

# CHRONOS

---

THE SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY UNDERGRADUATE  
HISTORY JOURNAL



*VOLUME I, ISSUE I*  
*SPRING 2005*





*Chronos*

---

**THE SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY UNDERGRADUATE HISTORY JOURNAL**

## *Letter from the Editors...*

We at *Chronos*, would like to invite you into the past. From the advent of writing to the present day, history is a living, breathing ongoing discourse that engineers innovation. Although Syracuse University does a remarkable job of encouraging individuality and personal development, we felt a lack of community spirit amongst the history majors. *Chronos* is our attempt to resolve this deficiency.

The inception of *Chronos* came from the fertile mind of Professor Kutcher and we would like to thank him for all his help in getting this journal off the ground. We would also like to thank him for securing funding for this endeavor. In similar regards, we would like to thank the Co-curricular fund of the College of Arts and Sciences for their taking a chance on a possibility. Hopefully, we have exceeded their expectations. We would like to thank the History Department administrative staff: Patti Blincoe, Patti Bohrer and Fran Bockus for all that they've done for us. The Office of Greek and Experimental Learning was a great help in facilitating the inception of our organization and in helping us to take our first steps as an organization. We hope that our journal will have a positive impact on the quality of life at the Syracuse University campus. In closing, we would like to thank one last person: Professor Samantha Herrick, our faculty advisor. Professor Herrick has been with the journal since the beginning and has given us her expertise and assistance. While being a constant presence, Professor Herrick offered us continuous advice and yet allowed us to find our own path. We would like to thank her for all her time and efforts on our behalf.

Included in this first issue are four outstanding pieces written by undergraduate history students. It is our aspiration that these works will provoke a historical dialogue with each reader and expand the breadth and experience of history on the Syracuse University campus.

### *The Editorial Staff..*

*Cherie N. Peters*  
*Corinne Colucci*  
*Andrew Jaz*  
*Phoebe Sanborn*  
*Kelly Bogart*  
*Nicole Sanford*

# CHRONOS

VOLUME 1, ISSUE 1

## Table of Contents

“Yun and Shen Fu: An Unusual Couple? The Confucian Family System in Theory and Practice.” <i>Lydia Stamato</i> .....	2
“The Price-Current of Human Flesh: American Slavery, The Female Body and Capitalism” <i>Rachel Moran</i> .....	5
“The Justification of Crusade: Constantinople, the Baltic States and Southern France.” <i>Matthew P. Jacobs</i> .....	13
“Progressivism and Higher Education at the Outbreak of WWI <i>Andrew Semuels</i> .....	18



## **Yun and Shen Fu: An Uncommon Couple? The Confucian Family System in Theory and Practice**

Lydia Stamato

The Confucian family system of China in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries was one of male dominance and female subordination. It was a world where women were ostracized from their natal families yet unwelcome in their husbands'—a world deprived of equality and humanity. In theory, women were objects to be used as their fathers, husbands and eventually, sons saw fit. In practice, however, many women enjoyed more freedoms than they were prescribed to have. Although familial expectations implied by Confucianism were portrayed as “normal” or “ideal,” the actual dynamics were often far more flexible depending on a family’s social class and the individual relationship between a husband and his wife. This relaxation of social mores and codes is exemplified in Shen Fu’s memoir *Six Records of a Floating Life*, in which Shen recounts his beautiful and unique relationship with his wife Yun.

Confucianism, a philosophy of behavior and ethics, was founded circa 400 B.C.E. and was first integrated into the government during the Western Han Dynasty, lingering for more than 2000 years (Wei 6). Although Confucianism was a peaceable creed, it was the “essential theoretical source of sexual discrimination in China” for it looked upon women as “inferior creatures” (Wei 6). Naturally, China was not the only culture to treat women as inferior; gender discrimination has been a pattern in societies across space and time, and still exists today. In the beginning, the codification of Confucian principles as familial principles was only among the elite, but over time it spread to the general populace and its theories were grossly exaggerated to be even more stifling for women (Johnson 24). By the middle of the Qing Dynasty, when the first cries for social reform sprang up, “Chinese women were embedded in perhaps the oldest, most highly developed, male-dominated kinship system in history” (Johnson 24). By this point in time, women were clearly viewed as “temporary members or future deserters of their natal families and stranger-intruders in their new husbands’ families” and were caught in a cycle that would prove to be very difficult to break (Johnson 9).

A great deal of long-standing scholarship articulates women in China as having been violently oppressed and abused with no hope for a decent life. According to Chen Hongmou, an eighteenth century scholar and official, women were not allowed to socialize, even with other women, and were expected to hide their hair and faces in public to prevent themselves from being observed. Their “proper ritual place” was being “sequestered in the inner apartments” (Chen). When Shen Fu’s father speaks to him about Yun’s behavior he says, “If you have any shame at all, you will recognize *your* errors” [emphasis mine] showing that Yun’s actions were Shen Fu’s responsibility (Shen 75). Yun, though she enjoyed a special situation in life, understood that this was the expected place of a woman and cleverly used this to her advantage when she cried saying, “I may have been wrong...but father should forgive the ignorance of a woman” (Shen 75).

Not only were women demoralized by their circumstances, they were often times physically disabled because of it. The ancient and brutal tradition of footbinding was clearly a “physical manifestation of the restrictions placed on women’s lives and of women’s subordination to men” and underscored women’s role as “goods for exchange” (Johnson 16). Women of all classes in China were crippled by footbinding and immobilized for their entire lives because men in the Tang Dynasty found abnormally small feet erotic (Johnson 16). This sadistic practice continued for over a thousand years because of a desire among the lower class to emulate the elite and because of the tradition and

expectation it became for all but a few (in this case) fortunate farming women. While footbinding was invented for its aesthetic qualities, it had an important side-effect: total physical control over women by men. “Feet are bound not to make them beautiful as a curved bow, but to restrain women when they go outdoors.” (Lang, qtd. in Johnson 16)

One reason this cycle of ill-treatment was perpetuated so long was the concept of the uterine family, that is, the connection a woman had with her children, particularly her sons. Though young women may have been idealistic and had thoughts of changing society when they were older, they became jaded by time and circumstance and when they assumed power as a mother-in-law, they sacrificed their ideals for the only family they could hold on to, the only family they belonged to and belonged to them: their sons. Johnson, a contemporary historian, states, “Women’s strategies directly and indirectly reinforced the traditional Confucian family system...through their actions to resist passivity and total male control, [women] became participants with vested interests in the system that oppressed them.” (Johnson 21) Many traditional Chinese folktales depicted the archetypal cruel and manipulative mother-in-law, a true reflection on society. (Johnson 21) Women, who suffered their entire lives oppressed in a loveless relationship, often made sure they chose wives for their sons that they could easily demean and control. By doing this, they ensured their sons’ full love and loyalty. Ideal wives were submissive and diligent. Often women “adopted” girls at a young age (or traded their own daughters) as to raise them to their liking, thus creating the “perfect wives” for their sons. Also beneficial to lonely mothers, betrothed children who were raised in the same household often regarded one another as siblings which greatly reduced the romantic feelings between them. (Johnson 19) Yun, however, did not have an interest in protecting her uterine family because of her rare and loving relationship with her husband and her unusual acumen.

