Alpata
A Journal of History

University of Florida
Volume III, Spring 2006

MANAGING EDITORS
Bridget Bihm-Manuel
Graduate
F. Evan Nooe
Undergraduate

EDITORS
Jason Antley
Alexandra de Padua
Javier Montoya
Julienne Obadia
Samuel Pierce
Griselda Rodriguez

FACULTY ADVISOR
SPONSOR
Dr. Jack E. Davis
University of Florida
Department of History
Dr. Joseph Spillane, Chair

TYPOGRAPHY AND
PAGE DESIGN
Charles Flowers

PHI ALPHA THETA
GAMMA ETA CHAPTER

Contributors

Benjamin Boyce's academic interests are many and vary greatly from day to day. Current projects include: examining pagan iconoclasts in the Plymouth colony; decoding the sociological and historical implications of quoting film dialog; and assessing the political significance of the graffiti in the restroom of the Salty Dog Saloon near the University of Florida campus in Gainesville.

Jason Goldman is a senior double majoring in political science and history. He is interested in interational relations as it relates to American history and American culture. After graduation, he plans to attend law school.

Brittany Tevis is a junior majoring in political science and Jewish studies. Her academic interests include Israeli history and politics and issues that impact Jewish identity. Tevis is a member of Golden Key International Honors Society, as well as a member and former president of Gators for Israel. She is currently studying abroad at Hebrew University of Jerusalem.

Matthew S.R. Bewig is a Ph.D. Candidate in American history. He earned his M.A. in history from the University of North Carolina, and a J.D. from The George Washington University Law School. He is writing a dissertation on the landmark constitutional law case of *Lochner v. New York*.

Joel Black earned a bachelor's degree from the University of Victoria and master's degree form Concordia University before enrolling at the University of Florida in 2004. He is currently completing his second year of doctoral study and intends to tackle postbellum labor law in his dissertation.

Charles Flowers earned a bachelor’s degree from the University of Florida in 1993 in computer engineering. He is returning to graduate school pursuing a M.A. in Medieval History. Current interests include the monasticism of Late Antiquity and the works of Columbanus from Early Medieval Ireland.

Cover Photo Courtesy of P. K. Yonge Library of Florida History.

Table of Contents

Special Section – Oral History at the University of Florida

Introduction and Methodology 5
F. Evan Nooe

Oral History and Its Shortcomings 7
Jason Antley and Julienne Obadia

Oral History and Cultures Across the World 10
Javier Motoya and Griselda Rodriguez

Special Collections at the University of Florida 16
Bridget Bihm-Manuel

The Samuel Proctor Oral History Program 18
Samuel Pierce

An Excerpt from the Oral History of Gatorade with Dr. Robert Cade 20
Dr. Samuel Proctor

Oral History Resources in Florida 28
Bridget Bihm-Manuel

Articles

Gender and the Missionary Experience 38
Bejamin Boyce

The United States – Israel Special [Cultural] Relationship 62
The Story of How Jews and Israelis became Ingrained on the American Psyche
Jason Goldman

Tasting Race 82
American Pie, Aunt Jemima, and Immigrant Acculturation
Brittany Tevis

Review Essay and Book Reviews

The Second Coming of Charles Austen Beard 107
Matthew S. R. Bewig

Lizabeth Cohen, *A Consumer's Republic: The Politics of Mass Consumption in Postwar America* 118

Ian Wood, *The Missionary Life: Saints and the Evangelisation of Europe 400-1050* 122

Oral History
At the University of Florida

F. Evan Nooe

Evidence of oral history can be found in diverse societies throughout time. The ancient Greeks, Native Americans, and Buddhists have utilized this methodology to pass down stories and traditions from one generation to the next. In contemporary society oral history has taken a more scientific approach in an attempt to ensure consistency and reliability. Whereas Native Americans had no method of recording their oral histories, today varying institutes make use of digital recordings, edited transcripts, and archives help to reinforce the credibility of their interviews. Today oral history research endeavors are as diverse as the historians who conduct them. One such historian, Bruce S. Chappell, is utilizing oral histories to enhance his documentation of the practice of *Regla de Ocha* in Cuba. At the University of Florida, the Samuel Proctor Oral History Program takes on diverse topics ranging from World War Two veterans to federal judges. Despite a refinement and institutionalization of oral history research there are still questions raised about its practice. In the lack of supporting documentation the bias of the interviewee can and should be questioned to try and maintain an objective approach.

Oral history can be broadly described as any verbal transmission from one individual to another in an attempt to understand past events. However, in contemporary society historians have refined this form of research to create a more concrete scientific approach. The task of conducting a single interview can be a complex task involving more than simply the interviewer and interviewee. A widely used approach is as follows:

- Initial research and familiarization by the interviewer regarding the topic to be discussed with the interviewee.
- The interview itself; this may be a one-hour session or one that takes several hours over weeks or months.
- The interview is transcribed, which includes demarcations indicating the speaker.
- A preliminary edit is given to the transcript in which false starts to sentences are removed and improper words such as “um” are removed to create a more fluid transcript.
- The transcribed interview is sent back for approval by the interviewee and to have any questions regarding content answered.
- Upon return, a final edit is preformed with the additional information given by the interviewee and foot notes are often included giving brief explanations of terms, events, and people mentioned in the interview.

This brief description of the interview process shows how historians try to ensure consistency between the interviewer and the interviewee. The final edit allows fellow researchers to utilize the interview with ease and to be able to reference cited materials in publications.

Oral History and Its Shortcomings

Jason Antley and Julienne Obadia

As a methodology, oral history holds a rather ambiguous place in the discipline of history. Valued as a means of reaching historical spaces that have left few associated written records, such as non-literate societies and unrecorded memories, oral histories are nevertheless often framed as "the next best thing" to document-based evidence. Alternatively described as unreliable, fragmented, and subject to the unpredictability's of memory, oral history, according to its harshest opponents, should be discounted for its inherent "bias" and "subjectivity." Critic Patrick O'Farrell, for instance, states that oral histories are located within "the world of image, selective memory, later overlays and utter subjectivity. . . . And where will it lead us? Not into history, but into myth."[1]

There are a number of underlying assumptions that inhere in this statement. Among them is the idea of a single historical reality that lies outside of human relationships and politics, simply waiting for the most appropriate methodologies to reveal it. Only the most cold and impersonal sources can be enlisted in the apprehension of the object—history—in question. Embedded in this is the related assumption that documentary sources are somehow better "reflections" of this single past. The argument is that documents do not change over time, that they retain their form and content, providing a "window" into a particular time and space. This argument is, of course, firmly based in colonialist rhetoric. The privileging of documents over memories is partially lodged in a preference of the methodical hands of colonial

[1] Patrick O'Farrell, "Oral History: Facts and Fiction," *Oral History Association of Australia Journal, Mt. Pleasant*, 5 (1982-1983): 4.

bureaucrats over the myth-infused nonsense of natives. While this is an extreme characterization, it brings into relief the logic underlying the privileging of the "quantitative" over the "qualitative" as well as that logic that entailed such a bifurcation of knowledge to begin with.

Aside from simply refuting the points of oral history's detractors, its proponents espouse a range of arguments of their own relating to the benefits of such a methodology. As historian Alistair Thomson points out in his overview of oral history since its emergence in the 1950s, "one of the most significant shifts in the last twenty-five years of oral history has been [the] recognition that the so-called unreliability of memory might be a resource, rather than a problem, for historical interpretation and reconstruction."[2] The resource is one that gives history life and warmth. One of the arguments for oral history, for example, is that a person recounting a story will offer his or her emotions in relation to the event in question, leading to a richer understanding of that event. In fact, one of the powerful lessons that oral history has taught is that such facets are inextricably linked. As relevant as dates, statistics, and censuses are the ways in which information travels. Ideas and signs are refigured, and notions of experience are formulated.

Beyond a simple pro/con stance, however, lies the idea of oral history as a *genre* of history. Designating "types" is a very powerful discursive mechanism that has the effect of drawing attention to, but also marginalizing, its object. The case of gender history provides an instructive example. It is clear that an extraordinary amount of work has been and continues to be devoted to asserting the relevance and importance of the genders and genderings that occur in history. It is also safe to say that issues surrounding gender have been deemed worthwhile investigative categories in academia. Nevertheless, the very

[2] Alistair Thomson, "Fifty Years On: An International Perspective on Oral History," *Journal of American History*, 85, no. 2 (1998): 585.

designation of gender history as a *genre* of history serves to marginalize it as an "alternative." Historians who explicitly explore gendered histories are historians of gender. It becomes possible for other historians to say simply, "I don't do gender" where it might, for instance, be much less imaginable to say "I don't do region." In similar ways, the cordoning off of oral history in some senses enforces it as another such alternative. Designating this methodology on the basis of the media on which it relies asserts a natural difference between written and oral sources that, again, only makes sense when seen in relation to its colonial genealogy. One does not, for example, distinguish between the use of newspapers and legal documents in spite of the fact that these materials represent different forms and distributions. This should not be taken as a critique of oral history (or gender history). Rather, it is an acknowledgment of the historically and culturally situated nature of these categories and a suggestion that we remember to keep issues regarding the politics of our discipline in mind whenever we attempt to categorize or enforce a disciplinary separation.

Oral History and Cultures across the World

Javier Montoya and Griselda Rodriguez

Regardless of how historians view oral history, it has played a role, at one time or another, in every culture in the world. History has always been told from person to person, whether through the commonly recognized methods of the book, film documentary, and university lecture, or in the most ancient of methods, oral transmission. Be it in the city-states of classical Greece, in the Buddhist monasteries of Asia, or in the plains of North America, oral history is a key part of historical memory. History in this context implies not only the recollecting of real events, but also the recollecting of events that are fictional to the modern mind. These events, however, were considered to be real at some point in that given culture's history.[3] The first area of discussion is a prime example of this.

The Iliad and *The Odyssey* of Homer are, arguably, the two most famous pieces of literature from the ancient world. These works, chronicling the last year of the Trojan War and Odysseus's misadventures on his way home respectively, were passed down orally from generation to generation in the schools, agoras, and homes of ancient Greece. Later on the Romans would do the same, going as far as emulating these works by penning their own *Odyssey*, that of Aeneas, and by assuring the dissemination of these works throughout the ancient world in the wake of their cultural and territorial conquests.

[3] This is better known as oral tradition; however, it is difficult to discuss oral history cross-culturally without reference to these traditions. For a definition see: http://www.bartleby.com/61/50/O0105050.html

For the Greeks, the Homeric epic poems stood not only as forms of entertainment, but as chronicles of *actual* historical events. These poetic works contained within them the models for ideal "Greek" behavior as derived from the exploits of their glorious ancestors. Achilles, Odysseus, Hektor, Telemachos and the other "leading men" of the poems embodied in different aspects of their personality the ideal rubric for Greek males. Their qualities of honor, sacrifice, nobility, strength, intelligence, and courage were the ones most admired by the majority of Greek society. Similarly, female characters like Penelope, Adromache, and Helen represented both the Greek perception that all women's personalities were inherently weak and corruptible as well as the admired characteristics of the female sex. No doubt Helen of Troy epitomized women's role as the "bringers of evil" by having been the central cause of the war, just like her counterpart Pandora was infamous for being the one who ended the Golden Age of humanity and the gods. On the other hand, Penelope and Andromache encompassed the preferred female characteristics of loyalty, fealty, motherhood, and beauty amongst others.

The oral transmission of these works and the methodologies by which they were transmitted has always been an issue in the academic world. In addition to other points of contention, debates rage on about whether or not they were ever truly oral histories due to their length and amount of detail. John Miles Foley, a professor of English at the University of Missouri-Columbia, wrote a series of works dealing with oral traditions and their transmission that build upon the works of Milman Parry and Albert Lord.[4] Foley's efforts ultimately resulted in the creation of the Center for Studies in Oral Tradition, which explores

[4] For Foley see: http://www.didaskalia.net/issues/vol3no3/foley.html, http://www.missouri.edu/~engwww/people/foley.html. For Parry see: http://www.bartleby.com/61/29/P0082950.html. For Lord and information on the Milman Parry Collection at Harvard University see: http://www.chs.harvard.edu/mpc/index.html .

topics related to oral culture, tradition, and history throughout the various peoples of the world.[5] In relation to the Homeric epic poems, particularly *The Odyssey*, Foley's works *Traditional Oral Epic: The Odyssey, Beowulf and the Serbo-Croatian Return-Song* and *Homer's Traditional Art* have helped to establish a possible transmission methodology for the epic poems. Parry's and Foley's comparative studies of South Slavic (Serbo-Croatian) *chansons de geste* as performed by *guslari* with the epic works of Homer revealed a system in which the *guslari* followed a general rubric or set of "essential ideas" for any particular story.[6] As the *guslar* went about the task of retelling the epic poem he would fill in details particular to that instance, such as tying it in to a specific village or ruler, while still maintaining the overall set of "essential ideas" or "fixed expressions." Foley's research has gone even further than Parry's, suggesting that Homer is not a real author but simply a legendary oral literary figure to which the epic poems are attributed, much like Orpheus was a legendary musical figure.[7] *The Odyssey* and *The Iliad* represented the beginnings of an oral history tradition in Europe that continued into the Middle Ages with works such as *Beowulf* and the *Song of Roland* and into the present day with the South Slavic *guslari*.

Like the Homeric epic poems, the oral traditions of Buddhism form an integral part of that religion and culture. In the few centuries after the Buddha's *parinirvana* (his death and escape from the cycle of rebirth), his teachings, called the Dharma, were transmitted orally by the community of monastic followers or *samgha*. The complexities of Dharma and Buddhist philosophy led to the formulation of lists as the preferred device for

---

[5] http://www.oraltradition.org/

[6] For a definition of *chanson de geste* see: http://www.bartleby.com/65/ch/chansons.html. For the *guslari* see: http://www.didaskalia.net/issues/vol3no3/foley.html.

[7] http://www.psupress.org/books/titles/0-271-01870-4.html.

memorization, transmission, and recitation. The basic building blocks of the religion, to this day, are a set of lists of attributes and truths that followers learn and strive to perfect and cultivate within them.[8] Specifically these "lists" are the Four Truths, the Noble Eightfold Path, the twelve links of dependent arising, and the five aggregates of attachment. These four doctrines were passed from monk to monk, nun to nun, and in some cases lay person to lay person. They taught that the cause of suffering in the world was the cycle of rebirth, that to escape from that suffering was to follow the path of the Buddha to enlightenment and release, and that the "right" modes of behavior included right view, right intention, right thought, right speech, and right livelihood. They also explained the nature of the universe and the individual through the twelve links of the chain of dependent arising that included feelings, cravings, clinging, and death, as well as through other, more complicated concepts.

The importance of Buddhist oral tradition continues to this day in the fortnightly *uposatha* ceremony, in which monks and nuns congregate together in their respective monasteries to recite the *pratimoksa* rules from the *Vinaya*, a text that contains rules, modes of behavior, and guidelines for monastic life. The *pratimoksa* rules and their recital are meant to remind the monk or nun how to stay on the path towards enlightenment as well as providing a venue for the confession of any faults or sins. The usage of lists intended to aid in memory recall and oral transmission extends to all aspects of the religion, from the twelve stages of the Buddha's hagiography to the ten precepts that must be taken on by novitiate monks and nuns.

Much as the Homeric poems served to provide standards for ideal behavior, Buddhist religious doctrines and guidelines provide similar models as well as

[8] Rupert Gethin, *The Foundations of Buddhism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998).

methodologies of practice and devotion that are meant to aid individuals in the cultivation of enlightenment. These two cases represent the usage of oral history both as the basis for a culture's past and as a method of transmitting important information about cultural norms and expectations. Likewise, the use of oral history amongst Plains Native Americans in North America served to provide not only a recollection and record of important past events but models of ideal behavior.[9]

Tribes like the Kiowa and Lakota kept oral accounts of past events that were supplemented by pictographic records called "winter counts." These records were typically drawn on buffalo hides and recorded events in intervals of summer and winter denoting the change in season by a vertical line or pictograph of a tree. The winter counts recorded events such as epidemics, battles, and the occurrence of religious rituals like the Sun Dance. The winter counts were meant to aid the oral historian of the tribes in memory recall by providing visual and mental cues to events much like the Greek "mnemonic temples," the lists of Buddhism, or the essential ideas of the ancient Greek poets and Slavic *guslari*[10].

On a wider scale than that of the Plains tribes, Native American oral traditions included folktales and myths, that at one time or another were considered to be representative of real history as the Homeric epics were for ancient Greeks. The tales consisted of creation myths and entertaining as well as educational stories that instilled ideas of culturally proper behavior. They often included topics such as "vision quests" and creation myths. This oral tradition extends to the modern day Native American Church or Peyote religion. In the latter, oral traditions and

---

[9] Colin G. Calloway, *First Peoples: A Documentary Survey of American Indian History* (Boston, Mass.: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2004).

[10] Bill Viola, "Will There Be Condominiums in Data Space?" In *Multimedia: From Wagner to Virtual Reality*, Randall Packer and Ken Jordan, eds. (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 2001).

songs inform individuals about cultural practices and beliefs as well as providing guidelines for understanding religious ideals. The "Peyote religion" of the late nineteenth century and its usage of the drug in all-night rituals that involved singing and meditation inspired generations of Native Americans to continue their struggle against Anglo-American cultural oppression. The religion also curbed alcoholism amongst the tribes and promoted the values of brotherly love, Indian nationalism, family care, and self-reliance, all of which were cultural ideals and history transmitted orally rather than in writing that aided many Native Americans in weathering a difficult time in their history.

Oral history, be it real or "fictional" (from the modern perspective), has served and continues to serve important functions in a range of cultures. The examples of the Homeric epic poems, Buddhism, and the Native American traditions only touch the surface of a universal cultural practice. What is important is that oral history and oral traditions form the beginnings, the roots, of modern historical, literary, and cultural studies. Without the orally transmitted information of the *samgha*, Buddhism would not exist; nor could we have most of the epic poems of ancient times without their traveling and village poets. Regardless of their accuracy oral historical sources have left their influence on written history and literature and on modern cultural practices throughout the world. In addition, more and more projects are begun each day and oral sources interviewed for a wide variety of historical subjects, from World War II submarine veterans to histories of urban renewal and of significant periods.

The University of Florida Special and Area Studies Collections and Cuban Oral Tradition

Bridget Bihm-Manuel

Another cultural group that utilizes oral transmission of its history is located on the island of Cuba. During the nineteenth century, some of the Yoruba people of Nigeria were enslaved in Cuba and inadvertently spawned a syncretic religion called *Regla de Ocha* that allowed them to worship their own deities within the framework of Christianity. Known in the United States as Santería, *Regla de Ocha* contains elements of Spanish Catholicism and the religion of the Yoruba. Each of their deities, known as *orishas*, was identified with a Catholic saint who shared similarities in personal attributes. For example, Changó, the orisha of fire, thunder, and lightening, was syncretized in Santería with Saint Barbara, a Catholic saint traditionally dressed in red and white (which are also the colors of Changó) and associated with lightening, which caused her death.[11]

Worship in Regla de Ocha focused on spirit possession, divination, and initiations. The religious specialists, or *santeros*, oversaw all religious ceremonies, which included the possession of some participants by their *orishas*. Another important function of *santeros* was the use of cowry shells to divine the will of the *orishas*, often for the resolution of their clients' problems. Finally, santeros and the *babalawos*, or high priests, presided over initiations. Through the major initiation, the *asiento*, which

[11] Migene González-Wippler, *Santería: The Religion* (St. Paul, Minn.: Llewellyn Publications, 1989), 41-44.

traditionally lasted two weeks, one became a santero, and was then able to initiate others and perform most of the duties of a priest in *Regla de Ocha.*[12]

Bruce S. Chappell, an archivist in the Department of Special and Area Collections at the University of Florida, is engaged in an oral history project in Cuba documenting the traditional practice of *Regla de Ocha* in Cuba. Chappell and his collaborators, who are working without institutional support, are all academics initiated into the religion and who have expertise in oral history. They want to preserve *Regla de Ocha*'s traditional ways in the face of increasing commercialization. Chappell states that commercialization in Brazil, the Dominican Republic, Puerto Rico, New York, South Florida, and other centers of Santería resulted in the loss of traditional knowledge. For a variety of reasons, but mostly because Cuba was not open to Western or "capitalist" tourism until 1993, Cuban *Regla de Ocha* has been spared such a transformation. The project organizers are helping to interview many of Havana's oldest santeros to document how *Regla de Ocha* was practiced at the end of the nineteenth century and how it has changed over the course of the twentieth. Because Santeria has been an orally based religion, these practitioners are often the only sources for the study of Regla de Ocha's history. Many of the subjects of their interviews are semi-literate and are the repositories of an oral tradition in danger of being lost.

[12] González-Wippler, *Santería*, 84-86; and Rómulo Lachatañeré, *Afro-Cuban Myths: Yemayá and Other Orishas* (Princeton: Markus Wiener Publishers, 2004), 37-41.

The Samuel Proctor Oral History Program
At the University of Florida

Samuel Pierce

At the University of Florida, oral history is an important part of understanding the past. In addition to the oral history projects at the Department of Special and Area Collections, the University of Florida is also the home of the Samuel Proctor Oral History Program. It currently houses a collection of approximately 4,000 interviews—over 100,000 pages of transcripts. Projects include a series of 900 interviews with Native Americans and interviews related to the Civil Rights Movement, Florida women, the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC), and Everglades restoration. Currently, the program is in the process of digitizing its resources (making them word searchable and available online). The program supports itself mostly through contract work for outside organizations, as well as transcription services. Water Management paid for sixty interviews, and the Department of the Interior has commissioned a project on federal judges.

According to Dr. Julian Pleasants, the program director, oral history is an "organized effort to gain information and insight that might not otherwise be available." It helps explain why people do things and how they experience them, often shedding light on their reactions to extraordinary events. Oral history studies the "spoken memories" of events, experiences, and careers. Much important information is not contained in the written record, and oral history provides a way to uncover it.

