and Bruclanni. The stellar attraction of the Orleans Theatre that season was the engagement of Senorita Soto and George Washington Smith; their productions encompassed "El Zapataedo," "El Jaleo de Xeres," "El Olé," and "La Manola." Their reception by the New Orleans public was curiously subdued. Pepita Soto had made her American debut in 1852 with a French and Spanish troupe of dancers; after this company dissolved, she took up partnership with Smith. The New Orleans Picayune recounted the "pleasure of witnessing the local debut of this beautiful and graceful danseuse"[18] but seemed oblivious to the "Spanish fire and passionate vigor" with which Charles Durang, of the Philadelphia stage, characterized her dancing:

> Of admirable physique and of enchanting symmetry, she was no doubt fascinating to the young, but the tendency was to pervert the innocent mind.[19]

The Ravel Family opened the next season at the Varieties in November of 1854, and, following a conflagration which destroyed most of their equipment and much of the theater, played benefits at the Orleans Theater. The company returned twice that season to play at the St. Charles. A new member of the cast was Yrca Mathias, the Russian danseuse. This ballerina had been an instant hit with her American audience since her debut in 1853.[20] The Ravel corps de ballet offered New Orleans theater-goers a selection of pieces this season, including "Parquita," and "Jeannette and Jeannot." Miss Fanny at the Pelican and Miss Marsham at Holland's Olympic played favorite dances between dramatic performances throughout the 1954-1855 season.

During the next season, Vallee and Bruclanni were the regular dancers at the St. Charles, and Kitty Gray replaced Miss Fanny at the Pelican. The Monplaisir Ballet Troupe undertook a brief appearance at the Gaieties (formerly the Varieties)in March; in April, the Ravels played the St. Charles. An advertisement from Niblo's Garden in New York for "LLorente's Troupe of Spanish dancers"[21] brought about brief engagements for the company at three New Orleans theaters--the Pelican, the St. Charles, and the Orleans. The fact that touring companies felt compelled to advertise through Southern newspapers is one indication that business was slow in entertainment.

Although Hattie Vallee at the St. Charles and a Mlle. Katarine at Crisp's Gaiety offered an occasional divertissement the following season, New Orleans audiences seemed to prefer the tableaux vivants of the Keller troupe to ballet

and dance performances. In March, 1857, Mr. and Mrs. W. J. Florence, "The Irish Boy and the Yankee Gal," opened at the St. Charles. In addition to their repertoire of songs and skits, Mrs. Florence executed a Spanish dance and a military dance. Previous to her marriage, Mrs. Florence had appeared on stage as the dancer Malvina. "One sees that Mrs. Florence aimed at being bewilderingly protean," noted George Odell, chronicler of the New York stage. "Mrs. Florence was a hearty, wholesome, likeable person whom one could not see too often."[22] In April, the Ravels with Yrca Mathias played a return engagement at the St. Charles.

For the next season, a Miss Sarah Bishop was hired at Crisp's Gaiety for entr'acte performances. The Martinetti-Blondin troupe, formerly with the Ravel company, appeared at the Gaiety and at the Orleans; their pieces included "Isle of Nymphus," and "Jeannette and Jeannot." In November, a Madame Torma from Milan appeared at the St. Charles in a Danse Espagnole;[23] this brief engagement was followed by a similar one at the Orleans. In March of 1858, the celebrated Ronzani Ballet Troupe was introduced to the New Orleans stage. Dominico Ronzani's company--with Louise Lamoureux, Annetta Galetti, Filipo Baretti, and Gaetano Pratesi--had opened in Philadelphia and in New York in 1877. Despite their undeniable talent, the Ronzani company was never to enjoy success in America, as initial technical difficulties with their production combined with a financial panic in the United States and a widespread decline of interest in quality ballet.

> The high tide of the popularity of the romantic ballet in America, which had slowly increased throughout the thirties until it reached the height with Elssler's triumphs, and the rich decade which followed, was now beginning to ebb.[24]

Nevertheless, the Ronzanis drew immense houses in New Orleans; the Bee pronounced the troupe "the largest and best we have ever seen."[25] Louise Lamoureux proved to be most popular--"...we confess we have seen nothing to compare with her in her graceful art, since the days of Fanny Elssler."[26] "We have never had so complete and accomplished a corps de ballet as this," pronounced the Picayune, "and are not likely soon to have another."[27] Despite their triumph, the Ronzanis did not return as a troupe to New Orleans. After the company dissolved, Annetta Galetti and other members returned the following season at the Orleans.[28] Shortly thereafter, Miss Galetti became Smith's new partner.

The last three theatrical seasons before Louisiana became embroiled in the Civil War were dominated in the field of dance by the Ravel Family, present and former members. Yrca Mathias appeared with the Ravels at the St. Charles in February and March of 1859 and March of 1860. The new Varieties theater engaged Mlle. Zoe Georgette, Miss Jackson, and the Gale sisters as principal dancers for the 1859-1860 season. While "pretty in person, and graceful in motion,"[29] these artists met a lukewarm reception. Only Hannah and Adoena Gale were reengaged for the nest season, and, in 1860, they were replaced by Mlle. Francis and Paul Brillant, late of the Ravel troupe. This couple performed for the season with a repertory that listed the "Tyrolienne," "L'Andalusia," and "Sailor's Hornpipe." Such performances earned them "...the liveliest plaudits; Mlle. Francis being

a particular and acknowledged favorite of the New Orleans public."[30]

Four months into the new season, Louisiana seceded from the Union, and on March 21, 1861, joined the Confederate States of America. The waning of interest in the art of dance was accelerated by the public's preoccupation with matters political. The names bandied about at social gatherings in the decade of the 1860's were not to be those of theatrical luminaries like Jenny Lind and Lola Montes, but those of secessionists and generals.

FOOTNOTES

[1] John S. Kendall, The Golden Age of the New Orleans Theater, (Baton Rouge, 1952), p. 37.

[2] Johnnie Allen Perkins, Dramatic Productions in New Orleans from 1817-1861, Master's Thesis submitted to the faculty of Louisiana State University, (Baton Rouge, 1929), p. 8.

[3] See George Amberg, Ballet in America: The Emergence of an American Art, (New York, 1949), chapter I.

[4] Lillian Moore, "George Washington Smith," Chronicles of the American Dance, Paul Magriel, ed., (New York, 1948), p. 139.

[5] Noah M. Ludlow, Dramatic Life as I Found It, (Bronx, N.Y., 1966), p. 704 .

[6] New Orleans Daily Picayune, May 28, 1850.

[7] Kendall, p. 249.

[8] Moore, pp. 143ff.

[9] Ludlow, p. 658.

[10] New Orleans Bee, February 12, 1851.

[11] George C.D. Odell, Annals of the New York Stage, (New York: 1947-1949), III 559-560.

[12] New Orleans Daily Picayune, November 30, 1861.

[13] Ludlow, p. 718.

[14] Ibid., p. 729.

[15] Kendall, pp. 338ff.

[16] Odell, VI, 115-116.

[17] Moore, p. 168.

[18] New Orleans Daily Picayune, December 21, 1853.

[19] Moore, p. 170.

[20] Odell, VI, 314.

[21] New Orleans Daily Picayune, February 3, 1856.

[22] Odell, VI, 528.

[23] New Orleans Daily Picayune, November 21, 1857.

[24] Moore, p. 177 .

[25] New Orleans Bee, March 17, 1858.

[26] New Orleans Daily Picayune, March 14, 1858.

[27] New Orleans Daily Picayune, March 19, 1858.

[28] New Orleans Daily Picayune, November 28, 1859.

[29] New Orleans Bee, December 10, 1858.

[30] New Orleans Daily Crescent, November 20, 1860.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Amberg, George. Ballet in America; The Emergence of an American Art, New York, 1949.

Kendall, John S. The Golden Age of the New Orleans Theater, Baton Rouge, 1952.

Ludlow, Noah M. Dramatic Life as I Found It, Bronx, 1966.

Moore, Lillian. "George Washington Smith," in Chronicles of the American Dance, Paul Magriel, ed., New York, 1948.

New Orleans Bee

New Orleans Daily Crescent

New Orleans Daily Picayune

Odell, George C.D. Annals of the New York Stage, 15 vols., New York, 1927-1949.

Perkins, Johnnie Allen. Dramatic Productions in New Orleans, from 1817-1861, Master's thesis submitted to the faculty of Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, 1929.

A BRIEF EXAMINATION OF THE MEDICAL HISTORY OF THE CONFEDERATE STATES OF AMERICA

Submitted by:

Kurt S. Blankenship

In this paper, I intend to examine certain aspects of the medical history of the short-lived Confederate States of America: the quality of Southern medical education, the organization of the Confederate Army Medical Department, the surgeons and the hospitals they worked in, the diseases of the common soldier, and the quality of the medical care he received. It is my hope that the reader will gain a general knowledge of the problems and challenges that confronted the physicians and nurses of the South during the American Civil War and, in so doing, also gain a greater appreciation of the miracle that is modern medicine.

Historians, both ancient and modern, have long considered the casualty lists of opposing armies to be a fairly accurate measurement of military success or failure. Most of us tend to think that the countless millions that have died in man's innumerable wars met their deaths on the battlefield, but this is far from accurate. In the American Civil War, as in all wars, the most formidable enemy of the man in uniform was disease. Disease confronted him on the battlefield, sat across from him in the mess hall, and stalked him in his sleep. There was no escape.

Joseph Jones, a prominent Confederate medical officer, estimated that out of 600,000 men mobilized for the Confederate Army, each one of these fell victim to disease and/or wounds approximately six times during the war. Of these 600,000 men, 200,000 either were killed outright or died as a result of disease.[1] Robert E. Lee himself was struck down by disease at a crucial stage of the Wilderness Campaign in May of 1864.[2] In the North, the toll of disease was even greater: 224,586 deaths due to disease alone.[3] The very first year of the conflict saw 1,219,251 cases of disease in the Confederate armies east of the Mississippi River.[4]

It is obvious that bullets were far less destructive than disease. The high mortality rate among the men in gray reflected in part the conditions in civil life, in part the conditions of medicine and public health care in the middle of the century, and in part the wholly inadequate preparation for war. It must be remembered that the medical knowledge of the nineteenth century was far, far inferior to the science of modern medicine. Antiseptics were unknown, the relation of dirt to infection was only just beginning to be understood, anesthesia was just coming into use, and drugs were inadequate.[5] Obviously, the magnitude of the problem facing the medical officers of the confederacy was astronomical.

Ante-Bellum Medical Care

The first school of medicine in the South was the Medical College of South Carolina, established at Charleston in 1824.[6] By the time the first cannon volleys ripped through the ramparts of Fort Sumpter, there were 21 medical schools in the South.[7] In general, medical education in the United States lagged behind that available in Europe, but the Southern medical schools and their faculties compared very favorably to those of the North.[8] Shortly before the war, Dean Paul Eve of the Medical College of Georgia served as the president of the American Medical Association.[9]

In the late ante-bellum period, a wave of quackery and mediocre medical care engulfed the United States. Licensing laws were greatly relaxed in the decade before the war, and patent medicine men made a thorough killing on the ever-gullible American public. There were very few trained pharmacists, but this did not stop the public from swallowing very large quantities of whatever happened to be popular at the time. In short, as Dr. Oliver Wendell Holmes explained to the Massachusetts Medical Society in May of 1860, the American people were "overdosed":

> How could a people which has a revolution once in four years, which has contrived the Bowie knife and the revolver, which has chewed the juice out of all the superlatives in the language in Fourth of July orations, and so used up its epithets in the rhetoric of abuse that it takes two great quarto dictionaries to supply the demand; which insists in sending out yachts and horses and boys to out-sail, out-run, out-fight, and checkmate all the rest of creation; how could such a people be content with any but heroic practice? What wonder that the stars and stripes wave over doses of ninety grains of sulphate of quinine, and that the American eagle screams with delight to see three drams of calomel given at a single mouthful.[10]

There were several important surgical advances shortly before the Civil War. These advances were largely the result of two important factors: 1) the rising influence of French pathology, with its increased stress on lesions of body organs as the cause of disease; 2) the boldness of many frontier physicians, whose separation from the conservative traditions of medical schools led to increasingly daring attempts to determine the healing power of surgery.[11] For example, in 1849, Dr. Ephraim McDowell performed the first successful ovariotomy (removal of an ovary). Prior to his success, this operation was considered certain death for the patient. A few years earlier, a rural Georgian practitioner named Crawford Long first administered ether successfully in operative surgery. The acceptance of ether led to more surgery, but also to more deaths from post-operative infections. Not many Southern physicians were yet aware of the growing importance in European medicine of boiling water and thorough cleansing of surgical apparatus.[12]

In conclusion, then, although there were certain depressing features in American medical practice before the Civil War, the general indication

was one of continuing advancement.

