THE LOYOLA UNIVERSITY

STUDENT HISTORICAL JOURNAL

VOL. VI

PREFACE

This journal is comprised of papers submitted by students of Loyola University. It 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 review the work these students have done. In selecting these papers, the editorial board has attempted to present the wide range of subject matter and the different perspectives of students in the field of history.

The Loyola University Student Historical Journal is jointly sponsored by the Loyola University Student Historical Association, Phi Alpha Theta, and the Student Government Association.

TABLES OF CONTENTS

"AS LONG AS THE GRASS GROWS GREEN AND WATER FLOWS"

Submitted by:

REGINA SCOTTO

> In the whole history of our
> Government's dealings with the
> Indian tribes, there is no record
> So black as the record of its
> Perfidy to (the Cherokee) nation.
>
> -Helen Hunt Jackson

> The Cherokee nation hereby cede relinquish
> and convey to the United States all
> the lands owned claimed or possessed
> by them east of the Mississippi river.
>
> -Article I
> New Echota Treaty, 1835

> The United States hereby covenant
> and agree that the lands ceded to
> the Cherokee nation in the foregoing
> article shall, in no future time
> without their consent, be included
> within the territorial limits or
> jurisdiction of any state or Territory.
>
> -Article V
> New Echota Treaty, 1835

> In 1907, dissolved in the new State of
> Oklahoma, the Cherokee Nation ceased to
> exist as a political entity.
>
> -Glen Fleishmann

"AS LONG AS THE GRASS GROWS GREEN AND WATER FLOWS"

The American Indians have had a long history of problems with the United States government. Even before the colonizers achieved independence, they had clashed with the Indians for land, wealth, and food. Some of the tribes met the white man with open arms and were willing to help them. However, those tribes soon discovered how much treachery the foreigners were capable of. One tribe, the Cherokee, did everything they could to live in peace, but all was in vain. The plight of the Cherokee Nation was climaxed during the Jacksonian administration, resulting in the removal of this people, along with others, to the West.

According to one author "the word "Cherokee" means "upland fields" and possibly refers to their country, which is thus described by Bancroft: "the mountaineers of aboriginal America were the Cherokees who occupied the valley of the Tennessee River as far west as the Muscle Shoals and the highlands of Carolina, Georgia, and Alabama, the most picturesque and salubrious region east of the Mississippi..."[1] Finding no meaning of "Cherokee" in their own language, the Cherokees feel that it must be of foreign origin. Their own word for the tribe is Tsalagi or Tsaragi. De Soto's expedition uses the word "Shalaque," while a French document of 1699 records it as "Cheraqui." The English form was first recorded around 1708 and appears to be derived from the Choctaw word for pit or cave, "choluk," or "chiluk."[2] These Indians were mainly farmers and hunters, and they possessed the skill of using some metal, probably copper, for various unimportant usages. They were a peaceful people, but no one seemed to want to respect this way of life. "...during the two hundred years or so up to the time of the Revolution, the Indians, simple and plain-spoken as all primitive people are, were continually disappointed, confused, and angered by constant treachery, greed, and unscrupulousness on the part of white explorers and colonizers."[3]

In order to alleviate the problem, or submit the Indians to more hardship, a series of treaties were negotiated starting in 1721. Thomas Parker lists just the main ones during this period: "...treaty relations began in 1721 when Governor Nicholson of South Carolina, prompted by jealousy of French encroachments, entered into an agreement with the Cherokees... In 1730 North Carolina concluded a treaty with the Cherokees in which the sovereignty of the King of England was acknowledged and the Indians agreed to trade only with the English. There was a treaty and purchase negotiated by South Carolina in 1755; a treaty of alliance with North Carolina followed one year later. A subsequent alliance with the French brought defeat at the hands of the English and a consequent treaty of peace in 1760 followed by a more decisive one the next year. The Indians were not principally to blame for the hostilities of this period, as they were treacherously dealt with by Governor Lyttleton."[4] During the next

twenty years, at least eight major treaties were signed by the Cherokees and the Carolinas. Most of the treaties dealt with land cessions and control.

With the American Revolution the problem was not solved. The battles of the Revolution continually assaulted the Cherokee boundaries until the entire Indian Nation was reduced to merely scattered fractions of the glorious people it had previously been.[5] After the Revolution peace was attempted with the Cherokee with the Treaty of Hopewell in 1786. "These treaties fixed boundaries for the Indian Country, withdrew United States protection from settlers who would not leave within six months, made arrangements for the punishment of cruminals, and declared in solemn tones that "the hatchet shall be forever buried.""[6] The boundaries set up reduced the Indian lands from nearly 50,000 square miles to a "few hundred miles of the mountainous corner of western North Carolina, a portion of North Georgia, and a small eastern corner of Tennessee, and even then there were no actual boundaries."[7]

Unfortunately, these treaties seemed to only limit the Indians. White settlers continued to pour into Cherokee lands and the Cherokees were powerless to stop them. Secretary of War Henry Knox reported this situation in July 1788, but it did little good. Congress only succeeded in issuing a proclamation, "that universal but generally useless prescription for such ills..."[8] The end of the Revolution, states Francis Prucha, "was the beginning of the destruction of their (Cherokee) nation."[9]

In order to satisfy those clamoring for justice a new treaty, the Treaty of Holston, was signed in July 1791. Again the boundary line was moved but Article VII provided that the "United States, solemnly guarantee to the Cherokee Nation, all their lands not hereby ceded;" and the following Article gave the Cherokee the right to punish anyone who settled on Cherokee land.[10] The Cherokee were reluctant to part with more of their land, but faced no real alternatives. Seven years later a new treaty, another land cession, was concluded at Tellico which delighted Tennessee, but not the Indians.

Problems with these states seemed small in comparison with those encountered between the Cherokee and Georgia. Problems reached a plateau in 1802 when Georgia ceded to the United States government the rights to land that form the greater part of what are now the states of Alabama and Mississippi. For this the Federal Government paid one million two hundred and fifty thousand dollars to the state of Georgia. In addition the Federal Government assumed the Yazoo Land Claims case and promised to relinquish Indian land titles to Georgia. This was to be accomplished as soon and as peaceably as possible. "... it was charged that practically no attempt had been made by the Federal government to carry out the agreement. Certainly the charge was not substantiated."[11] The people of Georgia were very

anxious to claim all the Cherokee lands within their boundaries. They refused to recognize the sovereignty of the nation and continued to encroach on Indian territory. While this was happening, things were becoming confused in Washington. President Jefferson had suggested in 1803 a removal to the west on a large scale, but to the Indians he wrote: "I sincerely wish you may succeed in your laudable endeavors to save the remnant of your nation by adopting industrious occupations, and a government of regular law. In this you may always rely on the counsel and assistance of the United States."[12] How ironic this seemed, for a new rash of treaties began in October 1805. Two others were signed on October 27, 1805. In succession to the treaties granted more land cessions. Upon examining the agreements of 1805 and 1806, secret articles were found that exposed evidence of the bribery of chiefs with money and rifles. This type of treaty became the rule in the Indian treatment, and in 1816 three more treaties ceding land were signed. One was with South Carolina, while the other two treaties of the same date were completed with the United States.[13]

The Cherokees attempted to follow the advice of Jefferson in order to secure their lands. They were a highly civilized tribe and on July 26, 1827, the Cherokee Nation adopted a written constitution which they molded after the United States Constitution. Again Georgia tried to destroy the Indians by nullifying the Cherokee Constitution. As a result of appeals to the U. S. Supreme Court by the Cherokees, Georgia's actions were declared null.[14] The problem created here will be discussed later. The Cherokees had their own alphabet, perfected by Seqouyah, shortly after 1810. This language has the distinction of being "the only written language of any American Indian tribe."[15] The state of affairs of the Cherokee nation was described in a report submitted to the War Department in 1825 by Thomas McKenney:

> Industry and commercial enterprise are extending themselves in every part...the population is rapidly increasing...White men in the nation enjoy all the immunities and privileges of the Cherokee people, except that they are not eligible to public offices...The Christian religion is their religion...Schools are increasing every year.[16]

The Cherokees wanted only to live in peace. When the Shawnee chief, Tecumseh, came to seek aid for his Indian Confederacy, the Cherokees replied that they would not raise a hand against their white brother. Even with all the injustices done to them, they still hoped that the white man's greed was satisfied and they could live on what little of their fathers' land they still held.

Unfortunately, new troubles were beginning to put an end to any hope of peace. The British struck again in 1812 and the Cherokees

vowed to take no part in either side. This was a white man's battle, or so they thought. Word soon reached them that their traditional enemy, the Creeks, had sided with the British and were destroying Cherokee lands in the south. To their dismay, the Cherokees discovered that they were involved in yet another battle. When Chief Junaluska learned that one of the generals he knew personally, Andrew Jackson, was in trouble, he led 600 of his best warriors and scouts into battle with Jackson's troops against the Creeks at Horseshoe Bend. They were successful, but thirty-six Cherokee warriors were among those wounded and eighteen died. Junaluska proved his friendship by killing a Creek warrior as he attacked Jackson. Peithman concluded this report by saying "Junaluska drove his tomahawk into the skull of the Creek Indian, but later events proved that Jackson did not appreciate this brave deed."[17] Junaluska saved his life and thus began his march via the Battle of New Orleans to the Presidency of the United States.

In return for saving his life, Jackson decided to take four million acres of Cherokee land during the 1814 Treaty. Now the Cherokee warriors wished they had sided with the "Red Stick" warriors and had shot "Old Mad Jackson." His involvement with the Cherokee was just beginning, for three years later, 1817, saw Jackson negotiating with the Indians in an attempt to relinquish their title to all their lands in the east. He failed, as did his successor Governor McMinn. The only arrangement the Federal Government achieved that year was a treaty with the Lower Cherokees. Signed on July 8, 1817, it exchanged their eastern lands for lands guaranteed for them west of the Mississippi. Of course this land was mostly waterless plain and very different from the rich lands they had to leave behind.[18]

Georgia continued her battle for control of Indian lands. Gold had been discovered, so more white settlers took over Indian territory. "Georgia's line of action was to extend her authority of the state and its laws over the Cherokee lands. This would in effect withdraw the Cherokee lands from the status of "Indian Country," bring control of the lands into Georgia's hands, and by overt as well as subtle pressure, force the Indians off most of the land."[19] She asserted her power over the Cherokee people: "And be it...enacted, that after the first day of June next, all laws, ordinances, orders and regulations of any kind whatever, made, passed, or enacted by the Cherokee Indians...are hereby declared to by null and void and of no effect, as if the same had never existed... no Indian or descendant of any Indian, shall be deemed a competent witness in any court of this state to which a white person may be a party..."[20]

The federal government continued to enact treaties trading western lands for Cherokee lands and imposing more hardships for those that remained. The Indians realized that even if they moved west, the protection promised by the United States meant very little

and that without organization, they could expect white settlers to claim their lands again. The government still gave aid to agricultural and educational programs for the Eastern Cherokees but held that the "preservation and civilization" of the Indians rested on a policy of removal.[21]

By this time Andrew Jackson had been elected President. John Parris has written in "History of the Cherokee," that General Andrew Jackson said to Junaluska: "As long as the sun shines and the grass grows, there shall be friendship between us, and the feet of the Cherokee shall be toward the east."[22] He was now in a position to live up to his promise. However, "when he entered the White House, Jackson was convinced that the Indians could no longer exist as independent enclaves within the states...the administration, of course, did not lack supporters in congress. These men repeated and amplified the Jacksonian doctrine that removal was in the best interest of the Indians..."[23]

Jackson used the Constitution to support his policy. "The Constitution forbade the erection of a new state within the territory of an existing state without that state's permission. Still less, then, could it allow a "foreign and independent government" to establish itself there."[24] The Cherokees challenged the action of Georgia based on this, which resulted in the case of Worcester vs. Georgia. "John Marshall declared the law of Georgia extending her authority over the Cherokee lands null and void, as contrary to treaties and to the Constitution."[25] Jackson's reply: "John Marshall has made his decision, now let him enforce it."

The Cherokees, in their newspaper The Phoenix, described their situation. "The state of Georgia has taken a strong stand against us, and the United States must either defend us and our rights or leave us to our foe. In the latter case she will violate her promise of protection, and we cannot in future depend upon any guarantee to us, either here, or beyond the Mississippi."[26]

The public was also becoming aware of the treatment of the Cherokees and most people seemed to be in sympathy with them, except for those in Georgia. In the Jacksonian period several attempts were made to regularize Federal Indian administration in an effort to please the public. However, "the War Department's head of Indian Affairs reported in 1828, that there were "fruitful sources of complaint" due to the lack of an organized system." The result of this was the creation of a permanent Indian Affairs Office which carried out Jackson's policy. "...these removal policies relied more on military force than diplomatic treaty."[27]

Jackson repeatedly advised the Indians to leave their homes and move to the western lands provided for them. When the governor of Georgia asked him to remove the protection of federal troops, he did so promptly. He did this on "the basis of his interpretation

of Indian rights."[28] The Indians protested this action and asked for help from the Supreme Court. The reply: "If it be true that the Cherokee nation have rights, this is not the tribunal in which those rights are to be asserted. If it be true that wrongs have been inflicted, and that still greater are to be apprehended, this is not the tribunal which can redress the past or prevent the future.

The motion for an injunction is denied."[29]

Jackson then began to speed the removal of the Indians. He told them that he had no wish to deceive them and that their only chance to live in peace and prosper was to join their countrymen in the West. He said that this emigration should be voluntary, but that it should proceed with haste. The names of men who championed the rights of the Indians were many and great. Such men as Henry Clay, Daniel Webster, and Davy Crockett endeavored to change the hand of Fate, but with no success.[30] Each of these men had a long record of opposing the removal, Crockett being typical. He was a member of the state legislature of Tennessee and entered Congress in 1828. Because he opposed President Jackson's Indian Removal policy of 1831, he was defeated for re-election. During the next election, however, he regained his seat, only to lose it in 1835. That year the New Echota Treaty was approved by a majority of one vote in the Senate and had been heralded as an obvious victory by Jackson. Crockett disclaimed both the policy and the treatment of the Cherokee Indians as "unjust, dishonest, cruel, and short-sighted in the extreme."[31]

In 1835 the New Echota Treaty was signed by the Ridge-Watie-Boudinot group which sold the title to all of the Cherokee lands to the Federal Government for lands west of the Mississippi in Oklahoma. Each acre was sold for approximately 50 cents, of which the Cherokees were doubtful of receiving.[32] The entire Eastern Cherokee tribe rose up in protest, but to no avail. The leaders refused to cooperate with the terms of the treaty, letting the use of force prove the illegality of the treaty. But the fateful day arrived; "In May, 1838, General Scott was ordered to go with a sufficient military force to compel the removal."[33] By the end of the month, 17,000 Cherokees had been rounded up and placed in stockades across the Cherokee Nation.

Even though the provisions of the treaty guaranteed food, clothing, and shelter, very few Indians received it because they felt it would be construed as the acceptance of the treaty. The treatment of the Indians had been harsh and cruel, but they were not prepared for the experiences encountered on the Trail of Tears. "The trail of the exiles was a trail of death. They had to sleep in the wagons and on the ground without fire. And I have known as many as twenty-two of them to die in one night of pneumonia due to ill treatment, cold, and exposure. Among this number was the beautiful Christian wife of Chief John Ross."[34] They had been forced out of their homes and off their fields with no time to collect their belongings in most cases. They

were at the mercy of the government, and there was little of that.

The Cherokees finally took over the task of the removal themselves, and organized the people to help solve some of the problems involved in moving. In March, 1839, the Cherokees reached the end of their march into exile. Far from their homes and pleasant climate, they had traveled for six months during the cruelest part of the year. The graves of more than 4,000 marked the Trail of Tears into alien lands, where the dead went unnamed but not forgotten.[35]

A few hundred of the Indians had managed to escape from the stockades or along the Trail and were hiding in the mountains. General Scott began searching for them, rounding them up a few at the time. But, even here there were examples of bravery and loyalty among the Indians. "Tsali was an old man, a simple nobody, who gave his life so that a remnant of his people might remain in the land of their birth."[36] After being forced out of his home, Tsali and his family were mistreated by the soldiers. Tsali's wife fell and was immediately struck by one of the soldiers for being clumsy. Tsali and a few other Indians devised a plan of excape, in order to avoid more humiliation. In the attempt to excape, Tsali accidently struck and killed one of the soldiers. General Scott was determined to find Tsali and use him as an example. "If Tsali and his kin will come in and give up," Thomas was told, "I won't hunt down the others. Tsali has killed a soldier and must be punished. If he will voluntarily pay the penalty I will intercede for the fugitives and have the government grant them permission to live in the Great Smokies. But if he refuses, tell him I'll turn my soldiers loose to hunt down each one of them."[37] Tsali relented and came down from the mountains. "Tsali, Ridges and Tawney were sentenced to be executed. Because of his youth, Wasituna was spared. So was the old man's wife...Guns were thrust into the hands of three Cherokee men. Tsali waved aside a blindfold. So did his kin. A volley rang out. Tsali slumped to the ground."[38]

With most of the Indians in the West and just a handful left in the mountains, their troubles were not over yet. Friends of the Cherokees still tried to make the Federal Government recognize the Cherokee Nation. One of these was Thomas who was "finally successful in 1846 when a treaty was signed in Washington which permitted the Cherokee to remain (in the Great Smokey Mountains). Thomas was also concerned with efforts to secure the $5,000,000 promised by the Treaty of New Echota. When he secured dribblets of this money he bought land for the Cherokee in Western Carolina."[39]

The Indians in the West had established themselves in the lands of Oklahoma. There they began to strive again to live in peace and harmony. They accomplished many great things for their tribe. That is another story, which also ends in death and failure and with a slight glimmer of hope.

FOOTNOTES

[1]Thomas Valentine Parker, The Cherokee Indians, with special reference to their relations with the United States Government (New York, 1907), p. 5-6.

[2]Cherokee Historical Association, "Unto These Hills," (Hendersonville, 1971), p. 10.

[3]Cherokee Historical, p. 10.

[4]Parker, p. 6.

[5]Cherokee Historical, p. 11.

[6]Francis Prucha, American Indian Policy in the Formative Years (Cambridge, 1962). p. 35-36.

[7]Cherokee Historical, p. 12.

[8]Prucha, p. 39.

[9]Prucha, p. 147

[10]Prucha, p. 149.

[11]Parker, p. 16.

[12]Helen Jackson, A Century of Dishonor (Boston, 1885), p. 273.

[13]Parker, p. 11-12.

[14]Bureau of Indian Affairs, U.S. Dept of Interior, Federal Indian Policies, 1972. p. 6.

[15]Cherokee Historical..., p. 12.

[16]Jackson, p. 275.

[17]Irvin Peithman, Broken Peace Pipes (Springfield, 1964), p. 36.

[18]Parker, p. 12.

[19]Prucha, p. 232.

[20]Louis Filler and Allen Guttmann (ed.), The Removal of the Cherokee Nation: Manifest Destiny or National Dishonor? (Boston, 1962), p. 19., 21.

[21]Prucha, p. 224.

[22]Cherokee Historical..., p. 32.

[23]Prucha, p. 235, 239.

[24]Prucha, p. 238.

[25]Prucha, p. 245-245.

[26]Jackson, p. 278.

[27]B. of Indian Affairs, p. 7, 6.

[28]Prucha, p. 244.

[29]Filler, p. 65.

[30]Tom Underwood, The Story of the Cherokee People (Knoxville, 1961), p. 35.

[31]Pelthman, Broken..., p. 253-4.

[32]Cherokee Historical..., p. 12.

[33]Jackson, p. 281.

[34]Underwood, p. 38.

[35]Cherokee Historical..., p. 30.

[36]Cherokee Historical..., p. 28.

[37]Cherokee Historical..., p. 28-29.

[38]Cherokee Historical..., p. 29.

