

— 1995 Cover Design by Katie Burt —

We felt that since 1995 is the final year of Wittenberg University's 150th anniversary celebration it was only appropriate to have the sesquicentennial seal as the cover design for this year's journal.

THE WITTENBERG HISTORY JOURNAL

Wittenberg University • Springfield, Ohio

Volume XXIV

Spring 1995

Editor's Note:

The *1995 History Journal* is a collection of articles which salute the resiliency of the human spirit through both individual and collective efforts to overcome the tragedies of societal struggles and war.

We would like to thank our staff for their insights, advice, and hard work. We couldn't have asked for a more dedicated group of people. Thanks also to the History Department and all of its support, especially Dr. Cynthia Behrman and Margaret DeButy. Carol Kneisley and the Publications Department, Gene Harvey and the Computing Center, and Maureen Fry and the Writers' Workshop staff also deserve recognition, as their hard work and patience helped reach the end result. Finally we would like to thank our advisor, Dr. Charles Chatfield for his advice, support, and encouragement.

Susan Klump
Seth Martin

History Journal Staff

Co-Editors	Susan Klump Seth Martin
Senior Editor	Molly Wilkinson
Staff	Julie Carpenter Jess Clayton Jen Gehlhausen April Helderman Teresa Naida Dave Norton Kelly Payne Laura Sponseller David Thomas
Faculty Advisor	Dr. Charles Chatfield
Cover	Katie Burt

Table of Contents

The Slave Who Would Be King: Eunus, and the First Sicilian Slave War	1
<i>by Jess E Clayton</i>	
Catherine Beecher: Nineteenth Century American Feminist?	4
<i>by Molly Wilkinson</i>	
Child Labor Reform Before the Beveridge Bill	9
<i>by David Thomas</i>	
The Vietnam Veterans Memorial	12
<i>by Julie Carpenter</i>	
The Battle of Britain, 1940-1941: London Works Together to Survive	14
<i>by Karen Larson</i>	
Ordinary Men and the Final Solution: The Work of Christopher Browning	18
<i>by Molly Wilkinson</i>	
The Empress's Old Clothes: CiXi's Flight from Beijing	25
<i>by Laura Sponseller</i>	

Address correspondence to:

Editor
The Wittenberg History Journal
History Department
Wittenberg University
Springfield, Ohio 45501

The Slave Who Would Be King: Eunus, and the First Sicilian Slave War

by Jess E. Clayton
(1995 Hartje Award winner)

On a dark autumn night in 135 B.C.E.,¹ some four hundred slaves assembled in a field on the high plateau, supporting the city of Enna, in the center of Sicily. In utter desperation, these men had sought the advice of the magician and wonder-worker named Eunus,² a slave who claimed to speak to the gods and prophesied the future. They came to him, seeking the gods' approval for a rebellion against their viciously cruel masters. Foreseeing his own opportunities in such an uprising, Eunus proclaimed the support of the gods only if the rebels did not hesitate and proceeded immediately with their plans. Approval granted, the rebels gathered what weapons they could find. With angry cries and the bright, mystical flash of fire flaming from Eunus' mouth,³ the mob swept down on the slumbering Enna. As their shouts and noise woke the citizens, the rebels were joined by the city slaves, who first slew their masters, and then merged with the teeming crowd in the streets.

When the most ruthless of Enna's slave holders, arrogant Damophilos and his cruel wife Megallis, were finally found in an orchard outside of the city, Eunus sent a group of rebels to drag them back to the city to stand trial.⁴ The great malcontented mass of rebels had come to hear the defense of the barbarous couple, whose malicious and merciless treatment of their slaves had caused the rebellion. But before a verdict could be reached, two of Damophilos' former slaves, full of hatred at the abuse and humiliation they had suffered, pushed through the crowd. Simultaneously, they struck off his head and cut out his heart. Amid the virulent cheering of the crowd, a king was elected to lead the slaves: who else but Eunus, medium to the gods and leader of the rebellion. He called himself Antiokhos, "King of the Slaves," after a great Syrian king, and proclaimed his followers "Syrians."⁵

Out of such ignoble beginnings arose the first Sicilian Slave War of the first century B.C.E., which lasted over four years and eventually encompassed the entire island. Only after the defeat of four Roman generals and their legions was the rebellion finally put down by P. Rupilius, who later became governor of Sicily.⁶ It was, in fact, Eunus' amazing charismatic

abilities that gave the rebellion its strength and resilience. But how did the magician-slave elicit such a devoted following among the rebels?

With actions that spoke of concern for their future survival and continued success, Antiokhos ordered the rebels to stop their revenge and not to set fire to farm buildings or storehouses. They were not to murder the blacksmiths or farmers, but instead to set these prisoners to work, amassing arms and supplies. When news of the uprising spread across Sicily, another leader named Kleon emerged in the west with his own army of slaves.⁷ Antiokhos did not challenge him, but instead welcomed him in Enna. Much to the dismay of the patrician class, who had hoped the two rival factions would destroy each other in a bid for power, Kleon conceded his position as leader to become general to the king.

The rebels' numbers eventually swelled to over 70,000.⁸ And while the rebel army under Kleon lay siege to almost every city in Sicily, Antiokhos continued to ingratiate himself to the rebel masses, using the pageantry of the Syrian court and the mysteries of the fertility goddess to fortify the unity of his monarchy.⁹ In complete accordance with Syrian custom, Antiokhos appointed a Royal council of advisors, took a goddess consort as wife, and even went so far as to have his own coins minted.¹⁰

These symbolic acts were not lost on his followers. The Sicilian slaves of this time were the plunder of the entire ancient world, brought from Syria, Persia, Egypt and Africa by their Roman conquerors. More importantly, many had not been born into slavery, but into the higher, educated classes, only later to be stolen from their native lands.¹¹ Because of their backgrounds, they were familiar with splendor and symbolism of Syrian royalty. Through the blatant use of Syrian pageantry and the goddess cult religion, Antiokhos earned their admiration and awe, thus insuring their loyalty to him.

Antiokhos may actually have believed himself to be heir to the Syrian dynasty, conveniently sold into slavery by a power hungry family member. As a slave, he had often prophesied about his own kingship.¹² Even during

his retreat in 132 B.C.E., after Rupilius had reclaimed the besieged cities of Sicily and starved the rebels out of Tauromenium, Antiokhos clung to his royal facade.¹³ With a retinue of a thousand men, he fled to the hills. When his men realized they could not prevail, they beheaded each other, rather than be taken prisoner and become gruesome entertainment for Romans in the arenas. Rupilius found the wonder-worker hiding in a

cave with the remains of his royal retinue - a cook, a baker, a masseuse, and a fool.¹⁴ Starving and ridden with lice, he was imprisoned for the remainder of his life. Whatever his cowardice at the end, the Romans dared not kill him outright. They feared to make a martyr out of the once glorious "King of the Slaves," so powerful was Eunus' charisma, even in defeat.

Endnotes

¹ The date of the rebellion, like many of the facts related to this incident, are a point of contention among scholars. Diodorus Siculus is the major source of information on the uprising, with often contradicting supplementary information coming from Paulus Orosius, Livy, Strabo and others. Green states that the rebellion takes place in the spring, rather than autumn of 135 B.C.E. Bradley and others contend that the uprising could have begun any year between 141 and 135 B.C.E.

² Wiedermann, 202. In some translations, Eunus is spelled "Eunous".

³ Wiedermann, 202, 204. In his opening description of Eunus, Diodorus related the trick of breathing fire that Eunus used to give validity to his wonder-working. Later, he says that Eunus uses this trick to inspire the rebels as they attack the city of Enna.

⁴ Wiedermann, 202, 204. A detailed account of Damophilos' crimes and demise are given by Diodorus in the description of the uprising.

⁵ Wiedermann, 205, and Green, 20. The importance of the name "Antiokhos" (sometimes spelled "Antiochos") and his calling the rebels "Syrians" should not be underestimated, according to Green. He maintains that Eunus believed himself to be an heir to Antiokhos the Great of Syria, and that the naming of the rebels was a religious rather than political ploy. Green maintains that it is religious elements of Eunus' rule which cleaves the group together.

⁶ Wiedermann, 205 and Verbrugghe, 57. After Rupilius became governor of Sicily, tax records note a change in policy, favoring those cities that resisted the slave army. Verbrugghe believes that Rupilius intended to punish certain cities for helping the slaves in order to prevent another uprising.

⁷ Wiedermann, 205 and Bradley, 59. Kleon is also known as "Cleon" in some text. Bradley describes his rise and relationship to Eunus in detail.

⁸ Wiedermann, 206, and Livy, 59. The greatest contention among many authors studying this uprising is the total number of rebels at the height of the fighting. Diodorus places this figure at 200,000, but Livy gives a more modest 70,000, which is more favored by modern historians.

⁹ Bradley, 55. The fertility goddess cult was very powerful all over the ancient world and would have been a familiar reference to all the slaves in Sicily, regardless of their background. Eunus used Demeter, the goddess of the harvest, on the coins. This was a particularly powerful cult in Sicily, which was known as the bread basket of the Roman Empire. Eunus also had a Syrian equivalent to Demeter: Atargatis, who was his goddess consort.

¹⁰ Verbrugghe, 53, Green, 13 and Manganaro, 208. Verbrugghe and Green give detailed descriptions of the coins, and both postulate on their significance. Manganaro's texts contain pictures of the actual coins. The coins had a silhouette of Demeter on one side and a sheaf of grain on the other where the words "BACI ANTIO" appear.

¹¹ Green, 13, Bradley, 49 and Verbrugghe, 51-53. This is one of Green's chief arguments, supported by Verbrugghe and Bradley for its significance.

¹² see footnote no. 5 and Verbrugghe, 53.

¹³ Bradley, 62. Tauromenium was the second city to be conquered by the rebels at the beginning of the war, and it was one of their strongholds.

¹⁴ Wiedermann, 207. The number of the retinue, of course, matches the number used by the Syrian royalty. Diodorus describes the remaining retinue as "... a cook, a baker, the man who massaged him in the bath and a fourth who used to entertain him when he was drinking."

Bibliography

CLASSICAL SOURCES

- Diodorus Siculus 34.2 [from: *Diodorus Siculus XII, Books XXXIII-XL*. London: F.R. Walton, 1967.]
- Florus, Fragment 2.6-7. [from: W. Arend, *Altertum, Geschichte in Quellen*. Munich: 1965, 468.]
- Livy, 32.26 and 39.29, Summaries 56. [from: *Livy, book XIV, Summaries, Fragments and General Index*. trans. A.C. Schlesinger, Ph.D. 59].
- Orosius, Chapters 6.3-6, and 9.6-8. [from: *Die Antike Weltgeschichte in Christlicher Sicht*. Book V-VII. Munich: A. Lippold, 1986. 19.]
- Strabo, *Geography*, 6.2.6. [from: Strabo, *Geography*. volume III. trans. H.L. Jones. 830].

SECONDARY SOURCES

- Alföldy, G. *Roemische Sozialgesellschaft*. Wiesbaden: 1979.
- Arend, W. *Altertum, Geschichte in Quellen*. Munich: 1965.
- Bradley, K. *Slavery and Rebellion in the Roman World: 140 B.C.-70 B.C.* London: 1989.
- Brockmeyer, N. *Antike Sklaverei*. Darmstadt: 1979.
- Eck, W. and J. Heinrichs. *Sklaven und Freigelassene in der Gesellschaft der roemischen Kaiserzeit*. Darmstadt: 1993.
- Finley, M.I. *Das Antike Sizilien*. Munich: 1968.
- Green, P. "The First Sicilian Slave War". *Past and Present* 20 (1961) 10.
- Guarino, A. *Spartakus*. Munich: 1980.
- Herrmann, E. and N. Brockmeyer. *Bibliographie zur Antiken Sklaverei*. Bochum: 1983.
- Manganaro, G. "Ueber die zwei Sklavenaufstaende in Sizilien". *Helikon* 7 (1967) 205.
- K. Sachs. *Diodorus Siculus and the First Century*. Princeton, NJ: 1990.
- Verbrugghe, G.P. "Slave Rebellion or Sicily in Revolt?" *Kokalos* 20 (1974) 46.
- Weber, C. *Sklaverei in Altertum*. Duesseldorf: 1981.
- Wiedemann, T. *Greek and Roman Slavery*. London: 1981.