Organization of the Confederate Medical Department

The Medical Department of the Confederate Army was authorized by the Provisional Congress at Montgomery, Alabama, on February 26, 1861, eight days before the inauguration of Jefferson Davis. It originally provided for one Surgeon General with the rank of colonel, four surgeons, and six assistant surgeons. The Surgeon General's salary was fixed at $3000.00 annually, while the surgeons and their assistants were to be paid between $110.00 and $200.00 per month, depending on their rank and length of service.[13] By May of the same year, Congress had augmented the department by six surgeons and fourteen assistant surgeons.[14] By the end of the war, some 3000 medical officers served in the Confederate army and navy.[15]

The first Surgeon General was David C. DeLeon of Mobile. He was replaced on July 12, 1861, by Charles J. Smith, who remained in office for exactly two weeks. His successor was Samuel P. Moore, who served for the remainder of the war. Moore was an excellent and highly qualified administrator. Under his command, the Medical Department developed into an orderly and fairly efficient organization. He established boards of examiners to screen physicians for service, reserving the final decision for himself.[16] His chief distinction was that he introduced the hut or pavilion-type hospital, the forerunner of the modern hospital. Instead of grouping together large numbers of patients, the sick and wounded received treatment in separate huts housing 25-30 patients each.[17]

The greatest complaint against Moore was that he was addicted to army discipline. His brusque and imperious manner often offended those under his command, but his abilities were widely acknowledged.

One of Moore's greatest problems was the procurement of adequate medical supplies. As the war dragged on, and the Northern blockade became more and more effective, medicine became perhaps the dearest item in the Confederacy.[18] As early as 1862, quinine was $20.00 an ounce in Louisiana, and two years later it was $100.00 an ounce.[19] One Confederate doctor bought contraband chloroform for $15.00 a bottle, and two weeks later was offered $300.00 a bottle for it.[20] By the end of the war, the Congressional appropriations for medical service totaled $77,000,000.00.[21]

The Confederate government established numerous medical laboratories, where various substitutes were sought for the dwindling supply of drugs. Most of what was acquired was used for the military, with the result that thousands of civilians must have perished for want of adequate drugs.[22]

Establishment of Hospitals

The establishment of hospitals was among the first priorities of the Medical Department, but initial efforts in that direction were

confused and chaotic. The result was that during the first part of the conflict, much of the mortality was no doubt the result of crowding the wounded and disabled into hotels, warehouses, stores, barns, churches, chickencoops, hay-sheds, and slave quarters.[23] There were so many wounded, crowded and crammed into every corner and closet, that most of them were neglected.[24] This neglect and overcrowding led many a wounded man to the conclusion that nothing was going to be ever done to help him, and that those whom he had defended no longer cared about his welfare.[25] To many of the soldiers, hospitalization was often regarded as equivalent to a death sentence.[26] One overworked surgeon indifferently described his arrival at a new hospital: "When I arrived at the hospital my ears were greeted as usual at such time with the moans and cries of the wounded".[27]

Gradually, a Confederacy-wide program of hospital organization was established that went far toward meeting the needs of the armed forces.[28] The Confederacy's largest and most famous hospital was Chimborazo. This institution, erected on a site overlooking the James River, had a capacity of over 8000 patients. It has been described as the largest military hospital that has ever been established on this continent.[29]

As the fortunes of the Confederacy declined, so did those of the hospital system. However, a remarkable effort from volunteer men, women, and children went far toward supplying the sick and wounded with adequate medical care and accommodations.[30]

Surgeons and Nurses

Three words can best describe the general condition of the Southern surgeons and nurses: underequipped, overworked, and frustrated. Most of the surgeons were unprepared for the demands of military practice. Their own civilian practices had afforded little opportunity for surgery. In the field hospitals, however, doctors stood before operating tables for 24-36 hours at a time.[31] Amputation "assembly" lines were set up: ether was administered at one table, the limb severed at another, and the wound dressed at another.[32]

One general gave a gruesome description of the surgeons at work immediately after a battle:

> There stood the surgeons, their sleeves rolled up to their elbows, their bare arms as well as their linen aprons smeared with blood, their knives not seldom held between their teeth, while they were helping a patient on or off the table, or had their hands otherwise occupied; around them pools of blood and amputated arms or legs in heaps, sometimes more than man-high. As a wounded man was lifted on the table, often shrieking with pain as the attendants handled him, the surgeon quickly examined the wound and resolved upon cutting off the injured limb. Some ether was administered and the body put in position in a moment. The surgeon snatched his knife from between his teeth, where it

had been while his hands were busy, wiped it rapidly once or twice across his blood-stained apron, and the cutting began. The operation accomplished, the surgeon would look around with a deep sigh, and then -- 'Next'! And so it went, hour after hour.[33]

Once a surgeon, unable to work any longer, would lay down his scalpel, clutch his trembling hand, and turn away from the table with hysterical tears running down his face.[34]

To add to his situation, during the early part of the war the surgeon had to endure capture and imprisonment. Not until the latter part of 1862 was it agreed that surgeons should not be captured.[35]

Twenty-five years after the war, a reunion of Confederate surgeons was held in Richmond. Those who had survived the conflict listened to this well-deserved tribute from Joseph Jones: "...the brave hearts, cool heads, and strong arms of Southern surgeons were employed but for one purpose--the preservation of the health and lives and limbs of their countrymen".[36]

Nurses were in as great a demand as surgeons. Most of them were volunteer women, working in hospitals for the first time. Women's organizations met to roll bandages rather than to sew quilts, although it is debateable which was more sorely needed.[37] Many Southern women founded hospitals. Ella King Newsom, an Arkansas woman who established hospitals throughout the south, became known as "the Florence Nightingale of the Southern Army".[38] When the hospitals became overcrowded, some women nursed the wounded in their own homes.[39]

Causes of Disease

The cause of disease in the field and in camp are so numerable that they warrant a complete study in themselves. I will attempt to list only a few of the more common causes:[40]

1) Inadequate physical examinations led to the induction of many men in poor health, men who were highly susceptible to disease and infection.

2) The preponderance of men from rural areas, where most normal childhood diseases and vaccination were unknown, established a large body of troops highly susceptible to many contagious diseases.

3) The neglect of camp hygiene contributed greatly to the prevalence and spread of disease. Dead animals were improperly buried or not buried at all. Latrines were constructed, but often the men had to be threatened with court martial before they would use them. Heavy rains carried excremental wastes into the camps' water supply system.

4) Insects of all kinds attacked the soldiers: sandflies, mosquitoes, gnats, and roaches. Worst of all were the lice. Nearly every single soldier on both sides of the conflict was infested with lice, making a miserable war even

more miserable.

5) Exposure was a prominent cause of disease. Inadequate clothing and camp equipment led to diarrhea, rheumatism, pneumonia, and other diseases. Winter was the worst time of all. Frostbite was very common. During one of Stonewall Jackson's campaigns, one entire squad of men froze to death while guarding the camp on a particularly cold night. In the summer, there were the never-ending rains to contend with.

6) Poor and insufficient food and water did much to cause disease. One soldier reported drinking water "so filled with animaleulae [sic] that no microscope was required to detect their presence".[41]

7) Mental disorders, although not widely recognized as being of great importance to the prevalence of disease, were always present. Monotony and boredom led to frequent illnesses and excessive drinking.

Prevalence and Treatment of Disease

Again, I can provide the reader with a brief list of the major diseases and their treatment:[42]

1) Diarrhea and dysentery were the most common diseases, and the most difficult to control. "No matter what a patient had," wrote one doctor, "he had diarrhoea [sic]." During the first few months of the war, diarrhea constituted 226,828 out of 848,555 reported cases of disease. Diarrhea, although technically a symptom rather than a disease, was especially damaging because it weakened its victim's resistance to other diseases. Some of the remedies tried included injections of silver nitrate, cauterization of the rectum for a distance of several inches from the anus, and opium.

2) Measles was especially prevalent during early stages of the war. It was gradually controlled by careful sanitary measures.

3) It has been estimated that one out of seven men in the Confederate Army had malaria. Its exact cause was still unknown, although it was recognized that camping upwind from a swampy area reduced the danger of infection. Quinine was the most common remedy applied.

4) Although it had been almost sixty years since Jenner had demonstrated that smallpox could be prevented by vaccination, most individuals had not been vaccinated. This led to serious outbreaks of the dreaded disease, and it was only when widespread vaccination was instituted that it could be controlled.

5) Pneumonia was exceedingly common. The attempted treatments included regulated diet, brandy or whisky, or opium administered twice daily.

6) Camp itch was the most common disease of the Confederate soldier. Thought to be a nonparasitic skin irritation, it was incurable except for the mildest cases, disappearing of its own accord only after varying lengths of time.

7) Mental depression and alcoholism exacted their toll among the men in gray. Nostalgia and homesickness were very common, especially among hospitalized men. Alcoholism became such a problem that any officer found guilty of drunkenness was subject to immediate court-martial.

Conclusion

Disease, then, was indeed the great enemy. The Confederate medical officers met the challenge as best they could, constantly striving to improve themselves. Without the modern miracles of blood-plasma, X-rays, antibiotics, vitamin concentrates, and vaccines, they did much to restore and maintain the physical condition of the men.[43]

Despite the depressing statistics, available records for the war indicate that the annual mortality and disease mortality rates throughout the conflict were less than those other armies that took the field in the nineteenth century.[44]

Some of the more positive benefits gained from the war experiences of the many Southern physicians include an increased awareness of the importance of a proper diet, a considerable increase in surgical skills, improved hospital construction and administration, and greatly increased knowledge of public health.[45]

Whatever the benefits, the horrible memories still remained; the searing recollections of the utterly disgusting evil of war that were imprinted on the souls of those that had been taught to heal--the piles of gory severed limbs, the swollen, disfigured corpses, the helpless moans, the sightless eyes. George A. Townsend, a war correspondent for the New York Herald, gave this moving account of his experience in a field hospital shortly after a fruitless battle:

> I think still, with a shudder, of the faces of those who were told mercifully that they could not live. The unutterable agony; the plea for somebody on whom to call; the longing eyes that poured out prayers; the looking on mortal as if its resources were infinite; the fearful looking to the immortal as if it were so far off, so implacable, that the dying appeal would be in vain; the open lips, through which one could almost look at the quaking heart below; the ghastliness of brow and tangled hair; the closing pangs; the awful quiet.[46]

FOOTNOTES

[1] H.H. Cunningham, Doctors in Gray, (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1958), p. 3.

[2] Ibid., p. 8.

[3] Ibid., p. 5.

[4] Ibid.

[5] Henry S. Commager, ed., The Blue and the Gray, (New York: Bobbs-Merrill Co., Inc.), II, p. 769.

[6] H.H. Cummingham, Doctors in Gray, (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1958), p. 11.

[7] Ibid.

[8] Ibid., p. 12.

[9] Ibid., p. 14.

[10] Ibid., p. 16.

[11] Ibid., p. 18.

[12] Ibid., p. 19.

[13] Ibid., p. 21.

[14] Ibid., p. 22.

[15] Ibid., p. 36.

[16] Ibid., p. 32

[17] Ibid., p. 29.

[18] Charles P. Roland, The Confederacy (Chicago: University of Chicato Press, 1960), p. 152.

[19] Ibid.

[20] F.E. Daniel, Recollections of a Rebel Surgeon (Austin: Von-Boeckmann, Schutze & Co., 1899), p. 117.

[21] H.H. Cunningham, Doctors in Gray, (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1958), p. 43.

[22] Charles P. Roland, The Confederacy (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960), p. 152

[23] H. H. Cunningham, "Confederate General Hospitals: Establishment and Organization", The Journal of Southern History, XX (Feb.-Nov., 1954), p. 350.