In doing oral history, interviewers must prepare thoroughly before asking any questions. Prior research

provides the basis for formulating appropriate questions. According to Dr. Pleasants, "If you don't have the knowledge, you'll waste your time" doing the interviews, because the questions asked may not accurately reflect the historical event. Often, oral history interviews are unreliable because interview subjects tend to be self-serving, and memories can fade over time. Interview subjects often exaggerate or re-interpret their role in events. For this reason, interviews must be put into the context of solid historical research. In many cases, interviewers can push interviewees to provide a more "accurate" answer by demonstrating a clear knowledge of the topic.

The process of compiling an oral history interview minimizes the possibility of including errors. Interviews are recorded, and then transcribed verbatim. An audit editor checks the transcript, corrects any transcription errors, also adding bracketed information about significant people whose names come up in the interview. After this, Dr. Pleasants edits the interview and returns it to the interviewee for further editing. Interviewees are allowed to make changes or additions, but they may not rewrite answers. After these changes are made, the interviews are placed in the program's repository for use by researchers.

Oral history is a subjective process, but it is also a democratic process. A look at the interview list from the UF program shows that in addition to politicians and prominent citizens, there have also been interviews with resident's of UF's Flavet Village (a housing area created to accomodate the influx of GI Bill veterans after World War Two) and homemakers (as part of the Voices of American Homemakers project). Done properly, oral history is a valuable tool in understanding the past.

An Oral History Interview With Dr. Robert Cade

Dr. Samuel Proctor

This is an excerpt from Dr. Robert Cade's interview from the Samuel Proctor Oral History Program. Dr. Proctor conducted this interview himself. The University of Florida Oral History Program holds the copyright on all materials.[13]

P: Now let us get to the Gatorade situation. Start off by saying how and why.

C: The "why" was basically Dwayne Douglas's [a volunteer coach for the University of Florida football team] question. We wanted to find out what really happened [to players during football games].

P: But you had the questions that you posed to Douglas, did you not, about why the players did not have to go to the bathroom.

C: *He* asked *me* why do players not "wee wee" during the game.

P: Oh, I see.

C: He knew that from his own experience. That alone I could answer after ten minutes of talking. It was of interest to know how much did temperatures go, how high did blood volume change, what happened to blood-sugars and lipids, and all of the other things.

[13] Samuel Proctor Oral History Program, University of Florida Health Center Collection, UFHC 25, Samuel Proctor interview with Robert Cade, Gatorade Story.

P: You had not thought about this before, you had no reason to.

C: I had no reason to. All of those were questions that we wanted to answer with studies we did on the football players. By the time we got all the data analyzed, all of that was very clear. What happened was that their blood volume went way down. With the blood volume down, the heart cannot put out as much blood. We did not know it at that time, but we found in later studies, what happened was as the amount of blood the heart pumps each minute goes down because blood volume has gone down, initially there is no pumping of blood to the skin, to maintain the flow to working muscles. Not pumping it to the skin, the players cannot get rid of the heat they are producing. They are not carrying anything to the skin, so instead of evaporating, the sweat will drip off in large measure. They get more cooling from that. That makes the blood volume deficit even worse, so flow goes down, cardiac output goes down, flow to the skin eventually goes down to basically nothing, then it will extend down to muscles everywhere, and to the brain and so on.

Another problem was that there is more water in sweat than there is salt. You lose water proportionately in much larger amounts than you lose sodium. So the concentration of sodium in the blood goes up, up, and up. Most of the time, your serum sodium is normally about 140. If your sodium got up to 145, you would be dreadfully thirsty. By 150, you would just about kill to get a drink of water. A lot of people are confused at 150. At 155, most everyone is confused.

P: When you say confused, you are referring to your orientation?

C: You cannot respond to things. If someone is going to hit you, you do not respond to that at all. You see the blow coming, but it does not record. Your response to it is so slow you cannot get out of the way.

P: This happens if one's sodium level reaches 155?

C: Yes. Some people will be unconscious. Some of them will have convulsions.

P: Is this what happens to people who get lost in the desert?

C: That was basically the problem. Those were two of the major problems. You are also losing large amounts of salt. You are proportionately losing more water though.

P: So the sodium builds up in the system.

C: The volume of blood goes down, the sodium concentration goes up, and everything gets worse. The next thing that happened was that they were burning up sugar. Most players had a low blood-sugar [count] by the end of practice. A normal blood-sugar is 80 to 120. Some of these guys had blood-sugars in the forties. If you were sitting here, and I lowered your blood-sugar to forty, you would have all kinds of problems. You would be nervous, weak, and sweating from that. The brain subsists entirely on sugar, so your mental responses would be slower and so on. We had three things, of those each by itself would to some extent incapacitate a player. Put them all together, and you can have real problems. The solution was to give them water, but with salt in it, to replace at least to a large degree the salt they were losing in sweat. Give them sugar to keep their blood sugar up, but do not give them so much sugar that it will affect how the stomach and intestine

work. You cannot give a whole bunch of sugar. You have to give a relatively small amount. If they were to drink enough to replace the water and salt they were using, then that way they would get enough sugar to keep their blood-sugar up. Sugar and sodium act together to increase the rate at which this stuff is absorbed from the intestine.

P: Does this mean they had to ingest all of this during the course of a game, which would fundamentally change the whole idea of not allowing the players to drink anything?

C: That is right.

P: That itself must have been a hard problem to sell to the athletic departments.

C: Again, one of the reasons I have respect for coach [Samuel Ray] Graves was that when we explained to him what we had found, he professed no ability to really understand what we were saying, but he accepted it, and hedged his bets a little bit. We could try it on the freshman team. They had a game they called the Toilet Bowl, between the freshman and the B team, on a Friday afternoon. We could give it to the freshman for that game, but we were not to give it to Larry Rentz or Larry Smith because they were his coming stars.

P: So to begin with, he gave you permission to do testing on the players after the game. Now he broadened it, to allow you to give freshmen this solution to drink during the game.

C: A solution to the problem. So we did that. Graves and the entire bunch of them were out there watching.

P: Have you a date on all of this?

C: That was early October 1965. They were playing at LSU [Louisiana State University, at Baton Rouge] the next day. It was the LSU game in early October 1965.

P: So you fed your concoction to this freshmen group in a Friday afternoon game.

C: Yes.

P: What did you find out at the end of it? Were they renewed?

C: What happened was at the end of the first half, the B team was ahead thirteen to nothing. They pushed the freshmen around pretty good. In the third period, the freshmen came out. *They* were pushing the B team around. They scored two or three touchdowns in the third period. In the fourth period, they scored five or six more. The B team did not even make a first down during the fourth period. At the end of the game, Larry Rentz was kicking the football and yelling, boy this is fun! Let us play another quarter. Two of the B team guys who were dragging by at that point said, "Oh, go to hell," and continued plodding over to the gym to shower.

P: Nobody unfurled a big banner saying, 'Long live Dr. Cade!'

C: No. Graves came up and said he was really impressed. When I had told him we could probably give him a better team during the fourth quarter and we had surely done that.

P: He liked that.

C: Oh yes. He asked, can you make it up for the varsity to use against LSU? I said sure.

P: You got your kettle out?

C: We went down to the lab. I had plenty of salt and water. We were putting phosphate in it because it helps.

P: Did you already figure out what the proportions were of sugar, salt, and all of these other things?

C: Yes, so that one would get rapid absorption and so on.

P: Did you use it Saturday against LSU?

C: Yes, although we ran into a problem. When we got to the lab, we [found] that I only had one bottle, 500 grams, of glucose. It was reagent grane glucose at about $5 a pound. We needed about five kilos [kilograms] to make up 100 liters which was what we planned for the team. I called the pharmacy and hospital stores; they did not have any glucose. I called a pharmacy warehouse over in Jacksonville; they did not have any. Dwayne Douglas came walking by, and he said, I have a key that will open every lab in the building. So we went up to the fifth floor, and walked into Mel Fregly's lab. I think I got four bottles out of there. Wendell Stainsby's lab right next door had five or six more. Sidney Cassin's lab had some more.

P: I hope you left an IOU in all of these places?

C: No, I did not. We got all the glucose we needed, went down, and made up our stuff. We put it in a walk-in freezer to get cold overnight. The next day, we had it in two big carboys. We had 100 liters of it in these carboys. I had them in a little red wagon and was walking across the field where the Gators bench would be. The public address guy came on and said, it is 104 degrees on the playing surface today. Because of the heat we expect to have nine or ten people with heat exhaustion or stroke in the stands.

The football players are not going to be affected because they will be taking...and I thought damn, who told them?...salt tablets, said the announcer. Taking salt tablets would be just the wrong thing to do because your sodium was already way up. That would just run it up more and compound the problem. I relaxed then. I got over to our bench. They kicked off to LSU. The defensive team went in. They finally stopped LSU at about the twenty-yard line. The defense came out. The first three guys on the bench were Bennett, a safety man; Benson, a tackle; and Larry Gagner, a guard. They sat down and the rest of the defense was sitting there. I handed a cup of the stuff to Benson, and he said, what is this? I told him, this is a glucose electrolyte solution. It will replace [the water, salt, and sugar he was losing because of the heat]. Not only would he keep his energy during the game, but if he kept drinking it throughout the game, at the end he would feel better and be stronger. He took it and just gluggled it all down, and wanted another cup. The next guy was Gagner, and I handed him a cup. He sort of sipped it. He said, this stuff tastes like piss. He poured it on his head because it was cold, and that would cool him off, which was one of the things we wanted. I handed a cup to Bennett who was right next to Gagner. He took it and sipped it. He said, Larry, it does not taste like piss to me. He glugged it down. Each time I came around during the first half, Gagner would take his and pour it on his head. The other guys would drink it and comment on how good it was. I could not get into the argument at that time because I had never tasted piss. Toward the end of the first half, Gagner took his cup and drank it down. He said, Doc, I have decided I like the taste of piss. He drank a couple of cups every time he came out after that for the rest of the game.

In that game, at the half, LSU was ahead thirteen to nothing. They outgamed the Gators about 200 yards to 50 yards. In the third period, the Gators stopped them, and scored a touchdown late in the third period. It was thirteen to seven. Then in the fourth period, the Gators were really dominating play, but they had not scored until about halfway through the fourth period. They had a tackle whose name I do not remember, but I know they threw a pass to him and he went in for a touchdown. The Gators won that game fourteen to thirteen. In the second half they outgamed LSU by more than LSU had outgamed them in the first half. It was something like 250 or 260 yards that they gained in the second half. I think LSU made one first down and that was all. Graves was again very impressed. After that, they started using Gatorade in all of the games.

Oral History Resources in Florida

Bridget Bihm-Manuel

The Samuel Proctor Oral History Program is one of the largest and best-known oral history programs in the state, but it is by no means the only resource for oral history in Florida. Most universities and other historical organizations across the United States maintain oral history collections of various sizes. These collections usually focus on local history and culture, while others, such as the Georgetown University Foreign Affairs Oral History Project, the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill Southern Oral History Program, or the South Dakota Oral History Center's American Indian Research Project and the South Dakota Oral History Project, tend to be thematic or regional. The collections in Florida fall into both categories. The following is a list containing some of the oral history programs in Florida and other organizations that support oral history research and preservation.

Florida A & M University Regional Black Archives and Research Center and Museum
Located in Historic Carnegie Library
Florida A&M University
Tallahassee, Florida 32307, USA
850-599-3020
850-561-2604 fax
http://www.famu.edu/acad/archives

The Black Archives at Florida A & M University are dedicated to "the collection, preservation, and dissemination of information significant to African

Americans and their experiences and contributions in Florida and throughout the Southeastern United States."[14] Part of its collection includes oral histories of African Americans in Florida.

Florida International University Cuban Living History Project Archives

Catherine Marsicek, Latin American and Caribbean Information Services Librarian
Green Library 225
University Park Campus
Miami, FL 33199
305-348-1991
http://lacc.fiu.edu/centers_institutes/?body=centers_cri_living_history&rightbody=centers_cri

Dr. Miguel González-Pando was the founder of the Cuban Living History Project at Florida International University. His mission was to document the creation of Cuban Miami, and he conducted many interviews with Cuban exiles as part of the project. In 2000, Green Library's Department of Special Collections created the Cuban Living History Project archives in order to make González-Pando's resources available to researchers. Green Library also contains the James Nelson Goodsell Photo Collection, consisting of hundreds of images and video clips from Latin American and the Caribbean. Many of the images include audio commentaries.

[14] "Quick Facts," http://www.famu.edu/acad/archives/qfacts.html.

The Florida Oral History Association

PO Box 248107
Coral Gables, FL 33124
305-667-4398
gregbush@aol.com
http://dlis.dos.state.fl.us/barm/foha/foha.htm

The Florida Oral History Association, located within the Florida Bureau of Archives and Records Management at the Florida Department of State in Tallahassee, Florida, is a statewide organization dedicated to coordinating and assisting oral history programs throughout the state. It promotes conferences on oral history and creates programs for television, radio, and other types of media that attempt to not only preserve the past but also expand knowledge about Florida's culture.

Florida Southern College Center for Florida Studies

Dr. James M. Denham, Executive Director
111 Lake Hollingsworth Drive
Lakeland, Florida 33801
863-680-4312
jdenham@flsouthern.edu
http://www.flsouthern.edu/flhistory/

The goal of the Center for Florida Studies at Florida Southern College is to keep Florida history available for students and the public. It trains schoolteachers of public and private schools on Florida history, sponsors a lecture series, and advises historical associations on preservation of materials, including oral histories.

Florida State University Reichelt Oral History Program

Dr. Robin Sellers, director
401 Bellamy Building
Tallahassee, Florida 32306-2200
rsellers@mailer.fsu.edu
http://www.fsu.edu/%7Eohp/index.html

The Florida State University Reichelt Oral History Program began in 1969, and was directed by Professor Edward F. Keuchel. In 1999, the program's name changed in order to honor the memory of history Professor Emeritus Wallace Ward Reichelt, who supported the program. The Reichelt Oral History Program includes documents related to the Florida State College for Women, the City of Tallahassee, and the State of Florida. In 1995, the program also added material on "military experiences," including material on veterans and civilian personnel from World War II and the Korean and Vietnam Wars. Other collections include information on the Florida Teacher's Strike in the late 1960s, the social aspects of some Florida retirement communities, and the black community of Macon in North Florida before 1950. For students interested in oral history, there is also an oral history course offered by the university's department of history.

Kennedy Space Center Oral History Program

Elaine Listion, Curator
Elaine.Liston-1@ksc.nasa.gov
http://www.ksc.nasa.gov/kscoralhistory/

The University of West Florida and the University of Central Florida are working with Kennedy Space Center to help it maintain an oral history program. The program collects interviews with employees of the space center and "is dedicated to the recording and preservation of the

institutional memory of Kennedy Space Center, Cape Canaveral Air Force Station and other locations as deemed appropriate." [15] There is also a UWF/UCF/NASA Collaborative Internship Program that allows students to work in the KSC Archives, with Delaware North Park Services to prepare museum exhibits, or in the Webcast studio to develop historical documentaries for web-based broadcasting.

South Florida Oral History Consortium

http://cwis.fcla.edu/sfohc/SPT--Home.php

Miami-Dade public schools, the University of Miami, and Florida International University came together to create the South Florida Oral History Consortium in an attempt to improve access to oral history programs and to promote oral history as important part of understanding history. The Consortium provides an Internet portal that allows users to search oral history collections across the state for information related to South Florida. Some of its activities include training researchers in oral history collection techniques, oral history preservation, and promoting collaborative projects.

[15] http://www.uwf.edu/publichistory/projects/

St. Augustine Lighthouse and Museum Maritime Memory Project

Annemarie van Hemmen, Research Curator
St. Augustine Lighthouse & Museum, Inc.
81 Lighthouse Avenue
St. Augustine, Florida 32080
904-829-0745, ext. 218
stauglh@aug.com

The St. Augustine Lighthouse and Museum is involved in a partnership with the Library of Congress Veterans History Project, the Lighthouse Archaeological Maritime Program, and the Junior Service League of St. Augustine to maintain a permanent oral history collection. The Museum gathers information related to maritime history, underwater archeology, and maritime military service after the Museum was selected as a partner repository for the Library of Congress Veterans History Project in 2004. The Museum also sponsors maritime oral history programs for students in conjunction with local schools, universities, and colleges in Florida.

University of Central Florida Cultural Heritage Alliance

12461 Research Parkway, Suite 500, Room 135
Orlando, FL 32826
407-823-4534
407-823-6103 fax
heritagealliance@dm.ucf.edu%20
http://sfdm.ucf.edu/heritagealliance/community.html

In 2002, the UCF College of Arts and Sciences and the Department of State Florida Folklife Program created the Central Florida Heritage Initiative, which later became the Cultural Heritage Alliance. The Alliance includes two types of programs, one focusing on community and education in order to teach about folklife research, while the second

allows artists to use new types of technology. Part of its goal was to create a Central Florida Folklife Archive that includes oral histories and videos of local folklife.

University of Florida Samuel Proctor Oral History Program

Dr. Julian Pleasants, director
4103 Turlington Hall
P.O. Box 115215
Gainesville, FL 32611-5215
Telephone: 352-392-7168
Fax: 352-8461983
jpleasan@history.ufl.edu
http://www.clas.ufl.edu/history/oral

The University of Florida Samuel Proctor Oral History Program holds about five thousand interviews and 85,000 pages of transcriptions. It is the largest oral history program in the South and one of the major collections in the United States. Its holdings include material on Florida folklife, heritage, and history in general. Its major collection contains over nine hundred interviews with Native Americans. Some of its other important collections are related to Florida politicians, Florida newspapers, Growth Management in Florida, a history of the University of Florida, the UF Law School, the UF Medical School, the Civilian Conservation Corps, African Americans in the Korean War, Florida business leaders, and the UF Women's Studies Program. The program also has a sound archive, including speeches related to the University of Florida, recordings of music, and Native American chants.

University of Miami Oral History Program

Maria R. Estorino
Interim Head
Archives and Special Collections
University of Miami Libraries
PO Box 248214
Coral Gables, FL 33124-0320
305-284-3247
asc.library@miami.edu
http://www.library.miami.edu/archives/ohp/mission.html

The Otto G. Richter the Library's Oral History Program, started in 2001, focuses on the history of South Florida and its unique immigrant communities. The program "endeavors to facilitate oral history initiatives by collecting, archiving, storing, preserving, and otherwise organizing and managing the materials produced by disparate organizations and individuals, and by making these sources available to researchers and patrons interested in exploring South Florida's history." [16] It consists of several different collections, which are inventoried separately and named after individual donators in order to maintain their integrity. Some of these collections include the Instituted for Public History Oral History Collection, the Valerie Lester Pan Am Flight Attendant Oral History Collection, and the Ione Wright Pan Am Pacific Route Exploration Oral History Collection.

[16] http://www.library.miami.edu/archives/ohp/mission.html

University of South Florida Oral History Program

Dr. Martin I. Greenberg
Florida Studies Center
University of South Florida
4202 E. Fowler Ave.,
LIB122
Tampa, FL 33620
813-974-4774
813-974-3417 fax
mgreenbe@lib.usf.edu
http://web.lib.usf.edu/flasc/oralhistory.html

In cooperation with the Florida Studies Center, the USF Libraries' Oral History Program focuses on Florida history and the history of Hillsborough County. Its collection includes over three hundred documents, in areas including political life in Florida, the history of the University of South Florida, social justice and the economic and cultural development of Tampa Bay. Many of its interviews have been filmed in a digital format and are available for viewing through its website.

University of West Florida Public History Program

11000 University Parkway
Pensacola, Florida 32514
850-474-2683
PublicHistory@uwf.edu
http://www.uwf.edu/publichistory/

The University of West Florida in Pensacola offers an M.A in public history through its history department, and part of its curriculum involves learning about oral history. There are also a number of oral history projects associated with the Public History Program, such as the Kennedy Space Center Oral History Program; the Guantanamo Bay Oral History Project, which involved interviews with Cuban exiles

living at Guantanamo Bay; a oral history study of the town of Seaside, Florida; and the National Museum of Naval Aviation Oral History Project, which was designed to preserve the memories of the people linked to the United States Navy and Pensacola Naval Aviation.

Gender and the Missionary Experience

Benjamin Boyce

This article draws comparisons to the missionary experiences of both colonial America and colonial India by looking at historical episodes in the missionary discourse. This study will focus primarily on the religious interaction between men and women and the native people of America and India. My contention is that the examples cited here illustrate global implications. European empire building required religious assimilation because religion was inextricably tied to who colonists were and what they thought their roles in empire building should be. Moreover, religious tension in Europe (particularly in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries) added urgency to religious efforts in foreign conquests.

In terms of religious interaction (though "collision" may be a more appropriate word), missionaries on both continents encountered faiths that were very different from their own. Both the Indians and the "(American) Indians" obeyed a polytheistic religious structure that was rooted, at least on the surface, in an organic spiritual connection with the natural world. There was a ritual component of both brands of polytheism that went far deeper than the practices of Catholic or Protestant doctrine. This was a sharp contrast to monotheistic Christianity, which not only avows that one God controls the physical and spiritual world, but that worshipping other gods is a mortal sin. This is an important distinction, because European missionaries in America and India faced deeply entrenched religions that were intertwined with the identity of the

native people. The methods to combat this problem were very different and were reflective of the culture that pervaded Europe at the time. There was a distinct difference in the way men and women addressed this issue as well. There were multiple gender issues in these episodes. The interface between male missionaries and female natives, the different approaches of male and female missionaries, and the reaction of church leaders to these approaches all fall under scrutiny here. It is important to examine the complex relationship between women, religion, and empire on two continents in this context.