Catharine Beecher: Nineteenth Century American Feminist?¹

by Molly Wilkinson

Who was Catharine Beecher? Many might first recognize her as the sister of Harriet Beecher Stowe or the daughter of Lyman Beecher. However, Catharine Beecher played a highly influential role in nineteenth century America in her own right, and the nature of that influence has been highly debated by modern historians. In order to understand why, we must first understand the issues confronting women during that era. Jacksonian America took much pride in the unprecedented equality it gave its citizens. However, this egalitarianism did not extend to women, slaves, and other minorities, creating a dilemma for women, who were restricted to a "separate sphere." According to Kathryn Kish Sklar, preeminent biographer of Catharine Beecher:

The major ambiguity faced by American women in the 1830s and 1840s was . . . how, in an egalitarian society, the submission of one sex to the other could be justified. Women in America had always experienced such inequity, but they had never before needed to reconcile it with a growing ideology of popular democracy and equal rights.²

Catharine Beecher addressed this dilemma in her book *Treatise on Domestic Economy*. Dismissing any ambiguity, she argued that women's separate sphere, the home, actually accorded them great equality and respect. Separate spheres not only elevated women but also benefited democratic society as a whole. Some modern scholars accuse Beecher of contributing to the suppression of American women, charging her with "shackling" women by "limiting" them to the home.³ These scholars label her a hindrance to nineteenth century feminism.⁴ However, as William D. and Deborah C. Andrews, in their article "Technology and the American Housewife" point out, "this view derives from a dangerous antihistoricism, a refusal to read the past on its own terms."⁵ An examination of Beecher's views in the context of the 1840s shows that Beecher, attempting to elevate women by giving them autonomy, respect, and an important civic purpose, actually contributed significantly to nineteenth century feminism.

Although many of Beecher's writings, and especially *Treatise on Domestic Economy*, were directed at housewives and mothers, Beecher herself was outside of that sphere. Because her fiancé had died in an accident and she never later married, she had to support herself.⁶ Her original ambition, expanding the educational opportunities for women in the unsettled West, remained an important concern throughout her life. However, most of the schools she founded were unsuccessful, and after the Western Female Institute in Cincinnati failed in 1837, Beecher was left with no means of self-support.⁷

Following the lead of her sister, Harriet Beecher—Stowe, Beecher turned to the profession through which she attained her ultimate success and influence, writing. Although she had previously published several essays dealing with education, her first significant publication was *Essay on Abolitionism with Reference to the Duty of American Females*, written to counteract the arguments of the controversial abolitionists Sarah and Angelina Grimke who linked women's rights with abolition. Sklar describes the publication of this essay as the first step in a "task that was to occupy [Beecher] for the rest of her career — that of interpreting and shaping the collective consciousness of American women."⁸ Throughout her career, Beecher wrote thirty-three books on domesticity and education, and *Treatise on Domestic Economy*, published in 1841, was Beecher's most successful publication with widespread impact on the consciousness of American women.

In order to understand Beecher's exploration of the role of women in her *Treatise*, we must first consider the general atmosphere of that era. During the early nineteenth century, the rapid growth of American industrialization significantly affected women. Because most production now occurred in factories, the home was no longer the central economic unit of society, a unit in which both men and women had always played an important role in securing the economic success of the family. Women of the middle and upper classes, who did not work in the new factories, remained at home.⁹ Therefore, Beecher was actually reacting to social reality when exploring the separate domestic sphere of women.

Industrialization also influenced society's perceptions of the home. The working world was harsh and unpleasant whereas the home was "a haven in a heartless world."¹⁰ The home was increasingly seen as a peaceful and secure escape from the chaos of industrial society. In this environment, women's sphere, the home, was actually elevated in that it represented what many considered superior characteristics.

Just as the dichotomy between the domestic and public spheres became more rigid, assumptions concerning male and female characteristics also became more differentiated. Men, to succeed in a capitalist society, were competitive, assertive, individualistic, and materialistic. Conversely, women, in the morally superior home, were pious, pure, gentle, nurturing, benevolent, and sacrificing.¹¹ Therefore, society, in creating a separate sphere for women during the industrial revolution, actually enhanced women's respectability by attributing to women what society considered morally superior characteristics.

The accepted societal norms were, therefore, that the woman's place was in the home, that women were morally superior to men, and that the home, over which the woman presided, was the moral center of society. However, according to the authors of a recent study on the Beecher family, although "this ideology . . . exalted the woman as morally superior," it simultaneously "circumscribed the boundaries of her life."¹² To us, this appears as an obvious contradiction to the Jacksonian rhetoric of expanding rights and opportunities for all individuals. Basing her arguments on these societal norms and on this seeming contradiction, Beecher, in her *Treatise on Domestic Economy*, attempted to show that this separate sphere for women was not at all contradictory to the democratic rhetoric of the era. In fact, women's separate sphere actually elevated women and enabled them to play a vital role in the success of democracy.

The *Treatise* was immensely popular and was distributed nationally and reprinted every year for over fifteen years.¹³ Described by historian Catharine Clinton as the "housewife's bible,"¹⁴ Beecher's *Treatise* went further than any previous household manual in consolidating household advice. Until Beecher's book, women "had to read separate books on health, child care, house building, and cooking. . . ."¹⁵ In contrast, the *Treatise*, for the price of fifty cents, provided a comprehensive guide to topics ranging from sewing, cooking, and cleaning to health and child care.¹⁶ More interesting for our purposes, however, are the first three chapters of her book through which she outlines her social philosophy concerning the importance of women's sphere. This inclusion of social philosophy made the *Treatise* exceptional, for it "contributed both practical details and some basic building blocks of social theory."¹⁷

Beecher's first task was to demonstrate that women's separate and subordinate sphere was not contrary to democracy. Beecher was greatly concerned with the tensions in the rapidly industrializing American society and believed that some kind of social order was needed to prevent society's collapse. Her solution was to remove one half of the population, women, from the public arena of society.¹⁸ Said Beecher: "Society could never go forward, harmoniously, nor could any craft or profession be successfully pursued, unless . . . superior and subordinate relations be instituted and sustained." She noted that, although the woman is subordinate to the man within marriage, she has freedom to choose whom she will marry. Once she makes the initial acceptance of her subordination, her relationship with her husband should be based on equal respect for the value of their respective spheres.¹⁹ To Beecher, therefore, women's subordination was not contrary to democracy and in fact made democracy less complicated and hence more likely to achieve success.²⁰ Women's subordination also served as a stabilizing force to democracy in another way. Women's voluntary submission to men, which Beecher thought would help reduce the chaos of society, encouraged all citizens to similarly subordinate their individuality to the general good of the democratic society.²¹

Women's sphere also reflected democratic rhetoric in that women of all classes were considered equal to one another within their separate sphere. Attempting to resolve social divisions, Beecher "began with the premise that the home was the perfect vehicle for national unity because it was a universally experienced institution."²² All women, in their separate sphere, were equally important to the great cause of giving America unity. According to Beecher, "Each and all may be animated by the consciousness that they are agents in accomplishing the greatest work that has ever been committed to human responsibility."²³ In a way, Beecher was trying to ignore class, religious, racial, and other divisions, suggesting that the only real division in America was between the genders.²⁴ In what can be interpreted as an attempt to incorporate women into Jacksonian democracy, Beecher was reacting to her intellectual and political milieu. She tried to find a way for women of all classes to experience equality, even if only as members of a separate and subordinate sphere.²⁵

Beecher's primary reason for justifying women's subordination was summarized by Sklar as an attempt to give women a "social importance transcending their own personal interests." Beecher hoped that this recognition of their unique responsibilities would enable women to reconcile themselves to their subordination, thus becoming better able to focus their attentions on the "grander purposes of their role."²⁶ What were these "grander purposes"? Beecher, dedicating her book to

"American Mothers," believed that women's primary duty, raising their children, was vital to the success of democracy. Women were responsible for raising their children with patriotic values and high morals. Says Beecher: "The success of democratic institutions . . . depends upon the intellectual and moral character of the mass of the people," which is to be achieved by the "female hand."²⁷ Since women were responsible for the moral character of their families, they also were, in a larger sense, responsible for the moral character of the entire democratic society.²⁸

Because of the immense importance of women's duties, especially raising their children, Beecher argued that these duties should gain respect as a profession, equal in its impact on society as any professions undertaken by men. Some historians mention that women's responsibilities were becoming increasingly trivialized in the public mind during industrialization because only paid professions were respected, and Beecher sought to regain respect for women.²⁹ In her article "Catharine Beecher and the Education of American Women," Joan Burstyn states: "An occupation becomes professionalized when people systemize the knowledge needed to perform it."³⁰ In many ways, Beecher's publication of her *Treatise*, covering all aspects of housekeeping and childraising in one volume, can be seen as her attempt to systemize the knowledge required of women to perform their "profession," their duties in their sphere.

However, Beecher took her elevation of housekeeping and childraising to the status of a profession even further. Believing that women were not by nature equipped to perform their sacred "profession," Beecher demanded equal education for women. Women had just as much right to education as preparation for their profession as did men, and this education should also contain the same emphasis on analytical thinking. Argued Beecher:

The formation of habits of investigation, of correct reasoning, of persevering attention, of regular system, of accurate analysis, and of vigorous mental action, is the primary object to be sought in preparing American women for their arduous duties; duties which will demand not only quickness of perception, but steadiness of purpose, regularity of system, and perseverance in action.³¹

The development of women's capacities to think and to analyze was the most important purpose of education because it helped them systematically organize their domestic duties, making these duties easier.³² This development also helped them better understand how to raise their children. Beecher argued that the education of women was, in fact, more important than that of men: "The proper education of a man decides the welfare of an

individual; but educate a woman, and the interests of a whole family are secured."³³ Admittedly, this education was primarily intended to enhance women's abilities to serve others, not to give women education as a natural right. However, Beecher had a greater purpose in mind. By raising the traditional roles of women to the status of a profession and by endorsing education to help them manage their responsibilities, Beecher was elevating the overall status of women.

Although modern feminists certainly lack consensus concerning the definition of feminism, most would probably hesitate to label someone like Catharine Beecher a feminist. She supported women's subordination to men, encouraged separate spheres, believed that women's service to their children and to society, rather than to themselves, was their most important duty, and was opposed to both suffrage and women's public involvement in the abolitionist movement.³⁴ However, as good historians, we must be careful not to judge history by our contemporary values and standards; we must judge it on its own terms. Indeed, Beecher's views, when examined within the context of the mid-nineteenth century, establish her as a significant contributor to nineteenth century feminism.

In her biography of Beecher, Kathryn Kish Sklar compares Beecher's *Treatise* to other nineteenth century domestic management manuals. Sklar focuses on evolving attitudes concerning the layout of the rooms of a house; Beecher explored such issues in the latter part of her *Treatise*. At the beginning of the nineteenth century, manuals did not include a discussion of differentiated rooms. During the mid-nineteenth century, Beecher discussed individual rooms arranged in a way to maximize communal effectiveness. By the end of the century, a theory that "a separate room is the right of every human being" had evolved. According to Sklar, Beecher's concern was to subsume individual diversity in order to build a commonality of culture," but by the end of the century, individuality as a right in itself was valued.³⁵

If Sklar's analysis is expanded to parallel Beecher's larger role within the nineteenth century women's movement, then we can see that she was a significant contributor to nineteenth century feminism. Beecher admittedly subsumed women's individuality by supporting a separate and subordinate sphere and by justifying her reforms not as women's innate rights but rather as a way to better enable them to serve the "commonality" of society. Nonetheless, we cannot ignore her contributions to elevating women's status. Perhaps the primary appeal of Beecher's work was that it gave women, as individuals, a sense of importance. Beecher had formulated a theory through which women could perform their expected duties and grow in autonomy within their own sphere, while also holding a vital role in the success of democracy.

Endnotes

¹ Presented at 1993 Phi Alpha Theta International Conference, winner of Wittenberg University's 1993 Women's Studies Writing Award, and selected for publication in the 1994 Spectrum, Wittenberg's undergraduate writing journal.