Though women were indeed oppressed and victimized, the view Chen and other scholars portray is oversimplified and outmoded. According to contemporary scholars, women exercised more power than they were intended to have and had considerable influence over the course of their own lives. As Johnson states, “Studies of women’s behavior in male-dominated family systems indicate that women are rarely as passive as norms dictate. Rather, women often actively attempt in patterned ways to influence their own lives and others even as they overtly accept the broad restrictions on formal rights and authority imposed on them by the system.” (Johnson 17) The view of women as helpless victims undeniably had merit but was too static to illuminate the actual lives of Chinese women. For example, Confucian norms indicated that when a woman’s husband died she was to remain faithful to him and his family for the remainder of her life. In practice, however, it was not uncommon for widows to remarry, especially among the lower classes. Nevertheless, this was a decision to be made by her parents-in-law. When a woman did remarry, her children remained, by both law and custom, the property of her first husband’s parents (Johnson 14).

The relationship between Shen Fu and his wife Yun seems to be an anomaly in its power; but even today love like theirs is rare and cherished. Still, the dynamic of their relationship exemplifies that of many couples who had a bond that extended beyond law and custom. Shen Fu said to Yun, “It’s a pity that you are a woman and have to remain hidden away at home. If only you could become a man we could visit famous mountains and search out magnificent ruins. We could travel the whole world together. Wouldn’t that be wonderful?” (Shen 40) Though Yun had to stay in the house according to custom, Shen Fu often took her out and even dressed her up as a man on one occasion. He also encouraged her to spend time with her female friends and praised her intelligence and talent. Shen remarked, “When we were first married Yun was very quiet, and enjoyed listening to me discuss things. But I drew her out, as a man will use a blade of grass to encourage a cricket to chirp, and she gradually

became able to express herself..." (Shen 38) In many ways, Shen Fu and Yun were ahead of their time. Though they lived in the eighteenth century, they behaved like a modern twentieth century couple. This was particularly evident in the way they regarded one another as equals. They "lived together with the greatest mutual respect," (Shen 33) illustrating the slogan "women can hold half the sky" that was popular in 1949 during the foundation of the People's Republic of China, when equality of men and women began to be accepted (Wei 11).

However, stating that women usually enjoyed certain freedoms is also an overgeneralization. It must be understood that the quality of life for women in China varied immensely. Shen Fu and Yun were unique. After they were married they became progressively more comfortable with each other and ceased hiding their affection; "Neither of us thought about this and it seemed quite natural...the strangest thing to me then was how old couples seemed to treat one another like enemies. I did not understand why. Yet people said, 'Otherwise, how could they grow old together?' Could this be true, I wondered?" (Shen 33) Shen Fu and Yun did not grow old together; this was perhaps attributed to their unusual devotion to each other and the warning of the old couples. Depending on a woman's class, location, personality and primarily her husband, her life could be one of isolation and abuse, or, like Yun, she could enjoy seeing the world, have friends, a loving family and enjoy art and poetry. Before her premature death, Yun told Shen Fu, "I have been happy as your wife these twenty-three years. You have loved me and sympathized with me in everything, and never rejected me despite my faults. Having had for my husband an intimate friend like you, I have no regrets over this life...in the midst of this life, I have been just like an Immortal." (Shen 87-88) Though the freedom Yun enjoyed in her life was exceptional, her story, in addition to Johnson and Wei's research, indicates that many women in eighteenth and nineteenth century China had similar experiences to differing degrees.

## References

- Johnson, Kay Ann. 1983. Women, the Family and Peasant Revolution in China. The University of Chicago Press: Chicago and London.
- Shen, Fu. 1983. Six Records of a Floating Life. Translated by Leonard Pratt and Chiang Su-hui. Penguin Books: England.
- Wei, Zhangling. 1989. Status of Women: China. Bangkok: UNESCO.

## Bio:

Lydia is a sophomore history major concentrating on American history, but is particularly interested in Asian history and anthropology. This paper was written in the spring of 2005 for HST 321: Modern China, under Professor Gang Zhao, whom she credits with the idea of this topic.

## The Price-Current of Human Flesh: American Slavery, The Female Body, and Capitalism

Rachel Moran

Understanding the commodification of the Black body –especially the Black female Body – has only been a prominent academic project for the past couple decades.<sup>1</sup> The history of the interplay between the Black female body and capitalism is a story that stretches back much further; to the roots of American agrarian capitalism and the slave women that were both exploited for their labors and exploited by the product of their labor which allowed capitalism to solidify as the mode of production.

This exploitation was not only raced, but also gendered: the bodies of women bound by slavery work as physical sites of excavation that have been used *against* Black women both historically and contemporarily. For example, Bell Hooks traces the contemporary Black American female understandings of cleanliness and modesty to the auction block.<sup>i</sup> Deborah Gray White connects the hypersexualized “Jezebel” characterization of Black women in slavery with the struggle of contemporary Black women to be recognized beyond stereotypes of promiscuity, and then further destroys the characterization by tracing its roots back to the shabby clothing worn by female field slaves and the white male association between nakedness and sexual availability.<sup>ii</sup> Claire Robertson takes note of the ownership of the female slave body, as well as its reproductive capacity, and considers briefly how a re-understanding of enslaved African women could have “contemporary implications for welfare policy.”<sup>iii</sup>

Given the interconnectedness of body politics, social politics, and economic politics, it only makes sense to address them all together. The meeting of slavery and capitalism created, then, two women’s “bodies” worth unpacking<sup>2</sup>: the (re)productive body and the fetishized body.

### The (Re)Productive Body

The labor of reproduction under slavery was complicated, in part because of the question of whom the labor was for. Contemporary Western understandings of reproduction centers in the individual female body, and the rhetoric of reproduction accentuates this situation: *choice*, *birth control*, *family planning*. Under agrarian capitalism, however, the labor of reproduction was viewed more literally as the production of labor. In New England, prior to industrialization, subsistence farming was a family-centered practice. The more children a family had, the more labor they had.

iv

---

<sup>1</sup> This is attributable to both racism within Feminist studies and sexism within Black studies. Additionally, the “body” has become an important theme through poststructuralist Feminism and queer studies, with titles like *Bodies That Matter*, *The Lesbian Body*, and *Revolting Bodies*. Contemporary race scholars have taken on gender through the body lens (which becomes tempting, if not crucial, when starting with the understanding that gender and race are constructs and should be treated as such), E. Frances White’s *Dark Continent of Our Bodies* and Dorothy Robert’s *Killing the Black Body: Race, Reproduction and the Meaning of Liberty*.

<sup>2</sup> The two bodies I outline are not in anyway intended as an inclusive understanding of slavewomen’s plight. The body framework is not mutually exclusive, and does not pit certain types against others. The reproductive body can become the fetishized body. For example, it is in the language and lens used by both primary and secondary researchers, and in the history itself. This is also not intended as a reproduction of Deborah Gray White’s Jezebel and Mammy, and I was originally working with three “bodies” – the third the “victimized body” (specifically subjected to violence), but the victimized body collapsed itself easily into the fetishized body. The emphasis on bodies is not intended to further dehumanize, but instead to understand the desires, demands and costs carved into these women’s bodies.