[24] Spencer G. Welch, A Confederate Surgeon's Letters to His Wife (New York: Neale Publishing Co., 1911), p. 16.

[25] Paul Angle and E. Miers, Tragic Years 1860-1865 (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1960), p. 288.

[26] Henry S. Commager, ed., The Blue and the Gray (New York: Bobbs-Merrill Co., Inc.), II, p. 769.

[27] H.H. Cunningham, "Confederate General Hospitals: Establishment and Organization", The Journal of Southern History, XX (Feb.-Nov., 1954), p. 67

[28] H.H. Cunningham, Doctors in Gray (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1958), p. 69.

[29] H.H. Cunningham, "Confederate General Hospitals: Establishment and Organization", The Journal of Southern History, XX (Feb.-Nov., 1954), p. 350.

[30] H.H. Cunningham, Doctors in Gray (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1958), p. 69.

[31] F.E. Daniel, Recollections of a Rebel Surgeon (Austin: Von-Boeckmann, Schutze & Co., 1899), p. 68.

[32] Henry S. Commager, ed., The Blue and the Gray (New York: Bobbs-Merrill Co., Inc.), II, p. 769.

[33] Paul Angle and E. Miers, Tragic Years 1860-1865 (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1960), p. 729.

[34] Henry S. Commager, ed., The Blue and the Gray (New York: Bobbs-Merrill Co., Inc.), II, p. 790

[35] Holland Thompson, ed., The Photographic History of the Civil War (New York: The Review of Reviews, 1911), VII, p. 228.

[36] Joseph Jones, "The Medical History of the Confederacy", Southern Historical Society Papers (Richmond, Va., 1892), p. 113.

[37] Henry S. Commager, ed., The Blue and the Gray (New York: Bobbs-Merrill Co., Inc.), II, p. 782.

[38] Charles P. Roland, The Confederacy (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960), p. 168.

[39] Ibid.

[40] H.H. Cunningham, Doctors in Gray (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1958), pp. 163-181.

[41] Ibid., p. 180.

[42] Ibid., pp. 186-215.

[43] Ibid., p. 264.

[44] Ibid., p. 265.

[45] Ibid., pp. 267-271

[46] Henry S. Commager, ed., The Blue and the Gray (New York: Bobbs-Merrill Co., Inc.), II, p. 772.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Angle, P. and Earl Miers. Tragic Years 1860-1865. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1960.

Commager, H. S. (ed.). The Blue and the Gray. 2 vols. New York: Bobbs-Merrill Co., Inc., 1950.

Cunningham, H. H. "Confederate General Hospitals: Establishment and Organization". The Journal of Southern History, XX (Feb.-Nov., 1954).

Cunningham, H. H. Doctors in Gray. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1958.

Daniel, F. E. Recollection of a Rebel Surgeon. Austin: Von-Boeckmann, Schutze & Co., 1899.

Jones, J. "Medical History of the Confederacy". Southern Historical Society Papers, XX, 1892.

Roland, C. P. The Confederacy. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960.

Thompson, J. (ed.). The Photographic History of the Civil War. 10 vols. New York: The Review of Reviews Co., 1911.

Welch, S. E. A Confederate Surgeons Letters to His Wife. New York: Neale Publishing Co., 1911.

THE ARISTOCRATIC VIEWPOINT AS REFLECTED BY HISTORIANS OF THE SOUTH

Submitted by:

Jane Cormack

According to romantic tradition, the southern colonies were settled by Cavaliers and royalists. The plantation system that evolved, was organized and came to be controlled by a social and economic aristocracy that liked to trace its heritage back to these royal émigrés. Whether these planters were descendents of Cavaliers, or of middleclass tradesmen, their impact on the history of the South would not have been felt any less, for by the early nineteenth century, by means of the land they owned, their wealth, power and legend, they dominated southern history. Historians have most often viewed southern history from this aristocratic vantage point. Portrayal of life in the antebellum South has at times been compromised by those who emphasized this dominant class over other classes of southern society.

The Old South by Thomas Nelson Page, was first published in 1892. Looking back not too many years, Page romanticizes the society he apparently loved, and longed to return to. If this society ever actually existed became the problem of later historians, Page is among the first to offer no apologies; he reveals the South to the nation, dispelling the hostile picture that the North had built up during the Civil War.

Reviewing Page today, eighty years later, it is apparent that he drew his picture of the antebellum South from a limited range of life at that time. For Page the South is everything the myths perpetuated -- white, columned mansions, fragrant magnolia blossoms, mint juleps, benevolent, paternalistic planters, and docile slaves. His view of slavery is typical of the turn of the century: "Slavery in any form shocks the sensibilities of this age; but surely this banjo-playing life was not so dreadful a lot for those just rescued from the cannibalism of the Congo."[1] The mistress of the plantation is a semi-godess. She devotes her life to caring for others, "...ever by her cheeriness inspiring new hope, by her strength giving courage, by her presence awaking faith... What she was only her husband knew, and even he stood before her in dumb, half-amazed admiration, as he might before the inscrutable vision of a superior being. What she really was, was only known to God."[2] In describing the master, Page says: "He was chivalrous, he was generous, he was usually incapable of fear or meanness. To be a Virginia gentleman was the first duty; it embraced being a Christian and all the virtues."[3] "Truly it was a charming life,"[4] if one were a wealthy planter or his family. How the lower classes lived is left to the imagination. This picture of the antebellum plantation as a paradise on earth, is actually only a partial history of the South.

Ulrich Bonnell Phillips is known as the first historian of the

plantation as a system and its related institutions. Like Francis Parkman his travels acquainted him with physical characteristics as well as human understanding. His knowledge as a human geographer was an asset in recapturing the atmosphere of the South. He believed as did William E. Dodd that Southern history should be written by southerners.

In presenting his viewpoint Phillips cites particulars and seldom given composite examples. He is reluctant to draw conclusions but interpreting his meaning is easy enough through his obvious examples which do not fail to prove their point. In Life and Labor in the Old South, published in 1929, he suggests that the lot of the slaves was often comfortable as illustrated by "the esteem in epitaphs, whether inscribed in diaries or on stone ... without doubt earned by their subjects and genuinely felt by their composers."[5] In reference to concubinage he states that it "was flagrantly prevalent in the Creole section of Louisiana, and was at least sporadic from New England to Texas."[6] This limited mention of the situation makes Phillips' point that it was not approved of, by the use of the word "flagrantly", but it does not make note of the situation from a historian's view. Perhaps he thought his limited illustrations were sufficient to indicate the presence of such evils. He seems more alert when collecting data in instances of abscondings, revolts, or other instances of protests by blacks.

His picture of antebellum plantation life is a world of kindly and sympathetic masters, happy and contented slaves. Everyone on the plantation had a role to play. From his own experience Phillips notes: "The blacks in my day were free tenants or wage laborers; but the planters and their wives were by no means emancipated in full from the manifold responsibilities of slavery times."[7] He describes the slaves as submissive and docile. In regards to those who survived the slave trade he claims that "... adequate food and shelter together perhaps with something of a sense of being cherished brought to most of them a will to live, to mate and to multiply."[8] He treats slavery as a commercial enterprise rather than as an evil. "No prophet in early times could have told that kindliness would grow as a flower from a soil so foul, that slaves would come to be cherished not only as property of high value but loving if lowly friends."[9]

Phillips is the epitome of an aristocratic, actually a racist, viewpoint of the plantation system. For him there was one dominant class in the South of this time, and the system this class perpetuated was an efficient method of transforming crude brawn into productive labor. Phillips utilized great masses of original source material, but made selections from them according to his own personal bias. His unifying theme is that the South should remain a white man's country. He could not fathom the Negro mind and showed little empathy for people not of the planter class. "Most overseers were not eligible as mates for heiresses, nor were they notable for zeal, intelligence, or ambition,"[10] he states. And of the nonplanter class he says they "had no cult of urbanity, of nicety in speech or fashion in dress, of distinction in house or equipage, of competitive expenditure or conspicuous waste. In short, they were plain men and women, not ladies

and gentlemen."[11]

The 1930's brought in a broader concept of subject matter in historiography. Historians discarded the passive role their predecessors had adopted while attempting to convert history into a science. In southern historiography the role of the nonplanter class came into perspective.

Another history entitled The Old South was written in 1936 by R. S. Cotterill. The aim of this volume was to present as accurate a story as possible. "Contemporary fiction and abolitionist propaganda made every Southerner an aristocrat and the owner of a plantation,"[12] says Cotterhill, when actually:

> It is evident, then, that the great mass of white people in the South were working people, ignorant of the supposed fact that white people could not endure the Southern sun and equally oblivious of any hypothetical stigma on manual labor.[13]

Cotterill sought to establish a theme of southern nationalism which had developed after the Missouri Compromise. His history is the first real attempt to synthesize the history of the South. He did not emphasize aristocrat over plain folks or plantations over farms. He believed, "One of the most striking features of the Old South was the homogeneity of its people."[14]

William E. Dodd recognized white supremacy as one of the essential characteristics of the southern tradition. While he carefully excludes the Negro from any futuristic vision of a cotton kingdom, in his The Old South Struggles For Democracy, like Cotterill, he is far less prejudice toward the lower classes than Phillips -- "While there were differences of rank known and acknowledged everywhere, all classes were brought into close and welcome contact with each other."[15] According to Dodd, "It was difficult to maintain an exclusive social status in a community so new and unstable."[16]

Dodd's own search for seeds of democracy in the past resulted in more examples than the evidence warrants. It is a pragmatic philosophy. The American democratic tradition becomes a rationale for sectionalism in Dodd. He compromises his position by attempting to present democracy historically. He does not see slavery as a benevolent system, and he recognizes that the power of the Old South was essentially in the hands of the plantation owners. But he holds these views because he knew a political democracy could not exist without an economic democracy. Dodd, therefore, is not a southern historian who over-emphasizes the dominant class. He finds the whole social structure of the antebellum South unhealthy for democracy and made no effort to conceal that his sympathy lies with the common man.

William B. Hesseltine holds a view similar to Cotterill's thesis that there was no southern consciousness before the Missouri Compromise. In A History of the South (1607 - 1936), Hesseltine sees the South as a reflection of the total nation, dealing with the same essential problems

and social adjustments, forced to adhere to sectionalism after the Missouri Compromise. The system of slavery, he says, created "a gap in society which had a tendency to make the whites less receptive to the precepts of democracy."[17] From this it appears that Hesseltine, like Dodd, views the social structure of the South as detrimental to democracy, with one saving factors -- "the ease by which a man might rise from the yeomanry to the ranks of the aristocracy."[18]

"Nobody of any considerable information of course any longer believes in the legend of the Old South,"[19] wrote Wilbur J. Cash in The Mind of the South, published in 1941. According to this historian though, the aristocrats secured as esteemed a position as legend leads one to believe:

> Here, manifestly, I do not infer that the Old South was ever egalitarian ... It is clear, that from an early time, there was a great deal of snobbish feeling; that an overweening pride in the possession of rich lands and slaves, and contempt for those who lacked them, quickly got to be commonplace; and that 'nouveaux', fired by the example of the Virginians and their high pride of birth and breeding, were eagerly engaged in heaping distinctionnupon distinction and establishing themselves in the role of proper gentlemen.[20]

Cash reveals the move in the antebellum South from Jeffersonian democracy to Calhoun's conservativism. Admittedly "... the politics of the Old South only represented the interest of the planter," but "prior to the last ten or fifteen years before secession, the Old South may be said, in truth to have been nearly innocent of the notion of class in any rigid and complete sense."[21] The main effect on the society as a whole was that the system of slavery and the plantation reassured the poor whites of their superior status over black laborers. For this reason the whites of the South were united in their attatchment to slavery. It was this situation that caused Phillips to declare that the South should remain a white man's country.