[39]Cherokee Historical..., p. 40.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Articles of a Treaty. United States of America, New Echota, 1835.

Bureau of Indian Affairs, U.S. Dept. of Interior, Federal Indian Policies. 1972.

Cherokee Historical Association. "Unto These Hills," Hendersonville: WNC Advertising Associates, 1971.

Dale, Edward. Cherokee Cavaliers, Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1940.

Filler, Louis and Allen Guttmann (ed.) The Removal of the Cherokee Nation: Manifest Destiny or National Dishonor? Boston: Heath & Co., 1962.

Fleischmann, Glen. The Cherokee Removal, 1838. New York: Franklin Watts, 1971.

Jackson, Helen. A Century of Dishonor, Boston: Roberts Brothers, 1885.

Lumpkin, Wilson. The Removal of the Cherokee Indians from Georgia, New York: Arno Press, 1969.

Parker, Thomas Valentine. The Cherokee Indians, with Special Reference to their relations with the U.S. Government. New York: The Grafton Press, 1907.

Pelthman, Irvin. Broken Peace Pipes, Springfield: Charles C. Thomas, 1964.

Prucha, Francis. American Indian Policy in the Fromative Years, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1962.

Starkey, Marion. The Cherokee Nation, New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1946.

Underwood, Tom. The Story of the Cherokee People, Knoxville: S. B. Newman, 1961.

U.S. Dept. of the Interior, The Indians of North Carolina, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1972.

FLAVIUS JOSEPHUS: THE MAN AND THE HISTORIAN

Submitted by:

ISAAC BELONGA

The annals of ancient history are full of the exploits of numerous colorful, controversial, and celebrated characters. Yet, there are probably few individuals among those who comprise this group who have aroused as much vigorous vituperation during their own lifetime and throughout the centuries as has the great Jewish historian Flavius Josephus. The primary thrust of this composition shall be the analysis of all of the surviving works of Josephus, with the objective being the production of a brief but coherent and correct commentary.

Fortunately, one of Flavius Josephus' surviving works is the Vita which was composed as a combination autobiography and apologia. From the opening passages it is learned that Josephus was actually born Joseph ben Matthias during the reign of Caius Caesar. (Josephus, trans. Whiston, 1827 ed., p. 1) The birth took place sometime during the first year that Caius was imperator, so it was either 37 A.D. or 38 A.D. The city of his birth was Jerusalem. Josephus claims to be descended from the royal line of Asamoneus through his mother and from the class of high priests through Simon Psellus, a contemporary of Hyrcanus. (Ibid.) He fathered three male children who survived beyond the early stages of infancy, they being Hyrcanus, Justus, and Agrippa respectively. (Ibid., p. xx) He was married a total of three times according to the Vita account.

Josephus asserts that at the age of fourteen he was consulted by the high priests and the Sanhedrin regarding the law (he apparently means the Torah and/or the Midrash). (Ibid., p. 1) At the age of sixteen, he states, he decided to study the various sects which were current in Judaism (Sadduceeism, Pharisaism, and Essenism) to determine which was the best to follow. Included in his period of religious study was a three year sojourn in the desert with an ascetic named Banus. (Ibid.) He finally settled on the Pharisees after returning to his native city. It is important to note that this rigorous study of Judaism by a descendant of the high priests should result in a very keen cognizance of religious matters of every type as regards the Jews of Roman occupied Judea. Therefore, in reading Josephus' works one should be alert for opportunities which this precocious, pious, learned historian had to demonstrate his profound understanding of his faith and its practitioners.

At the age of twenty-six, Josephus made what was to be for him and the future of his people, a highly significant journey. The young man

went to Rome on a mission to secure the release of some priests which the procurator Felix placed on trial. (Ibid., p. 11) This he says he accomplished through the emperor's consort Poppaea Sabrina whom he met through a Jewish playwright named Alturius. Of the utmost importance here is the fact that this young man was confronted with the full splendor and military might of the most powerful empire the world had known to that date. Although he had known the presence of Roman martial force all his life, it is quite unlikely that he had conceived of it on so grand a scale as that which he witnessed on this trip to Rome.

Josephus states that he returned to Judea and found a number of individuals agitating for armed rebellion against the Romans. He strongly advised against such a course of action arguing that the Romans were far superior. Whereas some of the authorities on this period and historian would refute the accuracy of this claim, using the subsequent actions of Josephus as a basis, it is instead most likely a correct account. The latter position is supported by two important facts. Josephus had surveyed the power of Rome first hand and comparing the two peoples it was clear that the Romans were simply too strong. Furthermore, most of the conservative faction quickly swung to the war camp when the initial success of the Jewish forces were compared to those of the Maccabees in 168 B.C. against superior Syrian forces and Hellenism. Therefore, the actions and reactions of Josephus in this instance are reasonable and consistent with his narrative.

After describing his failure to dissuade the rebellious faction, Josephus proceeds to briefly outline the opening of the hostilities. In so doing, he makes a statement of considerable interest, "I only mention them now, because I would demonstrate to my readers, that the Jews' war with the Romans was not voluntary, but that, for the main, they were forced by necessity to enter into it." (Ibid.) This statement is one which is frequently regarded by some historians and readers as a recurring ameliorotory declaration which Josephus records in a number of his works to either ingratiate himself with the population of hostile betrayed Jews, or as an endeavor to shift the burden of guilt and thereby pacify the bitter and anti-Semitic Roman citizens. However, such an evaluation is both superficial and misleading. Josephus took this position after making an evaluation of the events in the light of important historical precedents and certain deep religious beliefs. Although there is a lack of political emphasis in this interpretation, it is none-the-less a reasonable one for him to make. Fortunately, there is another point at which this fact can be better treated in the paper, so it will be fully explored there.

Next, Josephus informs his readers that he was sent to Galilee by the Sanhedrin. His narrative is worthy of being quoted here because two peculiarities in the text demand some attention at this point.

> "the principal men of Jerusalem, seeing that the robbers and innovators had arms in great plenty,

> and fearing least they, while they were unprovided of arms, should be in subjection to their enemies, which also came to be the case afterwards; and, being informed that all Galilee had not yet revolted from the Romans, but that some part of it was still quiet; sent me and two others of the priests, who were men of excellent characters, Joazar and Judas, in order to persuade the ill men there to lay down their arms"
>
> (Ibid., pp. 11f)

The two items which merit discussion are the reference to "robbers" and the description of the state of affairs in Galilee.

This puzzlingly odd reference to "robbers" must certainly be a slanderous misnomer for the Zealots. Although there is an explanation of sorts presented by Josephus in another work intended to clarify his persistant avoidance of this name when discussing Zealot activity, it is nevertheless biased and defamatory to dismiss them as "robbers". The fact that the Zealots were violent and radical religious fanatics is incontestable. However, one as learned in Judaism as Josephus claims to be would be well aware of the fact that these men had been conditioned by centuries of tradition which prompted those who were inclined to be ultraplous to pursue such a course of action. Josephus' right to disapprove of their methods is not sufficient cause to grant him libelous license.

The second statement which deserves special attention is the assessment of the state of affairs in Galilee which Josephus records as an accurate report of the area's sentiments which was known by the Sanhedrin. Since the history of the area clearly indicates that it was always disposed to seditious activity as well as a strong pro-Zealot region, it seems odd that such a change of attitude would be made there after the news of a successful skirmish against Florus and his legionnaires reached the inhabitants. It is more probable that the Zealots and the sympathetic population in Galilee were in the process of organizing large scale resistance to the Romans when Josephus was dispatched.

Oddly, Josephus reports that the Zealot John of Gischala was able to corrupt his fellow priests "of excellent characters" and in the midst of serious trouble he sent them back to Jerusalem. (Ibid., p. v) There is no mention of an attempt to have the Sanhedrin replace them. When this is viewed with the knowledge of the region's disposition, one must wonder what Josephus truely expected to accomplish alone that could not have been done more safely and expeditiously with good assistants. It is possible that this act marks the second major turning point in a clever scheme by Josephus to achieve fame and fortune through carefully balancing his deeds done on behalf of each side in order to

lithely jump to the victor's side whenever it became clear who would triumph.

Josephus' narrative goes on to give a description of his exploits in the office of governor of Galilee including his deeds in the Jewish Revolt of 66 A.D. Since these events are also covered in his Bellum Judaicum, observations on them shall be reserved until that work is analyzed.

The motivation for Josephus' writing the Vita is presented quite vividly in the concluding passages of this work.

> "And now I am come to this part of my narrative, I have a mind to say a few things to Justus, who hath himself written a history concerning these affairs... How then comes it to pass, O Justus, thou most sagacious of writers, (that I may address myself to him as if he were here present) for so thou boastest of thyself, that I and the Galileans have been the authors of that sedition which thy country engaged in, both against the Romans and the king? For before ever I was appointed governor of Galilee by the community of Jerusalem, both thou and all the people of Tiberias had not only taken up arms, but had made war with Decapolis of Syria."
>
> (Ibid., p. xvi)

Obviously, this is an attempt by Josephus to exonerate himself from an accusation of the most serious nature. Unfortunately there are no known surviving copies of the history of the period as written by Justus of Tiberias. Evidently the case he presented in the work against Josephus was so cogently argued that the average reader would have believed it to be wholly true and accurate. Finding himself in the precarious position of being confronted with charges by the suspicious Romans Josephus almost frantically appeals to every possible official or otherwise creditable source for support. This includes the campaign records of Vespasian and the administrative records of Justus himself. (Ibid., pp. xvif) Josephus succeeded, for he remained in the emperor's favor and Justus was discredited.

On a number of other occasions Josephus was attacked by the bitter countrymen whom he had betrayed. Jonathan, the leader of an uprising in Cyrene, credited Josephus with supplying him with arms and money. (Ibid., p. xix) However, Jonathan and the other accusers fared no better than Justus for Josephus states "Nay, after that, when those that envied my good fortune did frequently bring accusations against me, by God's providence I escaped them all." (Ibid.)

Following the war, Josephus was granted a pension, given an apartment

in Vespasian's home, and was made a citizen of Rome. (Ibid.) These privileges were perpetuated by both Titus and Domitian. With this statement, Josephus begins a brief summary of his own family affairs and ends by asking the reader to judge him as he will.

The Vita also serves as an introduction to Josephus' Antiquities of the Jews. This, the most ambitious of his undertakings, is an extremely important work because it provides much important information about the ancient Jews, it quotes a number of ancient historians whose works are lost, and it serves as a yardstick by which the historian himself can be appraised as a historian, because he sets the criteria for such an evaluation.

In the first preface to the work Josephus states his purpose for writing history. He declares that he is driven by force, as he is concerned in the facts, and so cannot excuse himself from committing them to writing. It is for the advantage of posterity that he is induced to draw historical facts out of darkness into light, and to produce them for the benefit of the public, on account of the great importance of the facts themselves with which they have been concerned. Certainly, Josephus' motivation and goal of historical writing are impressive.

In the second preface he describes the nature of this history.

> "for it will contain all our antiquities, and the constitution of our government, as interpreted out of the Hebrew Scriptures...to explain who the Jews originally were--and by what legislature they had been instructed in piety, and the exercise of other virtues,--what wars also they had made in remote ages till they were unwillingly engaged in this last one with the Romans"
>
> (Josephus, trans. Whiston, 1957 ed., p. 29)

It should be noted that in this passage, Josephus repeats his claim that the bulk of the Jewish populace was forced into participating in the rebellion.

In outlining his methodology he states: "I shall accurate describe what is contained in our records, in the order of time that belongs to them; for I have already promised to do so throughout this undertaking; and this without adding anything to what is therein contained, or taking away anything there from." (Ibid., p. 30)

The primary purpose of The Antiquities of the Jews is to provide skeptical Gentiles with a complete and accurate history of the Jewish people, which dramatically would reveal the long and glorious heritage of the Jews. Many of the ancients, especially the Greeks, viewed the

Jews with complete contempt out of both ignorance and malice and such a work would alleviate those anti-Semitic injustices which were being perpetuated by ignorance alone. It is, like the Vita, dedicated to Epaphroditus whose background is ambiguous, but who is credited by Josephus with encouraging him to undertake and complete this work. (Ibid., pp. 28ff)

Josephus paraphrased a version of the Old Testament which conforms in a great degree to the pre-Christian Greek Septuagint version for his earliest period account of Jewish history. One of the stylistic characteristics of Josephus which is both entertaining and informative is his habit of using Hebrew words in a narrative and then giving a translation. Adam, the name of the first man, is translated to mean "one that is red", since God formed him from red earth because that is the type which is virgin and true earth. (Josephus, trans. Whiston, 1827 ed. p. 1) (*The Hebrew root of the words earth, man, and red have אדם as its spelling. Therefore, a pun of sorts naturally exists in the language which would permit him to make such a translation.) Likewise the names Eve חוה, Cain קין, and Abel הבל are given to mean: the mother of all living, a possession, and a sorrow, respectively. Since the vowel point notation of the Masoretes give only an approximation of what originally was linked by pronunciation similarity, this type of information is valuable to the scholar of ancient languages.

In Josephus' account of the Great Deluge there are a couple of interesting details which demand attention. First is his use of other historians to document his work. One Berosus is cited who may have used a copy of "the Chaldean Account" which was discovered merely a century ago by George Smith in Nineveh. Berosus claimed that parts of the ark could still be seen resting on the mountain of the Cordyaeans, a fact which certainly would have added creditability to Josephus' narrative. (Ibid., p. 4) Also referred to are Hieronymus the Egyptian, Mnaseas, and Nicolaus of Damascus. Now in quoting Nicolaus, Josephus includes the first of several statements which are in conflict with all biblical versions. Nicolaus claims that a number of people other than Noah's family escaped death in the flood by scaling the heights of Baris. While one can easily see that this concession is made to prevent hostile reactions to the Judaic concept of their being the elect of God, Josephus had made an important deviation from the standards which he set for a historian.

Another important violation of Josephus' standards is found in his recording of the events following the escape of the Jews from Egypt. No where is there any mention of the idolatry of the children of Israel as recorded in the thirty-second chapter of the book of Exodus. The reason for this omission is to avoid offending practitioners of other religions, but for one who claims to be so pious and honest as Josephus, this is an extraordinary concession.

Josephus does appear to be truthful in claiming to be well versed

in the Law, for he takes every possible opportunity to give an adequate explanation of it. Some legal problems proved to be both difficult and delicate because persons of non-Jewish extraction either misinterpreted the Law or willfully distorted it to suit their anti-Semitic attacks on Judaic tradition. In one instance Josephus dealt with the Greek accusation that the Jewish Law advocated ass worship. The charge was a problematic one because the Jews regarded the ass as an animal which should never be sacrificed because it was a messianic animal. Josephus showed why the beast was not sacrificed by explaining almost matter-of-factly that every four footed beast was to be either sacrificed or redeemed by the owner from the class of high priests, if it was a first born. Thus the ass received no truely special treatment.

Chapter eight is almost entirely devoted to the explanation of the Law. One very interesting interpretation of the Law is given as "Let no one Blaspheme those gods which other cities esteem such; nor may any one steal what belongs to strange temples, nor take away the gifts that are dedicated to any god." (ibid., p. 73) Surprisingly, rabbis have taught for centuries that Judaism has no monopoly on salvation and that the righteous of all people shall share in the rewards of the future. Therefore this respect for other religions, though from afar, is in line with Judaic thought to this day.

Of the numerous authors quoted or referred to in this work, quite a few have had the misfortune of having their works lost in part or whole for some time. A few of the more famous persons whose names appear are: Hesiod, Homer, Hellanicus, Ephorus, Manetho, and Strabo (in addition, of course, to those already spoken of). This segment of the Antiquities of the Jews ends with book eleven, chapter six.

Book eleven, chapter seven, through thirteen, chapter seven, are a chronicle of the highly important period running from Ezra's and Nehemiah's return to Zion to complete the work begun by Zerubbabel ben Shaltiel and Joshua ben Jehozadek, to the death of Simon Maddabeus. Unfortunately the sources are fair to poor in quality for the most part. Josephus cites Polybius as a primary source but evidently the best information is taken from a text of First Maddabees. Josephus shows considerable skill at using geneologies to document events surrounding the priests.

The next major division covers the period from Simon Maccabeus' death to the rise of Archelaus. Although much legendary material mars the accuracy of the work, the latter portion uses Strabo and Nicholas of Damascus with good results. These two historians prove to be far more judicious in recording the facts, therefore the history of the Jews from Alexandra's death on is more reliable.

In writing his summation Josephus states that in researching the material used in this history he examined the records of the Roman Senate and the imperators. In ending Josephus boldly asserts:

> "I have so completely perfected the work I proposed to myself to do, that no other person, whether he were a Jew or a foreigner, had he ever so great an inclination to it, could so accurately deliver these accounts to the Greeks as is done in these books."
>
> (Ibid., p. 428)

Such characteristically ostentatious statements have probably contributed significantly to the ignominious reputation Josephus has had for centuries. However, the primary source of his great ill repute lies in the next work to be considered.

The Bellum Judaicum or Wars of the Jews is undoubtedly one of the most important historical works ever written. This is the only surviving primary source which details the Jewish Revolt of 66 A.D. This war and its immediate results were to have significant effects on the development of Judaism, Christianity, and Islam which were to remain unparalled until the twentieth century (in so far as armed conflicts are concerned). In his preface to the work, Josephus makes it clear to his readers that he viewed this war as the greatest of all time.

Originally published in Aramaic for the Jews of Babylonia, Parthia, and Arabia to convince them of the folly of armed revolt against Rome; this new version was written to correct the contradictory reports which were circulating in Greek and Latin throughout the empire, and which flattered the Romans and disparaged the Jews. (Josephus, trans. Whiston, 1957 ed., p. 604). It was divided into seven books by the author. Though Josephus claims that he will be impartial, it must be remembered that this history was written by Josephus while in Rome living in an apartment in the emperor's home. Furthermore, his patrons were the founders of a new dynasty in a very class conscious Rome. A glowing account of the deeds of Vespasian and Titus would accomplish much for the Flavian line in the aristocratic circles which would ordinarily spurn these burgher's sons. At the same time one must realize that this is an eyewitness account written by a man with a most unusual vantage point from which to view the progress of both sides in the execution of the hostilities. Furthermore, he had easy access to some valuable sources, such as Vespasian and Titus' campaign records, which were not available to most of the period's historians.

Before proceeding with the examination of the Wars of the Jews proper, a moment should be devoted to an interesting statement by Josephus. He implies that historians who engage themselves in the writing of a history of times already given coverage by earlier historians do little or no service of any worth. Instead, he prefers to see men write histories of their own times, or to write what has not been covered before. (Ibid., p. 605) He then proceeds to dedicate the work to the Greeks and to the Barbarians as a memorial of great actions.

In relating the events which led up to the outbreak of the war, Josephus seems to be quite accurate. However, he fails to give the type of explanation of the tradition of the Jews which would explain their growing sympathy for the Zealots and their rash course of actions. The Jewish people were bitter because it appeared that a continous succession of pagan powers would rule God's commonwealth. Insult compounded injury when the people saw Gaius Caligula Caesar attempt to have his image erected in the Holy of Holies in the summer of 40 A.D.; Cuspius Fadus' attempt to regain control of the garments of the High Priest in 44 A.D., and his making a martyr of the messianic claimant Theudas at a time when the people's minds were deeply absorbed in political-religious matters; the anti-Semitic gesture towards the Temple by one of Ventidius Cumanus' legionnaires; the destruction of a sacred Torah scroll; and the misappropriation of Temple funds were acts which individually could have caused the pious portion of the population to revolt. Yet, in Josephus' history it seems as if only the rabble rousers among the citizenry were inclined to pursue the course of revolution when in truth the callous administration was pushing many citizens of Judea into the Zealot camp. This form of presentation is tantamount to malicious distortion, especially since the source is one of the learned pious men of the priestly class.