² Kathryn Kish Sklar, *Catharine Beecher*, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1973), 155-156

³ Discussed in William D. and Deborah C. Andrews, "Technology and the Housewife in Nineteenth-Century America," *Women's Studies* 2 (1074): 314.

⁴ Discussed in Joan N. Burstyn, "Catharine Beecher and the Education of American Women," *New England Quarterly*, September (1984): 386.

⁵ Andrew, 314.

⁶ Sklar, 37.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 131.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 132.

⁹ Catherine Clinton, *The Other Civil War: American Women in the Nineteenth Century*, (New York: Hill and Wang, 1934), 18.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 18.

¹¹ Nancy Woloch, *Women and the American Experience*, (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1984), 119.

¹² Jeanne Boydston, Mary Kelley, and Anne Margolis, *The Limits of Sisterhood*, (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1988), 49.

¹³ Sklar, 151.

¹⁴ Clinton, 46.

¹⁵ Sklar, 151.

¹⁶ Catharine Beecher, *Treatise on Domestic Economy*, (New York: Schocken Books, 1977), xxv-xxxviii.

¹⁷ Sklar, 153.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 156.

¹⁹ Beecher, 2-3.

²⁰ Although Beecher seems such a strong proponent of women's subordination in marriage, the authors of *The Limits of Sisterhood* doubt whether Catharine herself could have ever accepted subordina-

tion. They cite as evidence her early ambition to "be head" (14) and her strong identification with her father, who called her his "best boy" and encouraged her independence and self-sufficiency. (17) Similarly, Sklar discusses Catharine's reticence to marry Yale University mathematics professor Alexander Fisher. Although she eventually consented, her reservations included the fear that she would not receive the "emotional nourishment" she received from her father. (33-37) Nonetheless, despite Beecher's personal preference for a more mutually supportive marriage than the accepted model, she was publicly a strong supporter of subordination.

²¹ Sklar, 161.

²² *Ibid.*, 158.

²³ Beecher, 14.

²⁴ Woloch, 114.

²⁵ However, Boydston et al. believe that Catharine, by asserting that the only significant division in America was between men and women, was counterproductive in alleviating racial and socioeconomic inequalities. They believe that she "helped to create a rhetoric that veiled many of the forms of privilege and deprivation in her world." (14) They later mention her discomfort with the "masses" and note her distinct white, middle-class bias. (122)

²⁶ Sklar, 158

²⁷ Beecher, 13.

²⁸ *Ibid.*

²⁹ Burstyn, 393.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 388.

³¹ Beecher, 34.

³² Burstyn, 391.

³³ Beecher, 13.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 134-135. Boydston et al. contrast Beecher's discouragement of women's involvement in abolition with Harriet Beecher Stowe's more public stance, as seen through her publication of *Uncle Tom's Cabin*. It is interesting to note that Stowe, even though she became an important contributor to the public abolition movement, based her opposition to slavery on slavery's negative effects on the family. Hence, she remained as much as possible within women's accepted sphere. (162)

³⁵ Sklar, 166.

Bibliography

- Andrews, William D. and Deborah C. "Technology and the Housewife in Nineteenth-Century America." *Women's Studies* 2 (1974): 309-328.
- Beecher, Catharine. *Treatise on Domestic Economy*. New York: Schocken Books, 1977.
- Boydston, Jeanne, Mary Kelley, and Anne Margolis. *The Limits of Sisterhood*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1988.
- Burstyn, Joan N. "Catharine Beecher and the Education of American Women." *New England Quarterly* 3 (September 1984): 386-403.
- Calhoun, Arthur W. *A Social History of The American Family: From Colonial Times to the Present*. New York: Barnes and Noble, Inc., 1945.
- Clinton, Catharine. *The Other Civil War: American Women in the Nineteenth Century*. New York: Hill and Wang, 1984.
- Harveson, Mae Elizabeth. *Catharine Esther Beecher: (Pioneer Educator)*. New York: Arno Press, 1969.
- Kuhn, Anne L. *The Mother's Role in Childhood Education: New England Concepts 1830-1860*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1947.
- Sklar, Kathryn Kish. *Catharine Beecher*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1973.
- Welter, Barbara. *Distant Convictions: The American Woman in the Nineteenth Century*. Athens: Ohio University Press, 1976.
- Woloch, Nancy. *Women and the American Experience*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1984.

Child Labor Reform Before the Beveridge Bill

by David Thomas

In stench, in heated rooms, amid the whirling of a thousand wheels, little fingers and little feet were kept in ceaseless action, forced into unnatural activity by blows from the heavy hands and feet of the merciless over-looker, and the infliction of bodily pain by instruments of punishment invented by the sharpened ingenuity of insatiable selfishness.¹

These were conditions common to the factories, mines, home shops, sweat shops, and mills of the United States of America at the turn of the century. The Census of 1900 reported that 1,752,187 children under sixteen years old working in the United States.² In 1905 John Spargo, in *The Bitter Cry of the Children*, contended that the number of people employed under fifteen years old at the time was much nearer 2,250,000.³ The discrepancy between these numbers is irrelevant. Either set of figures shows that the absolute number of minors working full-time at the turn of the century was mind-boggling, and the conditions under which these children worked were abhorrent. The movement to end child labor needed a national effort. The bill brought before the floor of the United States Senate by Senator Albert J. Beveridge in 1906 represented the first step in this major national effort to combat child labor.

Before Senator Beveridge's bill, reformers limited their attempts to the state level. Nearly every state or territory had some sort of law restricting child labor.⁴ For example, many laws specifically restricted the use of children in certain industries. Several states restricted the use of children in circuses, fairs, and other performing arenas. The state of Connecticut dictated that no person could employ "any child... in or for the vocation, occupation, service, or purpose of rope or wire walking, dancing, skating, bicycling, or peddling, or as a gymnast, contortionist, rider, or acrobat."⁵ Seventeen other states had similar statutes, often using very similar language. Many laws also prohibited or restricted child labor in certain types of industries, especially mines.

Also, many states used educational requirements designed to keep children out of the work place. These laws were very popular with reformers of the age.

Florence Kelley, a leader in the fight to end child labor at the state and national level and a colleague of Jane Addams at Hull House, stated in 1905 that "the best child-labor law is a compulsory education law..."⁶ At the 1905 annual meeting of the National Child Labor Committee (NCLC), of which Kelley was chair, James Kirkland cried out that the task of the movement was "to promote the work of education and to repress the evils of child labor."⁷ Existing state laws reflected this faith that compulsory education would alleviate the problem. Thirty-eight of the fifty-two states and territories covered in the Census Bureau's report on occupations in 1900 had some kind of law requiring school attendance or a certain level of literacy. These laws varied greatly from state to state, however, and countless loopholes existed.

The inconsistency between different states' laws was a major problem. Kelley argued in *Some Ethical Gains Through Legislation* that:

the lack of uniformity in one state renders it extremely difficult to establish protective restrictions upon work in another state having the same industries - and the worse inevitably checks the progress in the better.⁸

In addition many laws were poorly designed. Halford Erickson pointed out at the NCLC's 1905 meeting that passage of reform laws usually involved compromise, and because of this most legislation lost its power.⁹ For example, in 1903 New York's canning industry successfully gained an exemption from a pending child labor law.¹⁰ Spargo contended that "similar testimony might be given from practically every state."¹¹ Many laws provided for few or no enforcement mechanisms, and those that did exist were often ineffective. The experiences of the inspectors responsible for enforcing the laws support this. Employers abused the requirement of having certificates indicating a certain educational level with great abandon. Employers either forged certificates or inspectors accepted inadequate documents as replacements. Even if an inspector did catch an employer, the violator was probably safe from prosecution.

The New York State Commissioner of Labor reported:

Few realize the amount of work entailed in a prosecution of an employer for violating the Child Labor Law. Where a violation is found by a deputy, the latter reports it, and to secure competent and legal evidence he must revisit the premises accompanied by another deputy as a witness. Then the two deputies must prepare their own papers in each case, must be in attendance at the police magistrate's court and in the Court of Special Sessions. As several adjournments are probable in nearly every case, the amount of time occupied is a very serious loss the [sic] department.¹²

It is clear, then, that although many laws did exist in 1905 to attack the problem of child labor, most did not work.

By 1905 the child labor movement sensed a need for reform at the federal level. The annual meeting of the National Child Labor Committee in December 1905 in Cincinnati, Ohio, made this very apparent. Nearly every speaker stated at some point that national reform was vital. James Kirkland said that "all sections of our country must unite."¹³ Florence Kelley cited a relevant problem and proposed a solution when she told the meeting, "The next step which we need to take is to insist that this is a national evil, and we must have a national law abolishing it."¹⁴

John Spargo's *The Bitter Cry of the Children*, published in 1905, savagely indicted child labor. It had an important effect on the public perception of the child labor movement. The *New York Times* said, "Mr. Spargo's book ought to be epoch-making; it ought to mark the turning of the tide in the treatment of children."¹⁵ Historian Claude Bowers cites the book as one of the most important events in the child labor movement before Senator Beveridge's bill. Spargo's powerful language exposed the horrors of child labor. He vividly described:

little Anetta Fachini, four years old, making artificial flowers.... Every few minutes her head would droop and her weary eyelids close, but her little fingers still kept moving - uselessly, helplessly, mechanically moving. The mother would shake her gently, saying . . . "Sleep not, Anetta! Only a few more - only a few more."¹⁶

He cried out in print "that this nation in its commercial madness devours its babies."¹⁷ The publication of *The Bitter Cry of the Children* and the work of the National Child Labor Committee are clear signs that the child

labor movement wanted reform at a national level.

The first significant attempt at federal reform came from Senator Albert J. Beveridge of Indiana. He had read the many accounts of child labor, "and they had aroused his wrath and impelled him to the preparation of a bill to stop the slaughter of children."¹⁸ In 1906 he proposed to the Senate the first federal bill attacking child labor.¹⁹ Earlier in 1906 he asked that President Roosevelt propose federal child labor legislation to the nation. Roosevelt, however, told Beveridge that child labor legislation should be at a state level. In addition, men like Henry Cabot Lodge bitterly opposed any legislation that would seriously restrict child labor. In an attempt to head off Beveridge and appease those who wanted some sort of reform, Lodge proposed a bill outlawing child labor in the District of Columbia only. However, in December 1906 Beveridge proposed a bill that would prohibit all interstate transportation of goods produced at the expense of child labor. In doing so he finally brought the child labor fight to the United States Congress.²⁰

Although the Senate defeated it, the bill was significant because the child labor movement could claim one of its first victories at the national level. The bill itself was both feasible and enforceable. By prohibiting carriers from transporting the products of child labor across state lines, Beveridge's bill could have squeezed child labor out of existence. In addition, Sections Three and Four provided for a strong and reasonable enforcement mechanism. More importantly, the bill for the first time opened the subject of child labor to debate by the Senate. Beveridge supported the claims of Kelley and others by saying:

Mr. President, the next reason why the States cannot adequately handle this question is because neither in this nor in any other important question have the States ever succeeded in having uniform laws; and it is clear that this evil can not be remedied unless there are uniform laws upon it.²¹

By making this statement Beveridge finally brought into the legislature the idea that the entire nation had to deal with the one to two million children "gainfully employed" in the United States.

The fight was far from over. The Congress did not pass a national child labor bill until 1917, but the nation took its first small steps in 1906. For the first time, someone forced the nation's legislators to confront the issue.

Endnotes

¹ John Spargo, *The Bitter Cry of the Children*, (New York: MacMillan, 1905), 132.

² *Ibid.*, 142.

³ *Ibid.*, 145.

⁴ Until 1903, three states (Oregon, South Carolina, and Texas) had no laws at all dealing with child labor.

⁵ Department of Commerce and Labor: Bureau of the Census, *Special Reports: Occupations at the Twelfth Census* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1904), ccliv.

⁶ Florence Kelley, *Some Ethical Gains Through Legislation* (New York: MacMillan, 1905), 96.

⁷ James H. Kirkland, "The School as a Force Arrayed Against Child Labor," Address to the Annual Meeting of the National Child Labor Committee, February 14-16, 1905, in *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences*, v. 25 (May 1905), 561.