In the southern United States, small family farms gave way to large capitalist plantations, marginalizing – though inarguably to very different degrees – both white small farmers and enslaved Blacks. Comparing southern plantation-capitalism with budding northern industrialism, one economic historian claims both institutions were based on class division, but the power of southern slaveholders who “formed the core of southern agricultural societies” was unparalleled.<sup>v</sup> Eric Williams, in fact, argues that attempts at understanding Black slavery through anything other than “the creation of an inferior social and economic organization of exploiters and exploited” is to deny a “fundamental fact.”<sup>vi</sup> A *New York Times* article on the 1861 census unintentionally emphasizes the links between enslaved (re)productive labor and free (re)productive labor by reporting that “Virginia retains her old preeminence as the breeder of slaves for market, in which noble occupation she is apparently closely followed by South Carolina,”<sup>3</sup> and yet “among the *free colored* population the increase is very small.”<sup>vii</sup> While the census puts people into statistical bodies *intentionally*, the link between production and slavery can be gleaned from the given data. For enslaved African women, (re)production was demanded and rewarded (with some respite). For quasi-free Africans in America, especially as agrarian southern capitalism met the birth of northern industrial capitalism, children transformed into economic burdens.

Given, then, that slavery was an economic system that thrived with debt to its inequities, the laborers drafted into the institution had to be drafted through force and precedent. Plantation-capitalist Thomas Jefferson wrote in 1819, that “I consider the *labor of a breeding woman* as no object, and that a child raised every 2 years is of more profit than the crop of the best laboring man” (emphasis added).<sup>viii</sup> The gendering and racing of labor is specifically played out with the construction of this new “creature” – the breeding woman. While a contemporary white feminist might jump at Jefferson’s acknowledgement that pregnancy and childbearing is indeed labor, and as such is valuable, this would be shortsighted. Slavewomen were not any more humanized in the slaveholder’s perspective through reproduction. Instead their labor was treated entirely as labor, their children’s bodies weighed against cotton and tobacco.

The economic role of reproducing women was further confused for slave owners who wanted to accommodate mothers and ensure the health of infants through allowing breastfeeding. While plantation-capitalists wanted to keep their future profit healthy, this came at the cost of immediate field help. In some cases, owners compromised by allowing infants to accompany their enslaved mothers through domestic or field work, theoretically getting the best of both bodies (the mother, who is located here almost exclusively as the maternal breast, as well as the owned-infant’s body).<sup>ix</sup> Besides the long-term economic benefits to be found in preserving some extent of infant-health, Marie Jenkins Schwartz also points out that taking these steps “enabled owners to think of themselves as humane and enlightened managers, or even paternal figures, rather than as the cruel and despotic creatures that inhabited the pages of abolitionist tracts.”<sup>x</sup>

Plantation records that directly relate (re)production to production list the cotton-picking rates of enslaved women as they correspond to childbirth. The average woman picked 73.2 pounds of cotton 9-12 weeks before giving birth, 67 pounds of cotton 1 to 4 weeks before giving birth, and 31.3 pounds of cotton the week in which she gave birth.<sup>xi</sup> Two to three weeks after giving birth, the pounds picked were decreased to an average of 8.6 pounds per day, but by 8 to 11 weeks after the women were picking an average of 80.6 pounds of cotton a day, more than they were picking three months before giving

---

<sup>3</sup> The tone and language (i.e. “noble”) is sarcastic here, the piece goes on the talk of this “disgusting traffic.” The language of the feminized Virginia as a “breeder,” however, is less laughable.

birth.<sup>xii</sup> Compare this with the modern maternity leave in Great Britain, of 26 weeks.<sup>4</sup> Even more telling than the numbers themselves, are the existence of the data: for productivity to have been recorded in terms of childbirth it must have been without qualms that plantation-capitalists understood the bodies of enslaved women as chartable reproductive units.

The most extreme interference between slave owners and reproduction provide the most extreme examples of the (re)productive body archetype. A physician of the time insisted that enslaved infants should be fed only molasses and oil for their first ten days of life to provide safety from various diseases. During this time, the lactating mother's milk was "to be drawn off" by the nurse, the midwife, another and older child, or by a puppy."<sup>xiii</sup> The extreme animalization of the Black female body – the inconceivable demand that she nurse a puppy as if it were her child, for the profit of the plantation-capitalist – exemplifies this linkage of body, profit, race and gender.<sup>5</sup> Not only was it assumed the white male physician could better care for children than their mothers, it was also implicit that disease and harm came to infants through the Black female body (as opposed to the institution of slavery).

The commodification of enslaved women's bodies for (re)productive purposes also showed in the ways these "bodies" were marketed. An 1856 magazine article explained that "every man is worth not merely what he can do in the course of his life, but what he can fetch on any one day of his life, at an auction."<sup>xiv</sup> Were the piece to take gender into account, it might go on to discuss how this "worth" at auction could be determined not only by strength at field or domestic labor but also through the reproductive body of the enslaved woman in question. One twenty-year-old woman for whom a type of classified advertisement was placed in the *Charleston Mercury* was distinguished as being "very prolific in her generating qualities... [she] affords a rare opportunity to any person who wishes to raise a family of strong and healthy servants for their own use."<sup>xv</sup> The human qualities of the woman are eliminated; even the human potential in *childbearing* is transformed into the capitalist (re)production construction of "generating qualities."<sup>xvi</sup> The individualism and sexualized ownership implicit in "for their own use" is also telling of how the body is framed through slavery.

As *The Colored American*, which reprinted the advertisement for critique, comments: "the heiresses of southern plantations, making calculations upon the increase of their 'live stock' of human beings, with the same cool and self-satisfied *non chalance* with which a northern farmer speaks of the increase of his pigs and poultry!"<sup>xvii</sup> An advertisement several years later, in *The Georgia Constitutionalist* for "Five Negroes, 3 Women, 1 Fellow, and one small child," is followed with commentary that "the value of this property will depend [on] whether the woman be young and *likely*" (emphasis in original).<sup>xviii</sup> An advertisement in the intriguingly titled *Mississippi Free Trader* answers this question of reproductive "likeliness" upfront, hawking "A likely negro woman, acclimated."<sup>xix</sup> The evidence of (re)production serving as selling points of enslaved Black women are numerous and telling.

---

<sup>4</sup> From [www.dti.gov.uk/er/matleafr.htm](http://www.dti.gov.uk/er/matleafr.htm). Paid maternity leave in the contemporary United States is more tricky and dramatically less; while all women are technically allowed 12-paid weeks of leave before or after birth, these rights are dependent on the size of the corporation (smaller and decentralized businesses aren't held to this), the length of time of employment, the number of sick-days and vacation taken, and the work being full-time. I choose the UK's statistics here because of their *comparatively* socialist welfare state and because of the links that highlights between gender, race and capitalist-exploitation.

<sup>5</sup> It is noteworthy that Schwartz goes on to say the slave women subjected to this "health plan" quietly rebelled, and somehow breastfed their infants. One wonders if there isn't another contemporary connection to be made between the Black female body and profit in the distribution of unapproved and undesired birth control mechanisms to the most impoverished women in the country.

At the same time, the sale of enslaved Africans “so disrupted the peace and efficiency of the slave workforce” that some slaves were sold as family units, perhaps as in the case above.<sup>xx</sup> One historian cites evidence that proves the selling of family units, like other (re)productive questions around slavery, was less about the humanity of slave-holders or even their recognition of humanity in their enslaved, but instead about profit. She quotes the advice that “when you buy several small parcels & throw them all together among strangers they don’t assimilate.”<sup>xxi</sup> These “parcels,” of course, are humans.

### The Fetishized Body

Related to the use of the enslaved female body for (re)production is the use of the enslaved female body for sexual abuse: the fetishized body.