In giving account of his governorship of Galilee, Josephus alters some of the material which has a parallel in the Vita and thereby projects a contrary impression to the cursory reader of both works. For example, the Vita shows him as a strongly pro-Roman from the very beginning. However, in the Wars of the Jews, he presents himself as a loyalist to the Jewish cause. He fortifies cities against the Romans and tenaciously trains troops for combat against Roman forces. (Ibid., pp. 704 ff.) What is the truth. To further develop the theory outlined earlier--Josephus probably returned believing the Romans to be militarily and economically superior to the Jews. However, the initial engagements indicated that this revolution might proceed like the Maccabean Revolution against Antiochus Epiphanes. If success were achieved, the young general could gain fame and position. The only question was, "Is God on the side of Judea or is He going to use this conflict to chastise the Jews?" If the latter were the case, it would quickly become evident and someone who skillfully had straddled the fence and concealed his true motivation could adroitly try to swing to the winning side. Even serious complications could be handled if every resource available was properly employed.

Apparently Josephpus had trouble cloaking his moves and motives, for almost immediately he aroused the suspicion of John of Gischala, a gentleman of Zealot persuasion who sought every opportunity to see that Josephus was deposed and sent to his fathers. Unfortunately for John, Josephus escaped his death traps and thawed every coup d'etat. Almost a chapter is devoted to their running conflict.

Another interesting chapter vividly describes the Roman war machine. The information is entertaining and important, however one is almost

distracted by being subjected to the glowing respect shown the Roman forces and engines of war by Josephus who simultaneously portrays the Jews as so many armed fanatical incompetants. This is yet another instance in which Josephus shows the prejudice which he claims to lack. His excuse for this is that it should serve as a comfort to the defeated as well as a deterrent to the bold who would make a revolution against the superior armies of the Romans. (Ibid., p. 716)

In a rather curious manner, Josephus describes his engagement on the battlefield with Vespasian. Since this is a grand opportunity for Josephus to demonstrate the true nature of the Jewish combatants by telling how they fared when on equal terms with the Romans (that is, when fighting before the fortifications without the benefits of heights and walls), he says little that can be called enlightening. "Josephus was then in fear for the city, and leaped out, and all the Jewish multitude with him; these fell upon the Romans in great numbers, and drove them away from the wall, and performed many glorious and bold actions." This is not exactly what one would expect of a man describing the valiant efforts of his countrymen against a well trained and equipped professional army. Now some would say that this vagueness is due to the fact the writer has adopted the opponents's family name, is living in his home, and is writing about the emperor himself. Yet the fact is that the battle was won by Vespasian. Now Josephus is quite graphic in telling of the terrible sufferings inflicted on the poor Jews by the mighty Romans and their engines of war, but he becomes conservative at best in describing the Jewish effort. Then, the Jews appear to be valorous only in desperate moments. Impartial indeed!

Having been told of the horrors of the seige, readers are informed that Josephus used guile to have his soldiers select lots to pair off and slit each others throats rather than surrender or be captured. Believing that their general would be but a moment behind them in death, they willingly took each others lives. However, it seems that Josephus realized that this was the moment to hurdle the fence and somehow join the winning side. Evidently, God had not fought their battle and there was nothing an ambitious young man could gain in this world by death. Josephus convinced the fellow with whom he had paired off that it would be foll for them to die. Thus prevailed on, the man surrendered to the romans with Josephus. (Ibid., p. 730) Many may have forgiven Josephus for becoming a traitor to the just cause of his people, but this castardly and disgusting act was a form of treachery far beyond the forgiveness of most men.

There follows the story of how Josephus acquired his favored position. He states that immediately upon being brought to Vespasian, he declared that through his gift of divination he knew that the next emperor would be Vespasian. Although Josephus seems to have been able to improvise and think quickly, this story is an improbable one. Most likely, while being held captive he heard of Nero's demise and decided that it was time to play his last card. Knowing of the political interpretation of the Messiah which was enjoying popularity in Judaism at that time, he probably decided to apply the prophesy to Vespasian. Vespasian would certainly grant a captured general an audience in the

hope of obtaining information of value. What Josephus told him may have simply amused him at first, but he was probably startled when he learned that he had been chosen emperor. Quite naturally Vespasian would be desirous of keeping this seer alive. The guess was not a bad one on Josephus' part. A general who is winning an important war is on the minds of his fellow countrymen. A dynamic figure of this sort would have a good chance if the last emperor left no powerful heir. Thus this ambitious young man won the favor of the new emperor.

For all practical purposes, the account of the war in the remaining books is accurate. The only glaring flaws are the vilifying references to the Zealots and the exaggerated exploits of Titus and his father. A final word is in order here in reference to the Zealots. The biblical figure Phinehas and the historical character Mattathias served as models for the Jews who would aspire to be ultrapious. These men were regarded as national heroes because they killed people whose actions they felt were an affront to a God so highly revered that his name was not spoken (thus יהוה has no vowel points to this day because the Jews forgot how it was vocalized). (Ibid., pp. 364, 618). Josephus regards them as common criminals because of their failure to obtain God's support. Yet, it should be remembered that they had cause to expect just that form of assistance from God because they were fighting to restore Zion to a theocracy by casting out the pagans. For this reason there were many priests who supported the Zealots and who willingly went to their deaths when this project failed. Josephus' bitterness prevented him from accrediting the failure to the moral condition of the nation and the lack of zeal for the Law of God which most prophets would have declared to be the fault.

The final work to be analyzed is the Contra Apionem, Against Apion, or The Great Age of the Jewish People. Josephus' aim in writing this work was to prove the antiquity of the Jews which some doubted even after the Antiquities of the Jews was published. (Ibid., p. 858) In order to accomplish the task he declares: "As for the witnesses whom I shall produce for the proof of what I say, they shall be such as are esteemed to be of the greatest reputation for truth, and the most skilful in the knowledge of all antiquity by the Greeks themselves." (Ibid.)

There follows one of the most skillfully argued historical rebuttals ever composed. The tirade which is launched against the Greeks is the result of their pretentiousness as well as their anti-Semitism. Josephus derisively criticizes the primordial concepts the Greeks have concerning their culture: "for they will find that almost all which concerns the Greeks happened not long ago; nay, one may say, is of yesterday only." (Ibid., p. 859) They are likewise rebuked for claiming to record antiquity with authority, for he points out that their alphabet is relatively recent. Homer's illiteracy is ridiculed and the pre-Socratics are accused of borrowing from the Chaldeans and Egyptians. (Ibid.) He then points out that many conflicts exist in the accounts of the Greek historians, who he says concentrate on style at the expense of the truth.

Among the many historians cited by Josephus to certify his statements

in this work are: Menander, Manetho, Dius, Berosus, Herodotus, Hermippus, Cherilus and Hecateus. Aristotle is also used as a learned authority. The quotations are well chosen, for they give great testimany to the antiquity of the Jewish people. However, Jospehus returns to Manetho to castigate him for including a false charge in his work as a face saving device for the Egyptians. Manetho claims that the Jews were forced out of Egypt rather than delivered by God's providence because they had leprosy. (Ibid., p. 874) Josephus shatters this falsehood.

Apion's charges are treated in Book Two of this short work. The most important defense regards the ass worship claim. Apion wrote: "the Jews placed an ass's head in their holy place" according to Josephus. (Ibid., p. 885). The refuting of the charge is so entertaining that one almost gets lost in the tongue lashing that is meeded out. What is most amusing is the offense which Josephus takes at the praise which Apion gives himself. One would think that Josephus had been granted a monopoly on vanity.

The fine translation by William Whiston contains several works not mentioned in this paper. Included are a few references to Jesus of Nazareth who is accepted as the Messiah by Christians and as a prophet by Orthodox Islamics and Reform Jews. There is sufficient evidence that this is the work of a medieval translator and redactor. The style differs fromthat of Josephus and the author was definately a believing Christian. Whiston's claim that Josephus was a Christian does not hold up under extensive examination. No analysis shall be made in this paper of those works which are questionable.

Of course a work such as this does not represent the writings and life of Josephus as a complete commentary would. However, it advances a far more rational theory of why Josephus lived and wrote as he did, than the caustic and emotional hypotheses of some historians. Furthermore, this paper can serve as a guide for the reader who is unfamiliar with the works of this very important historian, so as to make it possible for the reader to properly evaluate the man and the historian.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Josephus, Flavius Whiston A.M., The Genuine Works of Flavius Josephus, trans. William London: John Tallis & Company, 1827.

Josephus, Flavius Whiston A.M., The Life and Works of Flavius Josephus, trans. William Philadelphia: John C. Winston Company, 1957.

A STUDY OF PROSTITUTION IN NEW ORLEANS

FROM THE 1800's TO 1917

Submitted By:

FRANK LEON

> "I am going to speak to you, beloved, of the things which I wish could be told without words. I am going to speak of those houses of darkness and death and blackness and despair, of those human slaughterhouses, of the gravest things of all the pitfalls in the way of virtue in this great city.... There are over five hundred of these dark places scattered throughout this city from Carrollton to the barracks, and they run the gamut of condition from the palatial palaces of velvet and gilt down to the veriest stinking and reeking pesthole of foul hags and noisomeness. Fifteen hundred angels of death and damnation inhabit these places. They affect and imperil the virtue and honor of every girl in the city."
>
> The Reverent E. A. Clay
> Pastor, Dryades German
> Methodist Church and
> President of the Society
> for the Prevention of
> Cruelty to Children.
> October 30, 1892.

New Orleans, during the Nineteenth century, had acclaimed world wide notoriety as a hot-bed of assorted evil. Among the more significant offerings that the Crescent City submitted to society was prostitution. Although prostitution reached its climax in New Orleans in the mid 1800's, references to the abandonment of scruples in women in the city date back to the early part of the Eighteenth century when Lamothe Cadillac, then governor of Louisiana revealed that "if I send away all the loose females, there would be no women left here at all!"[1] For the most part, Cadillac's exclamation was prophetic in that it significantly described a situation to be found in New Orleans for the next two hundred years until the demise of Storyville in 1917.

Prostitution in New Orleans on a large scale began soon after the Louisiana Purchase. It was noted that at this time, women were so bountiful and cheap that they could oftentimes be acquired for as little as a place to stay and a shot of grog. Much of the credit for this situation can be attributed to General Andrew Jackson, who in 1814 chose

New Orleans as a suitable site to pay his fatigued troops. When talk of tired men with money reached the ears of prostitutes located along the various river ports, a mass pilgrimage of harlots headed to New Orleans with a sense purpose that Mecca has probably never seen the likes of. When the two groups finally encountered one another, no time was spared in setting up headquarters for the harlots. Makeshift shacks arose quickly in what appeared to be a muddy pond that citizens, over a matter of years, had created by loading their wheel barrels in order to fill in the low spots of their yards. The area ultimately formed a spacious depression in the city, and with the settlement of the newly arrived floozies, Basin Street was born.

The colonization of the scarlet women did not go unchecked by the upper crust of New Orleans society however. For upon hearing of the goings on around the outskirts of town, a large group of these concerned citizens, consisting mostly of church ladies, became burning with curiosity. One night they banded together and met at the Cathedral where they prayed that the Almighty would forgive them in advance for the sights that they might encounter. Then they proceeded cautiously to the 'forbidden area' and stopped short of North Rampart Street (probably because of the bog). From that point, however, they stood for a few moments wide eyed with mouth agape as they witnessed what was most likely the first nudist colony in the United States. Upon recollecting their wits, the ladies quickly made their way back to the Cathedral for another reckoning with the Creator to atone for their misguided curiosity.

The situation around the basin persisted and gave rise to the district known as the Swamp, where criminals, derelicts, and prostitutes of the worst kind could be located in staggering quantities. The area was so tremendously dangerous, that a policeman did not set foot there for twenty years.

With the prosperity of the 1830's a new face arose in the family of harlotry. These were the large scale and grandiose luxury houses of New Orleans which operated in the affluent 'European' fashion, and caught on with such enthusiastic fervor, that by the 1850's, oppulent bordellos appeared throughout the city. By 1870, "it is said that there were very few blocks indeed in New Orleans without at least one 'sporting house.'"[2]

The brothels in New Orleans were among the most elaborate and expensive in the world. Basin Street, as it was now called, was bordered on both sides with these costly structures, that were financed more times than not by local politicians. The inside of one of these confines usually consisted of plush furniture such as sofas and chairs, as well as some of the best feather mattresses that could be found in the nation, beautifully constructed mahogany woodwork, one or two grand pianos, exquisite paintings, marble fireplaces with equally expensive mantels, and elaborately furnished bedrooms that were the epitome of the style and comfort of the day. These were but only a few of the indicators of wealth to be found throughout the structure, which was itself of noteworthy quality, as most of the bordels were

three story mansions of brick and brownstone.

Added to the above mentioned elegance, it should also be realized that the best of wine, women, and song were also to be found in the confines of Basin Street bordels. In most places, customers had to make appointments unless they were of respectful character and well known by the madame of the house. Upon entering the bordello, the gentleman was expected to purchase a bottle of wine, which usaully cost between ten and twenty dollars, and he would often consume it while perusing the strumpets who were clad in lavish evening attire. If a person were new to a particular house, he was seated alone with the madame where he would buy a bottle of wine and share it with her while she appraised him through a short conversation. Once okayed, the gentlemen was allowed toeenter the parlor. After making his selection of a mate, the customer was not hurried off upstairs and quickly disposed of. He may enjoy a sumptuous dinner--some reports have it that the best food in New Orleans was to be found in the bawdyhouses--and most often he was entertained as well. The entertainment often consisted of troupes of actors that sauntered throughout the country, singers, musicians, and other performers.

Above the cost of the dinner and wine, the value of the rest of the evening was also taken into concern. Usually, rates went from five dollars to twenty dollars for one gratification, while if the client should decide to stay the night, he must spend from twenty to fifty dollars (these figures are estimates offered by various sources and are the average rates; some went as high as one hundred dollars for one consummation). In some places, the overnight fee included breakfast, freshly pressed clothes and polished shoes, and cab fare home. In modern day terms, it was a bargain.

Of course rates could vary in accordance to the merchandise to be acquired. For instance, many 'procuresses' dealt specifically with specialty orders, usually meaning virgins and other rarities. One such woman, Mary Thompson, had a very lucrative trade of young innocents. In one instance she sold a fifteen year old girl to an elderly gentleman for three hundred dollars, and the old geezer was more than happy to pay, for it took over a year to get his order filled. Another famous procuress was Emma Johnson who had "a girl for sale in May 1892 and offered the child at a bargain to a Mascot reporter who was investigating the activities of the procuresses. When he refused to buy, she cried: 'You're a fool! This girl's a virgin! You'll never get another chance like this in New Orleans!"[3]

One assignation house located at No. 45 Basin Street, under the direction of Josephine Killeen, offered the attraction of a mother/daughter team that went for fifty dollars a night. The police decided to act upon this situation thinking that it was pushing matters just a bit too far. But when they tried to apprehend the little girl--who was only ten years old--Josephine was outraged because she was under the firm conviction that the child was merely trying to help her mother make ends meet!

Occasionally, young boys could be found in some of the brothels, but this was the exception rather than the rule. The cost of such an arrangement was usually twenty-five dollars.

Some of the rougher institutions that flourished during the latter half of the Nineteenth century enjoyed "such appetizing titles as Pig Trough Carrie's, a twenty-five cent crib house, the Picayune Mouse (a picayune being worth about six cents back then), and McCarty's Ranch, these more democratic establishments made their profit on volume trade."[4]

Prostitution was by no means limited to the confines of a bordel. On the contrary, there were a large number of streetwalkers who contracted business (as well as disease) usually through the aid of a pimp, then affectionately referred to as a heart director. Particularly renowned for the number of streetwalkers that it 'housed' was Dauphine Street. Strewn along this passageway, scores of sidewalk prostitutes simply unrolled their portable bedding and conducted business in full view, day or night, for a dime. Also crib ladies could be found in various nooks and crannies in the area. These talented tarts turned their tricks in small closets, or cribs as they were called, and demanded fifteen cents for services rendered. Although seclusion appeared to be a fringe benefit for these seeking pleasure onDauphine Street, there did not appear to be any preferences toward privacy.

Another familiar sight peculiar to the Dauphine Street area was a man known only as Joe the Whipper. Apparently many of the streetwalkers and crib ladies demanded a little rough treatment occasionally, so Joe catered to the 'garden variety' crowd with his black bag containing a cat-o-nine tails, assorted whips, thin, flexible metal rods, and other devices. Although Joe the Whipper was the only character of this note cited in literature, it is beyond no stretch of the imagination to realize that he was not unique to his profession.

Violence seemed to be quite popular in this district as shown in the section referred to as Smoky Row. Here was to be found the likes of Fighting Mary, Kidney-Foot Jeeny, One-Eyed Sal, and Gallus Lou, all notorious for their unbelievable ability to fight. A gentleman, or more likely a derelict in this district, strolling about the street may suddenly find himself pulled off of his feet from an arm within a dark establishment. Once inside, he would be brutally beaten by all four of the girls who would then steal his money and fight among themselves. Sometimes, in order to coax a man inside, his hat would be snatched from atop his head. Upon raiding one of these places, the New Orleans police found many a blood-stained wallet and weapon, but no evidence of dead bodies could be found after digging up various courtyards. Apparently then, no one was ever killed in one of these institutions where the four girls hung out at whim.

Because of the Dauphine Street area and other minor districts like

it, the New Orleans Police Department called for a law which would make medical examination of suspected prostitutes mandatory. The 1891 law was short-lived however, because the scarlet ladies declared it an insult to Southern womanhood. This was not the only action taken by the local government in trying to curb prostitution. In 1857 things were getting so out of hand with the expansion of successful brothels that licensing was sought as a means of control, as well as a way to bring in some much needed tax revenue. Hence, the Common Council affirmed Ordinance No. 3267, which read in part that "It shall be unlawful for any woman or girl, notoriously abandoned to lewdness, to occupy any one story building, or the lower floor of any house within these limits in certain districts."[5] Fees were set at two hundred fifty dollars for the madame, and one hundred dollars for each individual prostitute. Further in the Ordinance it was declared that it shall be unlawful to coax business from windows or doors of a house as well as to "'sit upon the steps thereof in an indecent posture,' or to 'stroll about the streets of the city indecently attired.'"[6] The prostitutes brought their case to the courts however, and with the help of excellent lawyers, and probably political influences as well, got the Ordinance declared unconstitutional. Apparently the only law passed in New Orleans that enjoyed any enforcement was one passed in 1886 which succeeded in moving most of the crib ladies and streetwalkers from Dauphine Street to Franklin Street.

Although previous Ordinances had met with embarrassing results, Alderman Sidney Story was not content to sit back and allow prostitution to go on in an uncontrolled manner. Therefore, Story, a successful rice and tobacco broker and respectful citizen, drafted in January of 1897 what was to become the most eventful treatise on prostitution ever encountered in New Orleans history thus far. By July of 1897, Story's proposal was revamped and touched up enough with legal considerations, and became adopted as Ordinance No. 13,032 C.S. It read in part as follows:

> "BE IT ORDAINED, by the Common Council of the City of New Orleans, That Section 1, of Ordinance 13,032 C.S., be and the is hereby amended as follows: From and after the first of October, 1897, it shall be unlawful for any prostitute or woman notoriously abandoned to lewdness, to occupy, inhabit, live or sleep in any house, room, or closet, situated without the following limits, viz: From the South side of Customhouse Street to the North side of St. Louis Street, and from the lower wood side of North Basin Street to the lower or wood side of Robertson Street: 2nd:--And from the upper side of Perdido Street to the lower side of Gravier Street, and from the river side of Franklin Street to the lower or wood side of Locust Street,

> provided that nothing herein shall be so construed as to authorize any lewd woman to occupy any house, room, or closet in any portion of the city. It shall be unlawful to open, operate, or carry on any cabaret, concert-saloon or place where can can, clodoche or similar female dancing or sensational performances are shown, without the following limits, viz: From the lower side of N. Basin Street to the lower side of N. Robertson Street, and from the south side of Customhouse Street to the north side of St. Louis Street."