Thomas Wertenbaker, in The Old South: The Founding of American Civilization, 1942, wrote:

> One cannot delve far into the history of the South without discovering that no part of the country was more complex, had a larger number of conflicting groups and interests ... The rice planter, the tar-burner, the tabacco planter, the Norfolk merchant, the German settler in the Valley of Virginia or western North Carolina, together constituted about as ill-assorted a group as one can find anywhere.[22]

Seventeenth century Virginia was, as Wertenbaker pictures it, a colony of small farmers, few Negro slaves, and many indentured servants who gradually rose to various levels of respectability. It was in the eighteenth century that slavery developed in response to the demands for tabacco. As

a result the small farmers had to compete with slave labor and gradually their influence faded. The fate of the artisan class in the nineteenth century was similar --

> On the whole, the artisan class was an important factor in the structure of Southern society. Its slow retreat before the advance of the factory system and its final almost complete disappearance, was a major misfortune more acutely felt than in the North, since this sturdy, intelligent, prosperous group constituted a sorely needed element of strength and democracy in a society economically unsound and basically aristocratic.[23]

Wertenbaker concerned himself with exploding the myths that had grown up about the people of the South. Following the "March of the Cohees -- of Germans, Scotch-Irish, Irish, Swiss, Quakers,"[24] he discusses the culture each group brought from the Old World, and how geography and intercultural conflicts acted as amalgamators of many diverse elements. His history is rich in details of the customs, arts, entertainment and crafts of the common people of the South. In comparison to a historian like Phillips, Wertenbaker is broader in his spectrum of antebellum life. He defends the aristocrats, "Certain it is, that the widely spread belief that the Virginia and Maryland planters, even of the wealthy group, spent all their leisure in racing, cock-fighting, gambling at cards, hunting or dancing, is entirely erroneous,"[25] but only devoted as much space to them as their numbers warranted. Like Dell he sought out examples of democracy in search for its roots.

The integrating theme of A History of the Old South, written by Clement Eaton and published in 1949, is the emergence of a southern culture that was created by all classes of society, not solely by an elite, aristocratic group. Although "the life of the aristocracy is much better known than the mute, inglorious history of the common people, who have left few written records,"[26] the truth is that "the stereo-type has taken certain real aspects of Southern society, especially the life of the small class of large planters, and has generalized and exaggerated them so that they appear to be typical of the South as a whole."[27] Eaton further states "This small privileged class of planters tended to think of themselves as "the South"; they confused their narrow class interests as identical with the welfare of the whole South."[28]

Eaton criticizes the romantic historians of the South whom he blames for such literature as Margaret Mitchell's Gone With The Wind. But Eaton in his own way is guilty of a class bias for he includes only the white man's reaction to racial issues. While this accusation can be applied to just about every southern historian who wrote before the age of civil rights, it especially is noticeable in Eaton because he devoted a chapter in A History of the Old South to "Black Labor." He discusses the efficiency of slave labor, its profitability, the laws and practices surrounding it, revolts and fears arising from it. But he states: "The history of slavery from the point of view of the Negro remains to be told."[29] Life on the antebellum plantation, though, is not complete without this intregal perspective. Granted, this judgment is being made in 1972 and

racial awareness has come a long way since 1949. Eaton, at that time, gave the most complete coverage of slavery to be found in histories of the South. His own opinion was that

> the Southern grip on the institution of slavery was bound to relax as a result of the frowns of world opinions. Thus slavery would have vanished in the South by a gradual process, like serfdom in Europe. This method of abolishing slavery would have been far more humane and productive of good results than the means adopted by a bloody civil war which left a bitter and unsolved race problem.[30]

Historians cannot live in a vacuum. The image of a southern racist has been perpetuated by incomplete analysis such as this of the antebellum plantation system.

The South as described by Francis B. Simkins is a cultural province with its own identity. In A History of the South, written in 1941 and revised in 1953, he announces "It is a civilization that created such noble types of Anglo-Saxon manhood as George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Robert E. Lee, Woodrow Wilson."[31] He adheres to the same thesis as R. S. Cotterill and William B. Hesseltine, that a distinctly southern consciousness did not appear until after the Missouri Compromise. He stresses the political and social traits that make the region unique:

> An aristocratic society based on slavery and the plantation economy then became fixed as the southern ideal. This ideal had its faults. It was in part a denial of the democratic philosophy which Southerners at the end of the Colonial period joined other Americans in extolling. But it was able in a great measure to withstand the disrupting influences of both the American Revolution and the American Civil War. It has always appealed to Southerners. Their ambition has never been to pull down their betters but to climb into their circles. They admire the good life of big houses, fine dress, and pliant Negroes; and on the whole they are as willing as the Virginians of the eighteenth century to speculate in lands and use the toil of other as means of attaining the life of the privileged.[32]

The antebellum plantation figures largely into Simkins' view of the South. The aristocratic lifestyle found in Thomas Nelson Page's The Old South is a vision cherished by all classes, a concept that has encouraged a spirit of unity throughout the South, according to Simkins. While Cotterill, Hesseltine and Cash make it seem as if the distinctions between the aristocracy and the plain folk were not as great as earlier historians supposed, Simkins claims "The historian of the South should join the social novelist who accepts the values of the age and the section about which he writes."[34]

Lester J. Cappon delivered his presidential address, entitled "The Provincial South", in 1949 to the Southern Historical Association. The definition of "provincial" he used was "attachment to one's own province,

its institutions, interests, etc. before those of the nation or state of which it is a part."[35] In describing the provincialism of the South, Cappon takes a similar argument to Simkins'. Instead of over-emphasizing the role of the aristocracy in shaping southern history as Phillips did, or playing it down as Cotterill and Hesseltine did, Cappon, like Simkins, says the history of the South should be viewed from an aristocratic vantage point because that is how it developed. "In politics," he says, "the aristocracy ... maintained its grip on the seaboard states by denying proportional representation to the western counties on a fair basis,"[37] and "This aristocratic tradition was strikingly expressed in education for the few and a belated sense of public responsibility for the many."[38] The progress, or lack of it, in the South is due to the actions of the planter class, according to Cappon.

The interpretation of the role of the aristocrats of southern society, the planter class, has changed considerably from the day of Thomas Nelson Page to the era of civil rights and of using computers to synthesize history. The myths have been destroyed, the southern legend is being revised. The domination of one class may be distasteful to 1972 egalitarian standards but the past should be appraised by standards of that period. The historian must recognize the existence of a hierarchy in southern history and be sympathetic while maintaining his objectivity.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Page, Thomas Nelson, The Old South, New York, 1892, p. 116.

[2] Ibid., p. 155-6.

[3] Ibid., p. 158.

[4] Ibid., p. 183.

[5] Phillips, Ulrich Bonnell, Life and Labor in the Old South, New York, 1929, p. 215.

[6] Ibid., p. 176.

[7] Ibid., p. 338.

[8] Ibid., p. 193.

[9] Ibid., p. 214.

[10] Ibid., p. 310.

[11] Ibid., p. 344.

[12] Cotterill, R. S. , The Old South, Glendale, California, 1936, p. 267.

[13] Ibid., p. 271.

[14] Ibid., p. 262.

[15] Dodd, William E., The Old South Struggles For Democracy, New York, 1937, p. 90.

[16] Ibid., p. 113.

[17] Hesseltine, William B., A History of the South 1607-1936, New York, 1941, p. 329.

[18] Ibid., p. 323.

[19] Cash, W. J., The Mind of the South, New York, 1941, p. 3.

[20] Ibid., p. 250.

[21] Ibid., p. 34.

[22] Wertenbaker, Thomas Jefferson, The Old South: The Founding of American Civilization, New York, 1942, p. 348.

[23] Ibid., p. 270.

[24] Ibid., p. 168.

[25] Ibid., p. 70.

[26] Eaton, Clement, A History of the Old South, New York, 1949, p. 60.

[27] Ibid., p. 444.

[28] Ibid., p. 454.

[29] Ibid., p. 257.

[30] Ibid., p. 276.

[31] Simkins, Francis Butler, A History of the South, New York, 1941, p. 13.

[32] Ibid., p. 78.

[33] Simkins, Francis Butler, "Tolerating the South's Past", The Pursuit of Southern History, Baton Rouge, 1964, p. 315

[34] Ibid., p. 324.

[35] Cappon, Lester, J., "The Provincial South", The Pursuit of Southern History, p. 247.

[36] Ibid., p. 249.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Cappon, Lester J., "The Provincial South", The Pursuit of Southern History, Louisiana University Press, Baton Rouge, 1964.

Cash, W. J., The Mind of the South, Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1941.

Cotterill, R. S., The Old South, The Arthur H. Clark Company, Glendale, California, 1936.

Dodd, William E., The Old South Struggles For Democracy, The Macmillan Company, New York, 1937.

Eaton, Clement, A History of the Old South, The Macmillan Company, New York, 1949.

Hesseltine, William B., A History of the South, 1607-1936, Prentice-Hall, Inc., New York, 1941.

Page, Thomas Nelson, The Old South, Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1892.

Phillips, Ulrich Bonnell, Life and Labor in the Old South, Little, Brown, and Company, 1929.

Simkins, Francis Butler, "Tolerating the South's Past", The Pursuit of Southern History, Louisiana University Press, Baton Rouge, 1964.

Simkins, Francis Butler, A History of the South, Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1941.

Wertenbaker, Thomas Jefferson, The Old South: The Founding of American Civilization, Russell and Russell, 1942.

THE NORMAN CONQUEST AND ITS IMPACT ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF FEUDALISM IN ENGLAND

Submitted by:

Dennis O'Toole

The fundamental problem of the Norman Conquest of England is a problem of revolution versus evolution; did the Normans transform England or was their invasion only an event in the natural development of Anglo-Saxon traditions? Pro-Norman historians are inclined to hold the latter view. The main issue is the question of continuity versus complete change.

There can be no single answer to this question because the Normans did institute some customs and laws whereas they also assimilated some Anglo-Saxon customs and laws. Furthermore, the Norman Conquest of 1066 took place about the same time that a great creative spirit was sweeping across Europe; this has come to be known as the High Middle Ages. Most of Europe went through dramatic changes after about the year 1050: towns grew and commercial interaction intensified; new religious orders were formed and a strong reform movement within the church swept across the Continent; scholastic philosophy began; agrarian production increased sharply, and along with it so did the population. When these changes are seen in pre-Conquest England one cannot abscribe them to the coming of the Normans.

The main area of disagreement among historians is that of aristocratic institutions: Did the Norman landholders control their land and carry out their political and military obligations in the same way as the Anglo-Saxon landholders had done? Did they perform the traditional services for their land, or were new, Norman services introduced? Was feudalism introduced by the Normans or was it already in existence in pre-Conquest England? These are some of the questions that historians of the Norman Conquest of England disagree upon.

The first historian from whom I have taken information is John Horace Round. John Round startled the English scholarly world of the 1890's by putting forth the 'feudal revolution' hypothesis. Round believed that the tendency to exalt the English and depreciate the Norman element in the development of England had led scholars (and he explicitly points to Edward Freeman) to try to base feudalism in the Anglo-Saxon institutions.

Round points to the policy of William the Conqueror of insisting on the direct allegiance of the under-tenant to the crown, thereby checking the disintegrating influence of a perfect feudal system. However, what Round refers to as the 'military service bargain' was a bargain between the king and the tenant-in-chief, not between the crown and the under-tenants. Therefore, as long as the baron (or tenant-in-chief) supplied

his servitium debitum to the king, the king had no right to look beyond the baron, who was responsible for the discharge of this service. If the under-tenant of a knight's fee failed to discharge his service, it was not to him, but to his lord that the king would address himself. It was in this point, and also in the question of the quotas of military service due from the barons to the king, that Round differed from most other historians of his day.

Round holds that the military service of a knight was in no way derived or developed from the Anglo-Saxons, but was arbitrarily fixed by the king, who fixed the numbers at his own pleasure. To substantiate his arguement, Round uses a writ, which has been dated to the year 1072. He believed it to be authentic because of the "vigour of its language" and also because there was nothing to be gained by forging a document which admits, by placing on record, the abbey's full liability.

> William, King of the English, to AEthelwig, abbot of Evesham, greeting. I command that you summon all those who are under your administration and jurisdiction that they bring before me on the Octave of Pentecost at Clarendom all the knights that they owe me, properly equipped, those five knights which you owe me from your abbacy. Witness Eudo the Steward. At Winchester.[1]

In this writ of military summons that Round quotes, the knightly quota of Evesham is given as five men. Almost one hundred years later, in 1166, the same figure of five men turns up in the statement prepared by the abbot of Evesham in response to a national survey of knightly enfeoffments of English tenants-in-chief ordered by King Henry II.