A starting consideration is the story of slave master Ellen Borden who sought revenge for the infidelity of her husband by assaulting and murdering the slave he raped.<sup>6</sup> The abuse of someone within her control, given the power dynamics between Borden and her husband, is both despicable and understandable. What is important here is the portrayal of the violence inflicted onto the unnamed female slave, the ways in which it is centered in the physical, and the sexual. The report of the woman’s death follows:

She was first tied and whipped, then boiling water was poured over the abdomen and legs until the skin was scalded off and the fatty tissue cooked, leaving her muscles bare; she was then taken into a smoke house and locked up, and probably on the next day the remaining injuries were inflicted which put an end to her misery. The last injuries were the hanging of the Negro by a rope attached to a joist in the smokehouse and a severe blow on the temple with some sharp pointed instrument which pierce the skull.<sup>xxii</sup>

The extreme details given not only report the murder, but also situate it firmly in the visceral. Another report, referring to the mistress this time as Mrs. Baolton, but which seems to be of the same incident: “It appears that Mrs. B., exasperated by jealousy, whipped the woman, who belonged to her husband, scalded her, knocked her in the head with a spade, and finally hung her.”<sup>xxiii</sup> In either description, sexual revenge is not merely taken on by the body, it engulfs the body.

Moving away from direct sexualized violence, momentarily, we are left with the institution which bred it. The ways in which slavery, which by definition was an institution of using humans as uncompensated labor, has fetishized<sup>7</sup> the slave woman’s body are demonstrative of the dangerous intersection of economics and social hierarchies.

The “Fancy Trade,” where lighter-skinned slaves were sold to white plantation-capitalists specifically for sex is an example of the Fetishized Body.<sup>xxiv</sup> “Fancy,” apparently a popular adjective for clothing and cloth at the time (one 1850 advertisement from *The National Era* lists fancy cassimeres,

---

<sup>6</sup> I am not trying to diminish the agency of enslaved African women by suggesting consensual sex with a master is impossible. Instead, it is a question of power, and whether consensual sex can occur in situations with such imbalanced power dynamics. I believe that it cannot.

<sup>7</sup> Throughout this section on the fetishized body I am playing with both sexual and asexual definitions of fetish. One of the more interesting and least vernacular definitions of fetishism is “an object that is believed to have magical or spiritual powers” (www.dictionary.com). This sort of fetish is interesting, especially when analyzing the fetish of white slave holding women (maintaining, perhaps problematically, a heterosexual framework) with regards to their / their husband’s slaves. The obsession, say in the case of Ellen Borden, must be considered not only for rage at her husband, but also a fear of perceived power in the unknown.

fancy-figured alpacas, mohair in fancy colors and fancy gingham),<sup>xxv</sup> is even more dangerous then. Signifying both desire and commodity, the situation White retells of a slave keeper selling “a handsome woman” for fifteen hundred dollars reminds how intensely intertwined capital and human sexuality are.<sup>xxvi</sup>

Maintaining order on plantations when sexual exploitation was part of daily life required an adjustment to the ways in which family was constructed. While changes in the mode of production (family farming to large scale agrarian capitalism) occur at the expense of traditional family structures<sup>8</sup> on plantations, historians have argued that the sexual exploitation of enslaved women that was claimed paternalistic was actually so only in the extent to which it was incestuous. “It becomes clear,” Carolyn J. Powell writes, “that the supposedly paternalistic, and in reality, dominant position of the slave master over the slave woman has always been in large part a sexual one. Moreover, paternalism...grew out of the necessity to discipline and morally justify a system of exploitation.”<sup>xxvii</sup> To unpack this analysis: the paternalistic attitudes of slave masters existed only to make atones, emotionally, for the slave holders. Here, too, the bodies of enslaved women become objects – what Powell says has always been sexual (as power and dominance can be tied up with sexual power and dominance, as the contemporary S/M community illustrates) has been portrayed as fatherly and nurturing only to the extent to which the female slave’s body alleviates the moral burden of human ownership.

Since White cites New Orleans as the hub of the “fancy trade,” an 1854 article in a New Orleans newspaper writes, “...it is a lamentable truth, that men occupying high and responsible positions are obnoxious to the charge of living in open concubine with slaves and free persons.”<sup>xxviii</sup> What is interesting here, however, goes beyond the sexualizing of Black women (enslaved and quasi-free) and into a critique of “amalgamation,” or interracial sexual relations. The New Orleans narrator is not concerned for the concubines but for “the present tone of public morals.”<sup>xxix</sup> More to the point, within the fetishized body produced by the “fancy trade” and related concubinage, is the fetishization of skin.

What constituted this “handsome” or light-skinned body? White specifies that the “fancy trade” was the sale of “light-skinned black women.”<sup>xxx</sup> The rape of Black women, both abhorred and expected in American society of the 19<sup>th</sup> century,<sup>9</sup> was heavily tied into a fetishization of skin pigment. The New York Evening Post reported in 1838 that:

...on the day previous to the mob, a colored man (very light) as seen walking arm and arm with two colored women, (much darker than himself) and some young men immediately exclaimed, “amalgamation and generation,” and it was with difficulty that these respectable persons escaped without injury. When the “gentlemen” were informed that the mulatto was brother to the colored women who were walking with him, they appeared to be much mortified.<sup>xxxi</sup>

The article was clearly intended to embarrass the racist citizen, both the “gentlemen” of the anecdote, and the readers who could identify that judgment in themselves. However, the emphasis on skin color within the anecdote negated this purpose. By giving the attention given in the parentheticals, female color is fetishized and the history of rape in slavery (the “mulatto” brother) is shown as less

---

<sup>8</sup> This was because families that were once independent now struggled against large plantations, and had to either send members outside of the family productive system to make money, or had to struggle in relative-poverty. This is not to excuse poor planters, however, who despite their own plights often still *aspired* to be slave owners.

<sup>9</sup> And perhaps the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

prominent than the history of fetishizing the Black female body as sexually available – even in the North.

Another incidence of this is a poem published in the abolitionist paper *The Liberator* by white English writer Jane Ashby. Her call to end Southern slavery is focused not on the evils of slavery, but on the sexuality enslaved women.

White matrons of the Southern States, who tremble at your frown?  
 Your husbands' darker concubines! Is that your marriage crown?  
 To live among each wretched ones, of sanctity deprives  
 The tie that binds in wedlock Southern husbands and their wives.<sup>xxxii</sup>

Ashby's plea emphasizes the sexuality of enslaved Africans, whether consensual or not, to the extent that any slave woman might be one of these "darker concubines." The wretched are not the husbands, but the women destroying marriage and therefore proper Christian femininity. White women were clearly as guilty of fetishizing the enslaved African women, disembodimenting their reality and then focusing on their bodies. Given the mentality cultivated, it is almost understandable how a woman like Ellen Borden could transfer her marital angst onto the flesh of one of their enslaved women.

As the poem goes on, it attempts to move towards liberating enslaved women (Black men, as they apparently were no sexual challenge, were not problematic.), but does so only in a fashion that aggrandizes the white woman and reinforces savior-victim narratives. "Does that careless mother, who at slavery connives, / Rear her daughters but for harem-chiefs, not pure and holy wives?"<sup>xxxiii</sup> An implicit contrast between pure white womanhood and the "othered" Black womanhood is evident. Another article, this one after the technical abolition of slavery, reiterates this "moral" argument, claiming Black women's morality is "necessary because the system of concubine under slavery had taken deep root in the social structure of the South."<sup>xxxiv</sup> In a sense, the entire white-perceived immorality of a race is positioned on the Black women's bodies, and therefore atonement is placed on these bodies as well.