Story, though successful in confining prostitution to certain boundaries, was humiliated when the district of harlotry and vice became known as Storyville soon after the Ordinance went into effect.

It was not long before Storyville had earned the reputation of being the most renowned red-light district in the United States. This was largely due to publicity as found in the Mascot, the Sunday Sun, and the Blue Book.

The Mascot was started in 1882 and came out weekly, on Saturdays, and sold for a nickel. It was of the same content and form as the present day National Tattler and other weekly thrillers. The Mascot was usually from four to six pages in length, and contained a column called "Society" which printed different articles concerning personal details of various harlots throughout the Storyville area. The following come from different columns of "Society" in 1894 and 1895, and are indictative of the material printed in the section:

> "Madame Julia Dean has received a draft of recruits, and the fair Julia is bragging loudly of her importation. She seems to forget that the ladies played a star engagement here last winter at Mme. Haley's, and they all carry their diplomas with them.
>
> Several amateurs have been enjoying quite a good time of late in the residence at the rear of a grocery store on Derbigny Street."[8]

Compared to the blatant gossip incorporated by the Sunday Sun, the Mascot was almost as innocuous as a Watchtower. The Sun appeared on the streets of New Orleans in 1888 and centered only on scandals. Like the Mascot, the Sunday Sun was a weekly rag and likewise asked a nickel of the buyer. Though shorter than the Mascot (often four pages) the Sun grabbed its readers with violent headlines usually dealing with a murder, adultery, or other 'juicy' matters. An example of the Sun's attention rousing headlines is this:

"Wife of...Commits Herself in a Most Notorious, Lewd and Outrageous Manner.

COMMITS ADULTERY

With a Person Known as...Who Openly Boasts That She is His Woman."9

The part of the Sunday Sun that maintained it being sold however was to be found on the inside of the paper. This was the column titled "Scarlet World" and it gave accounts of the doings of prostitutes located in and around the area. The journalistic style and content of this column can best be appreciated through the following examples:

> "Nina Jackson, who keeps the swell mansion, 1559 Customhouse Street, and who is herself one of the jolliest girls in the bunch, has gotten rid of those two tid-bits, May and Mamie, and in their stead she has two of the finest and most charming ladies to be found anywhere. Queen Emmette, known as the Diamond tooth, is one of the girls, and Etta Ross is the other.
>
> Eunice Deering, who presides at the swell mansion, No. 341 Basin Avenue, corner Conti, has increased her staff and is ready for the Carnival business. In this mansion nothing but swell women are to be seen."10

The Blue Book was the most famous of all scarlet publications and came out in 1902. Aside from being informative, the Blue Book was the only red light publication to cater to the upper class as implied by the preface:

> This Directory and Guide of the Sporting District has been before the people on many occasions, and has proven its authority as to what is doing in the "Queer Zone." Anyone who knows to-day from yesterday will say that the Blue Book is the right book for the right people."11

Although originally intended for the wealthier class in the city, the Blue Book ultimately worked its way throughout New Orleans society. Blue Books could be obtained in saloons, hotels, railroad stations, and steamboat landings for a quarter (nowadays they can be purchased at the New Orleans Jazz Museum for a dollar--these are reprints of the original and hence are not too useful today). The Blue Book operated somewhat like a phone directory in that the names of the prostitutes were listed in alphabetical order, while some were listed by streets. The Blue Book was kept up to date by printings of Late

Arrivals, as well as a list of names that included girls working in bars and cabarets thought to be 99 44/100 impure. Though the cover of the book was blue, the print was red, and aside from being pleasant to the eye, it was informative as well. For instance:

> "Martha Clark, 227 North Basin. Her women are known for their cleverness and beauty. Also in being able to entertain the most fastidious of mankind."[12]

No matter what the publications stated however, none disputed the fact that Josie Arlington ran the finest place in town. Josie's residence was No. 225 North Basin Street was a five dollar a day confine--the rates had dropped tremendously from earlier in the Century--and only the finest of women and entertainment could be found at her place. There was a legend surrounding Josie even after she died. At night a red glow always shone from her tombstone and many thought it indicative of Josie's successful past. It came to be recognized, however, that the glow originated from the fire station located across from her burial site, and from that point on, legends were quelled.

With people such as Josie Arlington and with publications such as the Mascot, the Sunday Sun, and the Blue Book Storyville flourished. By setting aside a district for pleasures of the flesh, the New Orleans Common Council had confined prostitution into an area where it could be kept under order and everyone seemed to prosper. Regular medical attention was assured as was a certain amount of revenue to the city, mostly to the furniture stores. The area was well policed by its own bouncers, and it was seldom that the flare ups witnessed before 1897 occurred. "Storyville at its peak was forty blocks of action. The then Chief of Police, D.S. Gaster reported it had 230 sporting houses, 30 houses of assignation, and 2000 whores."[13] The difference between the sporting houses and the assignation houses was basically in quality, the assignation house being the better of the two.

Unfortunately, in 1917, Secretary of the Navy, Josephus Daniels closed down Storyville on the "pretext that the fine young men marching off to war singing Over There needed to be protected from the vile, vile world."[14]

Upon Storyville's closing, prostitution in New Orleans spread throughout the city and the quality of the girls went down as the disease rates sky rocketed. The Glamour Period of prostitution was finished in New Orleans, and for that matter, was slowing down across the Nation. Most sociologists of the time seem to think that vice was cracked down upon because of the general loosening of morals throughout the country concerning pre-marital sex. Countess Willie Piazza, a famed New Orleans madame seems to have summed up the situation perfectly when she exclaimed:

> "The country club girls are ruining my business!"[15]

FOOTNOTES

[1]Herbert Ashbury, The French Quarter, Ballantine Books; New York, 1936, p. 2.

[2]Robert Kinney, The Bachelor in New Orleans, Bob Riley Studios, New Orleans, La., 1942, p. 87.

[3]Ashbury, op. cit., p. 295.

[4]Kinney, op. cit., p. 90.

[5]Clint Bolton, Prostitution Then And Now, New Orleans Magazine, New Orleans, April 1973, p. 78.

[6]Ashbury, op. cit., p. 268.

[7]Bolton, op. cit., p. 97.

[8]Ashbury, op. cit., p. 328.

[9]Ibid.

[10]Ibid., p. 329.

[11]Herbert Ashbury; The French Quarter: An Informal History of the New Orleans Underworld, Capricorn Books, New York, 1968, p. 446.

[12]Ibid., p. 446.

[13]Bolton, op. cit., p. 100.

[14]Ibid., p. 103.

[15]Ashbury, The French Quarter; p. 338

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ashbury, Herbert. The French Quarter, Ballantine Books, New York, 1936.

Ashbury, Herbert. The French Quarter: An Informal History of the New Orleans Underworld,, Capricorn Books, New York, 1968.

Bolton, Clint. Prostitution Then and Now, New Orleans Magazine, New Orleans, La., April, 1973.

King, Grace. New Orleans, The Place and the People, MacMillan and Company, New York, 1895.

Kinney, Robert. The Bachelor in New Orleans, Bob Riley Studies, New Orleans, La., 1942.

Navard, Andrew J., Old Basin Street: An Informal Narrative of its Rise and Fall, New Orleans, 1944.

COMMUNICATION IN LEADERSHIP

Submitted by:

JOHN SHINNERS

I have chosen the term "leader" over that of "hero" or "great man" for several reasons. First, as Sidney Hook indicates in The Hero in History (Beacon: Boston) 1943, page 33, our interest in heroes rests in "the indispensibility of leadership in all social life." Secondly, in a democracy, the power of the people prevents an individual from assuming "heroic power" (Hook, page 229). He leads an assenting constituency. Finally, all six men in our test cases have been leaders of one form or another--some deserve the appelation "hero," others do not.

COMMUNICATION IN LEADERSHIP

In studying the great leaders of democracy in America there are many individual characteristics that may be regarded as necessary to heroic leadership. Such noble traits as perseverance, courage, and self-confidence might all be singled out as prerequisites for the successful leader.

However, added to these, the leader in a democracy requires a very special characteristic because of the composition of the milieu in which he functions. He must function through a critical constituency that--according to democratic ideals--ultimately serves as his power base. In other words, he is constantly dependent upon the people for his power.

Therefore, there is a unique relation between the leader and the people. Because it is a relationsip involving two parties (the leader and the people) there must exist a channel of communication between both parties. There are two elements in this communication chain.

On the one hand, there is a necessity for the leader to effectively communicate his ideas or goals to the people. The skill with which the leader conveys his ideas to the people--his ability to persuade--can often determine whether a leader will succeed or fail in gaining the support of the people. On the other hand, the people's esteem for any particular leader is not based solely on his own noble ideas. To a large degree the leader's success will depend on his empathy with the unexpressed mood of the populace. Charles W. Smith states:

> "In a democracy, the people are supreme in power but their opinions will be unorganized and ineffective for the accomplishment of their more or less hazy desires unless great leaders come forward to crystallize opinion around a program. Leaders give definiteness of direction to public opinion and help the people to get what they want, at the same time helping make clear what it is they want and how they can get it."[1]

Thus, the leader not only gives his own ideas but also concretizes the feelings of his supporters through his "facility in the dramatic expression of the sentiments of large groups of people."[2]

This paper, then, will examine the necessity of communication with public as an important characteristic of the leader.

I. SAM ADAMS:

Sam Adams immediately presents an anomaly to this study. He will be seen to differ somewhat from our other five leaders in both his reasons for communicating with the public and in his communicative style.

As indicated above, there are two important aspects to be considered in the communication between a leader and his followers. On the one hand, the leader must be able to persuade the people to his ideas. On the other hand, he must be astute enough to express the implicit sentiments of the crowd. Adams' motives for establishing communicative relations with his people will be seen to be substantially lacking this second quality of empathy simply because he was responsible for the people's sentiments and thus knew what they were.

Adams' primary purpose for communication was to incite the populace to his own ideas. His desire was for revolution and to achieve this end he was compelled to propagandize the people of Boston and later others into following his goal for colonial autonomy.

Of course Adams could not totally ignore the underlying sentiment of the people. For instance, when he was crowned the leader of the Revolution he hastily pointed out that he could "merely lead the way as the people follow, and we can go no further than we are backed up by them..."[3] But his compliance to the people was merely because of his reliance upon them for support. John C. Miller states: "Because Adams always strove to be the spokesman of the common man, he was forced to adjust himself to the slow pace at which public opinion moved."[4] Of course the important fact remains that Adams was in control of public opinion.

Sam Adams hardly needed empathy with the public sentiment--he himself was responsible for the people's revolutionary fervor. They were incited to revolution by the information that Adams constructed for them. Thus, Adams was in substantial control of the news which Americans were using to form their opinions. He merely had to play on the pro-revolutionary emotions of the people which he himself--by his vitriolic propaganda--had caused.

Adams also differs from our other leaders in the style of his communications. Surely he was adept at oratory--the most personal and probably most effective variety of communication--as Miller indicates by his conclusion that Adams "was more violent in speech than in print."[5] But Adams himself "distrusted his oratorical powers."[6]

Adams' specialty in communication was undoubtedly the printed media. Besides the attested effectiveness of his printed messages

in inciting revolution[7] they were also more easily accessible to large numbers of people. This printed propaganda could send out the call-to-arms to groups of non-Bostonians and also more rural areas.

Thus, Sam Adams' talent as a mass communicator was absolutely necessary to the success of the American Revolution. We can safely conclude that, for Adams, his leadership was directly related to his communicative skill.

II. ANDREW JACKSON

Like Sam Adams, Andrew Jackson also presents difficulties in an analysis of his leadership as manifested by his communicative ability. The most prominent deficiency of Jackson in this regard resides in his seeming lack of outstanding communicative power--clearly a deviation from the stated thesis.

Jackson seems to have possessed scant oratory ability. The longest speech of his political career was a mere fifteen minutes.[8] This could perhaps reasonably be attributed to his loss of teeth which impeded his articulation, but the problem is deeper. Jackson's biographer, Marquis James, writes that "A set of teeth made by a Nashville dentist removed Old Hickory's difficulty in speaking but not his aversion to public appearances."[9]

Furthermore, because "he had never studied the niceties of language"[10] as Taney reported, he was ill-equipped to prepare eloquent oratory even if he had not been hesitant to deliver it. Throughout his presidency he had always relied on the services of Eaton, Lewis, and Judge Overton[11] in preparing his messages to the public. And Schlesinger reports that Amos Kendall's "supreme skill in interpreting, verbalizing and documenting Jackson's intuitions made him indispensable."[12]

Similarly, there is no evidence of the effectiveness of Jackson's leadership as manifested through the printed media. Here too, his messages were prepared by his competent staff of ghost writers.

If Jackson had no special skill in communication, what then was his talent for conveying his leadership to the American people? It must certainly lie in that nebulous quality of empathy--his ability to comprehend the people's sentiments. However, Jackson did not express this comprehension of the public mood in words. Rather, he translated it directly into democratic action. Schlesinger detects this empathy of Jackson: "In the last analysis, there lay the secret of his strength: his deep natural understanding of the people...The people called him, and he came...to lead them out of captivity and bondage."[13]

Thus, Jackson appeared as the noble, yet laconic standard bearer of democracy. Perhaps the term charisma could--not unjustly--be applied to Jackson. People found him "certainly the most popular man we have ever known.... He has a kind expression for each--the same to all, no doubt, but each thinks it intended for himself."[14]

In conclusion we may assert that Jackson's talent in communication was based on his sympathetic ability to represent the people's mood through his democratic actions and examples.

III. ABRAHAM LINCOLN

Abraham Lincoln's communicative ability could certainly represent the epitome of this skill in a democracy. Not only did he superbly express his admirable democratic ideals to the American populace, but he also had a shrewd awareness of the feelings of these people during the tumultuous period of the Civil War.

One of the distinguishing marks of Lincoln was certainly his eloquent oratorical ability. This trait served him well in his role as a leader for it enabled him to personally communicate with his constituency.

It is almost fatuous to resort to proof of Lincoln's remarkable skill as an orator. His Gettysburg Address is alone evidence of this gift; let alone his two inaugural addresses. One of Lincoln's many biographers, Lord Charnwood, expresses the appeal to Lincoln's speeches:

> "It is not to be thought that he was ordinarily what could be called eloquent; some of his speeches are commonplace enough...But the greatest gift of the orator he did possess; the personality behind the words was felt."[15]

Lincoln's works of oratory never deprecated his audience. They may have occasionally lamented faults in man, but to alienate an audience by enunciating their evilness was hardly Lincoln's style. In a rare passage he described his approach to oratory:

> ".... assume to dictate to his judgment, or to command his action, or to mark him as one to be shunned and despised, and he will retreat within himself, close all avenues to his head and heart; and though your cause be naked truth itself, transformed

> to the heaviest lance, harder than steel, and sharper than steel can be made, and though you throw it with more than Herculean force and precision, you shall no more be able to pierce him, than to penetrate the hard shell of a tortoise with a rye straw.
>
> Such is man, and so much he be understood by those who would lead him, even to his own best interest."[16]

Lincoln not only expressed his ideals of democracy in speech but--because of his understanding of the people--he centered on issues which implicitly concerned them. Thus his "house divided" speech can be seen as an expression of the people's innate desire to resolve the tension between the North and South over slavery.

The New York Herald expounded Lincoln's keen ability to read the people's opinion: "Plain common sense, a kindly disposition, a straight forward purpose, and a shrewd perception of the ins and outs of poor, weak human nature, have enabled him to master difficulties which would have swamped any other man."[17]

Clearly, once again the ability to successfully communicate has proved an indispensable asset to the leader.

IV. HENRY FORD:

Henry Ford will seem tarnished next to the shining qualities of leadership witnessed in our three previous leaders. Indeed, he should seem so for, whereas the communicative ability of Adams, Jackson and Lincoln has been shown to be an inherent quality in them used for a common good, Ford's ability to communicate as a leader was not so much his own as it was contrived by his subordinates; and it was used, ultimately, for self-serving ends.

Ford's personal ability as a communicator to the public can be dismissed. In his first speech he confessed "I've never made a speech in my life and never expect to."[18] Indeed, his trial against the Chicago Tribune reveals him as a decided bumpkin. However, the ominous machinations of the Ford public relations department portrayed Ford in an entirely different image. It used a propaganda technique that would have humbled even Sam Adams. And--just as Adams--it was tremendously successful in portraying a a doctored image of Ford to America.

For instance, Keith Sward finds that Ford's everyday speech as opposed to the speeches released to the public written for him

by the Company "are as unlike as two different dialects."[19]

However, this rustic quality of Ford was quite common in America and thus his image as a simple, yet rich, man who remained simple could be appreciated by the people.

It would not be fitting to consider the dishonest propaganda of the Ford Service as part of Ford's communicative ability. After all, he had no hand in contriving it. Like Jackson, we must turn not to his public pronouncements but rather to his actions to see how Ford communicated with the public.

Even without the propaganda of his subordinates Ford came across as a simple, honest man in public. Once again we may use his demeanor in the Tribune trial as substantiation. And in public his actions were philanthropic. Thus, because he was like them in manner and did benevolent words Ford was seen as good in the public's eye. His private actions in which he revealed his ruthlessness belie this image, of course. Therefore, Ford's public image was a mendacious facade. It portrayed but one aspect of Ford's double nature. As Sward says, "he was the calculating businessman engaged in the pursuit of purely selfish ends, and he was social prophet and philanthropist."[20]

Here we must disgress back to Sam Adams. It might be objected: Did Adams not also lie to the people with propaganda in order to gain support for a personal project--the Revolution? How is he thus more noble than Ford? The resolution to this problem lies in the personal benefit accrued by each man. Adams gained a modicum of fame but really no substantial personal gain and yet he led America to its independence. Ford, however, benefited no one but himself and his Company by the inflated image he conveyed to America. One is to be praised; the other castigated.

V. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT:

Once again with Franklin Roosevelt we encounter a leader who used his skilled communicative ability as a vital aspect of his leadership. Here too we must acknowledge the advent of radio. For the first time a leader could personally* reach a national audience. Roosevelt's "fireside chats" represent a watershed in the development of the leader's communication to the public.

Charles W. Smith, a contemporary of Roosevelt, described his great oratorical ability:

> "President Franklin D. Roosevelt is another leader whose power is to a considerable extent due to his oratory. He has the ability to present an issue in

*Ford had access to the radio but it was used for him, not by him.

> its simplest terms, and to carry his audience with him against the opposition.... Over the radio he talks quietly and in a conversational tone that carries an impression of reasonableness. His listeners feel that he is right, that he is fighting their battles, and they give him their support."[21]

Again, we see manifested the two necessary points for a leader's effective communication: the expression of his goals and ideas and the discernment of the feelings of the people.

The effectiveness of Roosevelt's communication is seen in his fireside chats. Soon after his first inauguration Roosevelt talked to the nation in his first fireside chat. Tugwell reports its success: "The first battle with fear was won with talk. The firesidechat was so simple, so lucid, so matter-of-fact that there was an unmistakable response to its appeal for confidence."[22]

Because he seemed to know how to solve their problems and assuage their fears the American public genuinely accepted Roosevelt. Tugwell finds one indicator of Roosevelt's successful communication to the people to be an increase of mail to the White House.[23]

Like Lincoln, Roosevelt's oratorical gifts (though greatly enhanced by ghost writers) persuaded the people that they could trust him and that he would work for them. And like Lincoln, he did not disappoint them.

VI. MARTIN LUTHER KING

Finally, we must examine the communicative skill of Martin Luther King. Along with Lincoln and Roosevelt, his oratory will be seen to be a great source of strength to his leadership.