⁸ Kelley, *Some Ethical Gains*, 103.

⁹ Halford Erickson, "Child Labor Legislation and Methods of Enforcement in Northern Central States," Address to the Annual Meeting of the National Child Labor Committee, February 14-16, 1905, *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences*, v. 25 (May 1905), 467.

¹⁰ Spargo, *The Bitter Cry*, 141-42.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 145.

¹² "New York Improves its Administration, 1904," [Report of the New York State Commissioner of Labor], *Legal Status in the Family*,

Apprenticeship and Child Labor: Select Documents With Introductory Notes, Vol. 1, The Child and The State, Grace Abbott ed., (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1938), 436-37.

¹³ Kirkland, "The School as a Force," 561.

¹⁴ "Mrs. Florence Kelley on Obstacles to the Enforcement of Child Labor Legislation," [Florence Kelley], *The Child and The State*, 441.

¹⁵ Review of *The Bitter Cry of the Children*, by John Spargo, in *Book Review Digest: Annual Accumulation*, vol. II (Minneapolis: H.W. Wilson, 1906), 330.

¹⁶ Spargo, *The Bitter Cry*, 147.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*

¹⁸ Claude G. Bowers, *Beveridge and the Progressive Era*, (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Riverside Press, 1932), 250. Beveridge, a Republican, was intimately involved with the Progressive Party's rise during the Roosevelt and Taft administrations. He was an energetic campaigner and impassioned advocate of many different issues, from statehood to individual rights.

¹⁹ *Congressional Record*, 23 and 28 January 1907.

²⁰ At the same time that Beveridge proposed his bill to the Senate, Congressman Alan Parsons of Indiana proposed the same bill to the House of Representatives. Its fate matched that of Senator Beveridge's. Both bills were referred to committees, where they eventually died.

²¹ "Senator Beveridge Declares Regulation of Child Labor a National Problem," *The Child and The State*, 474.

Bibliography

Abbott, Grace, ed. *The Child and the State*. Vol. 1, *Legal Status in the Family, Apprenticeship, and Child Labor: Select Documents With Introductory Notes*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1938.

Bowers, Claude G. *Beveridge and the Progressive Era*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Cambridge University Press, 1932.

Davis, Allen F. *Spearheads for Reform: The Social Settlements and the Progressive Movement, 1890-1914*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1967.

Department of Commerce and Labor: Bureau of the Census. *Special Reports: Occupations at the Twelfth Census*. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1904.

Erickson, Halford. "Child Labor Legislation and Methods of Enforcement in Northern Central States." Address to the Annual Meeting of the National Child Labor Committee, 14-16 February, 1905, in *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences*. v. 25, May 1905.

Kelley, Florence. *Some Ethical Gains Through Legislation*. New York: MacMillan, 1905.

Kirkland, James H. "The School as a Force Arrayed Against Child Labor." Address to the Annual Meeting of the National Child Labor Committee, 14-16 February, 1905, in *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences*. v. 25, May 1905.

Review of *The Bitter Cry of the Children*, by John Spargo, in *Book Review Digest: Annual Accumulation*, vol. II. Minneapolis: H.W. Wilson, 1906.

Spargo, John. *The Bitter Cry of the Children*. New York: Macmillan, 1905.

The Vietnam Veterans Memorial

by Julie Carpenter
(1995 Hartje Award runner-up)

*"2,700,000 served, 300,000 were wounded, 75,000 were disabled, 57,000 died, and more than 2,000 remain unaccounted for. . . . They are not forgotten."*¹

In 1979, in response to recent media interest in Vietnam and after completing a study on readjustment problems facing returning veterans, Jan Scruggs, a Vietnam veteran, decided America needed a memorial to commemorate those who fought in Vietnam. The memorial, intended to help heal the social wounds created by the war, would be funded by private donations; Scruggs's missions became fundraising, acquiring a site, and finding a design.

Scruggs, with help from other veterans, formed the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Fund (VVMF) as a non-profit organization established to raise money to build a memorial. They petitioned Congress to set aside a piece of land on the Washington Mall near the Lincoln Memorial for construction of the memorial. Although there were many hold-ups, especially regarding specific wording of the proposal, the VVMF succeeded in getting bipartisan support for their bill. The final draft of the bill was therefore approved, giving the VVMF an area of land at the foot of the Lincoln Memorial. With the site established, the veterans' next challenge was to find a suitable design.

Scruggs wanted a nonpolitical design that would act as "a symbol of national unity and reconciliation."² A panel of eight professional architects and landscape designers would select the winning design from anonymously submitted entries in a national competition. The VVMF guidelines for the contest stated that "the emphasis is to be on those who died" and that the names of those killed in Vietnam must be displayed on the memorial.³

In May 1981, after examining 1421 entries, the jurors unanimously selected the design of a young architecture student, Maya Lin. Lin submitted an entry as a requirement for her funerary architecture class at Yale, not expecting to win the contest. Her simple design consisted of two wedges of polished black granite etched with the names of those killed or missing in

Vietnam. Rather than projecting vertically, Lin's design cut into the earth, becoming part of the landscape instead of competing with it. After announcing the winning entry to the VVMF, juror Grady Gray prophetically stated, "We are certain this [design] will be debated for years to come."⁴

Because of the atypical nature of Lin's design, controversy began almost immediately; first among the VVMF organizers but soon spreading into public and governmental circles. The concerns over the design centered around the message the memorial was sending. Did it only honor those killed or missing? If so, what meaning would it have for surviving veterans? There were also stylistic issues: the color, the chronological listing of names, and the lack of an inscription. The debate quickly turned into a publicity war with underlying political motives.

Lin's extremely outspoken critics referred to the memorial as "a black gash of shame and sorrow,"⁵ a "tombstone," and "the most insulting and demeaning memorial . . . possible."⁶ The use of black granite was targeted as an anti-war statement. Veteran Tom Carhart and Texas billionaire H. Ross Perot led the attack on Lin and the memorial design. Many veterans took issue with Lin's almost complete unfamiliarity with the Vietnam war and the issues it involved. According to Scruggs, she had deliberately avoided any study of the subject, preferring to avoid the "real world" and focus on her art.⁷ Lin was also patronized as a student, a woman, and an Asian-American.

Although the critics received most of the media attention, Lin's design had many supporters. Art critics raved about Lin's "minimalist" and "modest" design.⁸ Both the Fine Arts Commission and the National Capital Planning Commission approved the design, an endorsement required before a group could obtain a building permit. The VVMF organizers supported the design, as did the jurors; however, both were coming under increasing personal attacks; for example, one juror was accused of being a communist sympathizer.

Dispute over the design also threatened the timetable for construction of the memorial. James Watt, Secretary

of the Interior, refused to grant a building permit until the VVMF reached an agreement about modifications to the design.

Perot and his supporters proposed adding a sculpture and flag pole to the site to appeal to surviving veterans. The VVMF, without informing Lin, entered discussions about modifications. A committee was established to select a sculpture, eventually deciding on Frederick Hart's figurative piece of three young, war-weary soldiers. Debate now ensued over the placement of the sculpture and flag. The VVMF insisted that they not compromise Lin's design. Lin completely opposed the additional elements, but was reluctant to publicly state her position. A compromise was reached placing both additions near the memorial entrance.

Finally, the building permits were issued; however, Watt insisted on postponing the dedication of the memorial until the additions were completed. Construction began, and the VVMF continued to push for a Veterans Day 1982 dedication. At this point, Lin broke her silence and protested the modifications to her design and the rush to complete construction. After avoiding the

ground-breaking, Lin, with hopes of removing the statue and flag from the plans, retained a lawyer to delay the dedication.

Less than a month before the planned dedication, Watt gave his approval. Scruggs and the VVMF scheduled a week of activities for veterans, culminating in the dedication ceremony. As construction was finished, Vietnam veterans from across the United States converged on Washington for parades, reunions and vigils. On November 13, 1982, the Vietnam Veterans Memorial was dedicated, without mention of the controversy of the past eighteen months. As the veterans, families, and press saw the completed work, disputes over the design were soon forgotten.

Although debate has continued in artistic circles, public opinion of the memorial has been mostly positive. Lin remains a controversial figure in the art world, refusing to be classified as either an architect or a sculptor.⁹ Over a decade after its completion, the prediction, "Someday the Vietnam memorial, too, may win the hearts and minds of the American people," has become a reality.¹⁰

Endnotes

1 Jan C. Scruggs and Joel L. Swerdlow, *To Heal a Nation: The Vietnam Veterans Memorial* New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1985, 113.

2 *Ibid.*, 43.

3 "Vietnam Memorial War," *Art News*, January 1983, 11.

4 Scruggs, 65.

5 Melinda Beck "Refighting the Vietnam War," *Newsweek*, 25 October 1982, 30.

⁹ Elizabeth Hess, "A Tale of Two Memorials," *Art in America*, April 1983, 122.

¹ Scruggs, 76.

⁸ Hess, 122.

^{*} Lin continues to take architectural commissions as well as create her own sculpture. Two of her more recent works, The Civil Rights Memorial in Montgomery, Alabama, and the Women's Table at Yale, combine elements of both architecture and sculpture. 1993 Current Biography Yearbook, 352.

¹⁰ Wolf Von Eckardt, "Storm Over the Vietnam Memorial," *Time*, 9 November 1981, 103.

Bibliography

Beck, Melinda. "Refighting the Vietnam War." *Newsweek*, 25 October 1982, 30.

Hess, Elizabeth. "A Tale of Two Memorials." *Art in America*, April 1983, 120-7.

Scruggs, Jan C., and Joel L. Swerdlow. *To Heal a Nation: The Vietnam Veterans Memorial*. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1985.

"Vietnam Memorial War." *Art News*, January 1983, 11.

Von Eckardt, Wolf. "Storm Over the Vietnam Memorial." *Time*, 9 November 1981, 103.

The Battle of Britain, 1940-1941: London Works Together to Survive

by Karen Larson

The raids would begin at nightfall and last until the early hours of the morning.¹ When sirens signaled the return of the Luftwaffe the streets of London would quickly empty.² Bombs destroyed entire houses and left craters fifteen feet deep and thirty feet wide. The streets were dangerous not just because of the bombs, but gas, falling debris, and shrapnel from the anti-aircraft fire were also hazards.³ Every night because of these dangers most of London's inhabitants would make the journey down to the safety of underground bomb shelters. Approximately a third of London slept in some kind of mass shelter, a third in private home shelters, and a third in their own beds.⁴ Some civilians worked throughout the night for the Civil Defense, a governmental department that helped London continue to function despite the destruction the Germans were causing. England was able to endure throughout the Battle of Britain because its citizens did not let adversity divide them, but instead they continued to work together toward the common goal of survival despite the horrors around them.

The Battle of Britain, which lasted through most of the fall of 1940 and some of 1941, was a major factor in the outcome of World War Two. The Blitz, as it is sometimes called, was an attempt by Germany to subdue England by establishing air supremacy. If Germany controlled the air, an invasion would be possible. In the early stages of the battle the Germans were quite successful because they concentrated on destroying English military targets. But Hitler made a fatal mistake when he changed this battle plan to avenge a British air attack on Berlin. He ordered an all-out onslaught on London and unintentionally gave the English military (which was on the verge of destruction) time to rebuild. The Royal Air Force (R.A.F.) was able to concentrate its defense on London, and with the help of the recently developed RADAR they outdueled the Luftwaffe.⁵

The English had prepared well for any "incident" (a term used to describe the effects of a bomb) that would result from war with Germany.⁶ Plans that the government had organized before the Blitz, such as caring for the wounded and fighting fires, proved to be invaluable.⁷ London was divided into sectors that

contained approximately six streets and 450 houses.⁸ Each sector kept up-to-date records of its inhabitants in case of emergency and had workers such as firemen, wardens, and doctors assigned to it.⁹ These workers were citizens who were trained to perform tasks that were vital to the survival of the city.