This is not a historiographical essay. It is part narrative, part theoretical exercise and part linguistic anthropology. The objective is to look at three distinct periods in the missionary experience and draw conclusions about the role of women and men, both Native and European. From these three separate events, which detail very different approaches to religious conversion, large implications emerge as to how women were seen in the various cultures represented.

What follows are three moments in the history of missionary discourse. Though they are separated by over two hundred years and thousands of miles, these three episodes illustrate a dramatic shift, not only in the role of the missionary in non-Christian lands, but in the role that gender played in missionary tactics and policies. This discussion begins in seventeenth-century New France, where Jesuit missionaries realized that in order to "civilize" the natives, they would first have to reverse the prevailing gender roles practiced by the natives. More than two hundred forty years later, missionaries in India took a very different approach to winning the souls of the natives there, an approach that impacted how the missionary movement saw its future in so-called "heathen" lands. Finally, looking through the lens of an early twentieth-century religious tract allows one to see how the varied experiences of missionaries affected church policy regarding men, women,

and their relationship to the heathen souls they were attempting to save.

Missionary activity proceeded apace following the discovery of the "New World" in 1492. To the devout of Europe, commanded by their faith to spread the message of the Gospel, mission work promised to be a worthwhile venture. Christopher Columbus's description of the native people he encountered in Hispaniola--deeply religious but horribly misguided--certainly heightened the enthusiasm among potential missionaries. The onset of the Protestant Reformation in 1520 gave mission work new urgency to the weary Catholic Church, which was exhausted and indignant after centuries of fighting "infidels" in the Crusades (the success of which was mixed, at best) and the disaster of the Great Schism during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. In the wake of these debacles, it is not surprising that two of the Catholic superpowers of Europe, France and Spain, would make mission work an integral part of their colonization efforts. Since religion was inextricably connected to government, successful colonization depended on the conversion, or total cultural submission, of the natives. It was, quite simply, a matter of pride as well as strategy. The conversion of natives in foreign lands began as much more than an interesting distraction from problems at home; it was an opportunity for all Christians to consolidate strategic and spiritual power on a global scale. To Catholics sailing across the Atlantic in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, it may have seemed that the future of their faith was in their hands.[1]

Carol Devons's article "Separate Confrontations: Gender as a Factor in Indian Adaptation to European

[1] Bartolomé de las Casas, a member of Columbus's expedition to the New World, wrote a disturbing account of Columbus's first meeting with the natives on Hispaniola. In *Historia de las Indias* (*A History of the Indies*) he quotes Columbus as saying the natives were "Una gente en Dios," which, in Spanish, translates to "A people in God."

Colonization in New France" provides an interesting case study of Catholic missionary efforts in colonial America. Not only does her analysis provide a glimpse of Catholic (specifically Jesuit) missionary tactics, but it also illustrates that the chief problem facing the evangelicals was one of gender, specifically the role of women in Native American culture.[2] Among the people of the Montagnais in New France (as well as countless other tribes), women held status and authority in society that was unheard of in Europe.[3] The men and women of the Montagnais had an elegant and complementary relationship that simultaneously fostered collaboration and autonomy. Though men were responsible for hunting, the women of

---

[2] Saint Ignatius Loyola founded the Jesuit Order in 1540 as an offshoot of the formal Catholic Church. The Order had two expressed and interwoven purposes: to further advance the Catholic gospel of Jesus Christ and to combat the Protestant Reformation. The Order quickly gained a reputation for fierceness for its methods both in Europe and in missions abroad. For our purposes, Jesuit and Catholic may be interchanged to avoid repetitive language. Source, *Catholic Encyclopedia Online- http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/14103a.htm.*

[3] Various historians echo this conclusion, which is based largely on ethnographic research as well as first-hand accounts of missionaries. For further discussions on this matter and the role of gender in European contact, see Juliana Barr, "A Diplomacy of Gender," and Michelene Pesantubbee, "Beyond Domesticity: Choctaw Women Negotiating the Tension Between Choctaw Culture and Protestantism" in *Journal of the American Academy of Religion*, 67 (June, 1999). In the article "A Diplomacy of Gender: Ritual of First Contact in the 'Land of the Tejas'" (*William and Mary Quarterly*, volume 63), Juliana Barr presents an interesting case study of cultural miscommunication in New Spain. This miscommunication had its roots in the divergent gender roles of the Spanish, French and the Hasinais Indians. The lack of common language (a "cognitive gap") between the Europeans and the Hasinais forced each party to base their relationship upon mutual experience and cultural values. Barr observes that Gender constructions were used to foment this relationship, with Europeans and Natives searching for similarities within their different gender roles. This breakdown in diplomacy was not the result of mere miscommunication, but rather the conflict of entrenched cultural and gender constructs that neither side was willing to part with.

the Montagnais were responsible for the cultivation of the killed animal and its distribution. Women worked communally to ensure that the needs of the camp were met. They managed the allocation of living space and the selection of arable land. Women were also the primary farmers, growing crops to supplement the meat brought in by the men. On all aspects of camp life, men deferred to women. To the amazement of the Jesuit missionaries, women would give away meat, killed by their husbands, without consulting them. This simple act, Devens argues, illustrates Montagnais women's "autonomy and control of particular resources while reinforcing a sense of community and interdependence between households."[4]

While Montagnais women participated actively in the community of the village, Montagnais men found their identity alone in the bush, communing with the spirits that might aid them in the hunt. This practice promoted solitude; men did not frequently interact with each other on long hunts. Their status in the tribe depended on their success in the wilderness; however, this status was dependent on the women's status within the tribe. If a hunter's wife did not properly allocate the catch, then both would suffer shame. Moreover, hunting was not the sole domain of men. Though women left the killing of large game to the men, they often hunted small game themselves, as well as fishing to provide surplus foods, particularly in the winter when large game hibernated or snow made trails unnavigable.[5]

Most galling to the missionaries was the sexual freedom enjoyed by Montagnais women. Both men and women carried on extra-marital affairs, but women clearly

---

[4] Carol Devens, "Separate Confrontations: Gender as a Factor in Indian Adaptation to European Colonization in New France," *American Quarterly* 38 (1986) 462-63. According to Devons, her argument can be directly applied to the surrounding tribes of New France, namely the Naskapi, Algonquin, and Ojibwa Indians.

[5] Ibid., 463-64.

had the advantage. Montagnais women controlled their own bodies and their sexual habits. This sexual freedom gave women power within the community that was consolidated through the act of child rearing. Men had little to do with raising the children outside of ritual education for young boys. Moreover, and perhaps most nerve-wracking for Montagnais men, a woman was free to divorce her husband at any time. This fact certainly kept many Montagnais men on notice, because a man without a wife was condemned to "live without help, without home, and to be forever wandering."[6]

This was the society that Jesuit missionaries faced in New France: one where women dominated politically and sexually; where gender roles were at once distinct and elastic; and where men had an important but distinctly minimized role in society. There is nothing to suggest that these missionaries were even remotely prepared to deal with such a scenario. All of the Jesuit missionaries were men, and because of the religious chaos in Europe, it was unthinkable that women would even consider going.[7] Everything about the missionaries' cultural background made them diametrically opposed to the Montagnais matrilineal system. The Christian faith in particular was very explicit on the hierarchy of the sexes and their roles in society. Though the rigidly defined gender identities of Victorian Womanhood was better than two hundred years away, the Jesuits brought with them the belief that women belonged in the home where they would be the moral

---

[6] Ibid., 467-68, 462.

[7] Devens does not offer any opinion as to why only men initially came to the New World. In her article "Women and Empire," Indrani Sen notes that empire building carried connotations of "adventure, warfare, conquest and administration," activities associated exclusively with manliness. I have come to the above conclusion given the state of affairs in Europe at the time and the nature of the Jesuit mission, which is to succeed at any cost. At its founding, the Jesuits were a men-only organization whose duties would prohibit women taking part under seventeenth century societal conventions.

foundation of the household. It quickly became apparent to the Jesuits that in order to secure religious conversion among the Montagnais, they had to reverse the gender roles of the natives. The missionaries needed a recognizable corollary as a foundation. The Jesuits accomplished this by capitalizing on what they perceived as the insecurities and resentments of the male natives.

The Jesuits had much to offer the men of the Montagnais. The teachings of the Christian God clearly made men the dominant power while relegating women to a subservient role. There was much more to it than that, however. If women refused to convert, then all their efforts amounted to was a one-sided change in perspective. The Jesuits, deliberately but sometimes serendipitously, began to dismantle the system that gave women their power in society. Jesuits chastised the native men for allowing themselves to be subservient to women, and found their audience to be receptive. They ministered to men constantly, again, meeting little resistance. The Montagnais men were attracted to Christianity's individualistic relationship to God: it mirrored their own connection to the spirit helpers of the hunt. More significantly, however, they encouraged the Montagnais to abandon their semi-nomadic ways and settle in one place. This suggestion had a two-fold benefit. It removed the occasional responsibility of choosing campsites and allocating land from the women. More importantly, it reduced the formerly sprawling village to a confined space, which made proselytizing more efficient, and established a permanent trading settlement.[8]

This last change was more sinister than it appears at first glance. Montagnais women traditionally provided the village with supplemental food in the form of crops. With the advent of sustained pelt trading, however, this changed quickly and dramatically. The Montagnais had no need for

[8] Ibid., 465.

abstract currency, so they bartered the pelts for European foodstuffs, reducing the village's dependence on female-grown crops. Moreover, women traditionally held responsibility for the conversion of game into wearables and meat. This role too was stripped away. The high-volume pelt trade forced women into the job of preparing beaver pelts for trade rather than for shelter and subsistence. Pelts were then traded for European clothes. Women, who had maintained authority by bearing these responsibilities, now were participating in a system that subordinated them for the good of commerce.[9]

Naturally, Montagnais women resisted these changes from the outset. Christianity had nothing to offer these women other than its own version of salvation; in fact, they had much to lose by its implementation. Nevertheless, the Jesuits made initial attempts to convert women because, ideally, they too had a role to play in this new religious order. Women were expected to be the moral foundation for men to prevent them from backsliding into sin. The missionaries were handicapped by their own societal limitations, however. They would go out of their way to avoid being alone with native women, for whose sake is unknown. One priest remarked, "it is not becoming for us to receive them [women] into our houses." This meant that the majority of religious instruction was going to the men. However, the Jesuits obviously did not feel that women's involvement was critical in the long run. When it became too difficult to convert women directly, the missionaries decided that women would be converted "by chance or by male converts."[10]

Jesuits in New France had another way of dealing with impenitent women. Through their exploitation of the gender divisions and perceived inequalities that favored women, Jesuits were successful in creating a real division

[9] Ibid., 472.
[10] Ibid., 465.

between the sexes in the Montagnais tribe. Village men came to the conclusion (with some assistance from the Jesuits) that the women would not convert because they did not want to relinquish their hold on power within the tribe, leading to resentment, which blossomed into violence. Jesuit accounts abound with stories of Montagnais men who punched, kicked, chained, and imprisoned their wives because they would not convert.[11]

The primary goal of the Jesuits mission in North America was not to eliminate the culture of the natives they encountered, though that was nearly the effect.[12] The goal was to convert "savages" to Christianity. The "earnest and educated" men who came to North America were active participants in the breakdown of the Montagnais society. A European cultural framework that made them unable to understand the Montagnais society directly influenced them, and the heated and desperate religious climate they came from made them unwilling to compromise. Anything was justifiable to achieve victory in the war for souls. To be sure, after the disastrous first half of the second millennia, the Jesuits most certainly were at war.

Like most well-written historical analysis, Devens's article raises many more questions than it answers. The long-term impact of this "cultural genocide" is left vague, so its effectiveness in perpetuating long-lasting economic and strategic relationships is unknown. She does make it clear

---

[11] Ibid., 466. The violent reaction of Montegnais men toward non-converted women at the prodding of Jesuits stands in sharp contrast to the reaction of the "Tejas" Indians of New Spain. When it became clear that the Spanish did not respect the "Tejas" women, the men of the tribe became very upset and drove the Spanish out. See Barr, "A Diplomacy of Gender."

[12] Ironically, Devons suggests that the constant pressure from all sides on women to abandon tradition may have actually helped that culture persist, at least in racial memory. The argument maintains that the constant pressure made women hold on to those values harder than they normally would have. This argument is echoed in Pesantubbee analysis of Choctaw women's culture, "Beyond Domesticity."

that women became responsible for maintaining some semblance of the old order, but to what effect? Is this silent refusal to fully assimilate Christian traditions and ideals part of a larger pattern among Indian women? If so, how effective was the Jesuit's pro-active, non-compromising approach when the "converted" were merely going through the motions publicly, but secretly were maintaining their old ways and customs? The answers to these questions may seem to be obvious, but they would not have been to the Jesuit missionaries in seventeenth-century New France.

By the 1880s, the role of missionary had changed significantly and so did the approach they took towards their ultimate goal, saving heathens from themselves. There was a panoply of factors that facilitated this change, but there are a few that stand out in relation to this analysis. By the nineteenth century, in contrast to the chaotic and sometimes violent religious climate in Europe that characterized the first six hundred years of the millennia, tempers had cooled significantly. This was not to say that Catholicism and Protestantism were not still bitter rivals in the quest for global religious hegemony; they most certainly were. By 1880, however, there were more important challenges looming on the horizon. Enlightenment thinkers had targeted religion (among other things) as a source of ignorance, tyranny, and oppression. This stance had grown in popularity in the eighteenth century, inspiring revolutions in America and France.

More importantly, perhaps, was women's changing role in European society. By the 1880s, the idea of "Victorian Womanhood" had developed into a set of rigidly defined parameters that structured women's role in society. The idea of separate spheres was a key component to Victorian Womanhood. Men's sphere of action was public and material; women's sphere was private and moral. Women of this era had a responsibility to be educated so that they might instruct their husbands and male children to be moral and ethical actors on the public stage. Religion,

of course, figured heavily in this concept. Respectable Victorian women were responsible for their family's religious education. It was their responsibility to maintain the moral integrity of their home, which was the key to Victorian ideology because it was where all the moral and ethical principles of men originated. The Victorian Womanhood movement gave women awesome responsibility while directing them to remain where they had been for centuries: in the home.

The Victorian ideal of the home strongly mirrors that held by the people of India, a country that had become a British protectorate in 1858. Missionary activity in India had been in place for decades by the 1880s, but it was in that decade that the Protestant mission movement finally, though unintentionally, hit upon a successful formula for converting the Indian people. The Victorian emphasis on the home had not been lost on Protestant mission leaders, and many searched for a way to gain access to Indian homes and the women that oversaw their moral foundation.[13] There were some problems with this idea, however. Primarily, some missionaries worried that the Victorian ideal of the "home" might be lost on Hindus. Hindus lack a word for "home" in their language, so it was unknown how the message would be conveyed. This was an intellectual and somewhat pedantic argument, but one that caused many missionaries to wonder if it was worth the bother. Additionally, due to the very strict gender segregation that characterized India, male missionaries

[13] Janaki Nair, "Uncovering the Zenana: Visions of Indian Womanhood in Englishwomen's Writings, 1813-1940," 33. In this article, Nair notes that the Zenana was also a prime location for the spread of Victorian ideology to women. Indeed, she writes that the white women of the Zenana changed their focus from religious conversion to education, "after which the undoubted virtues of Christianity would be easily recognized." It is likely that the white women of the Zenana changed their focus after they had had limited success with converting Indian women, leaving the converted Indian "Bible women" of the Zenana to take the lead in converting Hindus.

were barred from entering private homes to minister to women. In her article "Tamil Bible Women and the Zenana Missions of Colonial South India," Eliza Kent describes how important it was for the Protestant mission movement to gain access to the women of India:

Indian women. . . with their amulets and charms, their daily devotions and rituals for ensuring the auspicious condition of the home and its inhabitants. . . had the capacity, it was feared, to unravel the tapestry of Christian understanding painstakingly created by Christian men and their male students, converts and inquirers.[14] In other words, women were the enemy of Christian progress, not because of their resistance to Christianity necessarily, but because they were inaccessible.

The Zenana missions in Southern India were a self-actualized group of white women missionaries and converted Indian women. They developed their own solution to the "women problem" in India: they, being women themselves, were permitted access to the homes of Indian women. They would become mobile in order to, ironically, educate Indian women on the virtues of Victorian Womanhood and protestant piety. They were not subtle about their intentions, either. The stated goal of these women was to "lay our hand on the hand that rocks the cradle, and tune the lips that sing the lullabies. Let us win the mothers of India for Christ!"[15]

It stands to reason that the white women missionaries, despite having a distinct advantage over white male missionaries, were not as successful as the Indian converts who served as paid assistants in the missions. The white women found that penetrating the complex web of deities, rituals, social status, and caste systems was very difficult, particularly when viewed through the jaundiced

[14]Eliza Kent, "Tamil Bible Women and the Zenana Missions of Colonial South India." *History of Religions, Christianity in India* 39 (Nov. 1999): 118.
[15] Ibid., 118-19, 117.

eye of racism that was an unfortunate component of British imperialism. White women found they had little in common with their students, and the Hindu women found them to be condescending. White Christians in India felt that Hinduism was merely a collection of superstitions and that Indians who practiced the rituals of Hinduism were merely doing it because they did not know what else to do. The prevailing view was that people would give it up if they were offered something with real substance. Whether this was ignorance or hubris Kent does not say, but it is for these reasons Kent makes the Indian Christians (hereafter referred to as "Bible women") the primary focus of her article.[16]

The "Bible women," as they were known, had much better success than their white women superiors. They agreed with their superiors in theory; they believed that Indian women would be receptive to the message of Protestantism. Having been Hindu, however, they understood how deeply entrenched it was in the everyday life of Indians, particularly women. The Hindu woman's role in the home was not markedly different from the Victorian ideal. The Hindu's notion of home was as pervasive and steeped in spirituality as the Victorian model. It was a woman's responsibility to maintain the spiritual integrity of her family's home. Hinduism could not simply be written off as a collection of superstitions; the Bible women believed that if Christianity was going to have any success in reaching the people, then missionaries must learn to adapt Christianity to the Hindu mindset. It was this tacit acknowledgement of the value of Hinduism as a useful instrument that gave the Bible women their advantage.[17]

There were some difficulties presented by the Bible women's plan having to do with entrenched gender

[16] Ibid., 119.
[17] Ibid., 137.

dichotomies and class structures in India. Indian culture placed firm restrictions on a woman's mobility outside the home, restrictions that became inflexible after the British occupation. For the Bible women, this meant that their credibility as Indian women was compromised by their necessary mobility. Moreover, in an effort to make Christianity more palatable to lower-caste Hindus, the Bible women adopted the singing style of the Vaishnavis, a roaming group of spiritual entertainers popular among the lower classes. This attachment to the Vaishnavis was a double-edge sword, however. Though popular among the lower classes, the Vaishnavis had been banned by the middle and upper classes, which viewed the unmarried women as common prostitutes. When negotiating India's complex class structure, having an unfortunate association could quickly lead to social non-existence. The Bible women's status as unmarried, Christian women made them both the best and worst people for the job of proselytizing to Hindus.[18]

Indeed, the task of Bible women was very difficult despite their status as Indian women, particularly among the elite of Indian society. They *were* Indian, to be sure, but they lacked the qualities most valued by traditional Hindus (i.e. marriage and modesty) to be accepted by the upper caste of Hindus.[19] Their job was made all the more difficult by India's cultural reaction to the British occupation. As if to prove the superiority of their traditional social structure to that of the conquering British, upper-caste Indians strongly emphasized the social strictures of Indian respectability. The growing Muslim influence too, had an effect. Islam had been infiltrating India for decades, but found new support because it was

[18] Ibid., 146.

[19] Many traditional Hindus thought the Bible women to be immodest because of their mobility; it was viewed as presumptuous and decidedly unwomanly to be out roaming in search of souls to "save." Adopting the Vaishnavis' habit of singing their lessons did not help.

malleable and could be integrated into existing Hindu tradition. It was especially popular among the upper caste as it favored the wealthy and reinforced the segregation of women from the public sphere.[20]

As a result of these changes, social transgressions that might have been forgiven in the past resulted in severe censure. The unfortunate association with the Vaishnavis, for example, carried an extremely negative connotation. As Sumanta Banerjee demonstrates in her article "Marginalization of Popular Culture in Nineteenth Century Bengal," "what used to be innocent fun, now held a threat to domestic stability, thanks to the 'enlightenment.'"[21] The Bible women quickly reversed direction and abandoned all pretext of sexuality. They became ascetic, walking the streets with no ornamentation, wearing plain white saris. Despite repeated attempts to cater to the social conventions of the middle and upper castes, the Bible women never enjoyed their support. This episode taught them an important lesson, however. They knew that they had to be constantly aware of the impression they were giving their audience.

Their task of emphasizing the home when dealing with Hindu women was also fraught with peril. Because the Hindu tradition was so intertwined with the concept of home and motherhood, Bible women often crossed the line between educating their audience and insulting them. The various deities that occupied a Hindu person's home served as "moral barometers" of the status of the home. If the home fell into spiritual disrepair due to the moral weakness of a family member, then any or all of the deities would make their displeasure known in a variety of ways, such as causing illness or accidents. These minor gods were very important to the Hindu family. They helped maintain order and encouraged the airing of grievances in the event of

[20] Ibid., 135.
[21] Kent, "Tamil Bible Women," 146.

moral crisis. For the Bible women to delegitimize these gods struck at the heart of the Hindu family structure and the women that governed it. Bible women were careful not to suggest that these gods did not exist, even though that is one of the key teachings of Christianity. Rather, they agreed that the household deities did exist, using them as a rhetorical device to debate the superiority of the Christian God.[22]

Any success the Bible women enjoyed (and among certain segments of the class structure, their success was considerable) was due to the fact that they were brilliant improvisers who were willing to interweave Christian morality tropes with Hindu tradition. They were accomplished Biblical scholars who could recite chapter and verse to answer any question, which lent credibility to their efforts. They found corollaries in Hindu and Christian symbology and emphasized them, sometimes too much.[23] Most importantly, they knew their audience and what they wanted to hear. They were not afraid to make arguments that, while not quite theologically accurate, were nonetheless persuasive and compelling.[24]

In the end, the Bible women of the Zenana mission found their greatest success in the lower caste. However, this was due as much to the lower caste's rejection of rigidly defined social strata as it was to the teachings of the Bible women. Accepting Protestantism allowed the lower castes to indulge in the trappings of the upper castes.