Certainly his background as a Baptist preacher is reflected in his rhetoric. His speeches to his followers were an odd mixture of many sources: Scripture, patriotic songs, colloquialisms. The renowned "I have a Dream" speech is a good example of this odd eclecticism.

One cannot contribute the great eloquence and style to King's oratory that one might to Lincoln or Roosevelt. But surely his speeches were just as motivating. He brought to the surface the deep feelings that had burned in the black man for decades. As his biographer David Lewis notes, "He was the echo chamber of the racially oppressed but an echo chamber whose reverberations were sounder,

more intelligible, and much more polite than the raw cries that it transformed."[24]

Again we see the two-fold nature of the communications of a leader to his people in King's oratory. He consistently expressed his own admirable goal of non-violence while articulating the endless misfortune and hopelessness which had been frustratingly repressed by the black man. He captured the American black's desire to overcome his oppressed state and offered a peaceful and legitimate mean by which to do it. And continually--true to his Christianity--he wove the message of love throughout his talk. Probably more than any other leader in this study Martin Luther King unleashed and articulated the feelings of his people.

His orated guidance was the catalyst for a significant movement in America's history. It is hard to see how civil rights could have progressed as it has without the presence of a leader who was skilled in communication.

CONCLUSIONS:

We have examined six great men who can all be considered leaders of some type. Three led a country, one led a group of rebels, one was the leader of the long oppressed and one was a leader of industry. All have incommon the political system in which they worked. The democratic surroundings offered each man both unique opportunities and unique restrictions.

Their common opportunity was to freely influence broad groups of people with their ideas and lead them. All but one spoke a message of freedom.

Their common restriction was those whom they sought to influence. In a democracy a leader may assume only the power granted to him by the people. Any power he seizes beyond this popular mandate is taken at the risk of the withdrawal of that mandate. Thus, ideally, democracies can protect themselves from the tyrant.

This paper has attempted to prove that any leader must establish a channel of communication with the people around him in order to effectively lead. The evidence seems to support this thesis, but with an unforeseen twist. The thrust of the argumentation has been on direct, personal, verbal communication. As indicated, however, neither Jackson, Ford, nor--to a lesser extent--Adams relied on direct verbal contact with their followers. Therefore, this communication can be much more general in its form than originally theorized. The concrete actions of a leader can appease a public and at the same time completely bypass the verbal stage.

Of course, it is important to interject here that all symbolic

communication of the leader must be at least partially concretized in order for the leader to retain his support. Sidney Hook elaborates on this point: "whether or not the [leader] proves himself by works is a minor matter at first. To adapt a remark of Santayana: for those who believe, the substance of things hoped for becomes the evidence of things not seen."[25] Hook maintains that the leader cannot always fail to actualize his promises without losing support, but initially the belief in the leader's sincerity will satisfy the public.

But even though both forms of communication (verbal and visible actions) in the end produce the same result of fulfilling the people's needs, the berbal form of communication seems to add a fuller dimension to the leader. Instead of a rather abstracted figure who is symbolic of a lofty goal (Jackson the symbol of democracy or Ford the epitome of the simple, honest man) the leader who openly speaks to the public becomes very personal. He becomes a great man who--rather than being somewhat mysterious and unapproachable through his reticence--is born from the people and works for the people.

FOOTNOTES

[1]Charles W. Smith, Jr., Public Opinion in a Democracy (Prentice-Hall: New York), 1942. pp. 191-192.

[2]Ibid., p. 198.

[3]John C. Miller, Sam Adams: Pioneer in Propaganda (Stanford), 1964, p. 126.

[4]Ibid., p. 228.

[5]Ibid., p. 110.

[6]Ibid., p. 190.

[7]Ibid., p. 138.

[8]Marquis James, The Life of Andrew Jackson (Bobbs-Merrill: New York), 1938, p. 451.

[9]Ibid., p. 456.

[10]Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., The Age of Jackson (Little Brown: Boston), 1945, p. 41.

[11]Ibid., p. 59.

[12]Ibid., p. 70.

[13]Ibid., p. 43.

[14]Ibid., p. 99.

[15]Robert T. Oliver, History of Public Speaking in America, (Allyn & Bacon: Boston), 1965. pp. 299-300.

[16]Ibid., p. 301.

[17]Benjamin P. Thomas, Abraham Lincoln (Modern Library: New York), 1968, p. 497.

[18]Keith Sward, The Legend of Henry Ford (Atheneum: New York), 1968, p. 87.

[19]Ibid., p. 105.

[20]Ibid., p. 62.

[21]Smith, op. cit., p. 200.

[22]Rexford G. Tugwell, The Democratic Roosevelt (Penguin: Baltimore), 1957, p. 273.

[23]Ibid., p. 351.

[24]David L. Lewis, King A Critical Biography (Penguin: Baltimore), 1970, p. 394.

[25]Sidney Hook, The Hero in History (Beacon: Boston), 1943, p. 21.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Hook, Sidney, The Hero in History (Beacon: Boston), 1943.

James, Marquis, The Life of Andrew Jackson (Bobbs-Merrill: New York), 1938.

Lewis, David L., King A Critical Biography (Penguin: Baltimore) 1970.

Miller, John C., Sam Adams: Pioneer in Propaganda (Stanford University Press: Stanford) 1964.

Oliver, Robert T. History of Public Speaking in America (Allyn & Bacon: Boston), 1965.

Schlesinger, Arthur M., The Age of Jackson (Little Brown: Boston), 1945.

Smith, Charles W. Jr. Public Opinion in a Democracy (Prentice-Hall: New York) 1942.

Sward, Keith, The Legend of Henry Ford (Atheneum: New York), 1968.

Thomas, Benjamin P., Abraham Lincoln (Modern Library: New York), 1968.

Tugwell, Rexford G., The Democratic Roosevelt (Penguin: Baltimore), 1957.

HISTORIANS ON LUTHER

A Study in Historiography

Submitted by:

RUDOLPH R. RAMELLI

The life of a man is many things to many people, and the life of Martin Luther is no exception. When he walked those steps from the Augustinian Monastery across town to the Castle Church, and tacked his ninety-five theses to the door, little did he know of the complexity and controversy that his life, his works, and his character would present to future historians. Martin Luther was born in Eisleben in 1483 of German parents. After receiving his Master of Arts degree, he entered the monastery in 1505 after a brief stay in law school. By 1507 he was ordained as a priest, and continued studying scripture and theology. Luther was troubled over the question of salvation; he wanted assurance that he was saved. Usually, monastery life in the 16th century provided this sense of security, but for Martin anxiety only mounted. The preaching of indulgences particularly aggravated Luther and, in October of 1517, he posted his ninety-five theses against this preaching of indulgences.

From this point on, things moved rapidly. Luther began debating his position with noted theologians and all the time hardening his position. By 1521, he was excommunicated from the Catholic Church, and was on his way to found a new Christian religion. This new religion became the Lutheran Church, which is still much alive today. It differs from the Catholic Church not only in structure, but also in doctrine. This church stands as a living testimony of Luther's work and life.

A study of the life of Luther would, indeed, prove to be a fascinating project, but the purpose here is not Luther's life, but the way historians have treated Luther as a historical figure. Historians rarely agree conclusively on any historical figure or event. This is even more so with Martin Luther. He is more than just a figure in national politics, or a social reformer with the dreams of human bliss. He is a religious innovator, and religion seems to cut deeper into the human fabric than anything else. Luther has added a new dimension to historical controversy. Now historians can line up on more than just political or national sides. They can take up the cross of their religion, and write history with one eye on the past and the other on the teachings and doctrines of their church. Surely, not all historians write with the preoccupation of their religion, but Luther has added this religious perspective to historical thought.

In analyzing various historians' attitudes or treatment of Luther, emphasis will be placed on Luther's personality, character, and contribution to subsequent historical developments. Each historian to be analyzed deals with one of these three aspects of Luther. Some arrive at similar conclusions, but use different methods. Others use the same methods, but in their conclusions they strongly disagree. And, of course, there are still others who arrive at no conclusion, or conclusions which are unique in themselves.

Besides merely stating conclusions of the historians, methods will be considered. Some historians base their conclusions on an analysis of primary sources, such as letters, manuscripts, and various records. A number of other historians use the writings of others in addition to primary material. A more recent development has been the use of psychoanalysis, which is used by historians of all opinions. To say that a historian uses one method or another is not to say that he uses it to the exclusion of all others. Certain historians do, however, approach Luther from different ways. The archivist will take the primary sources as the ultimate of historical truth, while the psychoanalysist will take primary information and interpret it from a psychological point of view. All these different techniques add to the historical perspective of Luther, and prove to be a rich field for historiographical research.

Historians, for the most part (especially in the case of Luther) write history with various interpretations or reasons in mind. A work on Luther may be designed to praise him, or to condemn him; to praise his religion or to condemn it; to show Luther as a great catalyst in history, or to show him as a vehicle of the times. All these reasons, and many others, are captured by the historian, and presented through his works. To understand and discover these reasons is one of the duties of historiography.

To understand why a historian writes the way he does, his background must surely be considered. The historian does not write in a vacuum. He is influenced by his religion, his nationality, and his place in time. These things are essential if the historian is to be understood and appreciated. To ignore this would leave a gap in historical understanding.

As previously stated, the purpose here is to understand the how and why of historical research. The character, personality, and contribution of Martin Luther will be the common ground for consideration. This will serve as a basis around which the writings of various historians will be analyzed. Their methods, their backgrounds, their reasons, and their conclusions will be demonstrated. It is not specifically Martin Luther which is of interest, but the treatment of Martin Luther by the historian.

The first historian to be considered is Bartholomew Sastrow.

Sastrow was a German who lived from 1520 till 1603. He is the closest in time to Luther of any historian that will be studied, and it is this closeness that makes him interesting. The 16th century was a time of polemics, and Sastrow was well apart of this trend. In his memoirs, he paints a very provocative picture of Luther on the day of Luther's death:

> "One day, while at meat, my master announced the happy tidings of the death of Dr. Luther; the heresiarch had met with the end he deserved; a legion of devils had swooped down upon him, and a horrible din had put all those around him to flight. Luther himself had bellowed like a bull, and at the last moment he had uttered a terrible yell; his spirit went on haunting the house...that limb of Satan, doomed, like all other demons, to everlasting fire."[1]

Sastrow relates his reactions to the announcement of Luther's death by calling him a devil and a heresiarch. These seem to be emotional and vehement statements, but the 16th century is noted for that. Sastrow lived through the religious struggles of the Reformation, and undoubtedly heard older people talk of Luther's early exploits. This had an effect on his recording of the event. The immediateness of the circumstances and the polemical nature of the age are the reasons for the use of such terms as demon and limb of Satan. Other writers will have the same opinion as Sastrow, but they will not express it in the same manner. Sastrow is close to the event. His everyday life is affected by the actual conflicts of the Reformation. He writes with an emotional attachment. It is this last consideration that future historians will lack, and that influenced Sastrow to write in the manner in which he has done.

Leopold Von Ranke did not have the same historical perspective as did Sastrow. By the time he was born in 1795, the Lutheran Church had been firmly established in Germany. Ranke himself was a descendent of Lutheran Pastors.[2] He did not have the advantage of living through the conflicts of the Reformation, or talking to those who had. The picture that Ranke developed was based on archival sources.

Ranke put much stock in primary sources. For him there was only one way to write history, and that was to write it how it actually occurred. There was only one truth about any event, and that truth was to be found in primary information:

> "And thus I proceed boldly to the completion of this work; persuaded that when an inquirer has made researches of some extent in authentic records, with an earnest spirit and a genuine ardour for truth, though later discoveries may throw clearer and more certain

> light on details, they can only strengthen his fundamental conceptions of the subject: --for truth can be but one."[3]

There is no room in history for interpretation, Ranke believes. History should present the facts, and this is what he attempts to do in his History of the Reformation in Germany. Luther is presented, for the most part, not as a personality, but as a figure in German history. Whenever Luther is mentioned, he is presented as a listing of facts:

> "Luther relates that his mother once scourged him till blood came, on account of one miserable nut; that his father had punished him so severely that it was with great difficulty that he could get over the child's terror and alienation."[4]

This passage is not written with the same emotion and fervour as Sastrow's. It is written with the calmness and factual detachment that Ranke has obtained from his massive research.

Ranke, however, for all his efforts, had not fully been able to forget his religious heritage. This is not to discount what has been said above. It cannot be doubted that Ranke attempted to present Luther as objective as possible. He wanted to show Luther as a force in history, helping to drive the German nation forward in the movement of time.[5] But, in presenting this picture of Luther, Ranke occasionally slips into the outer edges of personal opinion:

> "A determined will has always the power of carrying others along with it. How resistless must it then be in one so filled with the Spirit of God?"[6]

These personal opinions are more of an exception, rather than the rule. Ranke wrote with the assurance that his archival research gave him, and he made no definite attempt to analyze Luther as a personality. His main concern was the presentation of the truth as revealed to him through his studies. For Ranke, Martin Luther was little more than a factor in the evolution of German history.

The Dominican Heinrick Seuse Denifle, O.P., gathered, like Ranke, most of his information from primary sources, but here the likeness to Ranke ends. Born in Austria in 1844 and living until 1905,[7] Denifle deals with Luther more in the polemic tradition of Sastrow, rather than in the detached scientific tradition of Ranke. Even though he uses the same historical research method as Ranke, he arrives at different conclusions for different reasons.

Denfile deals with Luther as a personality. He uses primary sources to substantiate the claims he makes, which for the most part are detrimental.

Luther is seen as a liar who distorts the truth:

> "It is a distortion of the truth. He employs it to attain his own end... The knave knew well that, if he stuck to the truth, the propositions of Catholic doctrine and the monastic constitutions, he would have played a losing game."[8]

Besides this view of Luther as a liar, Denifle sees other faults in him, such as his drunkenness:

> "There was still a further nutrient of carnal lust in Luther, and in by far the greater part of his younger adherents, and that was drunkenness, intemperance."[9]

and his sexual desire:

> "Everything tends towards the satisfying of the sexual instinct, just as eating and drinking tend to satisfy hunger and thirst. This is openly declared by Luther."[10]

Denifle deals with Luther in this manner for a specific purpose: to discredit him and his religion. Only the negative aspects of Luther's personality are presented in his work. In the tradition of 16th century polemics, Denifle again gives rise to the question of the good or bad of Luther. Luther is not considered as simply a historical figure in the movement of German history, but as a person with faults and fallings. Historical research becomes, in Denifle, not the tool for finding the truth, but the proof needed to demonstrate a conviction.

This negative treatment of Luther by Denifle can be traced to factors in his life. He was, as mentioned, born in Austria, which has traditionally been predominantly Catholic. This strong Catholic tradition may have unduly prejudiced him to Luther. Also, his religious order, the Dominicans, may have had an influence on his writings. When Luther lashed out against the preaching of indulgences, his attack was focused mainly on the Dominicans. This assault may not have been forgotten, and was possibly transmitted to Denifle during his religious training. It is within this tradition that Denifle was writing, and it is out of this that Luther is presented as faltering and adulterated.

Hartman Grisar wrote out of a similar tradition as that of Denifle. Born in Austria in 1845, and living till 1932, Grisar received his doctorate in theology and then later taught Church History at the University of Innsburck. His major works on Luther are Luther (1911-12) and Martin Luther: His Life and Works (1926).[11]

Grisar's approach to Luther is different from any seen so far. He attempts to present a psychological as well as historical picture of Luther:

> "The author's purpose in the present work has been to give an exact historical and psychological picture of Luther's personality, which still remains an enigma from so many points of view."[12]

In Grisar's works, historical facts take on new meanings. They are presented not only to find the truth or to win an argument, but also as a way of understanding the psychological make-up of Luther. Certain events and happenings in Luther's life had effects on him that influenced his psychological make-up:

> "What we do find is that the one-sidedness of this school, with its tendency to hair-splitting, had a negative effect upon him."[13]

> "This in connection with other bodily infirmities, an intolerable psychological condition developed, namely, a tormenting sense of fear which restlessly sought and found an object in the unrest of his conscience.... The first of the abnormal traits of Luther's psychology was his fear of the devil--Luther magnified and coarsened the maniacal ideas which his parental home and the tendency of his age implanted in his mind."[14]

These instances and many others are analyzed by Grisar and presented in his works.

Grisar, however, immediately recognizes that history cannot be written without some interpretation:

> "...the Catholic too must be free to express his opinion from the point of view of his own principles as soon as the facts have been established. The unreasonableness and impossibility of writing history from which personal convictions are entirely absent has been recognized by all competent authorities."[15]

In keeping with his tradition, Grisar points out many of the bad elements of Luther's character.[16] But, he is not entirely condemning.

He does on occasion give Luther credit when it is due him.[17]

The main concern in Grisar, however, is Luther's breaking away from the Catholic Church. Grisar's psychological research becomes what Denifle's archival research became: a method to show that Luther was wrong and that his church should not exist. Grisar, however, is not the harsh, polemical historian that Denifle was. He looks upon Luther's deeds in a severe, yet melancholy manner:

> "If a Catholic opponent of Luther, familiar with his life and death, a man noble-minded and sympathetic of heart, had entered that room in the morning after the reformer's death, what would have been his thoughts? Above all else he would have implored God to be merciful to the souls of the departed man, thus complying with the teaching of Him who commands men to love even their worst enemies. Then, there would have flashed before his mind's eye the monstrous and embittered attacks launched by Luther upon that sacred institution, the indestructible Church established by Jesus Christ at the price of His blood and founded upon Peter and his successors. In spirit, he would have beheld the deep wounds inflicted upon that Church by this man, so remarkably endowed with eloquence, will-power, and energy. How many thousands of souls redeemed by Christ, he would have said to himself, have been torn from the Saviour's living body by this man, without any fault of their own, and frequently without their knowledge, bequeathing their misfortune to posterity. But yielding to mercy, he would also have recalled the fateful enthusiasm of the dead reformer for his own cause, and that profound and serious self-delusion which domineered his ardent temperament with ever increasing force since the inception of his contest with Rome. Did not Luther, thus the spectator might have soliloquized, eventually find himself in a state of true mental obsession, though, of course, of his own volition and which, at least in its inception, had been caused by himself? Was it an obsession which allowed him to see naught else but his supposed vocation as the promulgator of a new and true Gospel, directed against Antichrist and the demoniac forces, just as he imagined the imminent dissolution of the world and the advent of the Great Judge? Did this delusion, in the evening of his life, incapacitate

him for receiving even one ray of light?