> Knights' service from Evesham Abbey:
> Ranulf "de Coctone" performs the full service of one knight with horses and arms, and the abbot shall pay his expenses so long as he is in the king's service.
> Ranulf "de Kinewartone" the same.
> Richard of Weston and Richard "de Piplumtone" the same.
> Bertram and Payn Travers the same.
> William of Beauchamp half the service of a knight at the abbot's expense.
> The aforesaid are of the old enferffment (enfeoffed A.D. 1135 or before).
> Richard, son of Maurice of Amberly, half the service of a knight at the abbot's expense, and he alone is of the new enfeoffment (i.e., enfeoffed between 1135 and 1166).[2]

Sir Frank Stenton, in his book The First Century of English Feudalism: 1066-1166, presents further arguments for the Round hypothesis of the Norman introduction of knights' service. However, Stenton's writings appear to be far more objective than Round's.

Stenton asserts that the Norman conquerors had established a system of military service which was completely different from the Old English precedent. Referring to an analyzation of Domesday Book, Stenton says,

> This work has only confirmed Round's main position that the amount of knight service which King William demanded from his several tenants in chief bore no definite relation to the extent or value of their lands. It has also confirmed his more general argument that the feudal society which underlies English life in the centuries after the Conquest represents a definite break away from Old English tradition.[3]

The bond between lord and man, made by the tie of homage, was common to the whole Germanic world. But Stenton states that the development of this relationship had been slow in England, and only a small attempt had been made before the Conquest to establish the feudal principle based on dependent tenure for definite service.

Except for a few garrisons of the castles built by Edward the Confessor's French dependants, knighthood was non-existent in pre-Conquest England. Within English and French society certain conceptions survived that were common throughout the germanic world; the relationship between lord and man was common to both France and pre-Conquest England. This relationship had become the basis for a new society based on war; this was not true in England. Stenton believed that,

> It is turning a useful term into a mere abstraction to apply the adjective "feudal" to a society which had never adopted the private fortress nor developed the art of fighting on horseback, which had no real conception of the specialization of service, and allowed innumerable landowners of position to go with their land to whatever lords they would.[4]

There are numerous historians who agree with the 'feudal revolution' hypothesis, but not in its entirety. Some support Round's ideas only in certain areas. Mr. R. R. Darlington is an enthusiastic exponent of pre-Conquest English creativity and on continuity of English customs extending past 1066 in all areas other than that of feudal military service. In this area he defends the 'feudal revolution' hypothesis of Round and Stenton.

Darlington holds that the attempts to establish the origin of the post-Conquest <u>servitia debita</u> and knights' fees to the Anglo-Saxons are unsuccessful.

> It may be doubted whether the case for continuity in military organization is helped by the contention, erroneous in my own opinion, that when we read that it was the custom to demand from a shire one soldier for a fixed number of hides and to require every hide to contribute to his expenses, the soldier in question is not a commoner but a thegn, and that the fyrd was a body of therns. Since it is at the same time argued that the thegns are to be equated with the post-Conquest knights, the feudal host and the fyrd ought to be identical.[5]

However, here Darlington interjects a quote from C. Warren Hollister who wrote, "The Anglo-Norman feudal army cannot possibly have evolved out of the pre-Conquest military force because that force continued to exist for decades after the Conquest as a separate and distinct English Army serving the Norman king alongside the new feudal host."[6] Darlington holds that even if Mr. Hollister is justified in claiming that the fyrd was the main agent through which Norman feudalism was Anglicised, its survival alone shows some measure of continuity. He also suggests that because of the important part played in warfare during the first three Norman reigns, it can be seen as an important Anglo-Saxon contribution to post-Conquest military organization.

Incidentally, C. Warren Hollister rejects the view that the Anglo-Saxon army developed into the feudal army. But at the same time he denies that the post-Conquest military organization made a radical change from the past. His own theory accepts Round's views on the introduction of knight service, but he does not agree with Round's conclusion that English military institutions were profoundly changed by the Norman Conquest. Mr. Hollister's own conclusion is based on his views concerning the importance of cavalry and infantry in post-Conquest warfare. This, I feel, has no direct bearing on this paper, consequently I have chosen not to pursue Hollister's reasoning any further.

Opposing the 'feudal revolution' hypothesis are many noted historians who argue that feudalism was already developing in pre-Conquest England. Generally, the Norman Conquest is seen by this group as an interruption in the flow of Anglo-Saxon society.

Donald J. A. Matthew contends that it is "...altogether incredible that the Conqueror introduced an entirely novel military obligation."[7] Matthew feels that the theory that he did revolutionize Anglo-Saxon military organization was elaborated to explain the existence of quotas of service (servitia debita) in the reign of Henry II.

> Since it is obvious that these quotas are totally unrelated to the wealth of the tenants-in-chief and appeared to be explicable only as the whim of a tyrant, historians have agreed to assign this role to the Conqueror at whose feet England lay defenceless in 1066.[8]

In addressing himself to the subject of the writ of 1072, addressed by the Conqueror to the abbot AEthelwig of Evesham, Matthew divides the document into two parts. In the first, the abbott is told to order men under his authority (sub ballia et justitia tua) to have all the knights that they owe to the king at Clarendon. The second part tells the abbot to bring with him the five soldiers that he owes to the king from his abbey. In both cases the soldiers should be prepared (paratos). Matthew feels that this double part is important. He contends that the abbot was so powerful until his death in 1077 that after the Conquest both Normans and Englishmen were drawn into his service. William did not know how many men like AEthelwig there were, nor did he know how many soldiers AEthelwig's vassals owed to him.

> But, if the Conqueror had just imposed fixed quotas, how could he be so ignorant and why did he have to rely on AEthelwig to produce as many men as were owed? Yet the Conqueror knows that Evesham abbey owes five men. How could he know this?[9]

Matthew believes that the abbey's estates were probably more or less constant between 1066 and 1072, for the vassals whom AEthelwig began to receive brought their lands to the abbot, by the Anglo-Saxon system of commendation. If the service of the abbey of Evesham was already owed from its own estates, then the Conqueror would discover this and would expect the old service on the old terms.

> The Conqueror's writ to Evesham cannot be used as a categoric proof that the king had introduced arbitrary quotas to replace an earlier territorial obligation in land. There is room for allowing that the new way of paying service owed was related to older obligations. But the writ cannot possibly crystallise doctrine on the king's military resources, because it has nothing to say about his infantry or his archers or his stipendiary soldiers.[10]

Matthew also points out that the writ orders that soldiers should be brought 'prepared' to Clarendon, the king's hunting lodge in Wiltshire, for the octave of pentecost on June 3, 1072. Matthew does not accept the interpretation that this means prepared for war, or that it is in reference to the campaigns in Scotland in the autumn of 1072 or even in Normandy in 1073. He feels that this interpretation is forced, because the writ orders soldiers to come 'prepared' but never declares that they were to be prepared for war. As Matthew so aptly phrases it, "Soldiers (milites) could be prepared for other things."[11]

The majority of the historians that I have come across during the course of my research for this paper are definite "middle of the road" historians. This is not meant as a criticism at all, because I, too, agree with these men.

Edward Freeman had definite "gradualist" views on the development of feudalism in England. He believed that the Norman Conquest of England gave strength to institutions that had been developing long before the Conquest, and that these institutions developed into a system of oppressive feudalism during the reign of William Rufus.

Freeman suggests that through the Assembly of Salisbury (1086) William tried to insure that no system of feudalism would ever arise in England. The principle of any feudal system is that the tenants-in-chief of the Crown are made to be as near a sovereign prince as possible, and that the under-tenants should owe their allegiance and obedience to their immediate lord only, and not to the king. Freeman holds that the main principle of William's legislation was that every man owed his allegiance to the king first.

Instead of William introducing a Feudal System into England,

> instead of consenting to sink from the national King of the whole nation into the personal lord of a few men in the nation, he stopped for ever any tendencies - whether tendencies at work before his coming or tendencies brought in by the circumstances of his coming - which could lower the King of the English to the level of the feudal Kings of the mainland.[12]

Feudalism tends to divide the land into segments with a weak central government, or no central government at all. William checked every tendency that would divide the land, while at the same time he strengthened every tendency which could help him in establishing a united kingdom with a strong central government. According to Freeman, William had no intention of doing away with the ancient laws and institutions because they could be turned into tools with which he could complete his objectives.

> Under the forms of lawful succession, he reigned as a conqueror, under the forms of free institutions, he reigned as a despot. In truth the acts of the despot were needed to undo the acts of the conqueror. As conqueror, he brought us to the brink of feudal anarchy; as despot, he saved us from passing the brink. Of any Feudal System, looked on as a form of government, or rather of no-government, William, instead of being the introducer, was the mightiest and most successful enemy.[13]

Tendencies in a feudal direction had been present long before William's coming to England, asserts Freeman, but he holds that the Conquest merely completed these changes which had already begun. William and his followers had come from the Continent, where feudal ideas had made far greater advances than in England. To most of his followers a feudal tenure, a military tenure, probably seemed the natural way of holding land.

> The effect of William's confiscations and grants was to bring the tenure of land, the holding of land as a grant from a lord, into a prominence which it had never held before, to make it in short the chief element in the policy of the kingdom. In this way the same reign which most effectually hindered the growth of feudalism in its political aspect, most effectually strengthened feudalism as a form of the tenure of land. And, in so doing, it strengthened thereby all those peculiar social relations and ideas which gather round such tenure.[14]

Freeman insists that there is no ground for thinking that William directly or systematically introduced any new kind of tenure into the holding of English lands, either in the Chronicles of his reign or in the Doomesday Book.

> But, when we come to the reign next but one, we are met by a document which shows us that, within thirteen years after the Conqueror's death, not only the military tenures, but the worst abuses of the military tenures, were in full force in

> England. The great charter of Henry the First, the groundwork of all later English legislation, is filled with promises to abolish the very same class of abuses which were at last swept away by the famous statue of Charles the Second.[15]

During the reign of William the Conqueror there was no elaborate system of tenures, as appears in the state of things which the charter of Henry I was meant to reform. Therefore, Freeman concludes, the system of military tenures, and their oppressive consequences, came about during the reign of William Rufus. Edward Freeman believed that the system of feudal land tenures was not introduced into England at all, but was devised in England during the reign of William Rufus. The Conquest of England by the Normans merely strengthened latent tendencies that were pushed to their logical results after William the Conqueror's death.

R. Allen Brown notes that contemporary written sources following the Conquest, except for Doomesday Book, are few and far between. He feels that according to the evidence he has studied, the introduction of feudalism, that is to say full feudal commendation; the feudal tenure of the fief; feudal knight-service; knights and castles; and feudal attitudes had not been found in any source before the year 1066.

Brown feels that Doomesday Book itself, quite apart from its references to fees and honours, knights and castles, "...has been very properly described by its latest historian as 'the formal written record of the introduction of feudal tenure, and therefore of feudal law into England!'"[16] because the commissioners of the great survey of 1086 rearranged the information they obtained from the ancient administrative divisions into the new categories of the king's demesne and the fiefs and honours of his tenants-in-chief.

Brown also refers to the work of John Round and the information that he used.

> A surviving writ of William the Conqueror from as early as 1072, upon which Round rightly placed great reliance as the climax of his argument, summons Ethelwig abbot of Evesham to come to the king at Clarendon with the five knights owed in respect of his abbey, and it is known from twelfth-century evidence that the quota of Evesham abbey was five knights.[18]

Brown also uses the twelfth-century Book of Ely as a reference and states that in 1072 for his Scottish campaign the king demanded that knight-service due from the bishops and abbots of England, which service was to be henceforth the Crown's perpetual right,[19] and later says that in the first year of his reign William Rufus demanded from the churches the due service (debitum servitium) of knights which his father had imposed upon them.[20]

In his reference to the twelfth-century evidence of the quota of Evesham, I believe that Brown is referring to the abbot of Evesham's entry in the Cartae Baronum. I am also of the opinion that the Scottish campaign of 1072 was the occasion for the writ from William to Aethelwig.

H. R. Loyn places much emphasis on the continuity of the Anglo-Saxon past, extending after 1066. However, he does acknowledge Norman innovations in secular government and in war.