To return, however, to the specific fetishization of the skin, is the case of a Mr. Simms, a Georgian runaway slave. What is relevant about his story is that it was his wife – "handsome and nearly white" – who apparently gave Simms escape plan away to the White man for whom she was a sexual concubine.<sup>xxxv</sup> The fetishization of her light skin in an article where it is apparently irrelevant (the lengthy piece makes no other references to pigments), and even the definition of its color not as light but as "nearly white," suggesting black draws attention to the woman's body. Sexualized as concubine, skin near-white, she is portrayed as a "race traitor." Without details outside of her fetishized body, it is difficult to draw any other conclusion.

The relationship between enslaved African women and the profits made off of them is a relationship inscribed onto the body. Enslaved Black women, when imagined as child bearers and concubines, and when understood by their skin shade, uterus, and breasts, in addition to the "masculine" physical labor expected from their bodies, became not only the object, but also the unhuman.

---

---

Notes

<sup>i</sup> Zillah Eisenstein, *Against Empire: Feminisms, Racism and the West*, Zed Books, 2004.

<sup>ii</sup> Deborah Gray White, *Ar'n't I a Woman? Female Slaves In the Plantation South*, W.W. Norton & Company: New York, 1999, 27-28.

<sup>iii</sup> Claire Robertson, "Africa Into the Americas?: Slavery, Women, the Family, and the Gender Division of Labor," in *Black Women and Slavery in the Americas: More Than Chattel*," Ed. David Barry Gaspar & Darlene Clark Hine, Indiana University Press: Bloomington, 1996, 9.

<sup>iv</sup> D'Emillio "Capitalism and Gay Identity."

<sup>v</sup> Joseph P. Reidy, *From Slavery to Agrarian Capitalism in the Cotton Plantation South: Central Georgia, 1800-1880*, The University of North Carolina Press: Chapel Hill, 1992, 6-7.

<sup>vi</sup> R. Guerra, *Azucar y Población en Las Antillas*, 1935, quoted in Eric Williams, *Capitalism and Slavery*, Russell & Russell: New York, 1961.

<sup>vii</sup> "Facts from the Census," *New York Times*, 27 September 1861, 4:3.

<sup>viii</sup> Jefferson quoted in Wilma King, "Suffer with them Till Death: Slave Women and their Children in Nineteenth-Century America," in *Black Women and Slavery in the Americas: More Than Chattel*," Ed. David Barry Gaspar & Darlene Clark Hine, Indiana University Press: Bloomington, 1996, 147.

<sup>ix</sup> Marie Jenkins Schwartz, "Oh How I Ran: Breastfeeding and Weaning on Plantation and Farm in Antebellum Virginia and Alabama," in *Discovering the Women in Slavery: Emancipating Perspectives on the American Past*, Ed. by Patricia Morton, The University of Georgia Press: Athens, 1996, 243-4.

<sup>x</sup> *ibid.*, 242.

<sup>xi</sup> Table 3: "Daily Cotton-Picking Rates of U.S. Women Slaves before and after Giving Birth," in Richard H. Steckel's "Women, Work, and Health Under Plantation Slavery in the United States," in *Black Women and Slavery in the Americas: More Than Chattel*," Ed. David Barry Gaspar & Darlene Clark Hine, Indiana University Press: Bloomington, 1996, 51.

<sup>xii</sup> *ibid.*, 51.

<sup>xiii</sup> *ibid.*, 246.

<sup>xiv</sup> Frederic Law Olmsted, "A Journey in the Seaboard Slave States; with remarks on their Economy," *The Living Age*, New York, 20 September 1856, 734.

<sup>xv</sup> E.J., *The Charleston Mercury*, 16 May 1838, reprinted in *The Colored American*, New York, 11 August 1838.

<sup>xvi</sup> *ibid.*

<sup>xvii</sup> "Most Detestable," *The Colored American*, New York, 11 August 1838.

<sup>xviii</sup> "Slavery As It Is," *The Colored American*, New York, 12 June 1841.

<sup>xix</sup> *The Mississippi Free Trader*, qtd. In *Frederick Douglass' Paper*, Rochester, 5 November 1852.

<sup>xx</sup> Leslie A. Schwalm, *A Hard Fight For We: Women's Transition from Slavery to Freedom in South Carolina*, University of Illinois: Urbana, 1997, 56.

<sup>xxi</sup> *ibid.*, 56.

<sup>xxii</sup> "Shocking Cruelty to a Negro: Inhuman Conduct of A Woman," *Frederick Douglass' Paper*, Rochester, 12 October 1955.

<sup>xxiii</sup> "A negro woman was killed," *Provincial Freeman*, Chatham, Canada West, 3 November 1855.

<sup>xxiv</sup> White, 37.

<sup>xxv</sup> "Fall and Winter Goods," *The National Era*, Washington D.C., 8 August 1850, 127.

<sup>xxvi</sup> White, 37.

<sup>xxvii</sup> Carolyn J. Powell, "In Remembrance of Mira: Reflections on the Death of a Slave Woman," in *Discovering the Women in Slavery: Emancipating Perspectives on the American Past*, Ed. by Patricia Morton, The University of Georgia Press: Athens, 1996, 55.

<sup>xxviii</sup> *Commonwealth*, reprinted in *Frederick Douglass' Paper*, Rochester: 24 March 1854.

<sup>xxix</sup> *ibid.*

<sup>xxx</sup> White, 37.

<sup>xxxi</sup> "Amalgamation – A Philadelphia Anecdote," *N.Y. Evening Post*, reprinted in *The Colored American*, New York, 14 July 1838.

<sup>xxxii</sup> "An English Woman's View of Slavery," *The Liberator*, reprinted in the *Provincial Freeman*, Chatham, 5 January 1856.

<sup>xxxiii</sup> *ibid.*

<sup>xxxiv</sup> Bishop R. H. Cain, "The Progressive Movements of the A.M.E. Church in the South," *The Christian Recorder*, Philadelphia, 12 August 1880.

<sup>xxxv</sup> Theodore Parker, "The Like and the Different," *Frederick Douglass' Paper*, Rochester, 8 April 1852.