> "If our hypothetical friend, thus absorbed in reflection at the bier of Luther, had been granted an insight into the mental evolution of the deceased, i.e., into his psychological condition since he left the parental roof, his frightening experiences at entering the monastery, as well as his state of despondency and the constant struggles caused by his disease, he would have felt all the more inclined to pronounce a charitable judgment on the dead reformer. Was Luther a great man? he might have asked himself, as he left the chamber of death impressed by these reflections. There could be no other answer than this: If he is to be called great, his greatness is negative. As our observer later in life recalled the stirring scene in Luther's death chamber, he might have entertained the hope that the misguided reformer would be saved. Janssen, the great Catholic historian who penetrated so deeply into the inwardness of the Reformation period, used to recommend to converts who sought his guidance to pray for the repose of Luther's soul. God alone searches the hearts and reins of men. Human understanding is too limited."[18]

Heinrich Boehmer comes from a different background than Denifle or Grisar. Like Ranke, he was born in Germany and a Protestant, in 1869. He, too, concerns himself with Luther's psyche,[19] but his purpose is different from that of Grisar's. Boehmen attempts to show Luther from the Protestant tradition, to explain his psychological make-up with an eye to defending Luther from the attacks of Denifle and Grisar. Luther's school days are seen as the reason for his attack on papal education,[20] and his monastery training as leading him to his intense scrupulosity.[21] Luther is not seen as abnormal, and the cause for his inner distress is presented as a product of his virtue and honesty, not as the possession of the devil:

> "In the final analysis, the real cause of Luther's inner distress was, first, the conviction that God requires absolute purity and total surrender; and, second, the inexorable rigor and honesty with which he judged his own heart."[22]

Boehmer sees Luther as a product of his environment and heredity. Out of this combination, a man emerges that has contributed much to Christianity and human life. The Protestant tradition of Boehmer comes through his work. The psychological analysis of Grisar is turned completely around and used to present Luther as a genius who is sure of his calling and who, through his works, has accomplished "miracles":

> "To retain his own metaphor, Luther could not give birth until he had conceived, that is, until he had become certain of his God. But when this had occurred, he became, more than any other man of German blood, the exemplification of the truth of the saying: 'Where genius and faith meet, miracles occur'."[23]

Robert Herndon Fife first heard of Luther from his Virginia parents whose religious traditions extend from Scotland. Born in 1871, Fife attempts to present in his work a balanced picture of Luther. In doing this, he presents primary material coupled with a presentation of critics and apologist:

> "His aim has been a careful reexamination of the sources and the opinions of competent critics, hostile or apologetic, in order to unfold before the reader more at home in English than in German the development of Luther from a viewpoint as free as possible of conscious confessional bias."[24]

Fife intends to present primary sources in his picture of Luther, but, unlike Ranke, he does not believe that these records are a conclusive unfolding of the truth:

> "The writer has not intended thereby to approximate Ranke's famous 'How the things actually occurred'. The combination of circumstance and individual genius which formed a man like the mature Luther does not yield all its secrets to so simple a formula, any more than to other ingenious patterns which the philosopher of history might deduce from the course of human events. Stimulating as such theories are to the insight and the imagination, they must always be tempered by the awareness that no portrayal of a great figure or an outstanding period can be definitive. Without eschewing necessary selection in the weighing of fact and theory, therefore, the writer has preferred to present in ample detail the background, actions, events, and traits of character as they appear in the sources in order to let the figure of Luther emerge, as it inevitably does from his writings, lectures, and letters, with the forcefulness, the weakness and strength, the contradictoriness --in short, with the mysterious alchemy of personality that will never cease to tantalize

and attract the scholar and student."[25]

Each student of Luther is to draw his own conclusions from the Luther that emerges from primary sources. The sources do not give a definite picture; they are merely a vehicle which historians use to paint their own pictures.

Fife attempts to analyze Luther through his writings. He sees Luther unfolding himself through the written word:

> "The Fourteen Consolers is a truly remarkable expression of Luther's complex personality."[26]
>
> "His bitterness toward Aristotle and Thomas and Scotus and other authorities of the scholastic theology in which he had been trained burns in his letters and writings with the naive fury of a combatant who looks into the eyes of a tricky and hated enemy."[27]

He does not use the psychological analysis of Grisar or Boehmer. He looks at the facts as instruments of interpretation, not as tools of psychological research. The writings of Luther are to be presented in order for the historian to see all sides of the man. Only by seeing the various shades of the man can a true understanding be found. To present primary material as truth in itself is not the way of Fife. He wants the facts presented not as the ultimate of truth and the only truth, but as material for understanding. Out of this material will emerge an understanding of the complexity of Luther. Fife gives the pros and cons of Luther, both in primary material and in historical writings, and out of this he tries to give an impartial picture of the man. His work ends there, and he leaves the judging of Luther to others.

Father Joseph Lortz, a German born in 1887, deals with Luther in a different way. He is not basically concerned with Luther as a personality to be understood or analyzed,[28] but as the originator of a new religious doctrine. In presenting his case, Lortz sees Luther's emotions and scrupulosity as affecting him, but he does not use Grisar's or Boehmer's psychological treatment. He sees Luther as a figure in time whose actions arose out of the time-conditioned elements of his age:

> "Yet it can be demonstrated that the beginning of this process is indeed related to just such time-conditioned theological elements so much and so profoundly so that without these elements it could not have taken place at all. Imagine Luther outside the monastery, Luther without theology, Luther filled with the theology of Thomas or the Roman missal instead

> of Ockhamist theology, and his reformist action simply could not have happened."[29]

> "Again it is illuminating to observe to what an extent minds were prepared in principle for revolt against Rome and the priest. When Luther came, he appeared to thousands and tens of thousands as the personification of old, long-overdue demands, demands long increasingly justified."[30]

Lortz is interested in the chain of events that made Luther a reformer,[31] not the events that shaped his psychological make-up.

Besides being interested in the events that led to Luther's revolt, Lortz also deals with Luther as a religious innovator. He attempts to show that Luther in his religious zeal misunderstood the teachings of the Catholic Church, and established a new church which was not needed or necessary. It cannot be denied, Lortz says, that Luther was a religious man,[32] but Luther, in his interpretations of the Bible and Catholic doctrine, let his personal likes and dislikes color his thinking. Lortz sees this misunderstanding as the problem of the Reformation, and one that should be corrected. He sees no need for a split in Christianity, and that it is the duty of all Christians to pray for reconciliation:

> "If Luther left the Church because he misunderstood the true Catholic doctrine, and if he gave his followers an essentially false picture of what Catholic doctrine was, then first of all, we must deny that he had any real justification by leaving the Church, and secondly, the false picture must be replaced by a true one. Thus it means that it was wrong for Catholics and Protestants to divide, to separate, in the first place. At the same time our true positions are seen to be incomparably closer to one another than we had suspected.... If we take these conclusions seriously we ask the question: If the Reformation came about because of misunderstanding and false pre-suppositions, can we in conscience permit the separation to continue? I feel that this question is more immediate and demanding now than previously. If we truly deserve the name of Christians, there is no time for hesitation or delay. As Christians, all of us have a serious obligation to consider anew the task of the Reformation.... It is precisely in our own day that the real meaning of the Reformation is becoming understood more clearly once again. What can we do in the face of the massive threat that we see before us, the mysterium iniquitatis, which causes love and faith to grow cold and makes men deaf to the message of the one Church? We can do nothing better than invoke the

aid of God himself by prayer.

> "What I have said before, I must repear: this prayer of union in faith is not something that we may make or omit as we please; it is our duty. We must make a firm resolution to do everything in our power to spread an understanding of this fact among those with whom we come into contact."[33]

Lortz's purpose in dealing with Luther and the Reformation was to show that Christianity should be one. He shows Luther's actions as being a product of circumstances, emotions and personal preferences. He criticizes Luther's interpretation of doctrine, but he does not do it for polemical reasons as Denifle does. Lortz is concerned over Christianity, and is not interested in defaming Luther's personality. His Catholic background at points does arise, but he does not let his work fall to a mere condemnation of Luther's Church. He wants a joining of Christiandom, not a further split.

Roland Bainton, born in 1894, paints a picture of Luther similar to the one that Boehmer presents, but he does this by a different method. Bainton's purpose in studying Luther is to understand the man and his contributions.[34] He does this by considering primary sources as a reservoir of information, but not information to be used primarily for psychological analysis.

Bainton sees Luther as contributing much to the keeping of Christian civilization:

> "If there is any sense remaining of Christian civilization in the West, this man Luther in no small measure deserves the credit."[35]

He disagrees with Denifle about Luther's drunkenness, and sees his coarse language as of little importance:

> "Luther delighted less in muck than many of the literary men of his age; but if he did indulge, he excelled in this as in every other area of speech. The volume of coarseness, however, in his total output is slight.... But Luther is not recorded ever to have exceeded a state of hilarity."[36]

He agrees with Lortz in that Luther was a religious man, and compares him to Shakespeare in his literary works.[37]

Bainton generally paints a favorable picture of Martin Luther. He sees Luther as contributing to many phases of German life, and

influencing the shaping of the country.[38] He is not primarily concerned with personality as was Sastrow, Grisar and Denifle, however, as shown, when personality is under consideration, his remarks are usually positive. Bainton's main concern, for the most part, is similar to that of Ranke's. He wants to see Luther in the history of Germany, not taken out and analyzed separately. Luther is a contributor to German culture, and it is in this light that Bainton treats him.

Richard Friedenthal, born 1896, gives a rather balanced picture of Luther. He shows Luther's good points:

> "Nor was he afraid for his own skin. Lack of courage can hardly be counted among his failings."[39]

> "Like all men of strong character and creative genius, Luther was subject to frequent attacks of severe depression, but he admitted this much more frankly and emphatically than other people"[40]

Luther's bad points:

> "Even among Luther's friends there were always some who were embarrassed by the coarseness and bluntness of his language."[41]

And, he also gives a picture of Luther's physical condition:

> "Very different temptations plagued him when he had eaten too much or drunk too quickly, as he often did in following the extremely unwholesome diet with which he tried to ward off his attacks of depression. While the severe mental disturbances from which he suffered are not to be explained entirely in this way, there is not doubt that his highly irregular way of life was an important contributory factor. Moreover, he slept badly on a wretched bed which no one kept in order for him. And on top of it all he worked tirelessly and heedless of his body, letting up only when his kidneys, or the gall-stones from which he suffered early in life, made a break imperative."[42]

Friedenthal is not pronounced in any area. He is neither overly praising nor overly condemning. In his treatment of Luther he is similar to Fife, but a little more prone to personal observation. Friedenthal presents a neutral view. One that is void of the controversial judgment of Denifle and the "strict scientific" approach of Ranke.

Erik Hamburger Erikson marks a return to the psychoanalytical study of history. Like Grisar and Boehmer, Erikson uses primary material as a basis of psychological study; but, unlike them, he is not interested in proving whether Luther was great or not. He is interested in the process of Luther's development such that it can be studied by the psychoanalyst. The process he attempts to study is this:

> "We will therefore concentrate on this process: how young Martin, at the end of a somber and harsh childhood, was precipitated into a severe identity crisis for which he sought delay and cure in the silence of the monastery; how, being silent, he became possessed; how, being possessed, he gradually learned to speak a new language: his language; how, being able to speak, he not only talked himself out of the monastery, and much of his country out of the Roman Church, but also formulated for himself and for all of mankind a new kind of ethical and psychological awareness: and how, at the end, this awareness, too, was marred by a return of the demons, whoever they may be."[43]

Erikson is a psychoanalyst and professor at Harvard University. Consequently, he is not interested in the validity of religious dogmas as was Denifle and Lortz. His only concern with religion is how it affected Luther:

> "In depicting the identity struggle of a young, great man, I am not concerned with the validity of the dogmas which laid claim to him, or of the philosophies which influenced his systematic thought, as I am with the spiritual and intellectual milieu which the isms of his time--and these isms had to be religious--offered to his passionate search."[44]

Erickson deals with Luther's identity crisis, that point in a young man's life where he is unsure of himself and searching. The event that Erikson centers much of his studies on is Luther's fit in the choir loft during his middle twenties. This event that Erikson cites has caused much controversy among historians as to its validity. Erikson, however, is not concerned with this. He is readily willing to accept the event as half-legend, and proceed from there:

> "The fit in the choir could well have happened in the specific form reported, under the specific conditions of Martin's monastery years. If some of it is legend, so be it; the

> making of legend is as much part of the scholarly re-writing of history as it is part of the original facts used in the work of scholars. We are thus obliged to accept half-legend as half-history, provided only that a reported episode does not contradict other well-established facts; persists in having a ring of truth; and yields a meaning consistent with psychological theory."[45]

This treatment of half history is very upsetting to Bainton,[46] and is not within the fact-as-truth tradition of Ranke. Erikson is more interested in psychoanalysis than in recording accurate history. He is not engaged in any religious argument over the validity of competing religious dogmas, nor is he engaged in any polemical presentation of Luther's personality. Erik Erikson is a psychoanalyst and it is in this way that he treats Martin Luther.

Each of the historians presented above has his own particular treatment of Luther that sets him apart from his fellow historians, but this individualized treatment does not prevent a comprehensive overview of their similarities and differences. The historians can be grouped into certain categories or schools. The main schools that have developed in the historiography of Martin Luther are obviously those who are pro-Luther, anti-Luther, and neutral towards him. Of the historians presented here, those who appear to be pro-Luther are Boehmer, Bainton and Ranke. By classifying these three men together as pro-Luther historians, there is no attempt to say that their treatment of Luther was identical. Only the final result is the same. Boehmer deals with Luther from a psychological analysis. He takes the events of Luther's life and gives to them psychological significance. Out of this methodology Luther arises as a man who has given much good to the world. Bainton takes the events of Luther's life and treats them as factors in history, not necessarily as tools for psychological study. As said before, Bainton treats Luther in a manner similar to that of Ranke's. He sees Luther as contributing to German religion and culture. He deals with personality only as an element of Luther to be studied and understood, and Bainton's understanding is, for the most part, favorable. Ranke, too, can be treated as pro-Luther historian, but he is not pro-Luther to the degree that Boehmer and Bainton are. He is mainly concerned with the historical significance of Luther, not the good or bad of his personality. His pro-Luther tendencies are below the surface, and only arise in general and impersonal statements. Ranke, therefore, can only be considered pro-Luther to the extent that his work flow with a subtle undercurrent of Lutheran tradition.

The anti-Lutheran historians studied above are Sastrow, Denifle, Grisar and Lortz. Of these, Sastrow and Denifle are the strongest in their convictions. Sastrow condemns Luther out of the experiences of

his own life and the life of those around him. Denifle sees Luther from his religious tradition, and develops a portrait of Luther that is neither kind nor objective. Grisar also writes out of a Catholic tradition, but his anti-Luther treatment is more moderate than Denifle's. He sees Luther's greatness as negative, but in expressing this opinion Grisar shows a melancholy that is not found in Denifle or Sastrow. This melancholy arises out of Grisar's concern for Christianity and the souls of Luther's Protestant adherents. This concern is part of Grisar's anti-Luther attitude. Lortz picks up where Grisar leaves off. He, too, is concerned for Christendom and sees Luther's actions as wrong, but his concern goes further than simply melancholy. Lortz wants to see Christianity united, and he discredits Luther to that purpose. His anti-Luther statements are not directed at Luther's personality, but to Luther's minunderstanding of Catholic doctrine. By attacking this aspect of Luther, Lortz believes that he can prove Christianity should be one and that it is the duty of all to work to this end.

The neutral historians are Fife, Friedenthal, and Erikson. Both Fife and Friedenthal attempt to present a balanced picture of Luther. Fife wants to present the facts concerning Luther, and let the essence of the man arise for all to see and analyze. Friedenthal gives both the good and bad of Luther. He is more prone to personal observation than Fife, but the sum of his observations is neutral. Erikson also presents a study of Luther that is void of partiality. This impartial treatment does not arise out of a balancing of pros and cons. Erikson's own psychoanalytical techniques have built into them an impartiality. Luther is studied as a problem of psychoanalysis, not as a problem of pros and cons. Erikson is a scientist, and Luther a subject to be considered in the light of scientific understanding. Out of this analysis, no polemical attitudes are developed.

In each of the schools above, there was something common among the historians. Each of them, in his own school, had similar attitudes, but their development and purpose of these attitudes differed. This can also be seen in historical methods. Grisar, Boehmer and Erikson all used psychoanalysis, but each for different reasons: Grisar to discredit Luther; Boehmer to praise him; and Erikson to further scientific understanding. Ranke and Denifle concentrated their efforts on primary material, but each for separate goals: Ranke to show what actually was; and Denifle to prove his preconceived convictions. This use of similar methods to reach different conclusions is part of the complexity of historical study, and adds much to its interest.

To judge the historians on their methods and conclusions is a task that can only be justified when complete knowledge of the historians and Luther is obtained. The study presented here is far from complete, but from the information given in the analysis of the historians certain conclusions and observations can be made.

Bartholomew Sastrow's statements about Luther must be taken for what they are, the emotional reactions of an individual to a particular person. Sastrow's reactions come down to the present through his memoirs. These are highly personalized accounts of his life and actions. To take them for more than this would be to put more credence in them than they deserve. Sastrow should be studied to get a feeling for the times, not to get an accurate picture of Luther.

Leopold Von Ranke sees Luther as a fact in history. His concern for Luther is limited to his role in German history, but is this all Luther has to give to historical understanding? Luther's character and personality have added much to history. The facts are essential in studying history, and Ranke has shown this more than any historian, but the facts themselves are lifeless. It is up to the historian to breathe life into them, and give them a relevance. Ranke, however, has given much to historical thought. He stands as a beacon to those who may stray too far in their own personal convictions.

Heindrick Denifle seems to pass Ranke's beacon, and sails into the tradition of Sastrow. Denifle, however, is not writing memoirs. He is dealing with historical material; but, unlike Ranke, he only takes what he needs to prove his point. The historian should take the facts and give them life, but, if only one view is considered, to the exclusion of all others, the facts may become distorted and misused.

Hartman Grisar takes a more scholarly approach to Luther. He does not use the harsh attitude that Denifle used. He tempers his work with a concern that Denifle lacks. For an anti-Luther Catholic work, Grisar is not overly polemical.

Heinrich Boehmer does for the Protestants what Grisar did for the Catholics. He looks at Luther's accomplishments and relates a favorable impression of the reformer. He is not overly praising as a Protestant is imagined to be. He presents an orthodox Protestant interpretation well worth consideration.

Robert Fife wants to use the method of Ranke, but he doesn't want to go as far as Ranke in his use of facts. Fife wants to present a picture of Luther from all sides, hoping that the true Luther will emerge. This is a fine approach, but Fife must be careful in his presentation of both sides of Luther. At times he has a tendency to interject his own thoughts about the opinions. If this practice is overly used, then it is possible that Fife will fail in his purpose.

Of all the historians that have been studied here, Joseph Lortz deals with Luther and the Reformation for the most noble of purposes. He wants to see a rejoining of Christendom. The split in Christianity, which he sees as the result of a misunderstanding, should be reconciled, but what if there is no misunderstanding? It is in considering this last consideration that the question leaves the confines of history and

moves into the concern of philosophy and theology. Lortz has attempted a commendable task, but it is a little more than history alone can handle. History must ally with philosophy and theology to prove him right or wrong.

Bainton deals with Luther in a way similar to Ranke's but he adds more to his history than mere facts. He, too, wants to see Luther's contribution to German life; but, unlike Ranke, he is not afraid to say whether he believes the facts as presented to be accurate or not. Bainton gives a picture of Luther that is direct and well documented, yet one that is lively and readable.

Richard Friedenthal seems to be a return to the purpose of Fife, with an adaptation of his method. He presents facts on both the pro and con sides of Luther, but he is more prone to personal opinion. This would seem to lead to a controversial presentation, but the result is a balanced picture of Luther that is neither provocative nor bothersome.

Erik Erikson, the last historian studied, dealt with Luther as a psychoanalyst. He wanted to study the identity crisis that he says Luther suffered in his young manhood. Erikson, however, is not very thorough in his historical research. He is willing to accept half-truths as sufficient historical evidence. This may be acceptable in psychoanalysis, but historical study has not yet reached the point where this will not be frowned upon. Erikson's psychoanalytical conclusion may be correct, but his lack of concern over historical accuracy puts a blight on him as a historian.

History is composed of many facets. It is not a clear crystal that can be seen perfectly from all angles. History is composed of events, records, and historians. Without these elements there can be no history, and without history there can be no understanding of the present. The student of history is under an obligation to find the nature of history, the nature of man in time. To find this nature, he must understand the elements of history. Since the events of history are gone in time and cannot be repeated, the student is left with only the records and the historians. An analysis of both of these will give an idea into the make-up of history. But, since historical records are not readily available, the student is left with the historians. Here is a rich field to explore. The historians are the ones who bring history to life. They are the ones who make it real and alive. To understand them is to get an understanding of their subject. Historiography is the tool used for exploring the historian, and this paper is but a small contribution to that endeavor.

FOOTNOTES

[1]Bartholomew Sastrow. Social Germany in Luther's Time, trans. Albert D. Vandam. Westminister, England: Archibald Constable & Co., Ltd., 1902, p. 152.