---

[22] Ibid., 141.

[23] Kent describes an encounter between Jesuvadial, an Indian convert, and an unnamed Hindu woman that went awry. Jesuvadial observed the woman conducting a ritual involving the water of Ramesvaram, which, according to Hindu tradition, will wash away sin. Seeing the connection to the blood of Christ, Jesuvadial began to excitedly proselytize to the woman until she finally aroused the ire of the woman and her husband. The account ends with Jesuvadial being chased off the couple's property. Kent, "Tamil Bible Women," 142-43.

[24] Ibid., 142.

Upper-caste status was conveyed by taking part in Hindu-based societal rituals and by carrying accessories laden with religious symbology. The attraction of Protestantism then was that it allowed converts to take part in these prerogatives of the upper castes because they were no longer involved with the spiritual component. They could refuse to play drums at religious festivals and carry an umbrella (which conveyed majesty and spiritual protection to upper-caste Hindus). Under Protestantism, these cultural taboos had cotton teeth.[25]

Despite the less-than-noble motives that influenced some in the lower castes to adopt Protestantism, it would be wrong to assume that the Bible women did not have a major impact. While it is true that they garnered few converts from the upper caste, there were many reasons for this. There were of course the various class-related conflicts having to do with transgressing respectable social behavior for women. What Kent failed to adequately explore, however, is that like the Montagnais women two hundred years prior, Hindus of the upper castes had nothing to gain from Protestantism. They did not need Christianity to consolidate their power. Hinduism, as entrenched as it was in marrow of Indian society, was incredibly effective to this end.

The real importance of the Bible women was not in their results, but in their attempts. These unmarried, non-Hindu women engaged in this task due to the fact that they essentially shared two commonalities with their heathen prospects: they were Indian and they were women. Given the extreme complexities of India's caste system, these two commonalities did not amount to much. Given the fact that they attempted to transcend class divides and were willing to trump gender conventions in the hope of reinforcing those very same conventions made these women very unusual. Part of their relative success was serendipitous.

[25] Ibid., 126.

They emerged at a time when Victorian values were clearly defining the role that women were to play in the home, challenging women with the responsibility of moral compass and religious bedrock. In their role in the public sphere they embodied the spirit of the Victorian challenge, if not the letter of the law.

As with Devons's article, Kent raises many more questions than she answers. Looking at the two articles together reveals even more. I have formed my own theories as to what motives Catholics and Protestants may have had when setting out on a mission, but neither author addresses it fully. How important was Catholic insecurity in the sixteenth century when discussing proselytizing (and by extension, conquest)? Does the fact that, by the 1880s, Protestantism had not only survived the Catholic Counter-Reformation but also flourished in Europe and America gives the church (and its various denominations) the confidence to allow the Bible women to try their rarified form of proselytizing? Most importantly, perhaps, is who is acting on whom? Were the Bible women of the Zenana mission manipulating both religions to achieve an end that basically amounted to a larger Protestant roll call, but no real expansion of the faith? Were low-caste Hindus aware of the Bible women's special brand of elastic Protestantism, manipulating the women and the religion to achieve justification for interloping into a higher caste? Admittedly, some of these questions have no demonstrative value other than evidence of my ability to think of them. The only question that really matters is: If women were even remotely successful at ministering to women, and women form the foundation of society's moral and spiritual foundation under the ideal of Victorian Womanhood, were men now superfluous? Had the Bible women of the Zenana missions usurped the power of spiritual transformation from the men?

In 1915, an article in the *Harvard Theological Review* entitled "The Protestant Missionary Propaganda in

India" J. P. Jones presented an argument that clarified the Protestant church's opinion on the evolution of women's role in missionary work without ever addressing it outright. In fact, the word "women" made only two appearances in the entire twenty-six-page essay. Likewise, there was no discussion of "gender," or public or private "spheres." Men did not use these words in 1915. Despite the lack of overt references to women, careful reading of the critique allows the reader to glean the author's true meaning. Through his clever and creative use of language (it was essentially written in a turn-of-the-century version of political correctness), author Jones managed to acknowledge the advances made by female missionaries like the Bible women of the Zenana mission while simultaneously undermining their efforts. He accomplished all this with a simple strategy: he changed the mission of the missionaries.

Jones began by remarking on the "revolutionary changes" he envisioned "[for] this great enterprise on the mission field." The changes Jones referred to were not so much a matter of method, but rather of motivation. Prior to Jones's writing, the main inspiration for the missionary was to ease the plight of the misguided heathens who were doomed without conversion and baptism. This approach was well intentioned, Jones wrote, but missed the point. The primary motivation should have been the fact that Jesus Christ commanded Christians to go forth and convert the masses so that they might be saved. There were important, though unwritten, distinctions in this change of focus. Primarily, Jones was commanding missionaries to get their priorities straight. If the focus on spreading the gospel of Christ was subordinated to mere conversion of the masses, then the message was lost. To put it another way, missionary work should not have been focused on converting as many "heathens" as possible. It should have been to construct a message that reflected the true teachings of Christ so that a genuine spiritual

transformation took place. This would benefit both the heathen and the missionary, for Jones insisted that the "supreme motive of a generation ago...has ceased to stir men." Changing focus would have fostered a renewal of motivation. To concentrate on alleviating worldly suffering, whether spiritual or physical, served the heathen well in life, but made them ill-prepared for the afterlife. However, without the full weight of the missionaries' love for Christ as a key part of the conversion, missionaries were merely saving someone from Hell, not preparing them for paradise.[26]

In advocating quality over quantity, Jones suggested a shift from the micro to the macro approach to missionary work. Indeed, individual conversion had its merits, but the goal should have been in the uplift of the various races of people who came into contact with the missions. This new purpose would have reflected the benevolent objective of the missionary, while fostering a larger role for the church within those cultures that would have been uplifted. This shift in direction correlated to a dramatic shift in how Christians viewed their God. "We no longer think of the Lord as the dread King of the Universe," Jones wrote, "but as the infinite loving Father and Savior." The cosmological relationship was no longer master and servant, but Father to son. "The heathen," Jones suggested, "are no longer to the missionary enemies to be shunned, but brothers to be converted and won to membership in the great family of God."[27]

When Jones wrote about changing focuses, or changing the missionary's relationship to God, he was actually talking about changing the language used to describe that focus or that relationship. The first several pages of his essay are a fascinating exercise in semantic

---

[26] J. .P. Jones, "The Protestant Missionary Propaganda in India," *The Harvard Theological, Review* 8 (Jan. 1915), 20.
[27] Ibid., 20.

validation. When changing the language from master/servant to father/son, he was employing gendered language to reinvigorate the legion of male missionaries who have become disenchanted with the experience. This disenchantment may have been due to the obstacles the missionary felt from opposition of potential converts, or in the successes, mediocre though they were, of female missionaries. In both cases (and there could be, and probably are, much more) this disillusionment had a female basis. Make no mistake: this was a call to arms for male missionaries.

Perhaps the most interesting aspect of Jones's treatise was not his desire to win "the soul of India," but his simultaneous rejection of the methods employed by the Zenana missionaries there. In addition to deriding those missionaries who focused on individual conversions, Jones disavowed the Victorian Motherhood ideal, suggesting that the way to cement permanent, true conversion was by being "a leader of men." The Indian people "have a genius for docility," and "look for a high type of manly character and sterling piety among their leaders, whereby they may easily be inspired and directed." Moreover, the missionary who sought to lead men to Christ should have exhibited extreme piety. "The missionary must be qualified and adapted to reveal by life the highest spiritual type of his religion." True leaders lead by example.[28]

If the reader will indulge a moment of pure conjecture at this point, there are a few observations to be made. The first is where the Indian people fit into the new familial cosmological order established at the outset. The heathens were our "brothers" to be welcomed into the family. Though this language implies an equal relationship, given the context, it most certainly does not. Ignoring the gender question for a moment, let us look at this statement contextually. Brotherhood does not implicitly suggest an

[28] Ibid., 35-36.

equal relationship, particularly when one brother is attempting to subvert the belief structure of another. Moreover, Jones's advocacy of a strong "leader of men" was especially telling. Again, forgetting the obvious gender component of the statement (which is so obvious it does not bear discussing), to suggest that the Indian people had a "genius for docility" and were waiting to be led in no way encouraged the missionaries to think of the "heathens" as true brothers in Christ.

What Jones wrote was a playbook for male missionaries seeking to reclaim their duty from the feminized movement that had been pervasive in southern India. There was evidence to support this conclusion. If we accept that Jones wished the missionary movement to be reclaimed by male missionaries who were couching their true intentions in the vernacular of fraternity, then it would have been ironic that Jones strongly suggested that male missionaries learned to appreciate the religion of the "heathens." He did, in fact strenuously advocate that missionaries learn to acknowledge the genius of the Hindu people. There was a pernicious reason for this, however. Missionaries had to learn and appreciate the Hindu people so that they might have become close enough to plant the "seed of doubt." Essentially, the leader of the missionary movement had to encourage the Indians to let their spiritual guard down.

Jones knew his audience, and he respected his reader if not their students. While he did not openly call into question the methods of any specific group of missionaries, he did provide many clues. His suggestion to the future "leader of men" to lead by example was one instance where his doubts came to light. His recommendation for "extreme piety" and to "reveal *by life* [emphasis added] the highest spiritual type of his religion." Fundamental Christianity holds that women are responsible for original sin and mankind's fall from grace. Hinduism does not look kindly upon women either,

relegating them to a subservient role in the church and in society. It is likely that upper-caste male concern over the public activities of the Zenana missionaries, particularly their association with the disgraced Vaishnavis, prompted this particular line of discourse.

J. P. Jones appeared to be responding to the perception that women had assumed the dominant role in missionary leadership, particularly in light of the hegemony of Victorian Motherhood. Jones's response was to minimize the role that women played by seeking a resurgence of male dominated leadership. He wanted to take religious conversion out of the private sphere and return it to the public sphere. Jones did not advocate totally removing women from the picture. Rather, he envisioned a system where women lose their dominance and men once again influence men. In that sense, he was like the Jesuit missionaries in New France. Rather than working within the present system, Jones and his ilk sought to subvert women's influence to achieve what to him was a holy objective. The fundamental teachings of all forms of Christianity maintain that women cannot be trusted. This teaching does not change in the face of societal trends like Victorian Motherhood.

From these three encounters with missionary discourse it is useful to draw some final conclusions. It is clear that the role of the missionary changed dramatically as the colonial enterprise changed. Women had been a part of that change, whether as natives struggling to maintain first their power in society and then their traditions that were under attack, or as missionaries who saw a way to create converts by co-opting Victorian ideology to suit their means. It is very important to gender history to remember that these women were not acted upon, but were dominant figures in these cultural wars. That was what gives primacy to Jones's tract. The conquest and subjugation of the far-flung empire depended, so Jones saw it, upon

women being relegated back into a role that depended entirely upon the freedoms that men would grant.

The United States-Israel Special [Cultural] Relationship
The Story of How Jews and Israelis became Ingrained on the American Psyche

Jason Goldman

The perception that the United States and the State of Israel share a "special relationship," comparable only to that of the United States and Britain, has become commonplace in popular discourse on American foreign policy. President Kennedy first used the term "special relationship" to describe the relations between the two countries in 1962. Since that time, and especially after the developments of the late 1960s, many observers have tended to agree with his assessment.[1] However, as "special" as that relationship might have been in 1962 or anytime thereafter, many historians assert that the relationship between the United States and the State of Israel was far from inevitable in 1948 when Israel was created.[2] Working on that premise, I argue that the U. S.-Israel relationship, which started as a rather ambivalent one in the 1940s and early 1950s, evolved into a special relationship by the mid 1960s because of cultural affiliations between the two countries.[3] Although this argument places popular

[1] H. W. Brands, *Into the Labyrinth: The United States and the Middle East 1945-1993* (New York: McGraw Hill, 1994), 88.
[2] Michelle Mart, "Tough Guys and American Cold War Policy: Images of Israel, 1948-1960" *Diplomatic History* 20, no. 3 (1996): 357.
[3] Brands, *Into the Labyrinth*, 88.

culture, including religion, at the foundation of the "special relationship," it is certainly not designed to be reductionist or detract from the roles that domestic politics and Cold War considerations played in the establishment and continuity of that relationship.

It is particularly clear that cultural factors have played a leading role in determining the course that the U.S.-Israel relationship has taken. From a foreign policy perspective, in an historical analysis of the United States' Cold War strategy and interests within the Middle East (i.e. Arab/Persian Oil and Client State Diplomacy), there appears to be a considerable disconnect between the United States' strategic and security interests and its policy of offering virtually unwavering support to the State of Israel.[4] Therefore, it has become worthwhile to investigate some of the ways in which the U.S.-Israel relationship has developed as well as why the United States's policy towards Israel appears to come as commonsense to so many Americans who could not imagine it any other way.

In an essay on the effect popular culture has on states' foreign policy decisions, political scientist Jutta Weldes argues, "state policy has a pervasive cultural basis and. . . that state action is made commonsensical through popular culture."[5] Weldes specifically addresses the impact that popular culture has on United States foreign policy stating, "in the case of U.S. foreign policy, the official vision of international politics is constructed out of the *cultural resources* offered by American society."[6] These *cultural resources* can be defined as the popular attitudes, perceptions, beliefs, and other generally diffuse social elements that combine to form shared communal identities and frameworks from which particular communities view themselves and others. Essentially, Weldes's argument is

[4] Ibid., 90.
[5] Jutta Weldes, "Going Cultural: Star Trek, State Action, and Popular Culture" *Millennium Journal of International Studies* 28 (1999): 119.
[6] Ibid., 119.

the same as Richard Slotkin's, a historian and political scientist who observes, "there is a 'reciprocal' relationship between culture and foreign policy."[7]

Given this interrelation between popular culture and foreign policy within the United States, it is fitting that between the 1940s and the 1970s, which were the formative years of the U.S.-Israel special relationship, some of the "cultural resources" being offered by American society for the first time allowed the portrayal of Jews in two very positive, pervasive, and culturally relevant ways. This article will focus on two such cultural resources first actuated in the 1940s: the creation of an agreed-upon image of the archetypal American masculine figure and the revival of religious faith as a guiding principle in American life.

The first of these cultural resources became generally diffuse throughout American popular culture during the boom years following the Second World War. It allowed for the recasting of Jews within the cultural economy, especially in relation to Israel, as a courageous fighting, resourceful, masculine, and innovative people (read: American). The second cultural resource actuated through the continued revival of religion in the United States, which began in the late 1940s and 1950s, and allowed for the co-opting of Jewish Zionism by evangelical Christians who believed they were witnessing the second coming of Christ in Israel.[8] This religious framework set in the Judeo-Christian heritage propelled the image of the Israeli Jew to mythic proportions both in the minds of individual Americans as well as in the mainstream and Christian-

---

[7] Richard Slotkin, *Gunfighter Nation: The Myth of the Frontier in Twentieth-Century America* (New York, 1992), 356, quoted in Michelle Mart, "Tough Guys and American Cold War Policy: Images of Israel, 1948-1960" *Diplomatic History* 20 (1996): 357.

[8] Lawrence Davidson, "Christian Zionism and American Foreign Policy: Paving the Road to Hell in Palestine," *Logosonline* 4 (Winter 2005): 2. www.logosjournal.com/issue_4.1/davidson.htm, accessed 1 January 2006.

based media. The pervasiveness of this religious element in American popular culture was evidenced by the fact that in the twelve years between 1950 and 1962, blockbuster biblical epics placed number one at the box office a total of six times.[9]

These often overlapping cultural resources provided for the two most significant changes to the image of the Jew in American popular culture. These two bridges linking Judaism and Israel to the popular culture of the United States in the general media, in churches, and within Christian media were the main reasons for the rapid change in status of Jews and Israel during the 1940s until the end of the 1960s. During this time, Jews as a group were brought into the American cultural mainstream and Israel became a reliable ally of the United States.

In this discussion on the discursive practices that brought Jews and Israelis from the "outside, culturally and politically speaking, to the 'inside' where they became 'kindred spirits and reliable allies of the Cold War,'" it is most prudent to begin with the idea of what it meant to be an American in the 1940s and 1950s.[10] Equally important in this discussion is how the old stereotypes of weak and effeminate Jews faded away in the late 1940s giving way to a much more masculine/Americanized Jew/Israeli. According to historian Michelle Mart, in the "1940s and 1950s, the 'American way of Life' included clearly defined gender roles" that was "not merely words or language" but "a system of meaning according to which behavior is polarized into two opposite categories according to which we view the actions of individuals and national states."[11] In the already polarized Cold War world, which emerged at the exact same time Israel came into existence, it was desperately important for Jews and then Israelis to fit the

[9] Melanie McAlister, *Epic Encounters: Culture, Media, and U.S. Interests in the Middle East, 1945-2000* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001), 44.
[10] Mart, "Tough Guys and American Cold War Policy," 357
[11] Ibid., 378.

ideal American masculine image in order to assert their claims to 'insider' status and ally with America.[12]

Historian Neal Gabler addressed the irony inherent in the fact that Jews, through their prominent roles in America's entertainment media during the first half of the twentieth century, actually played a large role in the creation of the archetype of the American masculine image that became diffuse in American popular culture during the 1940s and 1950s. In the opening pages of his book, *An Empire of Their Own: How the Jews Invented Hollywood*, Gabler argues:

> Ultimately, American values came to be defined by the movies the Jews made. Ultimately, by creating their idealized America on screen, the Jews reinvented the country in the image of their fiction. They would create its values and myths, its traditions and archetypes. It would be an America where fathers were strong, families stable, people attractive, resilient, resourceful, and decent.[13]

This was what it meant to be American in the 1940s and 1950s, and these images of America had been cultivated since the turn of the century by the original Hollywood Jews who pioneered the film industry.[14] These Jews gave America a huge part of its widespread Christian morality-based identity. As ironic as that may seem, most of these Hollywood Jews did not consider themselves Jewish, but American instead. In fact, Lewis Mayer, the second M in MGM Studios, had his birthday legally changed to the Fourth of July because he considered himself a supreme patriot.[15] Mayer's idealized image of America made its way into virtually all of the classic films his studio produced during Hollywood's Golden Age. These

---

[12] McAlister, *Epic Encounters*, 65.
[13] Neal Gabler, *An Empire of Their Own: How the Jews Invented Hollywood* (New York: Bantam Doubleday Dell Publishing Group, 1988), 6-7.
[14] Ibid., 216.
[15] Ibid., 79.

Hollywood Jews were motivated in part by the desire to cultivate an American culture unlike the former old world cultures their families had emigrated from.[16] Considering the power American myths and characters held not only over Americans, but over the whole world, it must be concluded that these men were largely successful. Many prominent political scientists and historians have written about this type of cultivation process, in which the media indoctrinates an entire society giving it a mass common culture, extensively.

Famed authors and social critics Edward Said and Toni Morrison have eloquently written about the cultivation processes that still take place as a result of the ways mass media portrays different cultures to themselves and to each other. To Said and Morrison, the media plays a massive role in creating what Said called "communities of interpretation,"[17] which in turn leads to what Morrison called "official stories."[18] These official stories can be defined as the shared assumptions, values, widespread perceived truths, and range of acceptable behaviors a given culture shares in its views on a particular topic or story. The reason why the media is so instrumental in the creation and reproduction of the way a culture perceives itself and other cultures, races, or social entities is because, as Said put it, the media operates in "the world of power and representations, a world that came into being as a series of decisions made by writers, politicians and philosophers to suggest or adumbrate one reality and at the same time efface others."[19]

---

[16] Ibid., 192.

[17] Edward Said, *Covering Islam: How the Media and the Experts Determine How We See the Rest of the World* (New York: Random House 1997), 36.

[18] Toni Morrison, "The Official Story: Dead Man Golfing," in *Birth of a Nation' Hood: Gaze, Script and Spectacle in the O.J. Simpson Case* (New York, NY: Random House, 1997), 3.

[19] Edward Said, "Between Worlds," *London Review of Books* 20 (May 1998): 8.

Going back to the "cultural resource" of the ideal American masculine image, there was some irony in the fact that until the 1940s and1950s, Jews were generally not included in the popular culture of an America that they themselves had helped to create. Jews were writing and directing the shows, but rarely staring in them as leading men. There were many famous Jewish actors during that time, but their 'Jewishness' was not generally put on screen. This did not change until after World War II and a recreation of Jewish identities within American popular culture. Starting in the mid 1940s, the powerful Hollywood Jewish executives, reminded of their own Jewish identities and the plight of their people during the Holocaust, were resentful of the fact that they could develop a billion dollar global industry and direct American popular culture from the arm chairs behind their desks, but still somehow be considered outsiders. During these early post-war years, from 1947 to 1949, the State of Israel was created, and some of the movies that were produced during this time provided commentary on the real world events that were taking place, particularly in reference to ideas of Jewish identities and masculinity.

In the aftermath of World War II, with the image of European Jews as victims of the Holocaust, filmmakers and authors first began to change that image by challenging the stereotypes that called Jewish masculinity into question.[20] This started with films such as *Crossfire* (1947), *Gentleman's Agreement* (1947), *The Sands of Iwo Jima* (1948), and *Murder Inc.* (1948), films in which producers and writers consciously tried to change popular American perceptions of what it meant to be Jewish.[21] In all of these films, filmmakers portrayed Jews in striking contrast to the typical stereotypes that had been propagated about them in American society since at least the beginning of the Civil

[20] Mart, "Tough Guys and American Cold War Policy," 363.
[21] Gabler, *An Empire of Their Own*, 216, 299, 304, 349.