He believes that England, though not feudal, was well placed to receive the feudal system of government. Each free man in Anglo-Saxon England owed military service to the fyrd, or what Loyn calls the "national army". He points out that the obligation of every freeman to fight was reserved to defensive campaigning, however there was no strictly defined system of feudal service.

> There is no trace in the quite extensive English records of lands being granted by the king to a great tenant-in-chief in return for the military service of a stated number of soldiers on precisely defined conditions.[21]

Loyn felt that the best indication of England's readiness for the institution of the feudal system is given by the five-hide units of land. Before 1066 five-hide units were not knight's fees, yet they represented the grouping of estates for taxation purposes which, Loyn believes, could serve as an example to a feudal lord.

> William's reorganization after Hastings, and even more after the rebellions of 1069-70, was feudal, and, as such, an innovation in Englands. The effect of land tenure in the upper ranks of society was revolutionary.[22]

Loyn feels that the situation in England was exceptionally favourable to the reception of feudalism, and that the best proof of the ideal circumstances under which feudalism was introduced lies in the fact that the tenurial revolution was somewhat orderly and never degenerated into a mad scramble for lands.

The next two historians view the Conquest of England as instituting Norman feudalism. In their opinions a type of feudalism was developing in Anglo-Saxon England, but it had not reached any recognizable stage.

G. W. S. Barrow believes that the Conquest of England introduced Norman feudalism into England. This was not done deliberately by William the Conqueror to replace English customs, but it was necessary to provide him with the large standing army of knights and a system of castles that he needed. These, however, were not to be found in pre-Conquest England.

> Thus, shortly after the conquest, there had been planted in many parts of southern and central England a foreign aristocracy imbued with the feudalism of Neustria (north-west France), the fitness of whose application of their newly won lands they took for granted. Since after the rebellions of 1068-70 the king granted away vastly more land to his Norman or other continental adherents, this application if feudal ideas became general throughout England....[23]

Barrow points out that nothing precisely like the fief existed in pre-Conquest England. There, land usually held either by inheritance, without

specific service, or by an outright grant from the Crown, or else under a lease which did not, like the enfeoffment, tie the land itself with a fixed, permanent service.

Barrow also mentions the preoccupation of the Normans with military service and skill which was not present in Anglo-Saxon England.

> The concept of military prowess and honour found social expression in the notion forming in men's minds that there could and should be an 'order' of knights and knighthood within society, to which young men who had proved themselves in battle or jousting might be admitted only by a solemn ceremony.[24]

He believes that it is important of how far Norman military feudalism was an innovation in England that the "mystique of knighthood", as Barrow puts it, had not grown in Anglo-Saxon England.

The Norman castle was also a new innovation into England which Barrow discusses. The establishment of Norman barons with their castles and knights meant the displacement of the Old English ruling class.

> Early feudal England, whose ruling members formed, with the king, a closely integrated group, had little room for the great earldoms known before the conquest. But there were men of high rank in Normandy whose title of 'count' (literally, "companion", that is, of the ruler) set them above the ordinary baron.... Nevertheless, the earls of Norman England did not resemble their Anglo-Saxon predecessors closely.[25]

These earls, together with the prelates of the Church, held membership in the great councils which under William I took the place of the Anglo-Saxon Witan. But the essential character of these councils was feudal; the members attended not through any position they inherited from Anglo-Saxon England but because they were the direct tenants of the king, who, like any other feudal lord, had his court.

Mr. G. O. Sayles, like Barrow and many others, believes that the condition of things in Anglo-Saxon England was receptive to the changes which the Normans were to introduce. William applied to England the only form of government that he knew whereby he could regulate his relations with the barons. Sayles points out that the practice of holding lands of a lord, of owing him services, and of helping him in times of war was not too different in Anglo-Saxon England then in the Norman system of government.

> Nevertheless, we must not minimize the Norman innovations. To one in William's precarious position the vital function of feudalism still remained as the organization of society on a war basis and the provision of an adequate military force. For that purpose he instituted the system he had known in Normandy, a system which had no special distinctive features from that in France as a whole, a system which converted what had before been casual and

> haphazard, vague and fluctuating, into a precise and definite scheme of organization. In short, he introduced the full conception of a feudal fief.[26]

Sayles maintains that the Anglo-Saxons had only been acquainted with the conception of property over which they had full property rights, and the services expected from them were connected with their persons. Therefore, they could part with their lands during their life times and split them up with will after they died. They were not familiar with the feudal tenures which kept lords and tenants bound together perpetually. Therefore, the most characteristic feudal tenure, knight service, was the most revolutionary conception that the Normans brought with them.

According to Sayle, then, after 1070 William made a drastic rearrangement in which a professional army was built and based on land tenures; the whole emphasis was placed upon the mounted knight. Sayle believes that William did not attempt to regulate the amount of land which should adequately provide for a knight. What the Conqueror wanted to be sure of was that he could get the services of some five thousand knights whenever necessary. Therefore he bargained with his vassals individually. The only common factor that Sayle points out is that the knights were provided as units of five or multiples of five; this was probably based on the normal unit of the Norman army called the "constabularia". We have already seen an example of this in the writ to the abbot of Evesham of 1072.

Based on this information, Sayles believes that the principle that the king was the owner of all the land and was the "lord of lords" was very important. The conditions of tenure that William imposed when he made land grants were passed down through society and could be seen in the contracts between the king's tenants-in-chief and their own undertenants. Sayles also points out that the vassals of the Anglo-Saxon king had sworn an oath of fealty, but they were not bound to him in a feudal sense because the king made no formal contracts with them. On the other hand, the Norman vassal held his land on a direct arrangement to provide the king with a set number of fully-equipped knights for a set time when called upon to do so. The Anglo-Saxon earl's military obligations were more vague and less direct; his land was a reward for past service rather than a gift with a condition of service in the future. Land tenure and military service were not connected in the same way as they were for a Norman baron. Sayles holds that while the Norman knight's military service came from his enfeoffment, the Anglo-Saxon thegn's service came from his personal loyalty to the king and from his rank as thegn.

> In short, public service, personal relationships and tenure of land were all fairly easily distinguishable in Anglo-Saxon England: in Norman England they were combined into a coherent system in which public service arose directly out of private contracts and private contracts were based securely and permanently on land tenure.[27]

Sayles firmly points out that neither William I nor William II brought any systematized form of feudalism to the whole country. The main cause of

confusion lay in the fact that Normans, Bretons, Flemings and those who came from other parts of France had different feudal laws and customs and therefore applied them to their different estates in England.

> So the systematization of feudalism was the work of the twelfth and not of the late eleventh century: it was a slow process and only recently have some of its details become known to us.[28]

Most historians agree that the main impact of the Norman Conquest of England is in the realm of the aristocratic institutions, since most of the Normans who came to England with William were members of the Norman military aristocracy. The effects of the Normans on agriculture, towns, and even ecclesiastical institutions were relatively slight. But there can be no doubt that the aristocracy was transformed after 1066; Frenchmen replaced Englishmen as the major lay and ecclesiastical landholders and royal counselors. Nevertheless, the peasant substructure was not greatly changed. Most likely the ordinary villagers found the Norman Conquest only a temporary disturbance in the harsh agricultural lives that they led. Norman leadership probably made little difference in rural England. What did change was the system of government. Anglo-Saxon institutions were not assimilated or discarded; Norman institutions were not absorbed into the existing Anglo-Saxon structures. What did emerge was a type of feudalism that was neither Norman nor Anglo-Saxon. It was unique, with bits and pieces of both systems pushed together to form a system of government that was new to Europe.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Round, John Horace, Fuedal England, London: Sonnenschein & Co., 1895, p. 304. W. Rex Anglor(um) Aftew' abbati de Evesh(am) sal(u)tem. Precipio tibi quod submoneas omnes illos qui sub ballia et l(us)titia s(u)nt quatin(us) omnes milites quo mihi debent p(ar)atos h(abe)ant ante me ad octaves pentecostes ap(ud) clarendun(am). Tu etiam illo die ad me venias et illos quingue milites quosde abb(at)ia tua mihi debes tec(um) paratos adducas. Teste Eudone dapif(er)o Ap(ud) Wintoniam.

[2] "Carta of the Abbey of Evesham," in The Red Book of the Exchequer, Hubert Hall, ed. Rolls Series, no. 99, 1896, vol. I, pp. 301-302.

[3] Sir Frank Stenton, The First Century of English Feudalism: 1066-1166, second edition, Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1961, p. 122.

[4] Ibid., p. 215.

[5] R. R. Darlington, "The Norman Conquest", The Impact of the Norman Conquest, ed. C. W. Hollister, New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1970, p. 108.

[6] C. Warren Hollister, "The Norman Conquest and the Genesis of English Reudalism", (American Historical Review, lxvi (1961), p. 659.)

[7] D. J. A. Matthew, The Norman Conquest, New York: Schocken Books, Inc., 1966, p. 117.

[8] Ibid., p. 117.

[9] Ibid., p. 118.

[10] Ibid., p. 119.

[11] Ibid., p. 120.

[12] Edward A. Freeman, The History of the Norman Conquest of England, second edition, Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1870-1879, vol. V, pl 369.

[13] Ibid., p. 377.

[14] Ibid., pl 377.

[15] Ibid., p. 378.

[16] R. Allen Brown, The Normans and the Norman Conquest, London: Constable & Co. Ltd., 1969, p. 224; taken from V. H. Galbraith, The Making of Doomesday Book, p. 160.

[17] Ibid., p. 224.

[18] Liber Eliensis, ed. E. O. Blake, p. 216. 'Iusserat enim tam abbatibus quam episcopis totius Anglie debita militie obsequia transmitte, constituitque ut ex tunc regibus Anglorum iure perpetuo in expeditione militum ex ipsis presidia impendi...'

[19] Ibid., 218. 'debitum servitium quod pater suus imposuerat, nunc ab ecclesiis violenter exigit.' Both these passages from the Liber Eliensis were cited by Round, op. cit., p. 299.

[20] H. R. Loyn, The Norman Conquest, London: Anchor Press, Ltd., 1965, p. 115.

[21] Ibid., p. 116.

[22] G. W. S. Barrow, Feudal Britain, London: Edward Arnold (Publishers) Ltd., 1956. p. 43.

[23] Ibid., p. 45.

[24] Ibid., p. 51.

[25] G. O. Sayles, The Medieval Foundations of England, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1950, p. 225.

[26] Ibid., p. 226-227.

[27] Ibid., p. 228.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Barrow, G. W. S. , Feudal Britain, (London, 1956).

Blake, E. O., ed. Liber Eliensis.

Brown, R. Allen, The Normans and the Norman Conquest (London, 1969).

Darlington, R. R., "The Norman Conquest," The Impact of the Norman Conquest, Hollister, C. W., ed. (New York, 1970).

Freeman, Edward A., The History of the Norman Conquest of England (Oxford, 1870-1879).

Galbraith, V. H., The Making of Doomesday Book (London, 1951).

Hall, Hubert, ed., The Red Book of the Exchequer (Oxford, 1896).

Hollister, C. Warren, "The Norman Conquest and the Genesis of English Feudalism," American Historical Review (lxvi, 1961).

Loyn, H. R., The Norman Conquest (London, 1965).

Matthew, D. J. A., The Norman Conquest (New York, 1966).

Round, John H., Feudal England (London, 1895).

Stenton, Sir Frank, The First Century of English Feudalism: 1066-1166 (Oxford, 1961).

A SELECTIVE ANALYSIS OF THE HISTORIOGRAPHY OF THE IRISH EASTER REBELLION-1916

Submitted by:

Susan M. Simoneaux

Analysis of the writing of ten historians--Irish, British, and American--reveals as many unique interpretations as historians. Today in Ireland, there is no single way of viewing what has become known in the last century as the "Irish problem," or that set of circumstances arising from the relationship between England and her former satellite. The case was more or less the same in 1916, and in subsequent histories no one point of view has prevailed. One would be guilty of oversimplification to assume that the historians under consideration to assume that the historians under consideration could be grouped into two opposing camps over the question of the Easter Rebellion.