## References

- “Amalgamation – A Philadelphia Anecdote.” *N.Y. Evening Post*. in *The Colored American*. New York, 14 July 1838.
- “A negro woman was killed.” *Provincial Freeman*. Chatham, 3 November 1855.
- “An English Woman’s View of Slavery.” *The Liberator*. in the *Provincial Freeman*. Chatham, 5 January 1856.
- Cain, Bishop R. H. “The Progressive Movements of the A.M.E. Church in the South.” *The Christian Recorder*. Philadelphia, 12 August 1880.
- Commonwealth*. reprinted in *Frederick Douglass’ Paper*. Rochester, 24 March 1854.
- “Daily Cotton-Picking Rates of U.S. Women Slaves before and after Giving Birth.” Richard H. Steckel. “Women, Work, and Health Under Plantation Slavery in the United States.” *Black Women and Slavery in the Americas: More Than Chattel*.” Eds. David Barry Gaspar & Darlene Clark Hine. Indiana University Press: Bloomington, 1996.
- Eisenstein, Zillah, *Against Empire: Feminisms, Racism and the West*. Zed Books, 2004...
- D’Emillio, John, “Capitalism and Gay Identity,” 1993.
- “Facts From the Census.” *New York Times* 27 September 1861.
- “Fall and Winter Goods.” *The National Era*. Washington D.C., 8 August 1850.
- J. E. *The Charleston Mercury*. 16 May 1838, reprinted in *The Colored American*. New York, 11 August 1838.
- King, Wilma. “Suffer with them Till Death: Slave Women and their Children in Nineteenth-Century America.” *Black Women and Slavery in the Americas: More Than Chattel*.” Eds. David Barry Gaspar & Darlene Clark Hine. Indiana University Press: Bloomington, 1996.
- The Mississippi Free Trader*. qtd. In *Frederick Douglass’ Paper*. Rochester, 5 November 1852.
- “Most Detestable.” *The Colored American*. New York, 11 August 1838.
- Olmsted, Frederic Law. “A Journey in the Seaboard Slave States; with remarks on their Economy.” *The Living Age*. New York, 20 September 1856, 734.
- Parker, Theodore. “The Like and the Different.” *Frederick Douglass’ Paper*. Rochester, 8 April 1852.
- Powell, Carolyn J. “In Remembrance of Mira: Reflections on the Death of a Slave Woman.” *Discovering the Women in Slavery: Emancipating Perspectives on the American Past*, Ed. Patricia Morton, The University of Georgia Press: Athens, 1996.
- Reidy, Joseph P. *From Slavery to Agrarian Capitalism in the Cotton Plantation South: Central Georgia, 1800-1880*. The University of North Carolina Press: Chapel Hill, 1992.
- Robertson, Claire. “Africa Into the Americas?: Slavery, Women, the Family, and the Gender Division of Labor.” *Black Women and Slavery in the Americas: More Than Chattel*.” Eds. David Barry Gaspar & Darlene Clark Hine. Indiana University Press: Bloomington, 1996.
- Schwalm, Leslie A. *A Hard Fight For We: Women’s Transition from Slavery to Freedom in South Carolina*., University of Illinois: Urbana, 1997.
- Schwartz, Marie Jenkins. “Oh How I Ran: Breastfeeding and Weaning on Plantation and Farm in Antebellum Virginia and Alabama.” *Discovering the Women in Slavery: Emancipating Perspectives on the American Past*. Ed. Patricia Morton. The University of Georgia Press: Athens, 1996.
- “Shocking Cruelty to a Negro: Inhuman Conduct of A Woman.” *Frederick Douglass’ Paper*. Rochester, 12 October 1855.
- “Slavery As It Is.” *The Colored American*. New York, 12 June 1841.
- Williams, Eric. *Capitalism and Slavery*. Russell & Russell: New York, 1961.
- White, Deborah Gray. *Ar’n’t I a Woman? Female Slaves In the Plantation South*. W.W. Norton & Company: New York, 1999.

## **The Justification of Crusade: Constantinople, the Baltic States, and Southern France**

Matthew P Jacobs

The scope of what a crusade is has changed and been challenged in the examination of the first crusade through the Albigensian Crusade. We have been motivated to examine the ideals and attitudes that have provoked the actions of crusading armies over a nearly two century long quest to spread Christianity. Names and dates are useful for constructing a time line of events important to understanding the ebb and flow of territorial loss and gain. However, they do not shed light on the human thought process that ultimately inspired men to take the cross and spread the word of Christianity.

The attitudes and beliefs of the crusaders are often conflicting with those inhabitants of lands containing potential Christians and serve as a catalyst for military action and occupation of foreign lands. After all, the ideal of crusade is based on Christian principles and ultimately to assist the inhabitants, whether they are open to Christianity or violently resistant.

Conversion to Christianity is not always the goal as we have seen in battles among Greeks and crusaders at Constantinople (1203-1205). Monetary necessity was a focal point in laying siege to Constantinople, although the attack was launched under a slightly different guise, as will be discussed later, which seemed to justify the crusader's actions against fellow Christians. How was this justification reached? Launched in 1147, the Baltic Crusade appeared to be a crusade undertaken with the best of Christian intentions in mind, namely, to convert the inhabitants of Eastern Europe. What made Christians think they had the right to strike out on such an endeavor?

The Albigensian Crusade (1209-1229) provided a unique challenge to the church. Christians were faced with an alternative faith that was not outwardly lacking in virtue and temperance. Nonetheless, the Cathar religion represented a threat to Christianity in southern France and, as a result, a crusade was launched to "take back" these lands in the name of God. The trick was convincing others that this was a just and necessary crusade. This was done with a degree of patience and diligence not yet experienced in previous crusades. How were these crusaders able to construct their argument for military action in southern France?

The aforementioned crusades will be analyzed using sources by Geoffroy Villehardouin, Henry of Livonia, and William of Puylaurens. At the conclusion of this analysis we will gain further understanding for how the Christian crusaders were able to legitimize their military action based on their perception and attitude toward their respective enemies.

### *War with the Greeks*

The war with the Greeks, which involved the siege at Constantinople, was a bizarre chapter in the history of the crusades. Since the Greeks were already Christian it would be difficult to make a case for this foray into the emperors' city as a Christian endeavor. To make the case for war, the Franks were able to turn the war with the Greeks into a religious issue.

The Franks did this by applying religious importance to monetary issues which enabled the crusaders to view the Greeks as violators of the Christian faith. Additionally, the crusaders were able to

legitimize deposing Murzuphlus by mandate of the Pope, once again showing that the crusaders thought themselves better than the Greeks in a religious sense and prompted them to act accordingly.

The crusaders were in dire need of resources. We know this because of the fiscal debacle in Venice that forced the crusaders to concede to sacking Zara (Villehardouin 43). The crusaders, many of whom had decided to take alternate routes, were unable to meet the terms of their agreement with the Venetians who were providing transport and resources. Furthermore, the crusaders grossly overestimated the number of ships and supplies required, even including those who traveled different routes, which further inflated the already lofty debt per man. They wished to go to Syria but with no way to finance a journey by sea, and a land route that was seemingly impossible to safely traverse, there was intense pressure to procure resources. This led to the encounter with young Alexius IV who promised the crusaders a substantial payday if they could place him on the throne of Constantinople as emperor: 220,000 silver marks, provisions, 10,000 men to fight, and 500 knights to serve overseas.

At this point, the crusaders devised a strategy to rationalize action against the Greeks. After all, they would be attacking a Christian city and Innocent III required a good reason to permit such an undertaking. So the argument was constructed by Conon de Bethune, a knight and poet, that attacking Constantinople was just, because in his words “since he (Alexius III) has wrongfully taken possession of this land, in defiance of God, and of right and justice” (63).

The invoking of the name of God is critical in establishing how the crusaders viewed Alexius III. He is showcased as being a violator of the Christian faith and thus deserving of any military action against him. The crusaders are able to turn what, at the outset, looked like the sacking of a friendly Christian city, into a righteous quest to place the true ruler onto the throne of Constantinople. The new leadership would be beneficial to all the Greeks because they would then have the proper Christian leadership.

The Byzantines and the Franks have had their quarrels since the first crusaders marched toward Jerusalem. So, it is reasonable to say that the crusaders may have been looking for a way to attack the Byzantines with the support of the church, whose permission would have been paramount. The crusaders were desperate for money and religious vilification of Alexius III furthered rationale to remove him, and in the process increase the coffers of those who would go to Syria. It would have been unthinkable to leave an impious man on the throne in such a prominent Christian city. By making a case that presented Alexius III as a thief to the throne and “in defiance of God and right”, (64) the crusaders had clearly shown the treachery of this deceitful leader and justified action against him.