War.[22] Historically, American anti-Semitism has sprung up around times of national and political crisis. The Civil War arguably provided the largest national crisis in United States history, and therefore, although Jews served in prominent positions within both the Union and Confederate governments and militaries, anti-Semitism spread as a result of the war.[23] During the twentieth century, the interwar period and World War II provided no exception to this general characteristic of American anti-Semitism, in which discrimination reached its zenith.[24] The Jews who appeared on screen in the mid- to late 1940s, however, were a contrast to the stereotypes in that they were heroic, morally courageous, decent, hardworking men who all did their part either in the war effort or in fighting evil within the United States. This concerted effort was perhaps partly responsible for the remaking of the popular image of the Jews as wholly American/masculine and very patriotic, which was how the Hollywood Jews actually saw themselves all along.[25]

It would be wrong to assume that the popular image of a masculine and heroic Jew, which was becoming more common in the late 1940s and 1950s, was simply a manufactured image created by American Jewish producers and writers. The most significant part of the Jew's transformation came not from Hollywood, but from the real events that were taking place with the creation of the State of Israel in 1948. Those events changed even American Jews' identities and level of acceptance within the United States. The early military successes and the innovative undertakings that the Israelis were seeing in the deserts of Israel benefited the identity of Jews everywhere in the late

---

[22] Harry Simonhoff, *Jewish Participants in the Civil War* (New York: Arco Publishing, 1963), 141.
[23] Ibid., 141.
[24] Lee J. Levinger, *A History of the Jews in the United States, 20th edition* (New York: Union of American Hebrew Congregations, 1961), 355.
[25] Gabler, *An Empire of Their Own*, 349-50.

1940s and early 1950s. In fact, the argument can be made that American Jews have Israeli Jews to thank for helping to stomp out vestiges of American anti-Semitism. As one historian saw it, "in forging an identification with Israeli soldiers and their toughness, American Jews identified with an image of masculinity that placed them firmly in the mainstream of white American national(ist) images."[26] The culturally sensitive Hollywood Jews were fully aware of the new Jewish masculine identity being born in Israel. A Jewish film executive, Robert Blumofe, related the Hollywood Jews sentiments about what was taking place in Israel by saying, "we were no longer the stereotype of the Jew: the moneylender, the businessman. These were fighters and they were farmers and they revived the land there. . . this was terribly uplifting."[27]

By the early 1950s, the newer image of the Jew was beginning to take root in American popular culture. The image of Paul Breines' "tough Jew" stood for a militarily disciplined and morally courageous fighter who seemed to always defeat his (Arab) enemies with righteous might, even when the odds were stacked against him. There were numerous parallels between the new "tough Jew" and the old tough American. These similarities were not lost on American popular culture, especially not at a time when western films set in American deserts with John Wayne characters fighting indigenous Native Americans was a popular genre.[28] The new image of the "tough Jew" fought through oppression and left the past behind him in order to build a free way of life in a new country endowed with biblical significance. If this sounds like an American tale, it should. These pioneering Jewish settlers were attacked continuously by an indigenous (Arab) enemy but always seemed to gain the upper hand, just like those John Wayne

[26] McAlister, *Epic Encounters*, 194.
[27] Gabler, *An Empire of Their Own*, 350.
[28] Mart, "Tough Guys and American Cold War Policy," 368.

characters always seemed to do. As Mart put it, "the ideal of a 'tough Jew' was built on a set of traits long prized in American culture. Thus, 'tough Jews' are 'insiders' in American culture because they are seen to exemplify characteristics of ideal masculinity," an ideal masculinity adopted by Americans for Americans but ironically developed, at least in part, by Jews in the American film industry long before Jews themselves were commonly seen to exemplify those characteristics.[29] This image of the tough Jew not only elevated Jews both in Israel and America to a more masculine/American status, it also reminded Americans of the "pioneer on the frontier" heritage they came from and what values and historical experiences the two cultures shared. The news or entertainment media might have promoted these images, but they certainly were not manufactured in America. They resonated in the hearts of Cold War Americans who needed to believe in the virtues and superiority of their own masculinity, decency, resourcefulness, and heritage in the face of a Godless and outwardly masculine Soviet Union.

By the mid to late 1950s, American popular culture became taken with Israel and its epic fights between European-looking Jews and darker "Oriental" Arabs who were widely perceived to be "dangerous, untrustworthy, undemocratic, barbaric, and primitive."[30] For this reason, it should be said that America's enthusiastic interest in Israel was not the result of Jews in the media informing popular culture, but was a result of the military successes the State of Israel had been enjoying. Those military victories, which saw a small American-like democracy devastate dictatorships and theocracies willing to take communist handouts, reaffirmed the spreading of American ideals and American prestige in a region of the world that

[29] Ibid., 364.
[30] Fawaz A. Gerges, *America and Political Islam: Clash of Cultures or Clash of Interests?* (New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 6-7.

was becoming increasingly important to America and had always lent itself to mythic images. Hollywood quickly capitalized on this American infatuation with the "Orient" and, in particular, with Israel. Some of the most striking examples of this can be found in the releases of the films *The Ten Commandments* (1956), *Ben-Hur* (1959), and *Soloman and Sheba* (1959).[31] In these films, striking parallels between traditional American stories and the creation and defense of Israel were being told through the eyes of resilient and very American-looking Jews, such as Charlton Heston. In *The Ten Commandments*, "the Zionist story of Israel also became an American tale. Israel emerged in the book and the film as an American-like refuge that had been hard fought and won (morally, politically, and militarily) from an indifferent world."[32] In these epic good versus evil films, released at the height of the Cold War, it was very easy for audiences to make a link between the slave states of ancient Egypt or Rome and the modern Soviet Union, all of which viewed men as "the property of the state." The equation of an American-like free state (the nation of Israel) defeating a Soviet-like slave state (ancient Egypt or Rome) was implied in the coded messages that these movies carried.[33]

Astonishingly, the release of *The Ten Commandments* in 1956, a film that depicted the soon-to-be Israelis defeating the Egyptian army with God's help, coincided with the Suez Canal Crisis in 1956, in which a modern Israeli army actually devastated a modern Egyptian one.[34] This unbelievable coincidence allowed audiences to watch a real live biblical movie unfold in a different form of media, the nightly news. It was almost a new form of entertainment in which movies came to life. These real and fictional images coinciding with one another could only serve to bolster

[31] McAlister, *Epic Encounters*, 65-66.
[32] Ibid., 163.
[33] Ibid., 44, 65.
[34] Ibid., 45.

Americans' sense of the superiority of their own way of life and their religious heritage. Because of the multi-dimensional nature of America's interest in and exposure to Israel, America's "official story" on Jews and the State of Israel had been constructed and accepted. As one historian of popular culture and foreign policy aptly put it, "'film and event speak to each other—event leading political resonance to the fiction, the fiction providing mythological justification for the particular scenarios of real world action.'"[35]

American popular culture's relationship with Jews and with Israel was truly a two-way street by the mid 1950s. By the 1960s, Israel's continued military successes and the popular perception that Israelis were "a pioneering people achieving miraculous development in the desert" further strengthened the historical ties between America and the American-like state.[36] When the cataclysmic 1967 Arab-Israeli War broke out, the United States was already considering its relationship with Israel a "special" one, but that war took the relationship to new heights. This war took place during America's failing adventure in Vietnam. The easily juxtaposed images of the two wars spoke directly to American popular and counter-culture because of the perception that the Israelis went to war only out of necessity and then once committed to the war fought in order to actually win it.[37] Israel's uncanny ability to make short work of its numerically superior enemies also contrasted with America's Vietnam experience. This image of the morally justifiable exercise of decisive might served as a reminder to many Americans of what the United States had stood for before the tumultuous 1960s. In that sense, Israel was something to hold onto during the crumbling of consensus and the general anxiety of the time. The 1967 war also played a significant role in American popular

[35] Mart, "Tough Guys and American Cold War Policy," 357.
[36] Ibid., 369.
[37] McAlister, *Epic Encounters*, 157.

culture because of Israel's retaking of the biblical city of Jerusalem.[38] This biblically significant and prophesized event increased membership in the growing evangelical Christian Zionist movement and widened many American's interest in, as well as support for, Israel.[39]

As stated earlier, there were two very relevant cultural resources present in American society during the formative years of the 1940s to the 1970s. The second cultural resource, which was also responsible for the remaking of Jews/Israelis as 'insiders' in American popular culture and foreign policy, was the resurgence of religion in American society throughout this time period. This was relevant in relation to the common religious roots that both Jews and the majority of Americans shared. By the 1950s, religion was generally perceived to be not only anti-communist, but in the words of one American theologian, a person's religion and faith had become a "civic religion of the American way of life."[40] This religious element that began during the 1940s and 1950s was central to the establishment and strengthening of the U.S.-Israel relationship because religious Americans, who even in 2006, "think little of foreign policy unless it can be linked to their everyday lives, had already been conditioned to view Palestine in romanticized biblical terms."[41] Therefore, to many Americans, "Israel was, and is still, an extension of Sunday School, and in this mythologized form does touch their lives."[42] To the increasingly religious and still quasi-isolationist American public, Israel was where the Jews were supposed to be. Not only did the Good Book say so, but movies and the nightly news also agreed, reaffirming what was quickly becoming commonsense.

---

[38] Davidson, "Christian Zionism and American Foreign Policy," 5.
[39] McAlister, *Epic Encounters*, 165.
[40] Ibid., 44.
[41] Davidson, "Christian Zionism and American Foreign Policy," 4.
[42] Ibid., 4.

Long before the founding of the modern Jewish state in 1948, American popular culture and politics had been affected by this religious framework, which many Americans used to view Jews and the State of Israel from. This framework led to the birth and rapid growth of what has become known as Christian Zionism. Although evidence of the existence of this movement can be found long before the recreation of Israel in 1948, the effects of the American Christian Zionist movement became more abundant after 1948 and especially after the 1967 Arab-Israeli War. This was not only a result of the founding of the new State of Israel, the retaking of Jerusalem, and the re-intensification of religion within American society, but was also a result of the new ways that American media marketed religion. An example of the early and more secular marketing carried out by Christian Zionists can be found in 1922, the same year that the U.S. Congress passed a joint resolution supporting the creation of a Jewish homeland in Palestine. An article appeared in the *New York Times* that year referring to the Jewish immigrants in Palestine as "Jewish Puritans. . . building the new Judea as the Puritans built New England."[43] Many examples of such an American religious imperative relating the pioneering proto-Israelis and the proto-Americans can be found during this time. In the years following the religious boom of the 1950s, these secular types of evangelical Christian Zionist endorsements took a less traditional American tone ("Puritans") and moved to a more scriptural and surprisingly broader one (the "Second Coming").

The evangelical message that Christians should support the State of Israel gained strength in America throughout the late 1950s and 1960s, but it was in the early 1970s, after Israel had completely retaken the biblical city of Jerusalem during the 1967 War, that

[43] Ibid., 3.

Christian television, radio, and publications took their familiar form and popular message. It was at this point that the message/image of Israel and Jews as providers of Christian prophecy really took off. By 1971, the city of Jerusalem was hosting "The Jerusalem Conference on Biblical Prophecy," organized by the American publication *Christianity Today*. This first conference marked the beginning of the Israeli government's widespread courting of what in 2006 would be defined as conservative America. The Prime Minister of Israel, David Ben-Gurion, attended the conference along with 1,500 American delegates to whom the conference proved a stunning success.[44] The extent to which the evangelical movement and religious-based support for Israel grew throughout the 1970s is best summarized in the following excerpt:

> "Two weeks before Jimmy Carter was elected the first twentieth-century President to claim membership in an evangelical denomination, *Newsweek* magazine declared the Year of the Evangelical, commenting on 'the most significant—and overlooked—religious phenomenon of the 1970s: the emergence of evangelical Christianity into a position of respect and power.' The rise of evangelicalism and fundamentalism had, in the words of Richard Neuhaus, 'kicked the tripwire alerting us to the much larger reality of unsecular America.'"[45]

By 1978, the year that the Likud party came to power in the Israeli government, evangelical Christians had already proven themselves a serious political force in the United States and Israel had proven itself a reliable U.S.

[44] McAlister, *Epic Encounters*, 170-71.
[45] Ibid., 172.

ally.[46] The relationship established between the Likud party and certain American political groups and politicians saw the beginnings of a long-term marriage of interests between Americans and Israelis. This perception is largely responsible for the relationship that the United States and Israel share presently. The cooperation between the American and Israeli militaries and defense industries has exponentially increased as a result of this perception, born of the 1970s.

Also furthering the relationship between Israel and the United States during this time was the fact that by the mid- to-late 1970s and early 1980s, America had lost faith in itself, largely because of oil shocks and terrorist acts blamed on Arabs and Persians as well as the humiliating experience of the Vietnam War. This general uncertainty over America's own economic and military strength (masculinity) was accompanied by the swelling of evangelical Christianity. The combination of the growing evangelical movement and the continued demonstration of Israel's military prowess, in light of the United States' own military woes, helped cement the close friendship between the two countries.[47]

The overlapping of these American cultural resources, in the form of a broader and deeper religious faith (expanding unsecular America) and the growing concern over a perceived loss of American military and economic effectiveness (masculinity), manifested itself in the political realignments and shifts within the United States that took place in the late 1970s and early 1980s. These events contributed to the convergence of military conservatives—who after comparing America's experience in Vietnam and Israel's long line of military successes, liked the "fight to win" Israeli military ethic, and religious conservatives—who liked Christian prophecy. These two

[46] Ibid., 175.
[47] Ibid., 165-67.

elements of modern popular conservatism combined to form the large base of what became the new conservative movement.

In 1979, one year before Ronald Reagan's conservative revolution swept America, Kevin Phillips, a conservative intellectual who had worked with President Nixon, picked up on the relationship between American perceptions of Israel and the political realignments and shifts within the American electorate. In his articles, Phillips began to express concerns about the Israeli nexus that accompanied the new "phenomenon of neo-conservatism."[48] Like Phillips, respected political scientist and historian Melanie McAlister convincingly argued that neo-conservatism, in both its 1980s and twenty-first century manifestations, was actually a result of the culmination of the United States' perceived interests in conjunction with its cultural and political affiliations with the State of Israel.

Never slow to commentate on social or political phenomena, Hollywood once again put these perceived American interests and the cultural/political affiliations shared between the United States and Israel on the big screen, in the 1986 blockbuster action-adventure movie *The Delta Force*. In this action-packed quintessential 1980s military movie, elite Israeli soldiers help American actor and popular culture icon Chuck Norris lead his elite American force into a major gun battle with Palestinian hijackers who took control of an American airliner. Notably, among the many innocent Americans onboard the plane, the story focuses on a couple of Jewish Holocaust survivors, an American priest, and vacationing U.S. Marines. The movie does a great job of exemplifying the combination of the two "cultural resources," and the dialogue from the trailer could literally be used as a speech for a neoconservative politician. In the trailer, the Palestinian hijackers are

[48] Ibid., 192-93.

referred to as "enemies of freedom," while the Holocaust survivors, the priest, and the U.S. Marines onboard are depicted as decent and upstanding Americans who work together to defeat their common Arab enemies.[49] The movie is all about Israel's and America's shared interests, similarities, masculinity, rationality, effectiveness and common enemies, who, it goes without saying, exemplify none of those qualities. Accurate or not, these types of powerful cultural images construct "official stories" and provide frameworks from which Americans see themselves and others. In the end, it all turned into commonsense and consequently gets reflected in foreign policy.

There is a great deal of evidence supporting Melani McAlister's conclusion that neo-conservatism was at least partially a product of the U.S.-Israel relationship, all of which could be traced back almost half a century within America's growing conservative movement. This is not the same as a Jewish neoconservative conspiracy bent on the goal of directing U.S. foreign policy in the direction of supporting Israel. This was deeper and more fundamental, existing at the cultural rather than the political level. The religious context/framework from which politicians and the media—especially Christian media—were able to simplify and make relevant U.S. foreign policy, at least in terms of Israel, was clearly encouraged and practiced by conservative leaders as far back as President Eisenhower. This was evident in Eisenhower's ideological holdings, exemplified by a comment he made during a speech he gave while in office regarding the relationship between religion and America's heritage. During the speech, Eisenhower stated, "Our government makes no sense unless founded in a deeply religious faith."[50] One has to assume that the "deeply religious faith" the President was talking about

[49] Manahem Golan, *The Delta Force* (Los Angeles, California: MGM Home Entertainment, 1986), videorecording

[50] Mart, "Tough Guys and American Cold War Policy," 367.

would also be used in order to "make sense" of American foreign policy.

In 1960, in an even less secular America, William Culberson of the Moody Bible Institute shared publicly in the growing belief that Jesus Christ's second coming was rapidly approaching when he wrote, "Israel's rebirth was the most striking of all the signs of an imminent Rapture."[51] In response to Israel's complete retaking of Jerusalem in 1967, Nelson Bell of *Christianity Today* wrote, it "gives a student of the Bible a thrill and a renewed faith in the accuracy and validity of the Bible."[52] In 1970, Billy Graham, the best-known and most respected evangelist, started the multi-million dollar multimedia marketing campaign for Christian support of Israel with the evangelist film *His Land*.[53] This type of commentary on the Jewish homeland and the message it sent calling for the overt support of Israel is so pervasive among Christian conservatives today that not a single day goes by when one can not hear such speech on the national news and especially on Christian talk radio. Pat Robertson's recent comment that Israeli Prime Minister Sharon's failing health was a result of his agreement to grant the Palestinians rights to certain parts of the Jewish homeland is a perfect example of this type of support for Israel/prophecy within non-secular America.

Today, American popular culture includes these fundamentalist Christian beliefs. So does the core of the Republican Party, which, not coincidentally also happens to be the party with the broadest support and the party that is currently directing American foreign policy. To any student of the evolving relationship between America and Israel, the policies that the U.S. has adopted toward Israel during the past two and a half decades should come as no surprise.

---

[51] McAlister, *Epic Encounters*, 169.
[52] Ibid., 170.
[53] Ibid.

Instead, they should be seen as what happens when popular culture, as it relates to nationalism and international politics, becomes the stuff of commonsense and is reflected in foreign policy.

It is important to realize that the two cultural resources elaborated on above, in relation to their effects on the U.S.-Israel relationship and the inclusion of Jews within a common conception of Americans, were not and are not exclusive of one another. Mainstream media and mass culture influence Christian conservatives. It also follows that more liberal Americans are certainly influenced by their conservative peers. These phenomena did not take place in a vacuum and they obviously have fed and continue to feed off of one another. Recently, popular Christian media has been going mainstream, but it would be wrong to assume that fundamental Christian views have not always been influencing American popular culture and politics. As a result of the two-way influential relationship shared by Israel and the United States, the militaristic and pious little State of Israel has established itself in the American psyche more firmly than anyone could have imagined in 1948. Israel's place in many American's conception of the world has led to what should properly be called a special cultural relationship between the two natural allies.

Tasting Race
American Pie, Aunt Jemima, and Immigrant Acculturation

Brittany Tevis

The history of food mirrors the history of humankind in both length and complexity. Food, and notions of what constitutes food, have gone through a dramatic transformation over time and continue to do so. According to a 2004 study conducted by the U.S. Department of Labor, the average American spends 1.24 hours of every day eating. With the addition of grocery shopping, preparation, and cleanup, food and food-related activities demand an inordinate amount of attention. Many historians mistakenly relegate food to the sidelines of history because it consumes so much time in our daily lives; however, food demands historical examination for precisely this reason.[1]

Foodways, according to historian Hasia Diner, "include food as material items and symbols of identity."[2] As such a symbol of identity, food played a pivotal role in the lives of millions of European immigrants who came to the United States between 1840 and 1920. Food acted as an identification system, not only for the immigrants themselves, but also for the country's dominant culture and the outside world. Food precipitated Anglo-Saxons' acceptance of "foreignness," literally and figuratively, by

---

[1] United States Department of Labor, "Average Hours Per Day Spent in Primary Activities for the Total Population by Activity Category, 2003 and 2004 Averages," http://www.bls.gov/news.release/atus.t12.htm, accessed 18 November 2005.

[2] Hasia Diner, *Hungering for America: Italian, Irish, and Jewish Foodways in the Age of Migration* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2003): 9.

way of consumption. Food also reflected immigrant acculturation into the Anglo-Saxon mold of America. In this essay I employ Matthew Frye Jacobson's formulations about the alchemy of race in order to understand American foodways. In *Whiteness of a Different Color,* Jacobson writes, "race resides not in nature but in politics and culture."[3] As a component of America's "social currency," food demonstrates that "variegated whiteness" defined America and Americans during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.[4] After the passage of the 1924 Johnson-Reed Immigration Act, which limited annual immigration rates to less than 150,000 individuals, food also propelled the "homogenization of whiteness," a "process by which Celts, Hebrews, Slavs and Mediterraneans became Caucasians."[5] Simultaneously, the birth of Aunt Jemima – the black mammy par excellence – and black migration to the North and to the West initiated the transformation of black food into Southern food. This transformation deprived African Americans of their own foodways, and thus enabled Anglo-Saxons to define blacks' internal and external identities. Finally, following World War II, Anglo-Saxon acceptance of "ethnic foods," in juxtaposition to the rejection of "soul food" in the 1960s, reaffirmed binary racial divisions according to color within American society.