However, to clarify this discussion, we choose to define four basic interpretations of the Rising. The Republican or Nationalist view point looks upon the Rebellion with approval and seeks to justify the actions of its leaders. This view is reflected in the writings of Dorothy Macardle and George Creel. On the other hand, in the writings of Sir James O'Connor, W. Alison Phillips, and to a slighter degree, Leon O'Brien the anti-separatist position emerges. These historians express both severe misgivings and reservations concerning the merit of the Rising. In addition, there is a distinct perspective associated with the American historians Charles Tansill and Allan J. Ward, who explore the United States' relationship to both the Irish revolutionaries and the British government. Finally, among more modern historians, there is an acceptance of both the Rebellion and the establishment of the Irish Free State as irreversible facts and, consequently, a tendency to be more impartial. In this group we find C. C. O'Brien, F. X. Martin, O.S.A., and Timothy Coogan.

Despite differing opinions, all ten historians agree that the 1916 Rising was significant in its effect on Irish, English, and American politics and history. Moreover, most of these historians feel that the Rebellion was significant in that it led directly to the founding of the Irish Republic. Although the most obvious disparity is between Irish Republicans and the anti-separatists, there is also a great incongruity between older and younger writers which cuts across partisan lines. Contemporary historians view the Rising not as the subject of debate or a struggle between good and evil, but as a historical event to be investigated in a detached manner. Many of the earlier writers, with vivid memories of the Rising fresh in their minds, seem to join in a heated argument to determine the life or death of the Irish state. First in this survey will be a consideration of some historians who were contempories of the principle figures in the Easter Rebellion.

George Creel's purpose in Ireland's Fight for Freedom is two-fold.

Primarily, Creel is trying to prove that the Irish problem, far from being England's alone, is one of international importance. In his forward, Creel appeals to the other Allied powers to recognize Ireland's right of self-determination as expressed in the Versailles Treaty, negotiated the same year as the publication of Creel's book. Secondly, Creel hopes to awaken all Americans to the situation in Ireland and impress upon Irish-Americans the extent of their political influence upon policy makers in Washington. Despite these broad generalizations, Creel's perspective on the Rising itself is unique in its romantic overtones and constitutes one of the major themes. According to Creel:

> ... the great mass of the Irish people definitely surrendered all hope of Home Rule by constitutional methods, ceased volunteering and gave themselves over to ancient hatred of England. Rage grew and events marched automatically to that tragic Easter Monday of 1916 when a handful of Dublin men pitted themselves against the might of England in one of those futile uprisings that are at once the glory and despair of Ireland. The mad venture was doomed to defeat from the very first, and virtually every man who took arms offered his life on the altar of Irish freedom with no larger hope than that his death might call the attention of the world to the Irish struggle for liberty.[1]

From this typical excerpt of Creel's writing we discover the germs of several of his theories. Primarily, Creel believes that the Rising was inevitable and that the Irish people were united in their antipathy toward England. John Redmond, gallantly pledging Ireland's support to England in 1914,was betrayed by Asquith's Government when the Home Rule proposal was suspended. Irish volunteers were abused by their British officers; Ulstermen opposed to Home Rule were appointed to several of the highest Cabinet positions. This was for most Irishmen the turning point; all became firm in their desire to resolve the problem by violence if necessary.

This brings us to the second of Creel's themes: the Irish tradition of violence and martyrdom to lost causes. Since the 12th century, Ireland's history has been that of invasion and constant struggle for freedom. "The Gael does not find his death in the grave but in the clank of a chain; with him liberty is not an intellectual process but a passion...no chance for liberty is too hazardous to keep him from staking his existence on it."[2] Men like Patrick Pearse, James Connolly, and Tom Clark, leaders of the revolt, were only acting out what was demanded of them by their heritage. Like previous revolts, it was doomed to failure as its leaders were ordained for death. However, in 1916 the link with the past was broken forever; because Ireland became the focus of international concern, England could no longer deny Ireland's appeal for recognition as an equal. Because their purpose of calling attention to the Irish situation was successful and because conditions rendered revolt necessary, the insurgents are justified.

While we can reasonable conclude that Creel is long on interpretation

and short on fact, a selective study of Dorothy Macardle's history leads us to the opposite conclusion, although she too writes within the Republican framework. Miss Macardle presents the facts in a manner which enables the reader to judge for himself the relative achievement of 1916; only rarely does she interject a purely personal opinion. In the Irish Republic she traces the origin and development of the Republic with one section specifically devoted to its proclamation by the Supreme Council of the Irish Republican Brotherhood the week of the Rising.

While Creel would appear to interpret the Rebellion as the almost instinctual carrying out of ancient tradition, Miss Macardle candidly admits that the Rebellion was the result of deliberate planning on the part of a small segment of the I.R.B. Even Eoin MacNeill, their President, was not informed until the week of the Rebellion. Secondly, Miss Macardle states that the I.R.B. negotiated with the German Imperial Government through Irish-American intermediaries. The Kaiser, however, was unwilling to totally commit Germany to Irish independence and refused to provide adequate arms and ammunition. Sir Roger Casement, acting as a Nationalist agent in Germany, made a desperate attempt to return to Ireland and stop the Rebellion when he discovered Germany's betrayal.

As Miss Macardle sees it, the Rebellion of 1916 was simply an act of political expediency. She is not hesitant, however, to point out the reasons for the Rising's failure. Because of the capture of the German arms ship, the Aud, the rebels were forced to rely on their own small caches of weapons. In addition, the overwhelming superiority of the British forces and the chaos within the insurgent ranks precluded any hopes for success. However, Miss Macardle sees the lack of popular support as the real reason the Rising failed. Unlike George Creel, Miss Macardle believes the public would have been perfectly content to settle for Home Rule and were only shaken out of apathy when the British proceded with the trials and execution of fifteen Irish rebels, including Sir Roger Casement. "A sense of pride in the insurgents of their own generation was uniting the people in a realization of nationhood."[3]

In her essay "James Connolly and Patrick Pearse," however, Miss Macardle's sentiments are much closer to those of George Creel. Her assessment of these two key figures is similar to Creel's view of them as martyrs to the cause of Irish independence. While her attitude toward the British in The Irish Republic is tolerant, if not compassionate:

> ...the task of an occupying or invading army, encountering resistance, is one which tends to produce a nervous and inflamed state of mind. The soldiers feel themselves to be surrounded by hostility. Boys and women, and ununiformed, as well as uniformed men are among the defenders; it is impossible to distinguish combatants from non-combatants.[4]

Her attitude in this later essay is less forgiving: "Remember the obtuseness

of the British governing class concerning Ireland--the insolence of the most powerful, the facitiousness of the multitude, the ruthlessness of a few..."[5] Also, this later essay is concerned with contemporary issues. The question of whether the deplorable partition of Ireland and the factionalism with Ireland were consequences of the Rising is perhaps the major theme. To those who hold the leaders of the 1916 Rebellion responsible for present conditions, Miss Macardle answers that men like Pearse and Connolly were sincere in their desire to see Ireland free and united; partition would have been as abhorent to them as it is to many Irishmen today.

Sir James O'Connor's perspective on events in Ireland between 1914 and 1916 is very different from that of staunch Republicans. In the first place, he does not have a very high opinion of the Irish citizen.

> The Irish were a slack people to whom hard work was repellant; ...business and farming were despised; official job hunting was the favorite occupation of the country; the popular public bodies and public magistrates were frequently corrupt; traffic in drink was immense; love of gambling, amusement, and excitement was inordinate.[6]

However, through the untiring efforts of parliamentarians like John Redmond, Home Rule was becoming a reality; Ireland and England were entering into an era of harmony and cooperation. Mac Neill's I.R.B., as well as other Sinn Fein orientated groups, was a small minority.

The April 24th Rebellion is seen as a conspiracy between Irish Nationalists and Imperial Germany. This entailed treason against both England and the constituted authority in Ireland itself. Redmond, a political realist, had been hindered in his push for Home Rule by the Republican party and press, whose vision was clouded by dreams of an Irish pastoral utopia. O'Connor describes these utopian visions with explicatives such as "trash," "diseased mentality of the day," and "blatant balderdash." Germany's complicity is made evident by the Aud incident and the secret arrival of Casement who, according to O'Connor, was sent by the Germans to lead armed insurrection against Dublin Castle, the seat of Irish administration. For these reasons the citizens of Ireland looked upon the Rebellion with disfavor. John Redmond had brought Ireland within sight of Home Rule in a peaceful manner; any injustices which remained were being remedied. The "narrow nationalism" of the rebels coupled with treason percipitated violent rebellion and eventually led to the partition of Ireland.

Walter Phillips had been accused by his critics of being unsympathetic to the cause of Irish independence because of his Unionism. Although Phillips readily admits these sympathies, he answers his critics in the Preface to the second edition of The Revolution in Ireland.

> ...the most I can claim is that I set out to write history and not propaganda; to find out the truth, if possible, and tell it; and while reserving the right to criticize and judge the actions of those with whom I disagree, to state their case as fully and as fairly as possible.[7]

Phillips is strongly against the Rising because it caused unnecessary terrorism, brutality, and death. While he supports the Free State as the legally established authority, Phillips contends that revolution and partition of Ireland is much too high a price to pay for independence. The only alternative is Union with Great Britain, since the Irish themselves are hopelessly divided.

While expressing views similar to those of O'Connor on the issues of Home Rule, the conspiracy with the German Government, and impractical nature of the Republicans' demands, Phillips does not hold the I.R.B. ultimately responsible for the Rising and its consequences, but the English and American Governments. Before the Rebellion, the Irish Government headed by Birrell and Nathan was weak and ineffectual in dealing with the dissenting minority. Phillips is also critical of Asquith's policy following suppression of the Rebellion.

> It was, in short, a moment when a wise and consistent policy might have settled the Irish question for a hundred years to come, when it would have been possible to have captured Irish sentiment by a magnanimous policy, or to have crushed out all opposition by the Machiavellian method or "cruelty well applied." The Government wavered between the two policies and achieved the usual results of half measures.[8]

This contradictory course of action changed the people's attitude. It ultimately gave them hope that the revolt had not been useless. Unfortunately violence became a feasible solution to their problems.

Leon O'Brion looks upon the Rising from the point of view of Dublin Castle, the visible representative of England's authority in Ireland. He examines the attitudes of Augustine Birrell, the Chief Secretary, and Matthew Nathan, the Undersecretary, during their time in office. Both men were thoroughly committed to the policy of Home Rule. In one essay O'Brien states that Nathan saw his purpose as: "to carry out fastidously the twin policies of keeping Ireland quiet so that recruiting could successfully take place and insuring that no alternative to Home Rule was allowed to make headway."[9] Birrell, at the time of his resignation, felt somewhat of a failure:

> This was not the ending to his career Birrell had expected. He had wanted to go down in history as the last Chief Secretary, which would have been the inevitable and desirable culmination of his work . . . for Home Rule.[10]

The Royal Commission appointed to investigate the Rebellion found both men accountable: Birell, because of his frequent absence from Ireland; and Nathan, because he failed not only to impress upon his superior the gravity of the situation but also to take firm action against certain elements of the population. O'Brion's position is that in carrying out their responsibilities, both men became victims of the Rebellion no less than the executed insurgents. Nathan had the almost impossible responsibility

of keeping peace between the hostile Irish factions; he was even moderately disposed toward the Sinn Fein (Republican) movement. However, the act of rebellion is interpreted as a breach of Ireland's promise to act responsibly in return for the Home Rule concession. Both Nathan and Birrell assumed that the confiscation of German arms, the arrest of Casement, and Mac Neill's restraint would successfully block any attempt to seize control of the government. As Nathan was issuing orders for the arrests of suspected leaders, the Rising began catching both political and military authorities unawares. O'Brion regrets that the gradualistic approach of the men of Dublin Castle was submerged in the violence and bloodshed out of which the Republic was born.

Charles C. Tansill in America and the Fight for Irish Freedom places emphasis on men and events scarcely mentioned by Irish and British historians. This is understandable since Tansill is concerned with the role played by certain Irish-American organizations in the founding of the Republic. Tansill is critical of both Home Rule--a cynical political move on the part of Britain to get Irish support for the war effort--and John Redmond who became little more than Britain's "recruiting sergeant" in Ireland. The I.R.B.'s rejection was shared by its American counterpart, the Clan-na-Gael, under the direction of Judge Daniel F. Cohalan and John Devoy.