Throughout the Battle of Britain the civilians of London displayed unselfish acts of courage and risked their lives in an attempt to do their part to defend their country. Citizens who were part of the Civil Defense were responsible for taking control at incident sites. These people came from all walks of life but were able to harmoniously perform their duties. Incident officers were "responsible for co-ordinating the work of the wardens, the rescue squads, the stretcher parties, the ambulances, and the auxiliary fire service."¹⁰

One of the most important and visible Civil Defense jobs was Air Raid Warden. During an air raid, wardens acted as "police men, nurses, firefighters, watchers for danger, aids in sickness, and [givers of] comfort and confidence" to those around them.¹¹ Wardens were also responsible for reporting bombs and damage, evacuating houses, and roping off streets.¹² All these tasks were vital and had to be performed under the constant danger of the nightly raids. One of the most dangerous jobs was that of fireman. London had about 30,000 trained firefighters who came from various backgrounds. Every night these men faced death as they fought the numerous blazes caused by the German raids. The danger of this job was that the fires the men fought were visible targets for German bombers that relied on sight to guide their bombs.¹³

Other jobs included men who diffused time bombs and those who would dig through rubble to uncover people buried alive. Doctors and nurses also worked long hours to keep the public healthy. Despite the bombing and the deplorable conditions of the shelters there were no outbreaks of epidemics. This miraculous feat was accomplished because medical workers labored to inoculate most of the population against disease.¹⁴ Volunteer and government workers from all walks of life bravely performed tasks which helped London through

the Blitz. The chaotic atmosphere of London required workers to perform not just their official duties but any job at any time.

Air raid shelters in London were critical to the survival of the population. The shelters evolved throughout the War from disordered to relatively organized places. This transformation was necessary because despite the months of planning that went into preparing for death and injury, fires and destruction, no plans were made for the care of the living and uninjured homeless.¹⁵ The living were expected to take care of themselves, but this was difficult if their home was destroyed or they did not have a safe place to spend the night.¹⁶ The citizens of London adapted and found many places to stay; subways, sub-basements of buildings, tunnels, storage depots, underground catacombs, and dockside underground warehouses were all used.¹⁷ Shallow surface shelters that were dug before the bombing were quickly abandoned because they could not take a direct hit by a bomb, and became instead tombs for their inhabitants.¹⁸

To ensure their safety, many of London's inhabitants moved underground each night to mass shelters. These shelters demonstrated the cooperation that was abundant in London. When the Blitz began, signs were posted on entrances to the Tubes (subways) which forbade citizens from sleeping in or using them as shelters.¹⁹ However, because they were some of the safest places in London, in a matter of days the tubes were full of citizens every night. The government did not stop this migration for fear of riots. Because the tubes were filled on a first-come, first-serve basis, lines began to form at eleven o'clock in the morning for good places on the platform. Londoners soon realized, however, that the city could not function with a major portion of its population standing in line all day. For this reason people would not begin to line up for the tubes until about six at night. Most people would be settled in a shelter by eight but would not get to sleep until about six in the morning when the noise from the bombing had subsided.²⁰ The shelters provided a safe but inconvenient place for inhabitants to sleep.

Subways were not the only type of mass shelter, but they serve as a good example for what life was like in this type of shelter during the Blitz. Although they kept London's population safe from German weapons, the tubes were not pleasant places to inhabit. They were very crowded, so there was little room to sit or lie down; it was hot, and people snored or were noisy.²¹ Every inch of platform was usually covered with people; the lucky early arrivals claimed areas against the walls away from the tracks.²² Sleeping was almost impossible because as one inhabitant remarked, "The stench is abominable; the sight dreary and appalling. The trains roar in with a gust of stale air. There is no drinking water to be had and only two washrooms to a station."²³ The bathroom was a

major problem early on in mass shelters which many times had only one washroom for hundreds of people.²⁴ In some places the toilets were simply buckets from which the "overflow of urine [became] a mounting pool which lap[ped] like a tide up to the blankets of the sleeping multitude."²⁵ Concrete warehouses in East London by the docks were worse than the subways because they were more crowded and had no ventilation.²⁶ In general, mass shelters were damp, dark, smelly, cold, dirty, places where people had to sit and sleep on hard concrete.²⁷

Although the mass shelters were never pleasant places to stay, they did improve over time. The cooperation of Londoners can be seen in this progress because improvements did not come solely from the government; the citizens themselves were responsible for many of them. Instead of fighting and rioting about their discomforts, Londoners were innovative and worked together to better their situation. Some people took upon themselves positions of leadership. An example of this is the Shelter Marshall who emerged to create some order in the shelters. These marshalls would deal with problems such as toothaches and childbirth and would mediate disputes between people. The government had no part in creating this position; it evolved out of necessity and general unspoken consent. The government eventually officially recognized this job, and Shelter Marshalls were paid for their work.²⁸ Other solutions were developed for problems that arose in the tubes. For example, the bathroom problem was solved when "tin containers, plus wooden frames and green curtains, were provided for every shelter."²⁹ By January of 1941 the largest shelters nearly all had first aid posts with nurses on duty all night and a doctor who would make at least one nightly visit.³⁰ Entertainment was also common in the shelters which helped keep the moral of the people up. Local entertainers would sometimes perform, and people would bring knitting, books, toys, and other items with them into the subways for diversion.³¹ Although the mass shelters were far from comfortable, citizens worked together to make them tolerable.

More affluent Londoners were able to avoid the dirty mass shelters. A few entrepreneurs had the foresight to build, or were lucky enough to possess, superior shelters which the wealthy members of West side London paid large sums of money to inhabit. These safe structures were buried as much as seven stories underground and were quite luxurious. Music, dinner, dancing, and a comfortable, quiet bed were part of these accommodations.³² Few Londoners, however, could afford this type of shelter. Many people simply stayed in their own homes. The basements of newer homes were relatively safe, and some families built personal Anderson-type shelters in their back gardens which were

big enough for just one family.³³ The different types of shelters are an example of the divisions between the classes in London.

Not only were shelters worse for the lower classes of London, but the lower-class East End was the hardest hit by the bombing. The shipyards, which were a major target for the Luftwaffe, were in the East End. The houses in the East End were closer together and not as new or strong as those in the West End; therefore, several homes might be destroyed by one bomb.³⁴ The subways in the West End were much deeper (150 feet underground) than those in the East End. Poor families from the East End would have to ride the subways West to find a safe place to spend their nights.³⁵ This inequality caused some resentment between the classes, but an all-out protest never took place. This is testament to Londoners' ability to cooperate unselfishly to achieve the goal of survival. Despite all the hardships, they were able to endure and focus on ultimate victory over the Germans.

The citizens of London refused to give in to the Germans and lose the Battle of Britain. There was a common bond among the people of London that empowered them to stand up to the Nazi attacks. Hysteria, panic, and fear were not found in London, just a strong desire to endure. One Londoner expressed his

thoughts in a letter:

We have taken what is probably the worst bashing of any city in history. We have been shot out of our beds, we have been driven underground, we have been forced to go without food, without baths and sometimes without drink. We have spent our nights in shelters with all hell dropping around us for six, seven, eight and ten hours at a time. Our streets have been smashed, our homes have been blasted to glory, we have rescued our dead from under the bricks and mortar, we have carried on our day's work with thousand-pound time bombs under our noses, we have put up the shutters when our windows have gone. And still we have got our chins up.³⁶

The people of London were able to work together despite the class differences and hardships that they faced. Common men became heroes and leaders.³⁷ The spirit of the city was one of survival and stopping the expansion of Nazi power. One man summed up his feelings with the words, "Anyhow, here we are, with our backs to the wall and (secretly) rather enjoying it. It is stupid but it's magnificent."³⁸ Londoners believed in themselves and their ability to unite and hold back the Germans. The adversity caused by the Battle of Britain was a unifying not a divisive force for the people of London.

Endnotes

¹ Diana Forbes-Robertson and Rodger W. Straus Jr. eds. *War Letters from Britain*. (New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1941), 156.

² R. Daniell, "When Total War Blasts a City; London Offers the Picture of a Struggle Where Civilians are Both Victims and Heroes," *New York Times Magazine*, 22 September 1940, 17.

³ C.E. Head, "Letters from London," *Current History*, 7 November 1940, 23.

⁴ "London Lives Underground," *Life*, 14 October 1940, 30.

⁵ Thomas Parrish, ed. *The Simon and Schuster Encyclopedia of World War II* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1978), s.v. "Battle of Britain."

⁶ John Strachey, "London Took It," from *Digging For Mrs. Miller*, chap. in *I Saw It Happen*, ed. Lewis Gannett, (New York: Pocket Books, Inc., 1942), 125.

⁷ E. Shillito, "Wartime London Works in Raids," *Christian Century*, 16 October 1940, 1286.

⁸ Strachey, "London Took It," 126.

⁹ John Strachey, "Incident in James Street; Twenty-Six Hours as an Air Raid Warden," *Harper's Magazine*, May 1941, 653.

¹⁰ Strachey, "Incident in James Street," 647.

¹¹ Forbes-Robertson, 214.

¹² G. Graham, "Take Cover! Personal Story of an Air-Raid Warden," *Reader's Digest*, February 1941, 112.

¹³ L.A. Wilson, "London Firefighter," *Life*, 21 October 1940, 52-53.

¹⁴ J. Listowel, "Miracle in the London Shelters," *American Mercury*, April 1941, 406.

¹⁵ K. Martin, "London's East End," *Life*, 21 October 1940, 20.

¹⁶ Listowel, 402.

¹⁷ "London Lives Underground," 30.

¹⁸ R. Daniell, "Life Underground in Battered London," *New York Times Magazine*, 13 October 1940, 16, 19. Listowel, 403.

¹⁹ Forbes-Robertson, 134.

²⁰ L. Griffin, "Subway Night: London," *New Republic*, 2 December 1940, 759.

²¹ Daniell, 5.

²² "London Lives Underground," 32.

²³ Listowel, 404.

²⁵ Martin, 19.

²⁶ Daniell, 5.

²⁷ "Bombing of London; Its People Learn to Live on Battlefield." *Life*, 7 October 1940, 85.

²⁸ Listowel, 405-407.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 404.

³⁰ W. Graebner, "London Stands Up to the Blitzkrieg," *Life*, 13 January 1941, 78.

³¹ Griffin, 759.

³² Daniell, 5.

³³ *Ibid.*, 16.

³⁴ Graebner, 74.

³⁵ "London Lives Underground," 32.

³⁶ Head, 22.

³⁷ H.J. Laski, "London: Democracy in Action," *Nation*, 12 October 1940, 326.

³⁸ Head, 23.

Bibliography

Bayles, W.D., and others. "London; Life's Staff There Reports on the War's Worst Air Raid on the Night of April 16." *Life*, 28 April 1941, 40-1.

"Bombing of London; its People Learn to Live on Battlefield." *Life*, 7 October 1940, 85-93.

"British Morale; Bombardment of London." *Nation*, 21 September 1940, 233.

Brittain, Vera. *England's Hour*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1941. D811.5.B75

"City of Firemen; Volunteer Brigades." *Newsweek*, 20 January 1941, 24-25.

Daniell, R. "Life Underground in Battered London." *New York Times Magazine*, 13 October 1940, 5+.

Daniell, R. "When Total War Blasts a City; London Offers the Picture of a Struggle Where Civilians are Both Victims and Heroes." *New York Times Magazine*, 22 September 1940, 3+.

"Fighting the Blazeblitz." *Time*, 27 January 1941, 23.

Forbes-Robertson, Diana and Straus, Rodger W. Jr., eds. *War Letters from Britain*. New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1941. D811.5.W37

Graebner, W. "London Stands Up to the Blitzkrieg." *Life*, 13 January 1941, 72-83.

Graham, G. "Take Cover! Personal Story of a Air-Raid Warden." *Reader's Digest*, February 1941, 103-112.

Griffin, L. "Subway Night: London." *New Republic*, 2 December 1940, 759.

Hall, H.N. "Why They Can't Beat London." *New York Times Magazine*, 27 April 1941, 10+.

Head, C. E. "Letters from London." *Current History*, 7 November 1940, 22-23.

Huxley, J. "Something Will Get Done." *Nation*, 23 November, 1940, 503-504.

Laski, H.J. "London: Democracy in Action." *Nation*, 12 October 1940, 325-326.

Listowel, J. "Miracle in the London Shelters." *American Mercury*, April 1941, 402-410. "London Lives Underground." *Life*, 14 October 1940, 30-34.