[2]Stephen Joseph Tonsar. "Ranke, Leopold Von." New Catholic Encyclopedia (1967), Vol. VI, p. 80.

[3]Leopold Von Ranke. History of the Reformation in Germany, trans. Sarah Austin, ed. Robert A. Johnson, 2 vols. New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing Co., 1966, p. XI.

[4]Ibid., pp. 143-4.

[5]Ibid., p. 155.

[6]Ibid., p. 616.

[7]"Denifle, Heinrick Seuse" Encyclopedia Britannica (1972), Vol. VII, p. 236.

[8]Heinrick Denifle, O.P. Luther and Lutherdom, trans. Raymond Volz, Somerset, Ohio: Torch Press, 1917, pp. 79-82.

[9]Ibid., p. 109.

[10]Ibid., pp. 265-6.

[11]Carlos Sevilla, "Grisar, Hartmann." New Catholic Encyclopedia (1967), Vol. VI, pp. 807-8.

[12]Hartman Grisar, S.J. Luther, trans. E.M. Lamond, ed. Luizi Cappadelta. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co., Ltd., 1913, p. XXVIII.

[13]Ibid., p. 13.

[14]Hartman Grisar, S.J. Martin Luther: His Life and Work, trans. Frank J. Eble., M.A., ed. Arthur Preuss. Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Press, 1954, pp. 489-91.

[15]Hartmann Grisar, S.J., Op. Cit., Luther, p. XXXII.

[16]Ibid., p. 123.

[17]Hartman Grisar, S.J., Op. Cit., Martin Luther: His Life and Work, p. 476.

[18]Ibid., pp. 574-5.

[19]Heinrick Boehmer. Martin Luther: Road to Reformation, 4th ed., trans. John W. Doberstein and Theodore G. Tappert. Cleveland: The World Publishing Co., 1963, p. VII.

[20]Ibid., p. 9.

[21]Ibid., p. 40.

[22]Ibid., pp. 94-95.

[23]Ibid., p. 433.

[24]Robert Herndon Fife. The Revolt of Martin Luther. New York; Columbia University Press, 1957, p. VIII.

[25]Robert Herndon Fife, loc. cit., p. VIII.

[26]Ibid., p. 452.

[27]Ibid., p. 395.

[28]Joseph Lortz. The Reformation: A Problem for Today, trans. John C. Dwyer, S.J. Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Press, 1964, p. 102.

[29]Joseph Lortz. How the Reformation Came, trans. Otto M. Knab. New York: Herder and Herder, 1964, p. 33.

[30]Ibid., p. 50.

[31]Joseph Lortz, Op. cit., The Reformation: A Problem for Today, p. 99.

[32]Joseph Lortz, The Reformation in Germany, trans. Ronald Walls, 2 vols. London: Darton, Longman, & Todd, Ltd., 1968, p. 429.

[33]Joseph Lortz, Op. cit., The Reformation: A Problem for Today, pp. 152-3.

[34]Roland Bainton. Here I Stand. New York: Abinzdon Press, 1950, p. 22.

[35]Roland Bainton, loc. cit., p. 22.

[36]Ibid., p. 298.

[37]Ibid., p. 384.

[38]Ibid., p. 385-6.

[39]Richard Friedenthal. Luther: His Life and Times, trans. John Nowell. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc., 1970, p. 425.

[40]Ibid., p. 28.

[41] Ibid., p. 377.

[42] Ibid., pp. 431-2.

[43] Erik H. Erikson. Young Man Luther. New York: W.N. Norton and Co., Inc., 1958, pp. 47-48.

[44] Ibid., p. 22.

[45] Ibid., pp. 37-38.

[46] Roland Bainton. Studies on the Reformation. Boston: Beacon Press, 1963, pp. 86-92.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bainton, Roland. Here I Stand. New York: Abingdon Press, 1950.

Bainton, Roland. Studies on the Reformation. Boston: Beacon Press, 1963.

Boehmer, Heinrich. Martin Luther: Road to Reformation, 4th ed., trans. John W. Doberstein and Theodore G. Tappert. Cleveland: The World Publishing Co., 1963.

"Denifle, Heinrich, O.P." Encyclopedia Britannica (1972), Vol. VII.

Denifle, Heinrich, O.P. Luther and Lutherdom, trans. Raymond Volz. Somerset, Ohio: Torch Press, 1917.

Erikson, Erik H. Young Man Luther. New York: W.N. Norton and Co., Inc., 1958.

Fife, Robert Herndon. The Revolt of Martin Luther. New York: Columbia University Press, 1957.

Friedenthal, Richard. Luther: His Life and Times, trans. John Nowell. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc., 1970.

Grisar, Hartmann, S.J. Luther. trans. E.M. Lamond, Ed. Luigi Cappadelta. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner and Co., Ltd., 1913.

Grisar, Hartmann, S.J. Martin Luther: His Life and Work, trans. Frank J. Eble, M.A. ed. Arthur Preuss. Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Press, 1954.

Lortz, Joseph. How The Reformation Came, trans. Otto M. Kneb. New York: Herder and Herder, 1964.

Lortz, Joseph. The Reformation in Germany, trans. Ronald Walls, 2 vols. London: Darton, Longman and Todd, Ltd., 1968.

Lortz, Joseph. The Reformation: A Problem for Today, trans. John C. Dwyer, S.J. Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Press, 1964.

Ranke, Leopold Von. History of the Reformation in Germany, trans. Sarah Austin, ed. Robert A. Johnson, 2 vols. New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing Co., 1966.

Sastrow, Bartholomew. Social Germany in Luther's Time, trans. Albert D. Van Dam. Westminster, England: Archibald Constable & Co., Ltd., 1902.

Sevilla, Carlos. "Grisar, Hartmann." New Catholic Encyclopedia. (1967), Vol. VI.

Tonsar, Stephen Joseph. "Ranke, Leopold Von." New Catholic Encyclopedia (1967), Vol. XII.

CITIES OF THE DEAD

Submitted by:

DAVID J. PELS

The city of New Orleans has become a "Mecca" for tourists due to many interesting factors. Some of the factors which make New Orleans so different, would seem abnormal if superimposed on the life styles of another large American city. One of these practices, which is the exception in New Orleans, rather than the rule, is the method of burying the dead.

Nature and tradition have combined over the years to effect New Orleans burial customs and mold them into their present state. Several factors must be considered to approach the matter in its entirety. The first factor is the natural condition of soil and climate of the New Orleans region. The average rainfall per year is 64 inches. The swampy character of the locality is a product of this heavy rainfall and overflows from the Mississippi River. Before the above-ground burial became popular, graves dug into the earth filled with water very rapidly to within a foot of the surface. The graves had to be bailed out immediately before interment. Even so, the casket was invariably lowered into two or three feet of water.

Secondly, burial in water-filled graves was repulsive to many people. They abhorred the idea. Dr. Bennett Dowler, a New Orleans physician, aptly called the New Orleans cemetery "the wet graveyard." People couldn't be interred during extremely heavy rains. It was impossible then, to prepare an adequate, sanitary grave. After the flooding subsided, mass interment usually followed. A suitable alternative to this "repulsive" water burial had to be found.

The alternative, the third factor, took the form of an old French-Spanish tradition of the Creole inhabitants--that of above-ground burial. The French and Spanish have taken the above-ground burial with them throughout the world and they brought the custom likewise to New Orleans in the latter 18th century when a suitable amount of excess building materials could be secured for construction of above ground vaults. New Orleans was an expanding city at this point, and building materials were funneling into the city for the construction of new buildings. It is probably for this reason that the red brick, which still may be seen by passers-by in buildings surrounding Jackson Square, was used for construction of tombs. The red cemetery brick, wastage from building construction, was no doubt cheaper secondhand.

Shortly after the turn of the century, in the early 1800's, the new additions to New Orleans society, the Americans, improved on the crude brick tombs of their French and Spanish predecessors. By 1860, they

evolved "a highly distinctive type of sepulcher in marble and granite."[1]

J.N.B. de Pouilly, an architect of French birth, came to New Orleans in the early 1830's and provided the fifth factor--through his designs of famous European tombs, he set the style trends of sepulcher architecture when he copied these styles for the New Orleans cemeteries. Most of de Pouilly's drawings were of monuments in the Père Lachaise Cemetery of Paris, one of the most prominent in Europe, and well known for its Greek revival designs.[2] De Pouilly's designs have since been copied by other architects to the extent that all fashionable sculpted tombs of New Orleans bear traces of his taste and flair.

Bienville founded the city of New Orleans in 1718. The original site comprised the area bounded by the Mississippi River, Canal Street, North Rampart Street and Esplanade Avenue. Most of the ground was or had been cypress swamp. Baron de Carondelet erected log ramparts, hence Rampart Street, to act as a levee to help minimize the water level. The Carondelet Canal was later constructed to drain a portion of the city.[3] Early interments, before such drainage, were made on high ground on the Mississippi River's banks.

In 1721, Adrien de Pauger, Royal Military Engineer of the French Government, laid out the city of New Orleans. His plans included a cemetery where the dead were buried below ground, as in most conventional cemeteries. This cemetery, later known as St. Peter Street Cemetery, extended along the upper side of St. Peter Street between what are now Burgundy and Rampart Street. A ditch, serving as a moat, separated the cemetery from the city. This was built as a defensive measure in 1729 after the Indian massacre of Natchez. One could gain access to the cemetery through a road which connected it with Orleans Street.[4]

Because burial in St. Peter Cemetery was below ground, a sufficient level had to be built up to provide sanitary conditions and to prevent the cadavers or caskets from floating to the surface. The elevation of the site was effected through ditches dug on the periphery of the cemetery. The dirt thus obtained was thrown inside of a stout wall of cypress logs surrounding the area of the cemetery. The logs prevented the dirt from leveling, and so maintained the proper elevation from the water table for burial.[5]

The St. Peter Cemetery served as the city's only burial place for nearly 70 years and was still being used when finally surrounded by the city. The cemetery extended to cover the entire area from St. Peter to Roulouse Streets. In 1742, Father Charles, the Rector of the St. Louis Church, directed the construction of a five foot brick wall. The wealthy contributed the money; the poor, the labor. The wall was dedicated on All Saints Day in 1743.

The rapid growth of the city was eventually the downfall of St. Peter Cemetery. Also in 1788, the city flooded causing death, and a massive fire destroyed 856 houses which laid waste 4/5 of the city. These disasters

were compounded by a serious epidemic. The Spanish Cabildo felt that St. Peter Street Cemetery, quickly becoming filled to capacity, would soon become congested and unsanitary in the event of possible catastrophes of the future. There was also the feeling among New Orleanians that the epidemic, in part, had been kindled by the miasmas from cadavers in St. Peter Street Cemetery.[6]

So the Cabildo decided to re-locate, or rather, establish another cemetery which would be away from the city. The Cabildo, in agreement with the Vicar General, selected a new site. The Cemetery occupied an area between streets known today as Basin, Conti, Tréme, and St. Louis. Its total area was 300 feet square and was fenced in at city expense by Antonio Gujdry for 523 pesos, 7 reales. The site in relation to the city, then, was "In the rear of Charity Hospiral about 40 yards from its garden." A Royal Decree was issued on August 14, 1789 by His Majesty officially approving construction of the cemetry.[7]

As St. Louis No. I, the new cemetery, was being constructed, St. Peter Street Cemetery was razed. Those who could afford it, moved the remains of their loved ones to St. Louis No. I. The others remained to be built over by houses. The bricks from the walls were used in 1797 by Don Almonaster Roxas in building St. Louis Cathedral. The cemetery was temporarily picketed in until all of the bodies possibly were removed. There remains today no visible sign that purports of St. Peter Street Cenetery's existence.[8]

The tombs in St. Louis No. I bear no discernable order. Being unfamiliar with the grounds could present difficulties when attempting to exit the cemetery. The pathways were narrow. The tombs were of simple square design, made of soft powdery red brick, plastered over, and whitewashed. The plaster served the dual purpose of beautifying the tomb, and sealing the cracks to prevent the escape of "deadly epidemic" gases.

St. Louis Cemetery No. I marked the beginning of above-ground burial in New Orleans on a large scale. As previously described, the tombs were simply constructed, and only in the cemetery's later years of existence were marble and sculpted tombs visible. Wrought iron crosses and fences marked off the plots. The tombs with their similar designs and sloping tops gives the appearance of "a city of small dimensions." This "city of the dead" was surrounded by brick wall vaults twelve feet high and nine feet thick. These served the dual purpose of enclosing the cemetery and providing spaces for above ground interment at low cost.[9]

The wall vaults were called "fours" or "ovens" because they resembled old bread ovens. Vaults were bricked up after a burial and an inscribed marble slab bearing the occupant's name, was fitted into the opening. These wall vaults were used for more than one burial by removing the wooden coffin and burning it, then shoving the remains of the deceased to the rear of the vault. The next coffin was then inserted. Sometimes the remains were scattered "helter-skelter in the rear of the cemetery."[10]

Inside of the wall vaults, in the cemetery's interior, were scattered

the tombs. The New Orleans tomb generally consisted of two vaults, one above the other, with a receptacle in the lower portion, the foundation. The body was first interred in the upper portion, the remains later being removed to the lower portion when the upper vault was again needed for a new interment. After interment therein, the upper vault is hermetically sealed with bricks and mortar. In this fashion, a single tomb served one family for several generations.[11] According to a government provision, "a tomb, or vault must remain sealed for a year and a day after a burial therein. After that time has expired...the tomb may be used again."[12]

St. Louis Cemetery No. 1, as well as subsequent New Orleans cemeteries, were not pains takingly elevated above the water table as St. Peter Street Cemetery had been. The availability of adequate materials made the building of above-ground tombs possible. From the city's founding to the advent of subsurface drainage in the late 19th century, the water level was twelve inches below ground. When later drainage decreased the level, the tombs sank, because the old peat and vegetable matter of the cypress swamps could not hold the tomb, due to soil erosion. It was also a common sight to see the lower vault level of the walls partially sunk.[13] There were usually four, five, or six levels of wall vaults, with the lower tier generally the cheapest to purchase. The cheaper cost was probably due to the fact that once sunk, the lower tiers could only be opened with difficulty.

St. Louis Cemetery No. 1 is the nation's oldest cemetery. It was named after Louis XIV of France, and not the Cathedral as many believe. Buried within it are many people prominent in early New Orleans history.[14] Also buried therein are many people of the original thirteen colonies,[15] reflecting American involvement in the growing and prosperous New Orleans trade and commerce. Creoles are predominantly buried in St. Louis Cemetery No. 1, which was owned and operated by the St. Louis Cathedral congregation, as are all the St. Louis Cemeteries (nos. 1, 2, 3, and 4). There is a "spattering of Portugese" in St. Louis No. 1. It is the "aristocratic cemetery par excellence," and the only one of the four St. Louis Cemeteries where the French language predominates almost completely.[16] St. Louis No. 1 was of Catholic denomination, there being a Protestant cemetery occupying the rear of the grounds, with a Negro cemetery located behind it.[17]

Part of the Protestant section, which had been given to Christ Church (Episcopal) in 1805, was in the way of an extension of Tremé Street. In 1822, the City of New Orleans offered land for a new location in the Faubourg St. Marie, because the old Protestant section was almost filled. So Mayor Joseph Raffignac sold to Christ Church "a tract of land in the upper limit of St. Marie having a frontage of 526 feet on St. Paul Street (now South Liberty Street) and running back to a depth of 594 feet and forming a long regular square between what is now Perrilliat and Cypress Streets (about 3 1/2 acres). The price of $3,140.67 was to be paid over 10 years. All persons "professing Protestant or Catholic religion in any denomination or sect" were to be allowed burial, according to the deed. Hence, this became New Orlean's first non-denominational cemetery.

The location of the cemetery was a bad one. At this time, the location was on the fringe of uptown expansion. It was frequently under water, and was known as "the swamp" by the rowdy flatboatmen who caroused in the dens which lined Girod Street.[18] The Christ Church Congregation was to oversee the use of the cemetery until the city felt it should be moved for sanitary reasons. The congregation would then dispose of the Girod St. Cemetery, as it came to be called, in any respectable manner as they saw fit.

Many of the bodies in the Protestant section of St. Louis No. I were removed to the Girod St. Cemetery. Most of the important tombs of the Girod St. Cemetery were built in the 40 year period between 1822 and 1860. This was during the eras when wealthy American Protestant merchants became firmly established in New Orleans. New Orleans correspondingly grew to be a very wealthy city. American families are responsible for building and maintaining the Girod St. Cemetery, yet they kept the tradition of above-ground burial, and in a sense added a lot of class to it by hiring architects to sculp private tombs. This is the time when de Pouilley's styles in memorial architecture came into prominence.

The Girod St. Cemetery had a "decidedly Creole flavor" with its many walls of oven vaults and closely built tombs, as in St. Louis No. I. Because the people using Girod St. Cemetery were wealthy, because of greater space, and due to the fact that there was now more than one cemetery in New Orleans (St. Louis No. I had been the sole place for burial since St. Peter's razing), the custom of using one tomb or vault for more than one burial wasn't as common. This was done, however, in the many "society" tombs of Girod St. Cemetery. The society tombs resembled sections of wall vaults in that they consisted of vaults constructed one upon the other. They were situated at various points throughout the cemetery. Often, there were small vaults on the top tier for the interment of infants. A "society" tomb was one constructed by one of the many mutual benevolent societies which existed in New Orleans in that day. People had banned together, such as ethnic groups and craft or trade organizations to provide benefits for their members. This was especially advantageous for the poor. By simply paying his dues, a member automatically acquired a vault in the tomb for himself or any one in his family upon their death. The Negro "society" tombs are especially famous for their craftsmanship.[19]

In Girod St. Cemetery, there were 2,319 wall vaults, with 526 more facing the aisles on the interior. There were over 100 benevolent society tombs containing 12-70 vaults each, and approximately 1000 privately owned tombs. Christ Church sold the vaults for $50 each. They sold 313 vaults in 1837 and 1839. But in the yellow fever year of 1853, the congregation grossed over $12,000 from interments and purchases. After the Civil War, the revenue greatly decreased to less than $400 a year.[20] This was barely enough to pay the sextons, or grounds keepers (they oversaw interments, dug graves, etc...). The average income per year before the Civil War had been $3,000.

As far as general arrangement, the Girod Street Cemetery was laid out

well, and in this respect proved to be the prototype of future New Orleans cemeteries--it had three spacious aisles from front to rear bisected by 22 cross-aisles. Shade trees were also planted. They had been absolutely prohibited in the Old St. Louis Cemetery, for it was found that the roots would weaken the many and closely packed together tombs. As New Orleans people grew more wealthy, finer, larger tombs appeared. The first tombs were of soft red locally made brick, the same as the city buildings. Some were constructed using Philadelphia brick. Italian white marble became increasingly more common. It was initially used only for name plates, then later used for entire tombs. There were also some very elegant tombs made from Quincy Granite from Massachusetts. But Girod lacked the character of the newer Cypress Grove Cemetery or St. Louis No. 2 and 3. It was well laid out, "but on the whole, was not an architecturally imposing place of last rest." The cemetery was accessible by a street car line from Canal. The line was poor and about the only time it had any considerable use was on All Saints Day when used as conveyance to Girod Cemetery.[21]

During the epidemic of 1853, the cemetery was well kept. After this, it degenerated as revenue dropped to less than $300 per year in the 1870's. In the 1880's and 90's the vestry erected no new vaults. More and more Negroes were interred, as fashionable society people had the remains of their loved ones removed to other cemeteries in the late 19th century and early 20th.

"Water green and slime" often filled the aisles. Undertakers often used boats to float to the tombs. Attempts were made in 1854 to "fill the principle walks and paths with stable manure, street dirt, oyster shells and other material, so as to place them (the tombs) above water." In the 1880's the cemetery began to look neglected and run down.[22] Even in the 1840's, robbers had stolen iron mailings and marble tablets.