1790 – 1840: American as Apple Pie

Concurrent with the passage of the Naturalization Act of 1790, which stipulated that potential immigrants must embody the prescription of "free white persons" in order to secure citizenship status in the newly formed United States of America, the oft-used phrase "American as

---

[3] Matthew Frye Jacobson, *Whiteness of a Different Color: European Immigrants and the Alchemy of Race* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1999): 9.
[4] Jacobson, *Whiteness of a Different Color,* 11, 52.
[5] Ibid., 8.

Apple pie" took on a meaning of indigenousness and tradition reflective of the ethnocentric and racist foundations of the country. Antithetical to the metaphoric "melting pot" of assimilated peoples, or the symbolic "salad bowl" of acculturation that Americans utilized in order to digest the intricacies of immigration and integration, the euphemism "American as Apple pie" signified the superiority of the English settlers who brought the tradition of baking fruit-filled pastries with them from Europe. In his work *The Encyclopedia of American Food and Drink*, historian John Mariani writes, "If something is said to be as 'American as apple pie,' it is credited with being as American as 'The Star Spangled Banner.' In fact, apples were brought from Europe to America, and apple pies were very popular in Europe, especially in England, before they came to epitomize American food. But Americans popularized the apple pie as the country became the world's largest apple-producing nation."[6] Thus, to be metaphorically "American as Apple pie" necessitated that one must be white.

The story of Jonathan Chapman, better known as Johnny Appleseed, also exemplified the bond between Anglo-Saxons and apples in early American history. In an 1871 article featured in *Harper's New Monthly Magazine*, author W. D. Haley labeled Appleseed "a Pioneer Hero." According to Haley, Appleseed transported "a load of apple seeds to the Western frontier, for the purpose of creating orchards on the farthest verge of white settlements." As a figure in Americans' imaginations about the origins of the country, Appleseed performed a highly symbolic act, in essence assuring Anglo-Saxons of their rights as Americans by bringing them apples wherever they lived.[7]

---

[6] John F. Mariani, *The Encyclopedia of American Food and Drink* (New York: Lebhar-Friedman, 1999): 11.

[7] W.D. Haley, "Johnny Appleseed – A Pioneer Hero," *Harpers New Monthly Magazine*, 43 (November 1871): 830.

African Ingredients

Much like Anglo-Saxons' characterization of themselves, their exposition of Africans also relied on associations with food. In fact, Anglo-Saxons' linkage of Africans and food prompted the importation of Africans from specific regions where Anglo-Saxons believed Africans sustained superior rice-cultivating abilities. As food historian Donna Gabaccia writes, "evidence even suggests that planters consciously imported their slaves from that region once rice cultivation became successful. Here, rice appeared on the planters' table daily, prepared by black hands." Anglo-Saxons selected Africans based on their abilities to produce food.[8]

Americans legally imported African slaves into America from 1619 until 1808. Throughout, and well beyond, this 189-year time period "Africans were perhaps the main shapers of eating customs in colonial areas where slavery flourished."[9] African slaves, who worked as cooks in plantation kitchens, dealt firsthand with the foods that Anglo-Saxons in the South ate. When Africans entered the country "mainstays of the black menu were transplanted from Africa: [including] yams, okra, plantains, and watermelons."[10] As black women incorporated their own cooking styles and ingredients into the dishes they prepared for white plantation owners, their foods became elements of various regional cuisines in the South, "often apparently without knowledge of their origins within the accepting European population."[11] For example, a West African dish containing chickpeas and rice "became the second classic dish of the [Southern] region--[named]

---

[8] Donna R. Gabaccia, *We Are What We Eat: Ethnic Food and the Making of Americans* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1998): 31.
[9] Ibid., 10.
[10] Felipe Ferandez-Armesto, *Food: A History* (London: Macmillan, 2001): 63.
[11] Richard Pillsbury, No Foreign Food: The American Diet in Time and Place (Boulder, Col.: Westview Press, 1998): 46.

hoppin' John."[12] Plantation owners also ate other African specialties including gumbo and jambalaya.[13]

Anglo-Saxons failed to notice the exotic flavor of their foods, first, due to Africans' positions as slaves. Analyzing the relationship between race and class in the nineteenth century, Jacobson states that, "race has been central to American conceptions of property (who can own property and who can *be* property)."[14] Southern Anglo-Saxons thought of Africans as property. Therefore, they found the notion of Africans possessing property (tangible, conceptual, or otherwise) unfathomable. In his essay "Equal Opportunity Eating," Roger Abrams notes that "one [only] need recall the ways in which such animal attributes have entered into the process of social exclusion in American history. Blacks have been legally designated as cattle during slavery, and consistently discussed as coons, mules or monkeys," so, although Africans cooked Anglo-Saxons' food, Anglo-Saxons actually *owned* it.[15] Ingesting and enjoying food cooked by black slaves, whom they believe they owned, enabled Anglo-Saxon plantation owners to define such cooking as Southern.[16]

The appearance of African foods slipped past Anglo-Saxons' cognition partly because of another development of the nineteenth century: the primitive black Southern mammy. Big, round, and dark, Aunt Jemima eventually came to personify this stereotype. This development was significant because the image of "the mammy cook has [long] been invoked to help constitute 'whiteness,'" and thus

---

[12] Pillsbury, *No Foreign Food*, 46.
[13] Gabaccia, *We Are What We Eat*, 31; Pillsbury, *No Foreign Food*, 46, 142; and Felipe Ferandez-Armesto, *Food: A History* (London: Macmillan, 2001): 163.
[14] Jacobson, *Whiteness of a Different Color*, 21.
[15] Roger Abrahams, "Equal Opportunity Eating, " in *Ethnic and Regional Foodways in the United States: The Performance of Group Identity*, Linda Keller Brown and Kay Mussell, ed., (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1984): 35.
[16] Ibid, 35.

shaped both Anglo-Saxon and immigrant identities. Although the image of the black mammy entered the American mindset long before her official birth during the twentieth century, Aunt Jemima institutionalized black women's roles as black mammy and servant extraordinaire. [17]

1840–1924: Immigrant Eating

The year 1840 initiated a period of great change in the demographic makeup of the American population. Over a one-hundred-year time span approximately 37 million immigrants entered the U.S. from across the world. De jure immigrant groups maintained citizenship status equal to that of American-born peoples. Anglo-Saxons, who entertained notions of racial superiority, ensured that these newly naturalized citizens experienced no such equity in American life. Notions of a "natural" racial hierarchy, articulated by European and American thinkers including Johann Blumenbach, Thomas Jefferson, Samuel Morton, Josiah Nott, and Charles Darwin, anchored Anglo-Saxons' worldview. They typically perceived Italians, Irishmen, Germans, and Jews not only as inferior citizens, but also as inferior beings. [18]

Anglo-Saxons applied their beliefs of their own superiority, and of a scientifically verifiable racial hierarchy, not only to immigrant populations but also to what these populations consumed. The foods and dishes that immigrants ate symbolized the immigrant populations themselves. As historian Linda Keller notes, Americans "frequently [used] foodways as a factor in the identification of subcultural groups and find the traditional dishes and

---

[17] Doris Witt, *Black Hunger: Food and the Politics of U.S. Identity* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), 14.

[18] See Matthew Frye Jacobson's *Whiteness of a Different Color* for further discussion of Blumenbach's "five-tier scheme ('Caucasian, Mongolian, Ethiopian, Malay, and American)" (p. 78.) and other notions regarding race in the nineteenth century.

ingredients of 'others' who eat differently from themselves as a set of convenient ways to categorize ethnic and regional character."[19] The application of this process during the mid-nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, however, did not result in the determination of ethnic character, but of racial character. Prior to 1924, "strictly biological understandings of race" trumped "cultural and environmental explanations" that came to define ethnicity.[20] Therefore, during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, eating spaghetti, for example, indicated one's membership in the Italian race. As Jacobson explains, "for those [immigrants] who arrived between 1840 and 1924, New World experience was also decisively stamped by their entertaining an arena where race was the prevailing idiom for discussing citizenship and the relative merits of a given people."[21] Despite the fact that Anglo-Saxons used foodways to identify immigrants, such processes produced racial identities.[22]

Many historians anachronistically claim that ethnic identities emerged by route of foodways, and credit food with the success of immigrant assimilation but such assertions portray immigrant acculturation inaccurately. Jacobson states that, "modern scholars are most comfortable discussing Poles, Greeks, or Italians as 'ethnic' or 'national' groups, and thus they tend to disparage and dismiss the lexicon of white races that characterize an earlier era."[23] In *Hungering for America: Italian, Irish, and Jewish Foodways in the Age of Migration*, Hasia Diner does this when she claims that "the distribution and consumption of food has been historically determined by

---

[19] Linda Keller Brown ed., *Ethnic and Regional Foodways in the United States: the Performance of Group Identity* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1985): 3.
[20] Jacobson, *Whiteness of a Different Color*, 99.
[21] Ibid., 9.
[22] Brown, *Ethnic and Regional Foodways in the United States*, 3.
[23] Jacobson, *Whiteness of a Different Color*, 68.

age, gender, and class," and that, "the histories of these immigrant groups as they fashioned *ethnic* identities around food stand on their own."[24] Although Diner correctly asserts that immigrants' identities hinged in part on their food choices, such choices only augmented notions of difference. To render nineteenth- and early-twentieth-century immigrants' identities ethnic, as Diner does, distorts immigrants' historical experiences and perverts the process by which foreign foods penetrated raced-based Anglo-Saxon institutions. By contending that food enabled immigrants to establish ethnic identities prior to the middle of the twentieth century, Diner effectively sugarcoats history.[25]

The use of foodways as a system of identification served the purpose of maintaining divisions between races. Whites' "defense against hybridity--is precisely what [kept]

---

[24] Diner, *Hungering for America*, 4, 20 (Emphasis added).

[25] Gabaccia also conflated ethnicity with race in her discussion of immigration and food in America. Gabaccia claimed that "culinary conservatives in ethnic and regional enclaves" explained why "large numbers of potential consumers – perhaps even the majority of Americans – seemed unwilling or unable to participate in the national food marketplace on a regular basis," regardless of the fact that "new systems of transport, distribution, and corporate organization increasingly linked the country's many regions into a single national market place." (p. 37) Other historians who obfuscated ethnicity and race include: Brown and Mussell (*Ethnic and Regional Foodways in the United States: the Performance of Group Identity*), Richard Pillsbury (*No Foreign Food: The American Diet in Time and Place*), James Hooker *(Food and Drink in America: A History*), and Harvey Levenstein *(Paradox of Plenty: A Social History of Eating in Modern America*). Hasia Diner explicitly stated her opposition to Jacobson's understanding of race in America. In her work *The Jews of the United States, 1654-2000* (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2004), Diner asserted that "Jews did not have to 'become' white," and added, in a footnote, that historian "Matthew Frye Jacobson, *Whiteness of a Different Color: European Immigrants and the Alchemy of Race* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1998), [has] worked on the assumption that Jews had to construct a white identity for themselves in America, a fact that I am here contesting" (p. 165, 374).

a racial group a racial group."[26] Anglo-Saxons, accordingly, constructed and reinforced racial groups using immigrant foodways. The author of an 1879 *New York Times* article, entitled "English and American Cooks," stated that "it is essentially doubtful whether the Anglo-Saxons races are inherently good cooks," and continued, "Jews and Catholics (the latter not Celtic) are invariably better cooks than are the Protestants or Methodists."[27] Thus, although Anglo-Saxons perceived certain races' foods as better tasting than their own, they still maintained their own diets. More often that not, however, Anglo-Saxons viewed European immigrants' foods as unfit to eat. As historian Richard Raspa explains, "Nativist Americans regarded Italians as violent people--non-whites from southern Europe who practiced Roman Catholicism, displayed socialist tendencies, and enjoyed quaint and often disgusting food."[28] Clearly, Anglo-Saxons usually found the idea of eating immigrant food unthinkable.

Regardless of the stigma attached to these foods, immigrants continued to consume the foods that they had enjoyed in their countries of origin. Because America offered a much larger array of foods, spices, and meats, immigrants often altered their favorite recipes, just slightly, by adding a new spice or substituting one type of meat for another. By and large, however, immigrants proceeded to cook and eat those foods consumed by previous generations.

Some immigrant populations maintained their traditional diets so extensively that they imported certain foods from their countries of origin. As a result, Native-born Americans perceived such food choices as indicative of

---

[26] Jacobson, *Whiteness of a Different Color*, 3.
[27] "English and American Cooks," *New York Times*, 12 October 1879, 9.
[28] Richard Raspa, "Nostalgic Enactment of Identity," in *Ethnic and Regional Foodways in the United States: The Performance of Group Identity*, Linda Keller Brown and Kay Mussell, ed., (Knoxville: The University of Tennessee Press, 1984): 187.

immigrants' difference, and thus food reinforced immigrants' racial identities. Immigrant rejection of American foods did not bode well with Anglo-Saxons, and especially upset Anglo-Saxon politicians. As suggested by a *New York Times* article entitled "Supply Here, Food We Bought Abroad: Mayor's Committee Sees No Good Reason for Importing Spaghetti," foreign food remained prominent in the hearts of Italian immigrants, much to the consternation of Anglo-Saxons.

For Italians, Jews, and others, food enabled immigrant groups to retain remnants of their pasts. Immigrants underwent great physical and emotional transformations upon arriving in America, including learning a new language, altering their dress, and reshaping their notions of national identity. Unlike language or clothing, which operated as externally perceived aspects of identity, food functioned internally, allowing immigrants to retain their sense of self, which explained Italian immigrants' continued ingestion of noodles "bought abroad."[29]

As immigrants settled into the country, many opened public restaurants that functioned as familial operations. Although the owners of these restaurants by no means discouraged outside patronage, immigrant restaurants almost always catered strictly to members of their own racial groups. As "Italian restaurants began appearing in New York and Philadelphia in the 1890s," while open to the public, "these Italian restaurants targeted their Italian neighbors."[30] Similarly, Jewish bakers catered to Jewish customers.

Just as "spaghetti eaters" were identified as members of the Italian race, bagels identified those who consumed

---

[29] Additional examples of immigrant groups who imported foods from their countries of origin include the Japanese. See Gabaccia's *We Are What We Eat* p. 50 for more information; and "Supply Here, Food We Bought Abroad," *New York Times*, 23 August 1914, 5.

[30] Pillsbury, *No Foreign Food*, 155.

them as members of the Hebrew race. In 1880, after the second wave of Jewish immigrants began arriving in America, "only Jews from Eastern Europe ate bagels."[31] Jewish bakers commonly sold bagels to Jewish consumers on Sunday mornings well through the 1920s, while very few Jews, or any other peoples, indulged in bagels on weekdays. As "bagel magnate Murray Lender [(the original owner of Lender's Bagels and a Jewish-American)] noted, 'Even up to the 1950s, you literally could not give a bagel away Monday to Saturday.'"[32] Lender's Bagels postwar marketing slogan--"'You Don't have to be Jewish [to eat bagels]'"--demonstrated that, indeed, prior to the mid-twentieth century one must have been Jewish to eat bagels.[33]

Racial "outsiders" consciously refrained from dining at foreign eateries, but foreign restaurants did not go without notice. The claim that outside populations lacked awareness of these foreign restaurants fails to explain why Anglo-Saxon patrons abstained from eating at these establishments. An 1885 *New York Times* article, entitled "The Restaurant System," chronicled New York's transforming character and specifically "the [rise of] foreign table d'hôte restaurants" in the city.[34] This article demonstrated that, at the very least, a consciousness of "foreign" restaurants existed within the Anglo-Saxon population. This article also highlighted Americans' proclivity to blur national identity and race during the late nineteenth century. In a discussion about the meaning of nationality and race during this era, Jacobson states that, "immigrant nationalisms were particularly prolific in generating and sustaining distinct racial identities."[35] Although the author of "The Restaurant System"

[31] Gabaccia, *We Are What We Eat*, 3.
[32] Pillsbury, *No Foreign Food*, 153.
[33] Ibid., 155.; and Gabaccia, *We Are What We Eat*, 5.
[34] "The Restaurant System," *New York Times*, 24 May 1885, 3.
[35] Jacobson, *Whiteness of a Different Color*, 9.

emphasized the novelty of foreign restaurants, the author noted, "as the quality of the guests and food improves, the national dishes disappear."[36] Thus, "the Italian cook shows stronger inclination to a hybrid cuisine than to the unadulterated and savory dishes of his mother land."[37] Because nationality and race maintained virtually synonymous meanings during the nineteenth century, the author's reference to the disappearance of "national dishes" referred to the disappearance of race. However, since the construction of race identified specific groups of peoples, neither the food nor the individuals lost their race, nor one race supplanted another as guests in the restaurant. The Italians themselves never changed; Anglo-Saxons merely replaced them, hence "the quality of the guests and food [improved]."[38]

Just as Anglo-Saxons identified different races by the foods they ate, immigrants also utilized foodways in order to identify "true" Americans. In *We Are What We Eat,* historian Donna Gabaccia recalls the comment of one early twentieth-century Italian immigrant, who stated, "'it never occurred to me that just being a citizen of the United States meant that I was an 'American.' 'Americans' were people who ate peanut butter and jelly on mushy white bread that came out of a plastic-package.'"[39] In immigrants' eyes, eating *white* bread denoted one's authenticity as an American. Similarly, in Anglo-Saxons' eyes, eating bagels marked one's membership in the Hebrew race, and eating spaghetti exposed one's kinship in the Italian race. Simply put, during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, Americans and immigrants understood the proverb "you are what you eat" quite literally.

---

[36] "The Restaurant System," May 24, 1885.
[37] Ibid.
[38] Ibid.
[39] "The Joy of Growing Up Italian," in Oblate Sisters of the Sacred Heart of Jesus, Villa Maria Teresa, Hubbard, Ohio, *La Cucina dell' Amore: The Kitchen of Love* (Youngstown: Ralph R. Zerbonia, 1990), xx, cited in Gabaccia, 55.

The Birth of Aunt Jemima

Simultaneous to the period of large-scale European immigration, three events altered America's population demographics: the American Civil War, Abraham Lincoln's 1863 Emancipation Proclamation, and the ratification of the Thirteenth Amendment in 1865, which abolished slavery in the United States. Between 1910 and 1940, large numbers of African Americans moved from the South to the West and the North. As they moved, they took their distinct culinary styles and cooking habits with them. The spread of African Americans also resulted in the dissemination of the stereotype of the black mammy. The propagation of the imaginary Aunt Jemima, symbolic of all African Americans, permanently tied somatic black women to the kitchen. Ultimately, African Americans' dispersion throughout the country and the success of Aunt Jemima as an advertising tool, culminated in the transformation of recognizably black foods into "Southern food." The resulting historical descriptions of griddlecakes, fried chicken, hoppin' John and gumbo as Southern food, instead of as black food, irreversibly appropriated African foodways. This process is particularly noteworthy because the "homogenization of whiteness," and, later, the later solidification of binary racial divisions in America, relied, in part, on the appropriation of African foodways.[40]

In 1893, at the Chicago World's Columbian Exposition, R. T. Davis, the owner of the R .T. Davis Milling Company, cast former slave Nancy Green as the first Aunt Jemima. Davis purchased a ready-made pancake mix and the trademark image of Aunt Jemima from Chris Rutt and Charles G. Underwood, two friends and co-owners of a small flourmill.[41] The original concept came to Rutt at a blackface team's performance of a "New Orleans style cakewalk to a tune called 'Aunt Jemima,'" during which the

[40] Jacobson, *Whiteness of a Different Color*, 95.
[41] Witt, *Black Hunger*, 26.

performer donned "'the apron and red-bandanna headband of the traditional southern cook.'"[42] Aunt Jemima embodied "the image of a wise old cook from the Deep South of Civil War times, who had brought her secret pancake recipe to benighted northland."[43] When Aunt Jemima first entered the market in 1889, she quickly became one of the most successful advertising images of all time, selling white Americans a "slave in a box" and the idea of traditional "Southern food." The strategic linkage of black food to the South, as opposed to racial character, slyly negated any relationship between Africans and African foods.[44]

Aunt Jemima's success as a marketing device reaffirmed African Americans' inferiority in the minds of Anglo-Saxons. Many northbound black women took jobs as household servants, a position that required them to care for children, clean, and cook for Anglo-Saxon families. Real-live Aunt Jemimas entered the homes of Anglo-Saxons who lived in the North, feeding them griddlecakes, fried chicken, hoppin' John, and gumbo. While Anglo-Saxons welcomed these foods into their homes, "Aunt Jemima's [supposed] culinary superiority" blinded Anglo-Saxons from recognizing these foods as examples of black cooking.[45]

One may argue that Aunt Jemima's popularity as a pancake maker demonstrated Anglo-Saxons' recognition of her superior cooking skills, and by extension, acknowledgement of African Americans as competent and even talented cooks. The viability of Aunt Jemima as an

---

[42] Ibid.
[43] Ibid.
[44] The phrase "slave in a box" is the title of M. M. Manring's work *Slave in a Box: The Strange Career of Aunt Jemima* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1998); and Witt, *Black Hunger*, 26.
[45] Manring, *Slave in a Box*, 83; and Alice A. Deck, "'Now Then-Who Said Biscuits?' The Black Woman Cook as Fetish in American Advertising, 1905-1953," in *Kitchen Culture: Popular Representations of Food, Gender, and Race*, Sherrie A. Inness, ed., (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2001): 81.

advertising tool, however, merely exhibited how deeply Anglo-Saxons believed in Africans' total inferiority. Symbolic of all African women, and arguably of all African peoples, Aunt Jemima's appeal rested on the fact that she "reinforced the social position of white middle-class America as higher than that of black people."[46]