"London Lives Underground." *Life*, 14 October 1940, 300-34.

"London Nights." *Nation*, 30 November 1940, 544.

Lupino, S. "Personal Letter." *Life*, 11 November 1940, 17-18+.

Mann, E. "They Don't Know London!" *Nation*, 19 October 1940, 361-364.

Martain, K. "London's East End." *Life*, 21 October 1940, 19-20.

Parrish, Thomas ed. *The Simon and Schuster Encyclopedia of World War II*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1978. "Britain, Battle of." D740.S57

Shillito, E. "Wartime London Works in Raids." *Christian Century*, 16 October 1940, 1286.

Strachey, J. "Incident in James Street; Twenty-Six Hours as an Air Raid Warden." *Harper's Magazine*, May 1941, 645-657.

Strachey, John. "London Took It," from *Digging for Mrs. Miller*. Chap. in *I Saw it Happen*, ed. Lewis Gannett. New York: Pocket Books, Inc., 1942. D811.I7

"War's Worst Raid." *Time*, 28 April 1941, 24.

Wilson, L.A. "London Firefighter." *Life*, 21 October 1940, 51-54.

Ordinary Men and the Final Solution: The Work of Christopher Browning

by Molly Wilkinson

Six million Jews were murdered during the Nazi Holocaust, or "Final Solution." Historians trying to explain the origins of this Final Solution have fallen into two general camps, labeled by the British historian Tim Mason in 1981 as the "intentionalists" and the "functionalists." Mason noted that the "intentionalists" believe that a highly centralized Nazi regime implemented the Final Solution under direct orders from Hitler as the fulfillment of his long-term intent to kill the Jews of Europe. On the other hand, the "functionalists" argue that there was a more "twisted road to Auschwitz." Denying the centrality of Hitler, the existence of a well-organized Nazi regime, or the importance of a long-term ideological commitment to exterminating the Jews, these historians argue that much of the killing emerged from the local level, as lower-echelon perpetrators took their own steps towards solving the "Jewish problem."¹ Christopher Browning's work figures prominently within this debate. His primary contributions to Holocaust historiography are his "moderate functionalist" interpretation and, to support this position, his illumination of the actions and motivations of the middle- and lower-echelon perpetrators of the Holocaust.

Browning, born on 22 May, 1944 in Durham, NC, received his A.B. degree from Oberlin College in 1967, his M.A. from the University of Wisconsin at Madison in 1968, and his Ph.D. from Wisconsin in 1975. He taught at Allegheny College from 1969 until 1971 and in 1974 began teaching at Pacific Lutheran University, where he is now Professor of History.² In addition to journal articles and book reviews, Browning's works include *The Final Solution and the German Foreign Office: A Study of Referat D III of Abteilung Deutschland 1940-43*; *Fateful Months: Essays on the Emergence of the Final Solution*; *The Path to Genocide: Essays on the Launching of the Final Solution*; and *Ordinary Men: Reserve Police Battalion 101 and the Final Solution in Poland*.³

Browning relies heavily upon archival sources for his research and is astutely attentive to detail. In the introduction to *Path to Genocide*, he defends this detail-oriented approach:

To some readers the attention historians have paid to the decision-making process and particularly its dating may seem inordinate and overblown. The argument can take on the quality of a scholastic splitting of hairs, as historians seem to quibble over a few months, weeks, or even days. However, I would argue . . . that the issue of dating is not a matter of arcane detail. Unless the chronology is established accurately, the historical context for the fateful decisions remains illusive, as do purported explanations of motivation and causality.⁴

In a personal letter, Browning further clarifies his empirical approach to research. He points out that he is most comfortable when his interpretations are "grounded in very carefully researched and particularly illuminating episodes" and then says: "I am clearly an empiricist and not particularly theory-grounded."⁵

In order to appreciate fully Browning's contributions to Holocaust historiography, we must further examine the intentionalist/functionalist debate. In a recent study on Holocaust historiography, Michael Marrus discusses these positions. Describing intentionalists as believing in a "straight path" towards the Final Solution, he notes that many intentionalists identify two components of Hitler's *Weltanschauung* (world-view): his need for *Lebensraum* (living space), achieved through military expansion, and his desire for an *Endlösung* (final solution) to the Jewish problem. According to intentionalist Lucy Davidowicz, author of *The War Against the Jews, 1933-1945*, a "twofold war" began in September 1939; when Hitler invaded Poland, fulfilling his desire for *Lebensraum*, he simultaneously began to plan his other long-term goal, *Endlösung*.⁶ The intentionalists believe that, even though no direct document, or "smoking pistol,"⁷ exists that incriminates Hitler personally, enough indirect evidence exists to indicate clearly that Hitler directly ordered the extermination of the Jews. Extermination was the fulfillment of his long-term ideological commitment, a commitment made as early as 1923 when he wrote *Mein Kampf*. In fact, intentionalists argue that Nazi-Jewish policy was evolving directly towards extermination from

its outset in the 1930s; the only reason organized extermination did not begin until 1941 was inopportune timing.⁸

On the other hand, the functionalists, while acknowledging Hitler's obsession with the Jews, doubt that he actually organized, or even ordered, their extermination. One functionalist, Martin Broszat, acknowledges that Hitler wanted "above all to make the territory of the Reich *judenfrei*, i.e. clear of Jews," but that Hitler never indicated how this was to be done. Broszat argues that the decision to exterminate the Jews emerged "bit by bit."⁹ He emphasizes that many Nazis, including Hitler, hoped to solve the "Jewish problem" by deporting the Jews either to the Lublin Reservation in Nazi-occupied Poland or to the island of Madagascar. However, even though these non-murderous plans were seriously considered, the Wehrmacht invasion of the Soviet Union during the summer of 1941, though initially successful, began to falter. According to Broszat, the Germans became frustrated, both with military obstacles and with the increasing numbers of Jews under Nazi control. This frustration drove the Germans to begin killing the Jews at the local level, not, as the intentionalists argue, because of orders from Hitler, during the fall of 1941. By the winter of 1942, Hitler's subordinates had organized the concentration/extermination camp system for mass murder, a system both more efficient and less psychologically difficult for the killers.¹⁰

How does Christopher Browning view the functionalist and intentionalist interpretations? He argues that this debate is part of a larger debate within the historical profession: . . .

between those who explain history through the ideas and decisions of individuals and those who explain history through the impersonalized and underlying structures of society . . . that limit and shape the actions of individuals.

He describes the first group as political and diplomatic historians and the second as social and institutional historians.¹¹ The British historian Alan Bullock similarly describes this as a debate between those who interpret history "from above" and those who analyze history "from below."¹² Browning, arguing that these two positions are unduly polarized, attempts to analyze the Final Solution both from above and from below. His work establishes him as a "moderate functionalist," and he explores most explicitly the role of the lower- and middle-echelon perpetrators of the Final Solution.

Browning's first book, *The Final Solution and the German Foreign Office*, based upon his dissertation, was published in 1978. By focusing on the activities of the German Foreign Office, this study explores various aspects of German Jewish policy, tracing the radicalization of this policy from persecution to

deportation and, finally, to extermination. Tim Mason had not yet written his article introducing the labels "functionalism" and "intentionalism" in 1978, so Browning obviously could not explore his explicit position. However, his first chapter, "Evolution of German Jewish Policy," provides insight into how he would stand on this debate in his later writings. This book also introduces Browning's research on lower- and middle-echelon perpetrators, in this case the bureaucrats in the German Foreign Office.

At the beginning of the chapter, Browning clearly breaks with the intentionalist camp, stating:

German Jewish policy was not the result of a conspirational plot hatched in Hitler's mind following Germany's defeat in World War I and then carried out with single-minded purpose [through] . . . a monolithic dictatorship. It evolved from a conjuncture of several factors of which Hitler's anti-Semitism was only one.¹³

Browning then argues, as do the functionalists, that Nazi Germany was not a centralized state but rather, borrowing an analogy from his advisor Robert Koehl, a system of "fiefs" governed by various "vassals" competing with one another to impress Hitler. Browning concludes that the Third Reich was in a "state of permanent internal war" and that Jewish policy emerged at the center of this "perpetual power struggle."¹⁴

Browning then traces the evolution of German Jewish policy to the disastrous "quantum jump" in policy in early 1941 when Hitler decided to exterminate the Russian Jews as they came under German control. Hitler authorized the *Einsatzgruppen* (action squads) to follow the advancing German lines into Russia, murdering all Jews on the newly acquired German territory. By the summer, Hitler had decided to extend the extermination of the Russian Jews to the European Jews. However, there were two drawbacks to the firing squad method of the *Einsatzgruppen*; it was psychologically difficult for the killers and was inconvenient in terms of the huge number of victims that a small number of men had to kill. By early 1942, Hitler's "vassals" had developed a concentration camp system for a more efficient slaughtering of the Jews.¹⁵

Although Browning could not articulate a specific position on functionalism and intentionalism until his later research, this work reveals that he would not quite fit into either camp. He is clearly not an orthodox functionalist because he acknowledges the importance of Hitler. However, he is not an intentionalist either in that he clearly indicates that the competitive and decentralized Nazi bureaucracy also played a significant role in the evolution of the Final Solution.

Browning's next work, *Fateful Months*, published in 1985, explicitly develops his position as a "moderate functionalist" and furthers his exploration of lower-

echelon perpetrators. In his first chapter, a historiographical essay, "The Decision Concerning the Final Solution," Browning argues that the Final Solution only became fixed in Hitler's mind in 1941 after the failure of other solutions such as resettlement. In summer 1941, the Wehrmacht invaded Russia; although military expansion enhanced Hitler's *Lebensraum*, it simultaneously expanded the number of Jews in the German empire. This influenced Hitler to make several key decisions in 1941 that led to the organized Final Solution. As Browning pointed out in *The Final Solution and the German Foreign Office*, Hitler decided to use the *Einsatzgruppen* to murder Russian Jews as they fell under German control. Browning emphasizes that, at this time, Hitler was so confident of a German military victory in Russia that he also authorized his "vassals" to plan the extermination of the European Jews.¹⁶ Browning later refers to this authorization, which is central to Browning's thesis, as Hitler's "green light." Although by October 1941 the Wehrmacht was encountering difficulty on the Eastern front, Hitler went ahead and approved the extermination plan that was presented to him.¹⁷

This essay, "The Decision Concerning the Final Solution," demonstrates that Browning, denying that extermination had been a long-term goal of Hitler's, disagrees with the intentionalists when he argues that Hitler did not decide on extermination until 1941. However, he also disagrees with the functionalists by recognizing the distinct role of Hitler in the Final Solution and by asserting that the fateful decision was made in the wake of confidence in victory, not, as Broszat argued, out of later frustrations with the Wehrmacht's difficulties on the Russian front. By borrowing elements of both the intentionalist and functionalist interpretations, Browning carves out a middle position.