Similarly, the crusaders once again invoked religious authority to attack Murzuphlus after he had imprisoned Alexius IV. Upon hearing of his self-ordained emperorship and imprisonment of Alexius IV, Villehardouin exclaims “Have you ever heard of any people guilty of such atrocious treachery” (84). With the subsequent murder of Alexius, a papal mandate is issued proclaiming “anyone guilty of such a murder had no right to hold lands, while those who consented to such a thing were accomplices in the crime; and over and above all this the Greeks as a people had seceded from the Church of Rome” (85).

The Greeks are now directly viewed, with no uncertainty, as defilers of the faith and no longer worthy of being called Christian. Military action was not only justified, but necessary to return the Greek people to the path of Christianity. War was now “just and lawful” (85) and arguably mandatory to uphold the faith.

### *The Baltic Crusade*

The Baltic Crusade was a more “conventional” crusade than the battles with the Greeks. The goal was to convert a pagan region and bring the inhabitants into the arms of the church. The Christians looked at the Balts as a “backward people” and “lesser breeds without the law” (Henry of Livonia 21). This condescending attitude toward the Baltic people actively urged a crusade to help them achieve a better life with Christianity as a focal point.

Henry of Livonia creates a picture of the Baltic people as helpless children that were waiting to be saved. This view of the Balts as being a flock in need of a shepherd is shown in this statement by Henry of Livonia:

“Thus, therefore, this untamed people, overly given to pagan rites, through the summons of Christ was steadily led to the yoke of the Lord and, leaving behind pagan darkness, through faith looked upon the true light, which is Christ” (53).

Not only was the pagan religion portrayed as a “dark” path, but the Balts were compared to stupid animals that must be taken to the appropriate place, lest they slip away into eternal damnation. With this mindset toward the pagans, the Christians could validate their military incursion into a land whose peoples had been largely peaceful toward the west.

This view of superiority is not simply a matter of Christian versus pagan. Even after the Balt’s had been baptized, they were continually seen as inept to rule their own lands. Take, for example, how the crusaders justified taking a fort controlled by baptized Balts:

It seemed to them that the Livonians were unworthy of such a large fort, although they had been baptized, they were nonetheless still rebels and unbelievers. For this reason, they sent Conrad in to take possession of his benefice and left with him certain strong pilgrims ready for war. (52).

We see by this example that the crusaders held a view of superiority over the Balts that did not concentrate strictly on religious difference. Even after the Balts had become Christian they were looked upon as unpredictable savages that must be governed by a superior group. Utilizing this viewpoint of superiority it was easy for the crusaders to exonerate themselves from any wrongdoing because, in their minds, the Baltic people were in need of guidance and any violence and acquisition of property is justifiable.

### *The Albigensian Crusade*

The Albigensian Crusade is perhaps the most complicated of all crusades. The Cathar inhabitants of Toulouse looked like Christians and lived in a similar fashion as other Franks. They were not barbaric or lacking in technological sophistication like the Baltic peoples and they had not done anything outwardly evident to enrage the Christians of Western Europe. Yet, the Cathars practiced a religion that was not Christian and this presented a challenge of authority to the Christian Church, intentional or not, on the part of the Cathars.

The debates at Montreal were of particular importance to the Christians. Here they were able to portray the Cathars as against God, or perhaps even on the side of the devil. Consider the comments

made by Cathar Arnold Oth “who stated that the Roman Church, was neither holy, nor the bride of Christ, but a church of the devil” (Puylauren 26). Notice that Oth is not equating Christianity, as a faith, with the devil but rather the institution of the Catholic Church. Whether or not the statement is contextually accurate, it served to effectively polarize Cathar ideology from that of the Church. Once it became clear, verbally, that the Cathars were not willing to accept Catholicism, Christians could view them as heretics and justly go to war in defense of the faith.

It was important for the Church to paint a picture of God being on the side of the Christians and correspondingly, the devil being allied with the Cathar. The formation of the Grand White Confraternity in 1210 sought to do that. The Confraternity separated the Christians from the Cathars in a battle of good versus evil, or quite literally, white versus black. The Confraternity could be used to create a miasma of fear surrounding Cathar intentions toward Christians, making military action against them acceptable. Consider this excerpt from Puylauren, “The situation developed to the extent that the confraternity in the cite was named ‘White’ and ‘Black’, and the two sides frequently became involved in armed combat” (37). The polarization of the two groups made justifying the slaughtering of heretics, armed or not, acceptable to those involved. Since the crusaders would be acting in the name of God they were encouraged to continue the purge of Catharism.

By analyzing the overthrow of the Byzantine Empire, the Baltic Crusade, and the Albigensian Crusade, it is evident that the attitudes adopted by the crusaders were unique and vital to justifying military action. Perceived religious impiety within the Christian faith, on the part of the Greeks, resulted in the siege and sacking of Constantinople. The crusaders attitude of superiority toward the Baltic people and their view that they, as Christians, were called to guide these helpless pagan people to the salvation of the church became the rallying cry for action in Eastern Europe. The idea that the Cathars were blasphemous heretics prompted Franks from the north to slaughter many innocents when we know that the Cathars were not aggressive toward the Christians.

As different as each of these crusades were, there is one common thread that links all three. None of the groups opposite the Christians was outwardly hostile to the Church prior to each crusade. Thus, we can conclude that the Church had to develop reasoning to shift the mindset of its secular leaders so that they could validate armed conquest in the name of God. The Catholic Church was overwhelmingly successful in using their vast resources to create an advantageous perception of their enemies surrounding each crusade that advanced their cause.

## References

- Joinville, J., & Villehardouin, G. (1963). *Chronicles of the Crusade*. Shaw, M. (Ed.). London: Penguin.
- Lettis, H. (2004). *The Chronicle of Henry of Livonia*. Brundage, J. A. (Ed.). New York: Columbia University Press.
- Mayer, H. E. (1988). *The Crusades*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Puylaurens, W. (2003). *The Chronicle of William of Puylaurens*. Sibley, W. A., & Sibley, M. D. (Eds.). Rochester: Boydell Press.

## Biography

Matthew Jacobs is senior psychology major in the College of Arts & Science. His paper on the justification of crusade was originally produced for History 300, the Crusades, taught by Professor Samantha Kahn Herrick. A member of Psi Chi, the national honor society for undergraduate psychology majors, Matthew is currently conducting a line of independent research with Dr. Barbara Fiese on the predictive and/or causal influence the family exerts on pre-adolescent obesity. Matthew works as a research assistant for The Family Life and Asthma Project at SU. Upon graduating this spring, he hopes to attend graduate school for clinical psychology in the fall of 2006. Matthew has a general interest and enjoyment of ancient and European history that he plans to pursue outside of the classroom upon graduation.

## **Progressivism and Higher Education at the Outbreak of WWI**

Andrew Semuels

The Progressive Era, which began in the last decade of the 19<sup>th</sup> Century, brought about drastic changes to all aspects of American life. The rise in both literacy and life expectancy, along with the emergence of settlement house programs, acute industrial growth, and trade unions, rallied the nation around the progressive cause. The attack of monopolies, exposure of government corruption, new agrarian policy, and significant municipal reforms, brought Americans into an era which was anchored by a newfound sense of liberation and freedom. The areas of science and medicine experienced major breakthroughs with the theories of Sigmund Freud in 1909, while the paintings of Pablo Picasso jolted art into the public eye. In addition, the movement had a distinct impact on all levels of education, and especially institutions for higher learning. New progressive leaders were exercising their expansionist and evolutionary ideals on campuses all over the country as enrollment in higher education swelled. Despite these progressive reforms, all was not well on these college campuses.