Anglo-Saxons welcomed Aunt Jemima into their homes because she served as "a labor-saving device." The suggestion that Aunt Jemima retained an organic inclination for making pancakes "contributed to the widespread naturalization of black women's culinary abilities, in effect denying [that] their cooking, as slaves and as domestic servants, was a form of expropriated labor."[47] Such "widespread naturalization" of Africans' skillfulness in the kitchen appeared in an 1879 *New York Times* article entitled "English and American Cooks," in which the author claimed, "the colored cook really has more genius and an innate consciousness about preparing a dinner than many a white person."[48] This comment affirmed that blacks produced better food than Anglo-Saxons; however, the author attributes the high quality of blacks' food not to talent but to "innate consciousness." Aunt Jemima's success, therefore, does not demonstrate Anglo-Saxon appreciation of black culinary talent. Rather, each time Anglo-Saxons purchased or ate Aunt Jemima's pancake mix, they sent Aunt Jemima back into the kitchen, symbolically re-enslaving African Americans, and reasserting their substandard position in society.[49]

Finally, Anglo-Saxons' penchant for tasty foods explained their efforts to salvage "Southern food." The literal and figurative distastefulness of would-be black food caused quite a dilemma in the Anglo-Saxon world. Physically internalizing the food of an inferior race meant

---

[46] Manring, *Slave in a Box*, 83.
[47] Witt, *Black Hunger*, 36.
[48] "English and American Cooks," *New York Times*, 12 October 1879, 9.
[49] Deck, *Kitchen Culture*, 80.

internalizing the race itself. White Americans simply enjoyed black cooking, and in order to reconcile their hunger and their heads, black food became tied to the South and to the name "Southern food," establishing its acceptability.[50]

Incongruent with Anglo-Saxon efforts to infuse Italian, Hebrew, Irish, and other immigrant foods with racial traits, the redemption of black food via name change initially appeared odd. Historical context, however, explained this effort to salvage "Southern food." Ironically, while most Northerners supported abolishing slavery, they also maintained strict racial separations. Conversely, Anglo-Saxons in the South maintained extremely intimate relationships with blacks while simultaneously supporting the institution of slavery. Noting the personal relationship between female African American slaves and the Anglo-Saxon women for whom they toiled, in *Roll, Jordan, Roll*, Eugene D. Genovese explains, "Ole Mammy, or merely 'the cook,' usually ran the kitchen with an iron hand and had learned what she knew from generation of black predecessors. What Missus knew, she usually learned from her cook, not vice versa."[51] While one can argue that Southerners recognized African Americans' culinary skills, Genovese's classification of such foods as "Southern" is undoubtedly problematic. Similarly, in his discussion of Mary Randolph's 1825 cookbook titled *Virginia House-Wife*, Richard Pillsbury writes "the role of African Americans in the elaboration and regionalization of the southern diet is very apparent."[52] Even after correctly identifying the origins of the foods that he discusses, Pillsbury, like Genovese and other historians, incorrectly insists on labeling those foods formulated, cooked, and served by black people as "Southern." Identification of fried foods, griddlecakes, and

---

[50] Genovese, *Roll, Jordan, Roll: The World the Slaves Made* (New York: Vintage Books, 1972): 540-41.
[51] Genovese, *Roll, Jordan, Roll*, 540-41.
[52] Pillsbury, *No Foreign Food*, 122.

gumbo as Southern permanently occurred in the minds of white Americans as the result of the birth of Aunt Jemima and the migration of blacks north and west.[53]

1924–1950: Taste Testing Ethnicity

In 1924 Congress passed the Johnson-Reed Immigration Act, limiting annual immigration to 150,000 individuals, and thus "[marked] the beginning of the ascent of monolithic whiteness."[54] The differences among peoples that Anglo-Saxons deemed significant prior to 1924 "[lost] their salience in American culture and disappear altogether as racially based differences."[55] According to Jacobson, three major events propelled this process: a steep decline in immigration, additional by-products of blacks' migration out of the South, and finally, the events in Nazi Germany. Simultaneous to and in conjunction with these events, significant advances in food production and distribution led to the homogenization the American diet. As a result of these processes, Anglo-Saxons and immigrants started to consume foods outside of their immediate palates.[56]

Canned goods served as a major force responsible for the popularization of immigrant foods. The production of canned foods enabled Anglo-Saxons to consume immigrant foods while denying such foods' origins. Originally invented in France, canned foods entered America with the original settlers. In the 1880s, cans encased baking powder, coffee, nutmeg, and a variety of other ingredients, and by the turn of the century Americans embraced canned goods with open arms. In an 1896 *New York Times* article entitled "Midsummer Cookery: Canned Goods Much Better Than Stale Fruit or Vegetables," writer Juliet Corson shared with readers the wonders of canned goods. According to Corson,

[53] Genovese, *Roll, Jordan, Roll*, 540 – 41.
[54] Jacobson, *Whiteness of a Different Color*, 93.
[55] Ibid., 92.
[56] Ibid., 95.

"there is no kind of dish that cannot be imitated with canned goods."[57]

The rise of canned goods during this period was significant in relation to the spread of immigrant foods for a number of reasons. As first-generation immigrants passed away and second-generation immigrants became increasingly comfortable in America, they felt less inhibited about their foodways. Immigrants' confidence in themselves as Americans prompted them to produce their own canned goods. This, in turn, enabled immigrants to literally package their foodways and ship them all over the country, both asserting and reassuring immigrants of their physical place within and throughout America. Ironically, Anglo-Saxon consumers easily disassociated canned goods with their racial origins because, on grocery shelves, cans were detached from their immigrant lineage. As Gabaccia explains, "before World War II, ethnic businessmen who succeeded in national markets most often did so by selling either products with no ethnic label attached."[58] Therefore, while Anglo-Saxons saw "No Good Reason for Importing Spaghetti" prior to the turn of the century, by "the 1920s Americans had begun to accept [Italians'] 'signature dish,' spaghetti and tomato sauce."[59] Tomatoes, like many other vegetables, were readily available canned. The popularization of spaghetti, outside of immigrant Italian communities, demonstrated the slow process by which Anglo-Saxons accepted Italians both physically and symbolically. That such foods became edible during this

[57] "Cans: A Visual History," Canned Manufacture's Institution, http://www.cancentral.com/brochure/default.htm, accessed 12 December 2005; "Canners Aid Government," *New York Times*, 6 May 1917, 7; and Juliet Corson, "Midsummer Cookery: Canned Goods Much Better Than Stale Fruit or Vegetables," *New York Times*, 12 July 1896, 22.
[58] Gabaccia, *We Are What We Eat*, 121.
[59] Levenstein, *Paradox of Plenty*, 29.

time signified the initial paradigm shift from race to ethnicity in Americans' minds.[60]

Although Anglo-Saxons began eating "foreign" foods, they did so hesitantly. Early twentieth-century cookbooks revealed such reluctance and practical denial of the consumption of immigrant foods. In an extensive discussion of cookbooks during this time period, Pillsbury notes that foreign foods were "almost totally absent"[61] from cookbooks between World War I and World War II because of "intense anti-immigrant sentiments."[62]

Colonel Sanders and the Invention of Fried Chicken

In 1954 a man named Harlan Sanders opened a fried chicken restaurant franchise named Kentucky Fried Chicken. Better known as KFC, the restaurant's success, as well as the legend and image of Colonel Harlan Sanders, completed Anglo-Saxons' appropriation of black foodways. According to KFC legend, Indiana native Harlan Sanders developed the secret KFC recipe while working as a cook, at a diner, in Corbin, Kentucky. Before he established KFC, Sanders "carried the secret formula for his Kentucky Fried Chicken in his head and the spice mixture in his car."[63] As the recognizable face and image of KFC, Colonel Sanders physically embodied a pre-Civil War Southern plantation owner. According to Levenstein, "prominent in [KFC's] marketing was the avuncular, white-haired, white-goateed, white-suited 'Colonel' Sanders amiably presiding over happily munching children."[64] KFC's triumph as a fast food

---

[60] For further discussion of the impact of canned goods on the American diet see Richard Hooker's *Food and Drink in America*; and Levenstein, *Paradox of Plenty*, 29.
[61] Pillsbury, *No Foreign Foods*, 127.
[62] Ibid.
[63] "About KFC: Colonel Harlan Saunders," http://www.kfc.com/about.colonel.html, accessed 12 December 2005; and Levenstein, *Paradox of Plenty*, 229.
[64] Levenstein, *Paradox of Plenty*, 229.

restaurant is indicative of Americans' underlying belief that Colonel Sanders actually "invented" fried chicken, despite the fact that decades before, while enslaved in the South, blacks cooked, served, and created fried chicken recipes. The combined success of Colonel Sanders and the perpetuation of his image permanently detached blacks from their original foodways in America.[65]

1950–1970: Ethnic Foods

If the implementation of the Johnson-Reed Immigration Act of 1924 initiated the homogenization of white foods in America, the end of World War II clinched the process. Beginning in the 1950s, the current staples of the American diet entered the stomachs of the masses. The relatively sudden popularization of bagels, pizza, and other so-called ethnic foods typified "the emergence and consolidation of a new, binary racial arrangement, [which came] to dominate the American political culture for the balance of the twentieth century."[66] Endowing these foods with "ethnicity" denied the racial characteristics previously attributed to these foods, and thus reinforced the determination of race by color. [67]

Jacobson attributes the replacement of racial designations with ethnic classifications, first, to the

---

[65] "About KFC," http://www.kfc.com/about.colonel.html,; and Levenstein, *Paradox of Plenty*, 229.

[66] Jacobson, *Whiteness of a Different Color*, 98.

[67] Many historians date the transformation of the American diet to immediately following the Second World War, including Richard Pillsbury, who noted, "the American diet has changed more in the past forty years than in the previous 150. A portion of this change was due to technological and immigration shifts discussed previously, but a good portion also stems from the nation's restructuring after World War II." In her essay "Symbol and Performance," Susan Kaloik wrote that "in general the period from the end of World War II to the present has been characterized by a live-and-let-eat mood." Richard Hooker and Richard Pillsbury also dated the emergence of ethnic foods to this time period.

perceived novelty of the differences among people, which arose following the Cold War. Second, "ethnicity itself provided a paradigm for assimilation which erased race as a category of historical experience for European and some Near Eastern immigrants."[68] Finally, the alchemy of race owed its existence to a "single anomaly: 'the Negro.'"[69] These developments, which catalyzed the replacement of race with ethnicity, also explained the addition of "ethnic foods" to mainstream American diets.

First, newly minted white Americans' adoption of *ethnicity* as a type of culturally based difference enabled immigrants to both "be white" and maintain their foodways. Levenstein notes "the ethnic food boom was also abetted by the revival of ethnic consciousness," and ethnic foods became symbols of pride for immigrant groups. Italians now ate Italian food with a new sense of delight. Because Anglo-Saxons perceived foodways as ethnic and thereby cultural, eating immigrants' foods not only became acceptable but the norm. American consumption following World War II "demonstrates the *transportability of ethnicity*," and marked completion of the "homogenization of whiteness."[70]

Pizza's climb to popularity illustrated how physical ingestion of immigrant foods both resulted from and encouraged Anglo-Saxons' symbolic ingestion of Italians. While before World War II, few non-Italian people ate pizza, in the decades following the war, as most current American citizens can attest, pizza became one of America's most marketable foods.[71] Levenstein notes that pizza's newfound acceptability rested on its disposition "as the ideal family food, equally acceptable to all ages and both sexes," which "fit so well with the culture of the times."[72] The "culture of the times," to which Levenstein refers, rested on the

[68] Jacobson, *Whiteness of a Different Color*, 110.
[69] Ibid.
[70] Ibid.; and Brown, *Ethnic and Regional Foodways*, 6.
[71] Pillsbury, *No Foreign Food*, 156.
[72] Levenstein, *Paradox of Plenty*, 230.

increasingly popular view of ethnic difference as opposed to racial difference. Because Italians no longer represented a different race, pizza became palatable.[73]

Soldiers' return home from overseas spotlighted another reason for the acceptance of pizza and other immigrant foods after World War II. Richard Hooker asserts "the Second World War gave millions of Americans of both sexes new eating experiences in Asia and Europe where they found food treated as serious subject and an important source of enjoyment." After sampling new foods in places such as Germany, France, and Japan, soldiers returned home with an affinity for exotic tastes, which helped explain the popularization of immigrant foods.[74]

Finally, analysis of the bagel and its rise to acceptability demonstrated both how food enabled and resulted in the homogenization of whiteness. Gabaccia argues that bagels "became firmly identified as 'Jewish' *only as Jewish bakers began selling* them to their multi-ethnic urban neighbors." This assertion, however, is misleading. Jewish bakers most likely sold non-Jewish customers bagels when such customers expressed any desire to purchase them. Non-Jews, however, rarely expressed such desire. Bagels emerged as a Jewish *ethnic* food only when Jews' so-called "multi-ethnic urban neighbors" *ate* them, and this only happened following World War II. Prior to the 1950s Anglo-Saxons viewed bagels as a wholly Jewish food, which was why they did not eat them. Once Jews became merely a "minor difference," bagels became breakfast royalty. In total, immigrant foods achieved edibility when the peoples from whom these foods originated gained acceptability.[75]

---

[73] Pillsbury, *No Foreign Food*, 156; and Levenstein, *Paradox of Plenty*, 230.
[74] Hooker, *Food and Drink*, 336.
[75] Gabaccia, *We Are What We Eat*, 5 (Emphasis added).

"Soul Food"

Following the "ethnic food boom" of the 1950s, in the 1960s African Americans attempted to generate Anglo-Saxon recognition of black culinary traditions, which they termed "soul food." Soul food never gained legitimacy in the eyes of the American public. Already known as Southern food, Anglo-Saxons believed the label soul food endowed fried chicken and collard greens with uncomfortable racial connotations. Additionally, most Anglo-Saxons also perceived blacks' claims to these foods as inaccurate and unfounded because, as they saw it, former slaves did not have "traditions distinctive enough to generate an enclave market where blacks enjoyed special knowledge."[76] In Americans' eyes, claiming soul food as a black foodway misrepresented African American history, and misrepresented Southern foods.[77]

While most Americans refused to recognize Southern food as soul food, black Americans' words did not fall on deaf ears. Analyzing the evolution of Aunt Jemima as an American stereotype, historian Marilyn Kern-Fox discusses civil rights activist Eldridge Cleaver's comments about Aunt Jemima. Kern-Fox writes that Cleaver "vehemently voiced his opposition to Aunt Jemima, claiming that she, like so many other black women, was a traitor to black American racial pride, identity values, and legacy. He accused the symbol of consorting with the enemy in the defeat of black America."[78]

In order to allay African American complaints during an era plagued with conflicts over segregation, racism, and ultimately power, Aunt Jemima underwent a series of makeovers. While in 1968 Aunt Jemima's appearance changed insignificantly, in 1989 she underwent a dramatic

---

[76] Ibid., 91.

[77] Levenstein, *Paradox of Plenty*, 215.

[78] Marilyn Kern-Foxworth, *Aunt Jemima, Uncle Ben, and Rastus: Blacks in Advertising, Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow* (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1994): 85.

change. In *Aunt Jemima, Uncle Ben, and Rastus: Blacks in Advertising, Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow*, Fox-Kern includes several descriptions of Aunt Jemima's "new" physique. One contributor wrote, "[Aunt Jemima] lost 150 pounds, dropped 40 years, got herself a new headdress and moved from the plantation to New Orleans."[79] Fox-Kern notes that following her makeover, Aunt Jemima looked "more like a black Betty Crocker than the Aunt Jemima who has graced our breakfast tables for over a century."[80] Even after her makeover, Aunt Jemima did not evolve into a proud black woman. Instead, Aunt Jemima's image was adapted to fit Anglo-Saxons' standard of beauty. Ironically, Aunt Jemima's transformation and Anglicization only emphasized that no matter what she wore or how she styled her hair she could never be white. As a representative of the African American community, Aunt Jemima epitomized the permanent status of the "black" race as "the other." In total, the wildly unsuccessful soul food movement, in which African Americans attempted to redefine themselves by reclaiming "Southern food" as a black foodway, and Aunt Jemima's makeovers, only validated the racial divisions between white and black Americans.[81]

Conclusion

For immigrants who lived in America during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, what one ate defined one's race. Following the 1924 Johnson-Reed Immigration Act, ethnicity replaced race as the definition of difference among immigrant populations, and strict separations among different foods quickly diminished. The revival of ethic foods in the 1950s, combined with the failure of the soul food movement in the 1960s, reaffirmed dyadic racial divisions within American society. Ultimately,

---

[79] Kern-Foxworth, *Aunt Jemima, Uncle Ben*, 90.
[80] Ibid., 99.
[81] Ibid.

food enabled the homogenization of whiteness and helped to establish and endorse binary racial designations in America.

Review Essay

The Second Coming of Charles Austin Beard

Matthew S. R. Bewig

Some time between 1776 and 1789, the American nation was born. All agree that the Declaration of Independence, the Revolutionary War, the Articles of Confederation, and the Constitution played crucial roles in this process. In particular, our understanding of the adoption of the Constitution has reflected contemporary political concerns. Thus, during the antebellum era, when sectional controversy stood at the heart of national politics, debate on the Constitution's ratification centered on the issue of states' rights versus national power; Gilded Age thinkers, consumed with Greenback and free-silver proposals to expand the money supply, focused on conflicts during the "Critical Period" over debtor relief; Progressive Era critics concerned with the "social question" brought early national class conflict to the fore; and Cold War-era historians shed light on 1780s liberal and republican ideology. Today, the republican synthesis has largely unraveled, but a new dominant paradigm has yet to emerge. One promising framework lies in the revival of historian Charles A. Beard's interpretation, modified and strengthened by the use of modern econometric methods, which could create a sound material basis for a more nuanced understanding of the origins of the Constitution.

Though initially greeted with alarm by some reviewers, Beard's magnum opus, *An Economic Interpretation of the Constitution of the United States,* soon became the dominant interpretation of the ratification of

the Constitution.[1] Writing in 1913, at the same time that law professor Roscoe Pound and other "Legal Realists" were criticizing the Supreme Court for overturning popular legislation that conflicted with property rights, Beard argued that the adoption of the Constitution itself constituted a triumph for those who were concerned with the protection of private property.[2] Beard advanced three main lines of argument. First, he explained the conflict between Federalists and Antifederalists as a clash of class interests between possessors of "personalty" (merchants, creditors, public securities holders, and large slaveowners) who tended to favor the Constitution, and owners of "realty" (yeoman farmers, debtors, and even the propertyless) who often opposed it.[3] In support of his thesis, Beard analyzed the property holdings of the Constitutional Convention delegates, concluding that holders of personalty, especially public securities, tended to become Federalists because they believed that the new central government would establish more effective protection for their property than

---

[1] Charles A. Beard, *An Economic Interpretation of the Constitution of the United States*, 2nd ed. (New York: The Free Press, 1935). Law professor E. S. Corwin, for example, attacked Beard for being "bent on demonstrating the truth of the socialistic theory of economic determinism and class struggle." E. S. Corwin, review of *An Economic Interpretation, History Teacher's Magazine* 5 (2) (February 1914): 65-66. Though Beard was often mistaken for a Marxist, he in fact was not, as he had no consistent theory of political economy or class relations, and presented "an eclecticism that drew indiscriminately on contending and irreconcilable schools of political economy and that introduced an often-noted ambiguity into his work." Eugene Genovese, "Charles A. Beard and the Economic Interpretation of History," in Charles A. Beard: An Observance of the Centennial of His Birth, ed. Marvin Swanson (Greencastle, Indiana: DePauw University, 1976): 25-44, 37.

[2] See, e.g., *Lochner v. New York*, 198 U.S. 45 (1905).

[3] "Personalty" is "personal property; movable property; chattels; property that is not attached to real estate," while "realty" is "a brief term for real property," which is "land, and generally whatever is erected or growing upon or affixed to land." *Black's Law Dictionary*, 6th ed. (St. Paul, Minn.: West Publishing, 1990): 1144, 1218, 1264.

the state governments, which had tended to adopt policies injurious to holders of personalty.[4]

Further, Beard argued that Federalist political thought reflected the economic interests protected by the Constitution. Specifically, Beard contended that Madison's "Tenth Federalist," with its emphasis on the Constitution's ability to control factions, was directed particularly at controlling economic factions or classes in order to protect the rights of property.[5] Finally, Beard concluded that the Federalists were essentially anti-democratic elitists, out to reverse the democratic tendencies of the early state constitutions and the Articles of Confederation. Beard noted that Federalists favored restricting suffrage to property owners, granting unelected judges the power of judicial review over legislation, electing the President and the Senate indirectly, and limiting the power of the popularly elected House of Representatives by making it inferior to the Senate.[6] Additionally, Beard argued that limitations on obtaining suffrage in the 1780s meant that the state ratifying conventions were unrepresentative bodies whose approval of the Constitution was essentially undemocratic.

In the Cold War era, however, the Beard thesis came under significant attack on two fronts, as some historians questioned how accurately it depicted the ideological and economic realities of the late eighteenth century. The first important critical publications were by Douglass Adair, who in the 1940s and 1950s set forth an early version of the "republicanism" thesis that gained dominance in the 1960s and 1970s.[7] Adair argues that the intellectual heritage of republican thought was the decisive factor in

---

[4] Beard, *Economic Interpretation*, 19-24, 31-40, 52-63, 73-151.
[5] Ibid., 156-58.
[6] Ibid., 189-216, esp. 191, 214-16.
[7] Douglass Adair, *Fame and the Founding Fathers*, ed. Trevor Colbourn (New York: W. W. Norton, 1974) (collecting Adair's articles published in the 1940s and 1950s).

understanding the origins of the Constitution, and far outweighed the sort of economic interests emphasized by Beard. He takes Beard to task for quoting Madison's Tenth Federalist selectively, in order to emphasize class and economic issues, while ignoring other factions that were equally important in Madison's mind. Adair also claims that the Framers, not the Antifederalists, were the true democrats, because they established a stable republic that had a "strong and inevitable tendency . . . towards the national democracy that would develop in the nineteenth century."[8] Crediting the Federalists with the democratic achievements of the nineteenth century, however, seems more than a bit teleological, and oddly credits the Federalists for changes they opposed in their time.