In this essay, Browning also interprets the positions of other key players in the functionalist/intentionalist debate and then defends more explicitly his "moderate functionalism." He solidly defends all components of his thesis, and one of his more important arguments concerns whether or not Hitler had a long-term goal of murdering the Jews. He clearly acknowledges anti-Semitism as Hitler's "deeply held obsession," arguing that this was the "keystone" of his *Weltanschauung*,¹⁸ but, as we have seen, Browning does not believe that Hitler envisioned actual extermination until 1941. His evidence includes the seriousness with which Hitler treated deportation and resettlement plans. Browning believes that some intentionalists might argue that Hitler was merely waiting for the most opportune moment to initiate murder and that deportation was the most effective interim solution. He flatly denies this, using as support the Nazi murder of seventy thousand mentally ill and handicapped Germans

between 1939 and 1941. Despite this murder of thousands, the Jews were allowed to live. Browning argues that if the time were opportune for the "euthanasia" program, it would also have been opportune for the extermination of the Jews, if an extermination plan had already existed. He concludes, therefore, that such a plan did not exist: "In short, the practice of Nazi Jewish policy until 1941 does not support the thesis of a long-held, fixed intention to murder the European Jews."¹⁹

The remaining chapters of *Fateful Months* explore the lower-echelon perpetrators of the Holocaust. In one essay, "Wehrmacht Reprisal Policy and the Murder of the Male Jews in Serbia," Browning discusses the decision for the fall 1941 firing squad execution of adult male Serbian Jews. He argues that, although the local SS certainly approved and even assisted in the executions, it was the military commanders of the Wehrmacht, not the SS, who ordered the executions.²⁰ This essay illustrates Browning's thesis that a policy of mass murder was initiated by lower-echelon perpetrators as well as by the elite of the Nazi regime. The other two essays concern the use of carbon monoxide gas vans to exterminate Jews before the concentration camps were ready; Browning discusses the contributions of the scientists and the auto mechanics to the development of these tools for murder.²¹

Browning's two most recent studies, *Path to Genocide* and *Ordinary Men*, were both published in 1992. *Path to Genocide*, a book of essays, includes a historiographical essay, "Beyond Functionalism and Intentionalism: The Decision for the Final Solution Reconsidered." In this essay, similar to the historiographical essay in *Fateful Months*, he analyzes studies of the Final Solution that have been published since 1985, and he uses his most recent research to further illuminate his position as a "moderate functionalist."²² *Path to Genocide* also includes essays on deportation and ghettoization, seriously considered between 1939 and 1941 as viable solutions to the Jewish problem. The essays demonstrate that the seriousness with which the Nazis took these plans detracts from the intentionalist argument that extermination was already planned. These essays, by exploring the complexity of approaches and reactions to these plans, also refute the functionalist interpretation that ghettoization and deportation invited a "cumulative radicalization" of Jewish policy.²³

The final essays in *Path to Genocide* explore the middle- and lower-echelon perpetrators of the Holocaust. One essay, "Genocide and Public Health: German Doctors and Polish Jews, 1939-1941," explores the role of doctors in the medical rationalization of mass murder. German doctors argued that spotted fever, common in the Jewish community (most likely because of poor living conditions), was endemic to the inferior Jewish race; therefore, the Jews had to be placed in ghettos to prevent

them from spreading fever to the Germans. However, when Jews were sealed in filthy and overcrowded ghettos without adequate food, disease naturally increased. As the fever epidemic grew, the doctors decided: "one way or another, by shooting or starvation, the Jews had to die." Browning points out that although the doctors did not actually initiate the Final Solution, they nonetheless functioned significantly:

Having decided to treat the Jews not as victims to be saved but as carriers to be avoided, the doctors were only a short psychological step from Hitler's belief that the Jews were no better than bacilli and vermin. . . . What the public health officials had done over the past two years ultimately provided justification . . . for . . . a policy of systematic mass murder, one carried out more quickly, with greater self-sufficiency — dare one say in an altogether more medical manner? — than the gradual disappearance of the Jews through starvation and firing-squad. . . .²⁴

The final essay in *Path to Genocide*, "One Day in Jozefow," is an adaptation of a chapter of Browning's fourth book, *Ordinary Men*. *Ordinary Men*, published in 1992, focuses on 500 lower-echelon perpetrators of the Holocaust, the men of Reserve Police Battalion 101, responsible for the deaths of over 80,000 Jews.²⁵ How "ordinary" were these men? Over 63 percent were members of the working class and most of the remaining 37 percent were lower middle class. The majority of the men were from Hamburg, one of the least nazified cities in Germany, most were uneducated, and only 25 percent were members of the Nazi party. Browning emphasizes the ages of the men, most in their mid thirties to late forties, pointing out that ". . . all went through their formative period in the pre-Nazi era. These were men who had known political standards and moral norms other than those of the Nazis." He concludes that "These men would not seem to have been a very promising group from which to recruit mass murderers . . ."²⁶

Even more unusual than the ordinary background of the men were the circumstances under which they committed murder. Their Lieutenant, Wilhelm Trapp, gave them an "extraordinary offer" when he ordered them to commit the first massacre at Jozefow, Poland. With "choking voice and tears in his eyes," he said that any men who did not wish to participate in the massacre could step out.²⁷ However, Browning estimates that only 10 to 20 percent of the men refused to kill.²⁸ Why did these men abstain? More importantly, what influenced 80 to 90 percent of this unpromising group to refuse Trapp's offer and kill?

Most of the book is a gripping, heart-wrenching, and very often gruesome narrative, describing in great detail how 500 men shot at least 38,000 Jews and loaded another 45,000 onto trains bound for death camps, resulting in a total of 83,000 Jews condemned to their

deaths by the Battalion.²⁹ In the final chapter of the book, Browning tries to uncover what motivated the men who refused Trapp's offer. He suggests that wartime polarization allows men to distance themselves from and objectify the enemy, in this case the Jews. He also mentions how division of labor made the tasks easier for the men; liquidating ghettos and loading Jews onto trains still sealed the deaths of the Jews, yet it was easier for men to distance themselves from the indirect consequences of their actions. Careerism also could have influenced the men: Browning notes that many of the Battalion members remained in the police after the war.³⁰ Browning also examines the anti-Semitic indoctrination of the Battalion, indoctrination that certainly bolstered the men's belief in racial superiority. However, the "ideological education" of the men primarily encouraged not the murder of Jews but rather of partisans and included surprisingly few explicit references to the Jews. Concludes Browning: "explicitly prepared for the task of killing the Jews they most certainly were not."³¹

After these initial attempts at explanation, Browning uses the famous Milgram experiments to enhance his interpretations of the behavior of the men. The Milgram experiments tested people's adherence to authority under unthreatening conditions and made the disturbing discovery that 2/3 of the people tested would, while following orders, inflict severe pain on others. Though acknowledging that these experiments, in which people were assured that their victims would not be seriously harmed, were drastically different from the conditions in totalitarian Germany, Milgram draws parallels between the two situations.³² Browning acknowledges that a deeply ingrained tendency towards adherence to authority certainly influenced the Battalion. However, he also points out that adherence to authority cannot be the sole explanation. For example, he points out that the men faced no threat to their own safety if they did not obey authority, and he stresses that Trapp was a "weak" authority figure. Nonetheless, Browning acknowledges that even though Trapp allowed the men to abstain, the orders to kill originated from an authority higher than Trapp, and the presence of a higher authority also could have influenced the men.³³

To this point, Browning has mentioned many factors that influenced the men, yet he has clearly pointed out that none of these factors, in and of themselves, were sufficient to impel the men to murder. What does he think ultimately influenced the Battalion? In the final pages of the conclusion, Browning discusses conformity, implicating conformity as the most significant of the factors that collectively influenced the men. Most of the men who stepped out felt guilty about their decision, fearing that they were leaving the dirty work to their comrades or that they were morally condemning them. Interestingly, most of the men who stepped out described themselves not as "too good" but rather as "too weak" to

kill. Toughness was valued by the Battalion, and of the men who abstained, those who stepped out after having already tried to kill were more respected than those too weak to kill at all.³⁴ Browning emphasizes the "comradeship" of the Battalion members. He points out that "Those who did not shoot risked isolation, rejection, and ostracism — a very uncomfortable prospect within the framework of a tight-knit unit stationed abroad among a hostile population. . . ." Browning believes that this strong need for acceptance, and the belief that "toughness" was the key to acceptance, most significantly influenced these "ordinary," unlikely killers.³⁵

What does Browning believe are the implications of the behavior of Reserve Police Battalion 101? In a public lecture, Browning described his conclusions as the "most worrisome and most disturbing result of [his] research."³⁶ In the concluding sentences of *Ordinary Men*, Browning summarizes the factors that he believes contributed to the murderous behavior of the Battalion and points out that racism, deference to authority, bureaucratization, and peer pressure exist in most societies. Then, Browning asks the thought-provoking and disturbing question: "If the men of Reserve Police Battalion 101 could become killers under such circumstances, what group of men cannot?"³⁷

Throughout his research, Christopher Browning has successfully blended various methods of historical inquiry: his examination of Hitler and of his "vassals" resembles traditional political history, whereas his study of lower-echelon perpetrators and his use of social scientific experiments reflect more recent trends in social and institutional history. This interpretation of the Final Solution both "from above" and "from below," to borrow Bullock's analogy, has contributed to Holocaust historiography both a "moderate functionalist" interpretation as well as a richer understanding of the

lower-echelon perpetrators of the Final Solution. Browning's "moderate functionalist" interpretation is certainly important. However, I think that his most significant contribution to Holocaust historiography is his research on lower-echelon perpetrators, research that transcends the functionalist and intentionalist debate by universalizing the moral dilemmas of the Holocaust.³⁸ Browning forces each of us to explore how we might have responded to the Nazis when he discusses the doctors, who reinforced that Jews were vermin who needed to be killed; the mechanics, who as part of a normal working day created the tools for mass murder; and the Reserve Police Battalion 101, who conformed to peer pressure and murdered 80,000 Jews.

In a personal letter, Christopher Browning explains: "It is precisely because the Holocaust is an event that allows us to study human behavior . . . under conditions of extremity that we can see what potentialities are contained therein."³⁹ True to his words, Browning's research forces us to examine human behavior in light of what the Holocaust reveals about the potential of human nature. What Browning uncovers does not allow people to dismiss the Holocaust as something unique to Germany or to the Third Reich. His question: "If the men of Reserve Police Battalion 101 could become killers under such circumstances, what group of men cannot?" forces us to look inside ourselves and confront the vulnerability of our own moral standards. Browning stated in the same letter: "Study of the Holocaust allows us to understand our civilization, the modern nation state, and human behavior better than we could by ignoring it."⁴⁰ Perhaps Browning's true motivation for studying history and the Final Solution has been the hope that studying human nature and civilization under past conditions of extremity will better enable us to understand and respond to the moral challenges of the present and the future.

Endnotes

¹ Charles S. Maier, *The Unmasterable Past: History, Holocaust, and German National Identity* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1988), 94-95. For Mason's actual text, see Timothy W. Mason, "Intention and Explanation: A Current Controversy About The Interpretation of National Socialism," in *Der Führerstaat: Mythos und Realität*, ed. Gerhard Hirschfeld and Lothar Kettenacker, (Stuttgart: Klett Cotta, 1981), 21-40.

² Hal May, ed., *Contemporary Authors*, vol. 112 (Detroit: Gale Research Company, 1985), 81. Browning first became interested in the study of the Holocaust when he read, as preparation for a German history course at Allegheny College, Raul Hilberg's *The Destruction of the European Jews*, still considered one of the most definitive contributions to Holocaust Studies. Browning describes this as a "book that changed my life." When he returned to Wisconsin to finish his Ph.D., he told his advisor, Robert Koehl, that he wanted to research Nazi persecution of the Jews. Amusingly now, Koehl told him "that would be a good research topic, but [he] should know that it

had no professional future!" At that time, Holocaust studies had not yet emerged as a significant field of research. Christopher Browning, Letter to Molly Wilkinson, 7 February 1994.

³ Hereinafter, *The Final Solution and the German Foreign Office, Fateful Months, Path to Genocide, and Ordinary Men*.

⁴ Christopher Browning, *Path to Genocide* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 3.

⁵ Browning, Letter.

⁶ Discussed in Michael Marrus, *The Holocaust in History* (Hanover and London: University Press of New England, 1987), 34.

⁷ Christopher Browning, *Fateful Months: Essays on the Emergence of the Final Solution* (New York: Holmes and Meier, 1985), 4.

* Discussed in Marrus, *The Holocaust in History*, 34-40.

⁹ Discussed in *Ibid.*, 41-42.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*

¹¹ Browning, *Path to Genocide*, 3.

¹² Alan Bullock, "The Evil Dream," review of *The Path to Genocide: Essays on Launching the Final Solution and Ordinary Men: Reserve Police Battalion 101 and the Final Solution in Poland*, by Christopher Browning, in *Times Literary Supplement* (5 February 1993): 3.

¹³ Christopher Browning, *The Final Solution and the German Foreign Office: A Study of Referat D III of Abteilung Deutschland 1940-43*. (New York: Holmes and Meier, 1978), 1.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 2.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 2-9

¹⁶ Browning, *Fateful Months*, 8.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 16.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 14.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 14-15.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 39.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 58. Browning points out that the primary rationale behind the creation of the gas van was to "alleviate the psychological burden upon the firing-squad murderers, many of them middle-aged family men who were disturbed most of all by the endless shooting of women and children." (57) Browning reinforces that the vans were intended to be more humane for the killers, not the victims, by pointing out that exhaust gas, as opposed to the chemically pure carbon monoxide used in the gas chambers, created an excruciating, painful death for the victims. (65)

²² Browning, *Path to Genocide*, 86-121.