The Clan provided indispensible aid to the Irish revolutionaries in several ways: it furnished financial support and gave expression to the Irish cause in America; also, the Clan's leaders acted as intermediaries in negotiations with Germany. Tansill is highly receptive to the fate of Sir Roger Casement. It was through the Clan that Casement was able to contact the German Government and was eventually able to take up residence there as Ireland's agent. His purpose in returning to Ireland was to stop the Rising. The subsequent arrest, trial, and character assassination are of a deplorable nature.

Tansill is especially critical of the manner in which the American Government, particularly President Wilson, handled the crisis. The United States is first accused of conduct unbecoming a neutral power during war. American intelligence agents, when raiding the German Embassy the week before the Rising, intercepted many communiques between Irish-Americans and the German Government and forwarded this information to the British. Thus the English received information of the Aud and the impending revolt. Wilson's conduct following this event is repellant to Tansill; moreover the President refused despite appeals from the American people, Congress, and press to intervene in behalf of Casement. A Senate resolution for clemency was not forwarded to the British Government until it was much too late to have any effect. Tansill suggests that Wilson was motivated by his dislike for Judge Cohalan and his Tammney Hall cohorts was behind his stance in this matter. "To him (Wilson) the Rising in Dublin on Easter morning had a distinct Cobalan flavor. His deep devotion to England made him despise Irish-Americans and those who dreamed of an independent Ireland." Largely because of Wilson's influence, the Irish were denied representation at Versailles. In summary, Tansill is influenced by the concept of an independent Ireland. Although men

like Devoy and Cohalan through the Clan-na-Gael were indispensible in bringing the Rising about, it was not through direct intervention. The I.R.B. planned and set the date for the Rising; the Clan responded to its appeal for arms and ammunition but did not, as Wilson is said to have believed, percipitate it.

Another American historian, Alan J. Ward, however, is much more reserved in his assessment of the United States' participation in the suppression of the revolt. His technique is more scientifically methodical. Ward proposes to write a diplomatic history; his research into diplomatic documents and related sources reveals a hightened perception of the complexity of the situation. Ward does, on certain points, call Tansill to task for rash generalization. The timing of the American raid, the quite accidental character of the capture of Roger Casement and the Aud, and the complete unpreparedness of Dublin Castle all point to the suggestion that the Americans did not inform the British of the coming revolt. Secondly, Ward ascribes Wilson's attitude toward the Casement issue as a mistake in judgment, but definitely not an attempt to strike a blow against Cohalan and the Clan. It is proposed that Wilson never dreamed the British would carry out their threat to execute Casement.

Ward's view of the Rising itself is brief and concise: the 1916 Rebellion can be seen as little more than a civil uprising during war time in which a segment of the population conspired with the declared enemy. This interpretation would seem to imply that Ireland is to only be considered an organic part of Great Britain. Ward, however, is more concerned with the influence of Irish-American pressure groups on the United States' relationship with Great Britain and the relative freedom with which diplomatic decisions were made. However, his research uncovers what he has ultimately discovered -- that is, the Rising did have a strong impact on many Americans--not only those of Irish descent. While this pressure group was not the most important influence it certainly was influential in determining U. S. policy. Even Wilson eventually aided Irish independence through the docterine of self-determination of peoples.

We move now to a consideration of three historians whose purpose is quite different from that of earlier historians such as Macardle, Creel, O'Connor, and Phillips. These historians writing fifty years after the Rebellion have several advantages over earlier writers. First, the Irish Republic is an unshakable reality; there is no longer any question of its legality or its ability to survive. Secondly, distance in time usually leads to physical and historical detachment. Also, many nebulous issues surrounding the Rebellion have been clarified over the years.

In the introduction to The Shaping of Modern Ireland, of which he is both editor and contributor, C. C. O'Brien questions the relevancy of investigating this period of his nation's past. "Thwarted plans, unsuccessful movements, defeated groups and classes go into the 'dustbin of history,' but may not some objects of value have been dumped there along with them?"[12] There are various reasons for O'Brien's "interest of salvage" or search to recover objects of value. Modern historians, he believes,

must investigate the past to help solve the problems of today. If similarity of problems, past and present, is discovered, we can possibly learn from others' solutions and mistakes. Also, O'Brien senses in the younger generation a deep need to seek meaning for the present political and social conditions in Ireland by going back to its origins. Finally, O'Brien states that confusion is the essence of the historical event; it is only through the historian's work that the event or a group of events is made intelligible to the modern reader.

O'Brien finds the study of the 1916 Rising significant because it was the first time in the 20th century that an occupied nation won its independence from one of the world's great powers. If one wishes to understand 20th century nationalism, Ireland is the first case history to which one must turn. The Rebellion in Ireland set many precedents for dealing with other emerging nations such as India, Central European, and African states. In his essay, "1891-1916" O'Brien is more concerned with tracing the causes of the Rising than discussing the Rising itself. Although it may appear uneventful to the objective observer, the period from 1891 to 1916 was replete with underground yet purposeful activity. O'Brien wishes to broaden his historical perspective by emphasizing those facets of the Rebellion he feels other historians have neglected: the cultural aspect of the revolutionary movement and the role of specifically non-political groups such as the Gaelic League and Abbey Theatre. The ideas promoted by these groups provided part of the ideological basis of the nationalistic movement which culminated in the Easter Rebellion. However, O'Brien's overall interpretation of the Rebellion bears a certain similarity to George Creel's; the Rebellion is simply another episode in Ireland's working out her destiny within a revolutionary framework.

F. X. Martin, O.S.A., on the other hand, calls older historians to task for being much to simplistic in their evaluation of the Rebellion. P. S. O'Hegarty, whose book The Victory of the Sinn Fein is one of the authorative works on Sinn Fein and I. R. B. and seems totally unwilling to take into consideration the relative weakness of this organization in comparison to the strength of the Redmondites and the English army. Martin, therefore, is interested in many related factors, such as the role of Dublin Castle, the Redmond faction, the Ulster question and World War I.

However, the only significant question as far as Martin is concerned is whether or not the Rising can be logically justified.

> The Easter Rising was a coup d'etat against the British Government, it ran counter to the wishes of Redmond and the majority of Irish nationalists, it was a mutiny against Mr. MacNeill and the Irish Volunteers, and it usurped the powers of the I. R. B. itself. But Pearse, Clark, and their followers believed they were the eternal minority who had the duty of preserving Ireland's identity.[13]

Regardless of the illegitimate nature of the Rebellion it was eventually justified. When in the election of 1918 the citizens of Ireland voted overwhelmingly in favor of the Sinn Fein movement, the primary qualification--the consent of the governed-- was fulfilled.

Timothy P. Coogan, writing within the tradition of Irish Republicanism, interprets the Rising as Ireland's decisive step toward self-government. He shares the views of many of the historians already considered. Like C. C. O'Brien, Coogan is particularly interested in establishing connections between the Rebellion and cultural as well as economic developments in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Again like O'Brien, Coogan describes the significance of the revolt in terms of its value as an example to other subjected nations.

> In many ways Ireland was the laboratory in which 19th century Britain conducted trial and error the experiments which facilitated her colonial disengagement in the 20th century. For Ireland taught Britain, in the end, the best remedial legislation in the world is of little avail if it excludes the principles of self-government.

Because of the denial of self-government many Irishmen became open to radical solutions to their problems, thus undermining Redmond's work. Connolly, Pearse, and Clark were instrumental in changing the focus of Sinn Fein groups from working for reform within the Empire to a separatist position. The undercurrent of dissatisfaction caused by British abuses during the War and lack of self-government surfaced after the Rebellion. The people were inspired by the integrity and courage of its leaders. In Coogan's writing there is a synthesis of traditional Irish Republican and modern points of view. There can be no doubt that he is very much in sympathy with the Rebellion, yet Coogan's critical detachment sets him apart.

It appears to be almost impossible to draw all these interpretations together in a unified manner. As Eámon de Valéra says in the introduction to The Irish Republic:

> As the Irish people were then (1916) divided, so, it may be well expected, will people in the future also be divided in their judgment as to which side was right or which side was wrong.... Opinion will vary, we may anticipate, with the character and temperament of the individual...[15]

All ten of these historians are reasonably expected to retain proper historical detachment. Eventually, all these historians are forced to form some attitude toward their subject. These attitudes cut across national, religious, and class lines. George Creel, an American, defends the Rising more staunchly than Dorothy Macardle, an Irish Republican. Sir James O'Connor, a Catholic and Redmondite Nationalist, is more critical of his fellow countrymen than W. Alison Phillips, who is a Unionist of English origins. With more recent historians, however, there is more homogenity in outlook.

Considering the Rebellion in general, we find that despite wide differences in opinion a few observations can be made which apply for nearly all. Foremost among them is the conclusion that by the 20th century Ireland

had every right to expect some type of concession from Great Britain. The differences of opinion arise over whether this concession should have been Independence or Home Rule; whether the British were serious in their committment to Irish autonomy; and over the question of the time involved in implementation of autonomous rule. There is among some the belief that conditions rendered the Rebellion necessary and inevitable, juxtaposed to the opposite idea that the Rebellion bordered on treason and could not possibly be justified. On the basis of concrete evidence, however, there is no disagreement that the Rebellion was initially a failure. But the Rebellion set off a chain of events which eventually led to the establishment of the Republic. Whether they are pro- or anti-Rebellion, all the historians are forced to admit that it was one of the world's most successful failures.

There are various reasons why these historians have undertaken such a study. Some seek to persuade; others seek to be as objective and candid as possible; still others are seeking answers to contemporary problems. Their purposes, to a limited extend, guide their presentations. It is precisely because of these various interpretations that one can begin to grasp the complex nature of any given historical event. Each interpretation with its particular observations and points of emphasis add another facet to one's understanding of the problem or situation. The processes of investigation and presentation lead the reader to a deeper awareness and appreciation of the complexity of reality and to the realization that there cannot be a single, definative way of viewing any historical event. One of history's chief virtues is that it is open-minded; it is an ongoing dialogue in which there will never be total similarity in outlook.

FOOTNOTES

[1] George Creel, Ireland's Fight for Freedom, (New York, 1919), p. 33.

[2] Creel, p. 58.

[3] Dorothy Macardle, The Irish Republic, (New York, 1965 American edition), p. 190.

[4] Macardle, p. 182-183.

[5] Dorothy Macardle, "James Connolly and Patrick Pearse," in C. C. O'Brien's The Shaping of Modern Ireland, (Toronto, 1960), p. 187.

[6] Sir James O'Connor, History of Ireland, Vol. II, (New York, 1926), p. 235.

[7] W. Alison Phillips, The Revolution in Ireland, (London, 1926), Preface.

[8] Phillips, p. 105.

[9] Leon O'Brion, "Birrell, Nathan, and the Men of Dublin Castle," in F. X. Martin's Leaders and Men of the Easter Rising: Dublin 1916, (New York, 1967), p.2.

[10] Leon O'Brion, Dublin Castle and the 1916 Rising, (New York, 1971), p. 116.

[11] Charles C. Tansill, America and the Fight for Irish Freedom, (Toronto, 1969) p. 213.

[12] C. C. O'Brien, The Shaping of Modern Ireland, (Toronto, 1960), p. 7.

[13] F. X. Martin, O.S.A., Leaders and Men of the Easter Rising: Dublin, 1916, (New York, 1967), p. 251.

[14] Timothy P. Coogan, Ireland Since the Rising, (New York, 1966), p.4.

[15] Eámon de Valéra, in Macardle, p. 20.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Timothy P. Coogan, Ireland Since the Rising, (New York, 1966)

George Creel, Ireland's Fight for Freedom, (New York, 1919)

Dorothy Macardle, The Irish Republic, American edition, (New York, 1965)

Francis X. Martin, O.S.A. (editor), Leaders and Men of the Easter Rising: Dublin 1916, (New York, 1967)

C. C. O'Brien (editor), The Shaping of Modern Ireland, (Toronto, 1960)

Leon O'Brion, Dublin Castle and the 1916 Rising, (New York, 1971)

Sir James O'Connor, History of Ireland, vol. II, (New York, 1926)

Walter Alison Phillips, The Revolution in Ireland, (London, 1926)

Charles C. Tansill, America and the Fight for Irish Freedom, 1866-1922, (New York, 1957)

Alan J. Ward, Irish and Anglo-American Relations 1899-1921, (Toronto, 1969)