As to the economic aspects of Beard's work, historians Robert Brown and Forrest McDonald wrote the two principal critiques. Brown contends that Beard had "violate[d] the precepts of the historical method in many ways . . . [including] omission to outright misrepresentation of evidence."[9] However, many of his criticisms missed the mark. For example, while he rightly takes Beard to task for stating, on the basis of scant evidence, that in 1787 the mass of men were disfranchised, Brown does no better when he argues that the franchise must have been extensive because some convention delegates implied that it was.[10] He attacks Beard for using the term "working class" in a pre-industrial context, yet refers to a large "middle class," apparently oblivious that both terms are equally anachronistic when applied to the early national period. Finally, while his critique of Beard's evidence regarding the property holdings of Convention delegates is telling, Brown fails to offer his own theory for the origins of the

[8] Id. at 123.
[9] Robert E. Brown, *Charles Beard and the Constitution: A Critical Analysis of "An Economic Interpretation of the Constitution"* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1956): 111.
[10] Ibid., 37-40.

Constitution, other than to assert that it was democratically adopted by a "middle-class" nation that sought to protect property and other individual rights.

Forrest McDonald launches a more damaging attack two years after Brown's by presenting economic data, not only on the Philadelphia Convention delegates as Beard had done, but also on the delegates to the state ratifying conventions.[11] Regarding Philadelphia, McDonald argues that data on sixteen "crucial" votes related to strengthening the national government or protecting the interests of personalty holders, evinced no divide between delegates holding personalty and those holding realty.[12] He further contends that the ratifying conventions were representative of the people at large and that there was no correlation between security holding or class interest and support for the Constitution.[13] Instead, McDonald argues that contending "factions," dominated by men of economic and political power, led the fight over the Constitution and that class conflict played little or no role. Thus, McDonald follows Beard in seeking the origins of the Constitution in conflict between economic interests, but located that conflict as being between different elite groupings, not between classes.

These consensus historians' attacks upon the late Charles Beard did not go without reply. Probably the most prominent of the neo-Progressive historians of the period was Jackson Turner Main, grandson of Progressive historian Frederick Jackson Turner. His "critical review" of *We the People* charges that McDonald was guilty of some of the same sins that he accused Beard of—particularly

[11] Forrest McDonald, *We the People: The Economic Origins of the Constitution* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1958).
[12] Ibid., 100-08.
[13] Ibid.

selective use of facts in order to support his thesis.[14] Specifically, Main contends that McDonald defined geographic regions and men's wealth or occupation to suit his argument. For example, he defines the regions of states such as Massachusetts and Virginia in such a way as to find that all regions were represented at the Philadelphia Convention, despite the fact that no one from the interior of either state attended.[15] Main concludes that, if the evidence is viewed more objectively, most of Beard's thesis remained valid despite the research and criticism of McDonald.

In his own book, Main contends that the struggle over the Constitution was primarily between merchants and those with allied interests living in commercially oriented areas, who supported the Constitution, and noncommercial farmers and those living in backcountry areas, who opposed it.[16] Though Main discarded Beard's emphasis on personalty versus realty, he nonetheless refines Beard's approach into a socio-geographical one, in which those living in cities, towns, or farm areas with access to markets supported the Constitution, while those in the subsistence-economy backcountry opposed it. Though Main modifies Beard significantly, he is far closer in spirit to him than to the consensus historians because he roots the fight over the Constitution in fundamental differences in ways of life and economic conflict, rather than in factional or political fighting between social groups in basic agreement on social and economic issues.

From the mid-1960s onward, historians largely ignored Beard's economic interpretation, focusing instead on issues of political thought and ideology. Bernard Bailyn

---

[14] Jackson Turner Main, "Charles A. Beard and the Constitution: A Critical Review of Forrest McDonald's *We the People," William and Mary Quarterly,* 17 (January 1960): 86-110 (includes a reply by McDonald).
[15] Ibid., 87-88.
[16] Jackson Turner Main, *The Antifederalists: Critics of the Constitution, 1781-1788* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1961).

and others emphasized the importance of English "Whig" thought to the origins of the American Revolution, arguing that republican ideology lead Americans to believe that Parliament was conspiring against their liberty.[17] Over the years, this ideological school and its "republican synthesis" virtually swept the fields of eighteenth and nineteenth century American history, fundamentally altering our understanding of both periods.[18]

Gordon Wood applies the emerging republican synthesis to the origins of the Constitution, arguing that the heritage of republican political thought was the crucial factor in the creation of a new American science of politics.[19] Wood emphasizes intellectual history above all other factors, and eschews economic or even political analysis in favor of the history of ideas. As to Charles Beard, Wood concludes that "[i]t seems obvious by now that Beard's notion that men's property holdings, particularly personalty holdings, determined their ideas and their behavior was so crude that no further time should be spent on it."[20]

The republican synthesis, though roundly criticized, has remained the most comprehensive explanatory model for the adoption of the Constitution, and has doubtless enhanced our knowledge of the Constitution. No longer can

---

[17] See, e.g., Bernard Bailyn, *The Ideological Origins of the American Revolution* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1967); Pauline Maier, *From Resistance to Revolution: Colonial Radicals and the Development of American Opposition to Britain, 1765-1776* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1972); J. G. A. Pocock, *The Machiavellian Moment: Florentine Political Thought and the Atlantic Republican Tradition* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1975).

[18] See, e.g., Robert E. Shalhope, "Toward A Republican Synthesis," *William and Mary Quarterly*, 29 (January 1972): 49-80; *idem*, "Republicanism and Early American Historiography," *William and Mary Quarterly*, 39 (April 1982): 334-56.

[19] Gordon Wood, *The Creation of the American Republic, 1776-1787* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1969).

[20] Ibid., 626.

historians look to John Locke as the only important point of origin for American political thought, and no one can deny that republican ideology played a very important role in the debate on the Constitution. Nevertheless, a purely ideological interpretation of the Constitution's framing is far too idealist to present the whole picture or entirely explain ratification. Though several historians have argued persuasively that the republican synthesis could not explain the ratification of the Constitution on its own, they have not been able to set forth an adequate or comprehensive non-ideological explanation for the Constitution.[21]

Recently, however, some ninety years after the publication of Beard's seminal volume, economic historian Robert McGuire attempts to upset the republican apple cart by arguing that economic factors played a decisive role in determining the content of the Constitution and who favored or opposed it.[22] McGuire concludes that ownership of public (and private) securities and proximity to navigable waterways were positively correlated with support for the Constitution, both at Philadelphia and at the state ratifying conventions, while ownership of slaves and distance from navigable waterways was negatively correlated. Using sophisticated statistical and econometric methods, McGuire analyzes votes at both the Constitutional Convention and the various state ratifying conventions. McGuire considers

---

[21] See, Roger H. Brown, *Redeeming the Republic: Federalists, Taxation, and the Origins of the Constitution* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993); Saul Cornell, *The Other Founders: The Antifederalists and the American Dissenting Tradition* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1999); Forrest MacDonald, *Novus Ordo Seclorum: The Intellectual Origins of the Constitution* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1985); Peter Onuf, *The Origins of the Federal Republic, Jurisdictional Controversies in the United States, 1775-1787* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1983).

[22] Robert A. McGuire, *To Form A More Perfect Union: A New Economic Interpretation of the United States Constitution* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003).

the characteristics not only of the state convention delegates, as McDonald had done, but also of their constituents, to determine how their interests might have affected a given delegate's vote.

For the Constitutional Convention, McGuire looks at the sixteen key votes stressed by McDonald, but, instead of the straight correlation method used by Beard, Brown, and McDonald, employs the technique of logistic regression, in which "each potential factor, each explanatory variable, affecting the vote is examined separately from the influence of the other factors, while controlling for the influence of the other factors."[23] Thus, McGuire is able to determine that while the "average" delegate to the Philadelphia convention was 37.9% likely to vote for the failed measure that would have granted Congress the power to veto state legislation, delegates living near navigable waterways were 47.2% likely to do so, and those living 100 miles away from navigable water were only 8% likely.[24]

For the Philadelphia convention, McGuire concludes that public and private security holders were more likely to support measures creating a strong national government and restricting the powers of the states over economic affairs, while those from less commercial areas were likely to oppose such proposals.[25] The findings regarding the state conventions were even more significant, as McGuire finds that "delegates who were merchants or farmers, or who owned western lands or private or public securities generally were significantly more likely to have supported ratification [while] . . . delegates who were in personal debt, owned slaves, or represented more isolated backcountry areas generally were significantly less likely to have ratified than other delegates."[26] Moreover, the data shows that the effect of economic interests was more powerful than the

[23] Ibid., 40.
[24] Ibid., 69.
[25] Ibid., 91-93.
[26] Ibid., 159.

effect of regional or demographic differences. While the findings were roughly in line with Beard's, and contradict those of Brown and McDonald, they were most consistent with the conclusions reached by Jackson Turner Main, who argued that the fight over the Constitution was essentially a socio-geographical one, pitting backcountry subsistence farmers and debtors against securities holders and others living in commercially oriented areas. Though McGuire did not enter the debate over whether the Constitution was ratified in a democratic way, he did conclude that "had different [economic] interests been represented at the state ratifying conventions, there likely would have been no ratification of the Constitution as drafted."[27] McGuire follows Main in abandoning Beard's focus on personalty versus realty, yet the economic interpretation of the Constitution, first undertaken by Charles Beard, lives on.

In the future, the findings of Robert McGuire, which validate an economic interpretation of the Constitution, will have to be integrated with those of the ideological school. While McGuire is able to demonstrate that economic interests strongly influenced the design and ratification of the Constitution, he is not able to examine the thoughts or motivations of the actors. Specifically, economic interests may have shaped Constitutional outcomes, but the range of choices available in 1787 was constrained by political and ideological factors not easily–or at all–susceptible to regression analysis. How those particular options came to be voted on in the first place cannot be answered statistically, but must be considered in light of the broader history of the era.

One potentially fruitful way of doing that would be to place ratification in the context of the market revolution and the transition to capitalism in America. A nuanced body of literature shows that, starting in the Confederation era, farmers began to become enmeshed in market

[27] Ibid., 160.

participation to a far greater extent than previously, while in the north, free wage labor began to pre-dominate as never before.[28] Because ratification of the Constitution occurred at roughly the same time as the beginnings of the transition to capitalism, and McGuire's findings correlate well with a conflict between those already engaged in a market economy and those just starting to experience the stresses of the transition, placement of ratification in that social and economic context may allow us to understand the political and ideological aspects of ratification in a more holistic way.

[28] *See, e.g.*, Christopher Clark, *The Roots of Rural Capitalism* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1990); James Henretta, *The Origins of American Capitalism: Collected Essays* (Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1991); Winifred Rothenberg, *From Market Places to a Market Economy* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992); Naomi Lamoreaux, "Rethinking the Transition to Capitalism in the Early American Northeast," *Journal of American History* 90 (Sept. 2003): 437-61; Steven Hahn and Jonathan Prude, eds., *The Countryside in the Age of Capitalist Transformation* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1985); Allan Kulikoff, *The Agrarian Origins of American Capitalism* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1992); Sean Wilentz, *Chants Democratic: New York City and the Rise of the American Working Class, 1788 - 1850* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1984).

Lizabeth Cohen, *A Consumers' Republic: The Politics of Mass Consumption in Postwar America*.

New York: Random House, 2003.

Spending and consumption boomed after the Second World War as affluence came within the reach of an increasing number of Americans. In *A Consumers' Republic: The Politics of Mass Consumption in Postwar America* (2003), Lizabeth Cohen argues that increased spending in the postwar period signaled the democratization of the marketplace and a reconceptualization of American citizenship as constituted by participation in that marketplace. While Cohen begins with a discussion of the Depression era and the New Deal through the Second World War, she focuses primarily on the post war period. Specifically, she argues that economic reconvergence after the war took the form of a Consumers Republic as a force, which she defines as "an elaborate and integrated ideal of economic abundance and democratic political freedom," which "became almost a national civil religion from the late 1940s into the 1970s" (127). Cohen expresses ambivalence about the Republic's claim of a democratized marketplace, and addresses the disjuncture between this ideal and the actual postwar economic conditions.

Cohen employs two precepts in her discussion, the citizen consumer and the purchaser consumer, which not only define types of consumers, but also emerge chronologically in the development of her Republic. The citizen consumer, prominent under FDR's New Deal administration, sought regulation and legislation as protection from the marketplace. Meanwhile, the purchaser consumer, prominent after the war, was a source of material demand that could facilitate economic recovery and growth. According to Cohen, the 1930s witnessed a fundamental transition from a classical economic emphasis

on production-guided consumption to a Keynesian emphasis on government spending and consumer-directed production as a tenet of macro-level economic growth, development, and stability. During this period, the state effectively imbued consumerism with notions of patriotic duty as a component of postwar economic reconversion, which linked material "desire with [the] obligations of citizenship" (75). The promise of consumerism was constituted as an "alternate route to democracy, a mass consumption utopia that would benefit all purchaser consumers by raising everyone's standard of living" (109). However, the early postwar decades witnessed the gradual erosion of the social and political undertones of the citizen consumer construct that had accompanied the rise of mass consumerism and underscored its promise of an equalizing force.

Much of Cohen's discussion of the material benefits of post-war affluence covers familiar territory, including domesticity, the G. I. Bills, and suburbanization. Notably, Cohen argues, the benefits contained in the G. I. Bill were denied to women, who made up "the largest segment by far of excluded non-veterans," and who, because of this exclusion, were "forced into new dependencies that limited their life options" after the war (138). More generally, Cohen argues, the Consumers' Republic, which "heralded the arrival of class integration," in effect "implicitly endorsed gender differentiation and even inequality" (164). Restrictions imposed on women by the Consumers' Republic are perhaps best summed up by the refusal of institutions to extend credit, "an essential pillar in the Consumers' Republic's infrastructure," to women, thus deepening their "economic dependence on men" (281). Clearly, the politics of the Consumers' Republic reflected official forms of discrimination for women as well as African Americans.

Through the "Double V" campaign, for victory abroad and victory at home, African American leadership during

the Second World War linked the rampant discrimination of African Americans at home with the war effort—the fight would not be over until the two evils were extinguished. Part of the discrimination at home, Cohen argues, centered on the exclusion of African Americans from sites of consumption, such as restaurants, bars and hotels, along with other segregated practices underpinning white superiority. According to Cohen, however, the Republic provided African Americans "new opportunities for fighting discrimination," (166) as they fought for access to public sites of consumption, and, "literally, a place at the table" (167). That fight, however, was militated against by the increased privatization of publicly used spaces, such as malls, as well as the subtle and often legal disregard for dissent.

Cohen's discussion of market segmentation fits in neatly with her broader argument of failed market place democratization. The promise that consumption held social and political advantages benefiting the broader democratic society withered with the rise of segmentation, which responded to increased differentiation in the population with specialized products and services. In effect, marketers seeking alternatives to mass marketing incorporated "social difference in pursuit of profit" (310). They were simultaneously reacting to the "rising assertiveness of ethnically defined subgroups," such as black power advocates in the mid-1960s (323). The limitations of segmentation, however, were reflected in the "ambivalence of mainstream marketers toward embracing homosexuals," (331) suggesting that market segmentation also sanctioned lifestyle. Significantly, by the 1960s the promise of social equality had dissolved into fatuous affect: "smoking a camel [became] a badge of working class identity" (313). In the end, Cohen finds that personal entitlement has replaced a "commitment to society's collective well-being" (387). It is as though the marketers were not lying, but were simply incorrect.

Cohen concludes her sweeping discussion on a relative naïve note. Additionally, her analysis might have connected with previous studies to ascertain whether her Republic occupied previous eras of consumption and reform. Paula Fuss's *The Damned and the Beautiful* highlights the role of consumption in peer group conformity, with the rise of fads in the 1920s, while Upton Sinclair illustrated the need for reform at sites of capitalist production in *The Jungle*. Consumption and production have long been a battleground of social, political and economic concern. Additionally, her correlation between mass consumption and civic and political identity vacillates at times as to the meaning of the correlate. It is not clear how Americans were coping with changing patterns of mass consumption or its ultimate failure to meet its promise. Nevertheless, *Consumers' Republic* is an ambitious, and welcome, addition to studies on the postwar period, emphasizing "the centrality of mass consumption in twentieth-century American society," and paving the way for additional scholarship detailing the ways mass consumption has shaped being American (9).

Joel Black

Ian Wood. ***The Missionary Life: Saints and the Evangelisation of Europe 400-1050.*** Harlow, England: Pearson Education Limited, 2001.

In *The Missionary Life*, Ian Wood states, "the history of mission has to be written largely from the *Lives* of saints" (265). Building on this premise, he explores *Lives* during the period from 400-1000 C.E. occupying the main missionary efforts of the Anglo-Saxons amongst the Bavarians, Slavs, and Saxons. Wood shows how to use these texts to piece together a historical narrative from often contradictory and incomplete documents. He notes, "some have little to tell us about the world and actions of the missionaries, others take us remarkably deeply into the experiences of Christians working in a pagan environment" (20). He provides a critical reading of the sources, examining the purposes of the hagiographers, the contexts in which the documents were written, and their response to other hagiographical texts. Within this interrelated group of documents that serve multiple purposes to their authors and audiences, Wood succeeds in his goal of gaining an understanding of early medieval mission and how hagiographers represented it.

The first step in unraveling the complexity was a careful reading of a text in order to determine the purpose behind the author's writing. Wood uncovers a series of purposes that fell into broad categories. For example, Willibald's *Vita Bonifati* was politically focused on Carolingian hostility to the perceived return to paganism of the Thuringians as cited in the letters of Boniface. Similarly, the jurisdictional issues in Eigil's *Life of Sturm* are used to undermine property claims in the foundation of Fulda, the monastery founded by Boniface. A similar highly legalized text was Rimbert's *Vita Anskarii*, which argued for the integration of Hamburg/Bremen. The anonymous *Vita*

Altera Bonifati approached the Saint with a different purpose in mind: the exploration of Boniface as doctor to the inner man, whereas the *Vita Rimberti* was mainly concerned with monasteries, piety, and pastoral care. These texts illustrated a spiritual focus, as opposed to a strictly missionary ideal. Other texts focused specifically on missions, such as the *Vita Willibrordi*, which allowed Alcuin to express a sensible missionary policy based on preaching and evangelization. Finally, some accounts came close to autobiography, like the *Vita Gregori*, a personal work wherein Liudeger related his own accomplishments to Boniface and Gregory. All of these purposes are clearly delineated in Wood's dense text, but the reader has to extract different ones for each text encountered on his/her own. Since purpose occupies a central place in Wood's argument, the inclusion of a summary for his categories of purpose and which texts featured a particular category would help the reader better organize and follow the main argument.

Examining the textual relationships amongst authors and their responses to each other is Wood's second method for handling complexity. Wood observes that many of the sources were interrelated. The lives of Boniface, his disciples, and their hagiographers provided ample ground for exploring the "genealogy" of a group of *Lives*. By knowing the "place in the chains of *Lives* to which it is linked" Wood determines how each added to or rejected positions in prior *Lives* (247). Throughout his work, Wood does not follow the chronology of the saints or missionaries, but "of the hagiography, and the connections between individual texts" (19). This constructive approach allows him to explore the motivations of authors, compare them to each other, and arrive at a more accurate historical narrative. The texts would have been well served by the inclusion of diagrams and maps showing the travels of the Saints and their hagiographers. There are a few maps included as geographical reference points, but additional

information on when and where authors and texts intersected could have better explained complex relationships and assisted the reader in understanding context.

By dealing with each text as the unique expression of a particular author within a broader framework, Wood successfully navigates through a sea of bias. The texts by Willibald and Eigil used different methods to examine Boniface and in the process they provided the historian with genuine research, legal documentation, and an account of private conversation. In tracing the genealogy of texts, Wood also examines the family ties of the authors. Alcuin, his subject Willibrord, and Beornrad, to whom he addressed the *Life of Willibrord*, were all relatives. Wood concludes that the historical focus on Anglo-Saxon missionary work in Europe had been overemphasized due to the tight grouping of literary sources within a single extended family. Similar attention paid to the *Vita Lebuini Antiqua* and its information on the political life of early pagan Saxony is also called into question due to its total dependence on written sources and doubtful dates. Wood notes that phrases used in the work to describe events in the eighth century actually appeared in ninth-century Byzantine works contemporary to the writing of this *Life*. Finally, through direct comparison between texts and known historical events, the fraudulent *Vita Vulframni* can still yield genuine information on Frisian paganism. All of these examples demonstrate how to examine texts critically to arrive at useful historical facts.

Wood succeeds at extracting valuable information about missions from all of his hagiographic sources. Through the *Lives* he is able to examine pagan beliefs, syncretism, deviant Christianity, and political propaganda. Where paganism was confronted, a close reading of texts helped to explain the far more violent confrontation of missionaries with the Slavs than with the Germans encountered by Boniface and his successors. The

strategies employed by missionaries in Christianizing these different groups were also apparent. Persuasion, baptism, preaching in local vernaculars, adoption of native lifestyle, and dependence on books and ritual objects could all be gleaned from these sources once they are placed in a proper context. Beyond the strategy of mission, Wood delves into the role of visions and the miraculous in the missionary model as it evolved through the eighth and ninth century. Visions served a conciliatory function for the saint on the way to martyrdom. The role of miracles gradually changed from influencing pagans to convert to consoling missionaries as the early missionary period came to an end thanks to the Vikings. In his process, Wood provides the historian with insight on how to confront hagiography. "Hagiography is an infinitely flexible religious and literary form" with no single standard for missionary practice nor a single missionary that can be called representative (19, 266). With the caveat that "a source tells us at least as much about its author and audience as about its subject matter," Ian Wood adds to our understanding of missionary history as much as those who originally recounted it.

Charles Flowers