²³ *Ibid.*, 3-56.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 160-61.

²⁵ Christopher Browning, *Ordinary Men: Reserve Police*

Battalion 101 and the Final Solution in Poland (New York: Harper Perennial, 1992), xv-xvi.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 47-48.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 2.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, 159

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 142.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 162-170.

³¹ *Ibid.*, 184.

³² Milgram discussed in *Ibid.*, 171-172.

³³ *Ibid.*, 174.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 185

³⁵ *Ibid.*

³⁶ Christopher Browning, "Ordinary Germans or Ordinary Men: Holocaust Perpetrators and Human Nature," delivered at Wittenberg University's 1993 International Conference on Teaching the Holocaust, 25 October 1993, Audio-Visual Special Collections, Thomas Library, Wittenberg University, Springfield, Ohio.

³⁷ Browning, *Ordinary Men*, 189.

³⁸ However, Browning has been criticized for universalizing the Holocaust in this manner. Some historians believe that universalizing the atrocities somehow lessens their horror. I would argue, however, that this universalization actually increases the horror because it forces all of us to explore how we, under similar conditions, might have reacted. Browning's work forces us to see the Holocaust as something "ordinary men" committed, not something "ordinary Germans" committed. For an example of the opposition to Browning's work on these grounds see: Daniel Jonah Goldhagen, "The Evil of Banality," review of *Ordinary Men: Reserve Police Battalion 101 and the Final Solution in Poland*, by Christopher Browning, in *New Republic* 207 (July 13 and 20, 1992): 49-52.

³⁹ Browning, Letter to Molly Wilkinson, 7 February 1994.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*

Bibliography

Baldwin, Peter, ed. *Reworking the Past: Hitler, the Holocaust, and the Historian's Debate*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1990.

Berghahn, V.R. "Revisionism in Germany." Review of *Forever in the Shadow of Hitler*, trans. by James Knowlton and Truett Cates, and *The Path to Genocide: Essays on Launching the Final Solution*, by Christopher Browning. In *The New York Times Book Review* 18 April 1993, 3, 33.

Browning, Christopher R. "Approaches to the 'Final Solution' in German Historiography of the Last Two Decades." In *The Historiography of the Holocaust Period: Proceedings of the*

Fifth Yad Vashem International Historical Conference, March, 1983, ed. Yisrael Gutman and Gideon Greif, 53-77. Jerusalem: Yad Vashem, 1988.

_____. "Barbarous Utopia." Review of *The Racial State: Germany, 1933-1945*, by Michael Burleigh. In *Times Literary Supplement* 20 March 1992, 5.

_____. *Fateful Months: Essays on the Emergence of the Final Solution*. New York: Holmes and Meier, 1985.

- _____. *The Final Solution and the German Foreign Office: A Study of Referat D III of Abteilung Deutschland 1940-43*. New York: Holmes and Meier, 1978.
- _____. "Genocide Forestalled." Review of *All or Nothing: The Axis and the Holocaust*, by Jonathan Steinberg. In *Times Literary Supplement* 19 October 1990, 1125.
- _____. "He Outfought the Holocaust" Review of *A Surplus of Memory*, by Yitzhak Zuckerman. In *The New York Times Book Review* 23 May 1993, 22.
- _____. Letter to Molly Wilkinson, 7 February 1994.
- _____. "Nazi Ghettoization Policy in Poland: 1939-41." *Central European History* 19 (December 1987): 343-68.
- _____. "Nazi Resettlement Policy and the Search for a Solution to the Jewish Question, 1939-1941." *German Studies Review* 9 (October 1986): 497-519.
- _____. "Ordinary Germans or Ordinary Men: Holocaust Perpetrators and Human Nature." Delivered at Wittenberg University's 1993 International Conference on Teaching the Holocaust, 25 October 1993. Audio-Visual Special Collections, Thomas Library, Wittenberg University, Springfield, Ohio.
- _____. *Ordinary Men: Reserve Police Battalion 101 and the Final Solution in Poland*. New York: Harper Perennial, 1992.
- _____. *The Path to Genocide: Essays on Launching the Final Solution*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- Bullock, Alan. "The Evil Dream." Review of *The Path to Genocide: Essays on Launching the Final Solution and Ordinary Men: Reserve Police Battalion 101 and the Final Solution in Poland*, by Christopher Browning. In *Times Literary Supplement* 5 February 1993, 3.
- Evans, Richard. *In Hitler's Shadow: West German Historians and the Attempt to Escape from the Nazi Past*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1989.
- Gilman, Sander L. and Steven T. Katz, eds. *Anti-Semitism in Times of Crisis*. New York: New York University Press, 1991.
- Glees, Anthony. Review of *Fateful Months: Essays on the Emergence of the Final Solution*, by Christopher Browning. In *English Historical Review* 105 (April 1990): 538.
- Goldhagen, Daniel Jonah. "The Evil of Banality." Review of *Ordinary Men: Reserve Police Battalion 101 and the Final Solution in Poland*, by Christopher Browning. In *New Republic* 207 (July 13 and 20, 1992): 49-52.
- Kershaw, Ian. *The Nazi Dictatorship: Problems and Perspectives of Interpretation*. 2d ed. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1989.
- _____. "Warrant for Genocide." Review of *Fateful Months: Essays on the Emergence of the Final Solution*, by Christopher Browning. In *Times Literary Supplement* 7 November 1986, 1242.
- Maier, Charles S. *The Unmasterable Past: History, Holocaust, and German National Identity*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1988.
- Marrus, Michael. *The Holocaust in History*. Hanover and London: University Press of New England, 1987.
- May, Hal, ed. *Contemporary Authors*, vol 112. Detroit: Gale Research Company, 1985.
- Reich, Walter. "The Men Who Pulled the Triggers." Review of *Ordinary Men: Reserve Police Battalion 101 and the Final Solution in Poland*, by Christopher Browning. In *New York Times Book Review* 12 April 1992, 1, 25-27.
- Rosenfeld, Alvin H. Review of *Fateful Months: Essays on the Emergence of the Final Solution*, by Christopher Browning and *Bergen-Belsen: From "Detention Camp" to Concentration Camp, 1943-1945*, by Eberhard Kolb. In *American Historical Review* 93 (October 1988): 1076-1078.
- Stokes, Lawrence D. Review of *The Final Solution and the German Foreign Office*, by Christopher Browning. In *American Historical Review* 85 (February 1980): 156.

The Empress's Old Clothes: CiXi's Flight from Beijing

*by Laura Sponseller
(1995 Hartje Award runner-up)*

In the early morning hours of August 15, 1900, CiXi scrutinized herself in the mirror of her royal bedchamber. A high official's diary records that the Empress Dowager of China exclaimed, "When the trouble with the Boxers began, who would have thought that it would come to the strange appearance of today!" Priceless jewels, rich robes, and jade hair ornaments were discarded, and she wore the coarse blue cotton robe of a peasant woman. Her hair was in a simple knot instead of an intricate Manchu style. She had chopped off the six-inch fingernails which symbolized the indolent lifestyle of the imperial class.

A cacophony of gunfire tore through the darkness. The Boxers, xenophobic Chinese rebels, had instigated a wave of anti-foreign violence that swept northern China in 1900. Foreign nationals in Beijing had been besieged in legations for two months. The previous afternoon, August 14, an international force of Americans, British, Russians, French, Germans, and Japanese had arrived in the capital to relieve their beleaguered countrymen. For the second time in forty years the Imperial capital was occupied by foreign troops, and the disguised Empress Dowager hoped to slip out of the city in the ensuing chaos.

CiXi had summoned the palace inhabitants to gather at 3:30 a.m. The royal entourage would be minuscule, comprised of CiXi, the faltering Guang Xu emperor (her grandson), his wife, the Heir Apparent, and two eunuchs. The Empress Dowager informed the rest of the assembled company that it would not be accompanying the Court in its flight. At this, the Guang Xu emperor's favorite, Chen Fei, the "Pearl Concubine," fell on her knees before CiXi and begged that the emperor be allowed to remain in Beijing. CiXi "lifted up her voice like the sound of thunder" and ordered two eunuchs to throw Chen Fei down a well. The emperor then fell on his knees to beg for the life of his favorite, but to no avail. Chen Fei was summarily killed and CiXi ordered the sorrowful Emperor to climb back into his cart. Three carts carrying the imperial might of China pulled out of the Forbidden City.

CiXi's flight symbolized her inability to deal adequately with foreign influence in China. Nineteenth century attempts to stop foreign encroachment in China had resulted in humiliation after humiliation. Conflicts such as the Opium War (1839-1842) and the Arrow War (1856-60) resulted in staggering indemnities that crippled the economy. Foreign steamboats on inland waterways put hordes of natives out of work. Christian missionaries penetrated the interior, intent on saving a populace that did not welcome salvation. China could not compete with western technology and military might in an era of manifest destiny and the white man's burden.

During the Hundred Days of Reform in the summer of 1898, the Guang Xu emperor had attempted to institute radical western-style reforms in China. He issued over forty reform edicts, calling for a revision of the exam system, of legal codes, and for the creation of a cabinet system, a parliament, and a constitution, among other measures. The Dowager Empress snuffed out these efforts as she had snuffed out the life of Chen Fei, and the Emperor had been a virtual prisoner ever since. Then, when the Boxers rose in xenophobic hatred, blaming China's troubles on foreign missionaries and calling for their death en masse, CiXi did not suppress their efforts. She refused to send out imperial edicts condemning the Boxers and allowed the bombardment of the foreign legations in Beijing.

The carts carrying CiXi's party were temporarily delayed by the crush of people fleeing fallen Beijing, but eventually passed in disguise through the northwest gate of the city. After a brief stop at the Summer Palace north of the capital, the carts rumbled and jolted westward toward the Great Wall.

In the confusion, the eunuchs had failed to pack food, clothing, or water for the journey. After two days, the famished group received rude shelter and a cauldron of millet porridge from Magistrate Wu Yung at the town of Huai-lai, north of the Great Wall.

For the first time, the Empress Dowager received a true picture of the life of her subjects. Previously she had been insulated in the luxurious confines of the Forbidden City and the Summer Palace, with information

filtered by a bevy of kowtowing officials. Now she experienced hunger, and saw the wreckage of the Chinese countryside. Besides the devastation of fighting due to the Boxer Rebellion, a flood of the Yellow River in 1898 had killed masses of peasants and prevented crop planting. Shandong Province, the birthplace of the Boxer Rebellion, had been hardest hit, and its misery had spread.

The Empress Dowager finally arrived at her destination, the ancient capital of Xi'an, on October 28,

1900. Ahead of her government lay humiliating negotiations with foreign powers and more indemnities and crippling terms before she would return to Beijing in January of 1902. The Qing dynasty would finally fall in 1911, barely more than a decade after the flight from Beijing, when the Empress Dowager was forced to flee in a rain of foreign fire, reduced to the garb of a peasant woman.

Bibliography

The Boxer Rising: A History of the Boxer Trouble in China. New York: Arno Press, 1967.

Ching-Shan. *The Diary of His Excellency Ching-Shan.* Translated by J.J.L. Duyvendak. Arlington, Virginia: University Publications of America, Inc., 1976.

Haldane, Charlotte. *The Last Great Empress of China.* Great Britain: Garden City Press Limited, 1965.

Mateer, A.H. *Siege Days: Personal Experiences of American Women and Children During the Peking Siege.* San Francisco: Chinese Materials Center, Inc., 1976.

O'Connor, Richard. *The Spirit Soldiers: A Historical Narrative of the Boxer Rebellion.* New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1973.

Warner, Marina. *The Dragon Empress: Life and Times of Tz'u-hsi, 1835-1908, Empress Dowager of China.* New York: Atheneum, 1986.

Wehrle, Edmund. *Britain, China, and the Anti-Missionary Riots, 1891-1900.* Minneapolis, Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press, 1966.