In 1910, a visitor reported that Brown, the sexton was raising chickens in the rear of the cemetery to supplement his meager income from burials. There were few at this date. There was no sexton hired after 1950.

In 1927 the Very Reverend William Hamilton Ness became Dean of Christ Church Cathedral. He was interested in history, and curious about Girod Street Cemetery's degeneration. But his efforts to "resurrect" the cemetery and put it again on a self-supporting basis failed to materialize. In the 1930's, people were urged to clear their plots, but many just removed the dead instead. The Works Progress Administration also attempted to clear the cemetery. The Cemetery Committee of Christ Cathedral in 1939 tried to negotiate with the City of New Orleans to buy the property. Eventually in the 1950's, the property was sold and the more than 22,000 bodies were removed. The cemetery was deconsecrated by Rt. Reverend Girault M. Jones, Bishop of Louisiana on January 4, 1957. Afterward, the cemetery was destroyed.[23] The real estate was sold for $332,708.58, which was a far cry from the $3,140.67 paid by Christ Church when the land was initially purchased.[24]

Girod St. Cemetery seems to have been plagued by bad luck. In 1948, through a misunderstanding, some city workers tore down about 100 feet of the front wall. After this, "vandals and ghouls" broke in to look for dental gold and jewelry. Bagrants and bums used the unoccupied tombs as a place of refuge. By 1956, over a thousand vaults had been broken into. Dense vegetation had overtaken Girod and roots had pried through the tombs busting them apart.[25]

One interesting aspect in particular must be noted of Girod St. Cemetery which doesn't quite fit in elsewhere in other cemeteries. This has to do with the "Yellow fever mound" located in the cemetery. There was a particularly large area of consecrated land in Girod St. Cemetery, otherwise off-limits for regular burial, but marked with a stone. In this area, it is hypothesized that during one of the 23 epidemics which hit New Orleans between 1850 and 1860, that there was mass interment in a gigantic hole. In this period, there had been 28,192 recorded deaths of "yellow jack." It is estimated that 12,000 alone died in 1853.

Dr. Michael Halpher says that in some cemeteries "...it became necessary to dig trenches and in them the coffins were laid five deep with scarcely two feet of earth thrown on top of them. Quicklime was used over the coffins, but it was scarce and of such poor quality so the effect was almost null."[26] Those buried included many young men who had been attracted to New Orleans by the river trade.

At other times, corpses would brought into the cemeteries uncoffined and a large trench dug. The corpses were thrown in without any personal marker or coffin. Girod Cemetery did not have to dig such pits during the great yellow fever epidemic of 1853. The so called "yellow fever mound" is thought to be from the cholers epidemic of 1832-1833. It measured about 100 x 40 feet.[27]

There are several reasons for the decline of Girod St. Cemetery. Some say that a sexton should have been provided after 1950, but this wouldn't have helped matters much. A portion of the revenue obtained from original sales could have been set aside in a perpetual care fund. The location of the cemetery was poor--a virtual swamp when the cemetery was established. The cemetery was located in an industrial area, and grew up in a tangle of tracks and warehouses. After 1850, it had the increasing competition of newer, better located cemeteries on Metairie Ridge, such as Cypress Grove, Greenwood, Odd Fellows Rest and the St. Patrick Cemeteries. The Negroes, who were first tolerated, later came in such great numbers as to drive the white families away. And finally, the Girod St. Cemetery was poorly built by modern standards. The tombs crumbled due to the nature of the mortar used, and from inferior worksmanship.[28]

As Girod St. Cemetery was declining through the 1880's, the Metairie Cemetery came into existence. Metairie Cemetery can be viewed as a transition stage between the old style cemeteries, such as Girod or St. Louis

Nos. I and 2 and the new modern "Forest Lawn" types. Metairie Cemetery is unique in that it bears semblance to both types. It's large size has allowed it to keep pace with the times to the present date. Its future prospects are still very good.

Metairie is one of the Western world's finest cemeteries. It was originally a race track, managed by the Louisiana Jockey Club. There is an old legend that one Charles T. Howard wished to become a member of this club. He had made two applications to join and was twice refused. He confided to some of his friends, "I am going to make the third application. If I am blackballed, I'll buy the mortgage on the place and if the stockholders cannot pay off, I'll make it the deadest place this side of the Atlantic Ocean." He made the third application and was again refused. True to his word, he foreclosed, and turned the place into a cemetery.[29]

The Metairie Cemetery Association was founded in 1872. The forming of cemetery associations was a development of the latter 1800's. It did have the effect of providing for more efficient administration of the cemetery, especially when these associations were joint stock ventures, such as in the Metairie Cemetery Association. The old church board run and affiliated cemeteries were a thing of the past. The few that remain (church affiliated) will soon live out their usefulness. The fact that Metairie Cemetery had to produce, from a stand point of private gain, undoubtedly is the chief factor for its great success.

The charter, by-laws, rules and regulations of Metairie Cemetery Association were adopted November 12, 1873. The board of directors would consist of six people. The capital stock was fixed at $120,000. $80,000 worth of stock, 800 shares at $100 apiece, was subscribed for and taken by members of the Metairie Racing Association. The other 400 shares were subscribed for and taken by Charles T. Howard of New Orleans and John A. Morris of New York. The money from these shares would aleviate the Metairie Racing Association's debt. The Board of Directors would "have the right to make such by-laws, rules and regulations for the government of the Association, and for disposal and sale of burial lots."[30]

Metairie Cemetery is now located at the intersection of Pontchartrain Expressway and Metairie Road. It can be viewed while driving through Metairie on Interstate-10. Although the first interment was in 1873, the grounds were laid out in 1895 by Benjamin Morgan Harrod at a cost of $30,000. The old oval race course was converted into the main drive. A lake was made in the center. The grounds are beautifully landscaped with carriage drives, lagoons, and tree shaded promenades for pedestrians. There formerly existed lagoons (now filled) of 1200, 2400, and 2700 feet.

Many styles of architecture prevail in Metairie Cemetery: miniature Gothic Churches, Grecian Temples, Oriental kiosks, and even an Egyptian style pyramid complete with sphinx.

There are several famous tombs in the cemetery. The monument to the Louisiana Division of the Army of Tennessee is well known. Astride his horse, General Albert Sidney Johnston, killed at the Battle of Shiloh, guards the tomb which stands below him. This tomb contains the remains of soldiers of the Army of Tennessee, including General P.T. Beauregard and at one time, those of Confederate President Jefferson Davis. 2500 men are buried within the mausoleum of the tomb of the Louisiana Division of the Army of Northern Virginia, which is surmounted by a bronze statue of General "Stonewall" Jackson.[31]

A recent brochure put out by the Metairie Cemetery Association describes their development as "a sanctuary for those departed--a source of inspiration for the living--such is beautiful Metairie Cemetery." Since 1873, over 7000 burial places therein.[32] The ground burials became more and more popular with improved drainage of the latter 1800's. Cremation at this time was also viewed as repulsive by New Orleanians,[33] but now is viewed as a practical alternative to tomb construction or ground interment. Both ground burial and cremation can be viewed as evidence of infusion of "alien" blood into New Orleans' traditional form of burial above ground. Within the bounds of Metairie Cemetery is offered every form of interment sanctioned by custom. The cemetery is non-sectarian, so virtually all groups have representation in interments throughout its long history. Interments number approximately 38,000, and only 65% of its 150 acres has been sold. The land has been drained, greatly improved, and landscaped. The very picturesque Metairie Parklawn section was developed to meet the demand for an inexpensive, modern, garden-like place of burial. There is allowed only one interment per plot, but several adjacent plots may be purchased. The lots are marked with flush granite markers, which allow for easy maintenance. When one looks out on this section, it gives the effect of a tranquil meadow.

By state law, Perpetual Care and General Maintenance Funds are taken out of payments to provide eternal care for the lot or tomb. The Metairie Cemetery cannot fall into decadency as did Girod St. Cemetery.

If there is a sudden death, and you have no burial spot, you may temporarily inter the deceased for one year in a "receiving vault" in a special building until you make arrangements to secure or prepare the needed lot for burial. These receiving vaults are in the receiving mausoleum and have been used since 1876.[34]

With the coming of the mid-1900's, the cemetery business has indeed become a lucrative trade. The real-estate boom has been a big impetus in the establishment of cemeteries in recent years. In the present era of upward bound prices, the "memorial counselors" (formerly called undertakers or grave salesmen) "will be happy to accomodate any extravagances you have in mind."[35] Caskets may be purchased in a range of from $300 up to around $7000. The average middle class burial in New Orleans is estimated at around $3000. In New Orleans, "establishing precisely what

are essential and what are extra costs" is complicated by local customs and traditions which may be unfamiliar to newcomers in this area. "Custom and the profit motive are so intertwined in the funeral business that they are sometimes inseparable." A good example would be the purchase of expensive wooden and metal caskets which will have to be burned during cremation. L.B. Pepitune, in charge of cremations at Metairie Cemetery says "People don't realize it, but we would take cremations in a sack. In fact, it would be easier that way." But the "memorial counselors" don't exactly go out of their way to disuade people from buying an expensive casket for cremations. The caskets have to be junked after one usage. In only two of the 145 cremations at Metairie Cemetery in the last two years, has the process been done without a casket. One of the extra "services" due to cremation (of course needing an extra charge) is the pulverizing of remains and then going over them with a magnet "so that no nails or nuts or bolts will remain in the ashes to disturb the loved ones."[36]

Of the 40-some odd cemeteries in the New Orleans area, the most recent ones typify what Bill Winn of New Orleans "Courier" calls the "Forest Lawn Syndrome." He cites Westlawn Memorial Park in Gretna and the Garden of Memories Memorial Park and Mausoleum on Airline Highway as examples. They "create the illusion that no one is really dead at all," that the dead are only "slumbering." The vast tracts with low marked graves give a peaceful meadow-like effect. Dotting the landscape are "features" or statues, and "there is almost always a Baby Land for the burial of infants, a secluded little spot with a statue of a child." There is invariably a mausoleum, several stories high "resembling a miniature Pentagon or a bank vault from a distance."[37]

Winn says, "the similarity to a bank vault is appropriate, for this is the money-making center of the whole." Some say the mausoleum type burial is the solution to overcrowded burial grounds of New Orleans, but if the "memorial counselors" can persuade the people of New Orleans to abandon the habit of multiple vault burial, the "mausoleum boosters" will be in for an immense fortune.

Most of the selling in cemeteries is now on a "pre-need" basis. Credit terms and "lay away" plans are available and for a service, an $85 down-payment with 100 months to pay may be arranged at Westlawn. The sexton fee that was $3 at Girod Street Cemetery, has now been replaced by an interment fee--$85 at Westlawn and $115 if it is on the weekend. "The sexton fee at Garden of Memories is $110 for in-ground burials ($125 on weekends) and $50 in a crypt."[38] The charges, at Garden of Memories, for interment in the mausoleum are $2,390 for the first level, $2,590 on the "heart" level, to $2,090 on the top. These prices are for double crypts.

The conventional marble tombstone is being phased out by flat bronze grave markers with removable vases at Garden of Memories. The removable vase makes grass cutting easier, which means less money for upkeep from the Perpetual Care fund, now required by the State of Louisiana. 10% of the original charge must be put back for a Perpetual

Care fund.[39]

Metairie Cemetery is one of the most expensive and prestigious cemeteries of the city. Single burial lots start at $500 in Metairie, but a 12 x 12 plot for two burials enclosed with a granite coping costs $3,650. Many private tombs in Metairie are valued at $100,000 and one is being planned for $250,000. Metairie Cemetery also has a mausoleum and an urn garden, where the remains of cremated loved ones are kept in urns which may top out at $180. The patch of ground in the garden for the urn costs $200.[40]

Winn says, "almost no one can afford to die anymore."

The cemetery picture has changed quite a lot in the New Orleans area. But native New Orleanians are tightly holding on to their burial customs as newcomers bring in an atmosphere of conformity and contemporary practice. Several trends are evident over the years.

The criteria for location of cemeteries has changed somewhat. Nevertheless, location is an important factor. Before efficient drainage, cemeteries had to be established on high ground and at least several hundred yards from the city due to the prevalent belief that miasmas from cadavers caused disease plagues. The miasma question was answered, however, in 1878 when the dreaded epidemic started in the First District, which had only one cemetery, and the plague centered in an area more than a mile from it. This served to relieve most people of all doubts.[41] With the improvements in drainage, the worry of selecting a spot prone to flooding is no longer prevalent. Realtors simply find an undeveloped location and then commence to construct a cemetery. There should be no more flooding Girod Street Cemeteries.

Through New Orleans interments in particular cemeteries, we may be able to trace the percentages of certain groups in the city's populace at various times. The St. Peter Street Cemetery was entirely Creole, while St. Louis No. I contained a few Americans, some Polish. The Girod Street Cemetery contained a large number of Protestant Americans, mirroring their entry into New Orleans in the early 1800's. With Metairie Cemetery, we see the mixture of more people of various ethnic groups which serves as a creditable measuring device for the continuing influx of all groups to New Orlenas in recent years.

The number of Church affiliated cemeteries have declined tremendously in recent years. They are being phased out by private firms and joint stock cemetery associations. This reflects the "business efficiency" image in virtually all fields of American endeavor of the 20th century.

The New Orleans cemeteries still point out one fact--that of racial segregation. But this seems to be a mutual preference of both

Whites and Negroes. "Black people just don't seem to feel at home in the white funeral establishments," says Joseph Misshore head of Gertrude Geddis Willis Funeral Home.[42] In 1960, Negroes had had three cemeteries of their own in New Orleans: Holt, Mt. Olivet, and Providence. In some of the old burial grounds, there was no race distinction. In other cases it was very evident.[43] The Negroes had a separate cemetery behind the protestant section of St. Louis No. I. In the instance of Girod Street Cemetery, the white families removed their deceased relatives when Negroes buried there increasingly in the latter 1800's. There was a distinct color line.

Most New Orleans cemeteries, excepting Metairie and Greenwood, are small compared to cemeteries in most urban American communities. The average size is from I 1/2 to 4 acres which is probably a reason for the large number of them. There are over 40 cemeteries in the New Orleans area.[44]

The types of monuments in a cemetery can be used as a guideline of economic status. This was already prevalent in early New Orleans as most fashionable New Orleanians passed up Girod Street Cemetery and St. Louis No. I to inter their relatives in the other St. Louis Cemeteries or one of the newer cemeteries.

In early New Orleans, cemeteries were established because the older one was becoming filled, i.e., only out of necessity. These were regulated usually by the local Church e.g. St. Louis Cathedral or Christ Church (Girod Street Cemetery). But as time progresses, cemeteries are established by various groups other than Churches such as the Cypress Grove Cemetery, which was established by the Volunteer Firemen's Association. Later still, as with Metairie, cemeteries are established for private profit.

What happens to the declining cemetery? Most will persist, immemorial to future generations. The practice of razing a cemetery, such as Girod Street, or St. Peter Street, has become unpopular in recent years. But this practice may resurface as space becomes more and more limited in urban areas. Only time will remain to tell us of the efficienty of the present day Perpetual Care plans, which have been designed to provide upkeep for cemetery grounds forever. But what happens when the funds are depleted? We will just have to wait and see.

The upkeep of New Orleans cemeteries has been greatly aided by the Louisiana statute which forces cemetery directors to keep back 10% of charges for perpetual care funds. So now there isn't as much danger of a cemetery, such as Girod Street Cemetery, declining because of inadequate upkeep.

The economics of the cemetery? The monetary costs will, of course, fluctuate with the economy. The hard-nosed promotion and selling tactics of "memorial counselors" have transformed the cemetery business into one comparable to the automobile business. With the cemetery business these days, the extravagance of the indivIdual is the limit.

FOOTNOTES

[1]Leonard V. Huber and Guy F. Bernard, To Glorious Immortality--The Rise and Fall of the Girod St. Cemetery, pub. Albert Brooks. (New Orleans, La., 1961), pp. 13-14.

[2]Ibid., p. 14.

[3]"Souvenir Booklet--St. Louis Cemetery Number One. (New Orleans,La., 1956), p. 2.

[4]Sandi Donnelly, "New Orleans First Cemetery," Times Picayune, Nov. 13, 1972, (pp. not available).

[5]"Did You Know," Rider's Digest, Vol. XXII, No. 1, (August 19, 1968), p. 1.

[6]Donnelly.

[7]Samuel Wilson, Jr., FAIA and Leonard V. Huber, The St. Louis Cemeteries of New Orleans, publ. A.F. Laborde and Sons, (New Orleans, La., 1963), p. 8.

[8]Donnelly.

[9]Huber and Bernard, p. 13.

[10]Ibid., p. 17.

[11]Ibid., pp. 18-19.

[12]R.A. McGuire, A Cemetery in a Church and Other Stories, publ. Arthur Koepp, (New Orleans, La., no date given).

[13]Souvenir Booklet, p. 4.

[14]McGuire, p. 3.

[15]Souvenir Booklet, p. 9.

[16]Huber and Bernard, p. 14.

[17]Wilson and Huber, p. 11.

[18]Huber and Bernard, p. 25.

[19]Ibid., p. 17.

[20]"Girod St." Louisiana Vertical File on Cemeteries, Tulane University Library.

[21]Huber and Bernard, pp. 22-25.

[22]Ibid., pp. 25-29.

[23]Ibid., p. 82.

[24]"Girod St." La. Vert. File.

[25]Huber and Bernard, pp. 30-35.

[26]Ibid., p. 74.

[27]Ibid., pp. 75-76.

[28]Ibid., p. 82.

[29]McGuire, p. 9.

[30]"Metairie Cemetery Association of New Orleans--Charter, By-Laws, Rules and Regulations," (New Orleans, La., 1873), pp. 4-6.

[31]Rider's Digest, September 4, 1972.

[32]"Beautiful and Historic Metairie Cemetery," publ. Metairie Cemetery Assn.

[33]McGuire, p. 6.

[34]"Beautiful and Historic..."

[35]Bill Winn, "Death in New Orleans," Courier, November 1, 1973. Vol. X, No. 26, p. 9.

[36]Ibid., p. 1.

[37]Ibid., p. 5.

[38]Ibid., pp. 5-7.

[39]Ibid., p. 6.

[40]Ibid., p. 7.

[41]"Report on Intramural Sepulture in the City of New Orleans," New Orleans Medical and Surgical Assn., 1879.

[42]Winn, p. 7.

[43]Huber and Bernard, p. 17.

[44]Ibid., p. 17.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Beautiful and Historic Metairie Cemetery," publ. Metairie Cemetery Assn.

Donnelly, Sandi. "New Orleans First Cemetery," Times Picayune, November 13, 1972.

"Girod St." La. Vertical File on Cemeteries, Tulane University Library.

Huber, Leonard V. and Guy F. Bernard. To Glorious Immortality--The Rise and Fall of the Girod St. Cemetery, publ., Albert Brooks. (New Orleans, La., 1961).

McGuire, R.A. A Cemetery in A Church and Other Stories, publ. Arthur Koepp, (New Orleans, La.)

"Metairie Cemetery Association of New Orleans--Charter, By-Laws, Rules and Regulations," (New Orleans, La., 1873).

"Report on Intra Mural Sepulture in the City of New Orleans," New Orleans Medical and Surgical Assn., 1879.

Rider's Digest, Sept. 4, 1972, and August 19, 1968.

"Souvenir Booklet--St. Louis Cemetery Number One," (New Orleans, La., 1956).

Wilson, Samuel, Jr., FAIA and Leonard V. Huber. The St. Louis Cemeteries of New Orleans, publ. A.F. Laborde and Sons, (New Orleans, La., 1963).

Winn, Bill. "Death in New Orleans," Courier, November 1, 1973. Vol. X, No. 26.