The outbreak of WWI in 1914 brought about a bevy of opinions and arguments on campuses all over the country. Differing views on America's role in the war, ranging from pacifism to interventionism, were further compounded by a large contingency of German sympathizers on campus, many of whom were administrative leaders or renowned professors. The role of universities in the war effort, and especially in military preparedness, exposed different ideals of progressivism on college campuses around the nation, and created deep divisions between faculty members and administrative leaders.

Although the most prominent and well documented investigation of the events on college campuses during the war took place at Columbia University under President Nicolas Murray Butler, its example is not universal. As intriguing as the events at Columbia were, which will be covered in the latter part of the paper, it is important to understand that the type of chaotic disturbance caused by the censorship of basic civil rights at Columbia was not widespread throughout the country. Many college campuses faced similar protests as Columbia, yet were able to avoid the type of crisis experienced under President Butler. One such university which displayed a different, yet equally important reaction to the war was Syracuse University, while under the leadership of Chancellor James R. Day. An interesting point however, is the examination of the different methods used by each of the two leaders in an effort to deal with internal conflict. These methods and actions by both Butler and Day can be viewed as reflections of each man's progressive ideals and opinions of the war.

Before we can analyze the turmoil caused by the Great War on these two campuses, we must first establish the details behind each conflict. First, we will examine the seemingly untold story regarding the reactions to WWI at Syracuse University. Sitting atop a hill, overlooking the industrial city of Syracuse in central New York, lay Syracuse University. As the 20<sup>th</sup> Century approached, students on campus showed little interest in foreign affairs. Instead, they turned their attention to the changes brought about by progressive reforms such as the expansion of enrollment and the women's rights movement.

The outbreak of the Spanish American war in 1898 grabbed their attention, as the campus rallied to support the U.S. cause. Signs of interest for the conflict were displayed all over campus. Students printed patriotic editorials in the student newspapers, discussed foreign affairs in history lectures, and

most notably, burned a doll that represented the Spanish General, while Edith Knight sang “Down in Havana”.<sup>1</sup>

In addition, eight known alumni served their country at the front line, and the community took interest in their status and wellbeing. But the fighting was soon over and life on campus returned to normal, focusing on more trivial things such as prom dates and football games. Despite this, in the first few years of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century, guest lecturers on campus spoke on the topics of imperialism, the naval race, the wars in the Balkans, and the idea of human injustice. Thanks to these lectures, the campus remained somewhat focused on European affairs.

When the Great War did finally break out in late July 1914, Chancellor James R. Day addressed the students and voiced his opinion against the war, predicting massive death and destruction. Day expressed his contempt for all forms of war other than self- defense when he said, “No nation should ever be permitted to fight except against the invasion of an unchristian or semi-barbarous cause.”<sup>2</sup> Initially, the students and faculty accepted Day’s pacifism with open arms and following the speech, the campus exploded with opinions about the war.

On October 12, the Cosmopolitan Club held a meeting to discuss the war, which was centered on the presentation and discussion of the “Moral Equivalent of the War”.<sup>3</sup> In other such instances, students went to great efforts to aid the people of Europe by raising money for war-torn nations. For example, students created a Belgium relief fund and the Chaplain offered an address titled, “Socialism, a cure for present war,” which was endorsed by the Syracuse branch of the Intercollegiate Socialist Society.<sup>4</sup>

The faculty became directly involved as well, holding lectures like that of Professor Sperry, who preached that “Germany’s desire to expand was the underlying cause of the war.”<sup>5</sup> Because Day himself was a German sympathizer, this type of accusation could have easily divided the campus. However, instead of choosing a side in the conflict, Day remained strongly against the war, and peace on campus remained.

As the end of 1914 approached and the events taking place in Europe intensified, Day clearly reiterated his opposition to the war. To drive his point home, Day gave a stirring speech at commencement in May 1914, emphasizing the need for upright moral character, as well as the prospect of a new future. Day concluded by advising students to:

Fear war. Avoid it if possible. Welcome it in defense of our land and our citizens in any land if we have no other defense. Be honest, be truthful, be brave. Be more careful about the right thing than the popular thing.<sup>6</sup>

As would be expected, the war remained the main subject on campus the following year. In 1915, differing opinions of the war emerged around campus in editorials and lectures. A faculty member named Dr. Mez was the leading peace advocate, giving a series of three speeches on the need for peace in Europe. Mez, like Day was strongly opposed to military preparedness, stating that, “War is

---

<sup>1</sup> Freeman Galpin, *Syracuse University II; The Growing Years* (New York: Syracuse University Press, 1960), p. 373.

<sup>2</sup> Galpin, *Syracuse University Volume II; The Growing Years*, p. 374.

<sup>3</sup> “European War Discussed by Cosmopolitans”, *Daily Orange*, October 13, 1914.

<sup>4</sup> Galpin, *Syracuse University Volume II; The Growing Years*, p. 375.

<sup>5</sup> “Professor Sperry Gives Lecture on War Situation”, *DO*, November 11, 1914.

<sup>6</sup> Galpin, *Syracuse University Volume II; The Growing Years*, p. 375.

the failing of human wisdom. Just so long as the nations of the world prepare for war, it will exist.”<sup>7</sup> Mez’s lectures prompted many students to join the peace movement, as nearly 800 students packed into the Liberal Arts Chapel to hear him speak. The supporters formed the International Polity Club to channel this sentiment.<sup>8</sup>

Many professors and students also debated the precise cause of the conflict. These theories varied greatly, and numerous opinions about the war, its causes and consequences, spread throughout campus. One theory, as explained by a prominent member of the faculty, Professor Alexander C. Flick, to his European History class, was one which preached that the war was inevitable due to the very essence of Europe:

Over twenty independent governments exist in an equal area in Europe. Each has its own ideas, its own aspiration, its own conception of right and wrong. Their different programs result in a clash of interests which brings on war...The chief result of the war will be the spread of democracy in Europe.<sup>9</sup>

By contrast, Professor John A. Silver saw the war as anything but inevitable, and placed the blame for the war squarely on Germany, claiming that:

The European war seemed to us like a bolt from the blue. Other storm clouds threatening the peace of Europe had blown away: it seemed to us that future storms would be averted.<sup>10</sup>

Though this type of accusation most likely angered Chancellor Day and other German sympathizers in the faculty, neither Day nor any authority figure quelled such opinions, illustrating for the first time the non-regulatory policy of Day’s administration throughout the war.

While the campus was still very much unified in its stance against the war itself, the issue of military preparedness soon spread throughout the country and invaded many college campuses. The argument over whether preparedness was necessary, as well as which side of the conflict the U.S. should support, circulated throughout the nation and caused major rumblings in many academic environments. Syracuse University was certainly one of these environments, as strong protests and demands for a program for military preparedness on campus emerged. Being bitterly opposed to any type of U.S. intervention, Day chose to ignore the outcry. By ignoring these opinions rather than speaking out against them, Day encouraged free speech on campus, subtly voicing his own opinion and quietly pledging his support for those who sympathized with the Germans and those who were against any form of conflict.

The emergence of an increased number of German U-Boats off the east coast in 1916, prompted another outbreak of protest for preparedness on campus. Sparked by an editorial in *The Daily Orange*, which demanded the end of isolationism and the immediate initiation of military training at Syracuse, the protest was supported by the majority of the students and faculty at SU, including many of Day’s own staff.

---

<sup>7</sup> “Dr. Mez Gives First of Series of Peace Lectures”, DO, February 2, 1915

<sup>8</sup> “Dr. Mez’s Campaign Culminates in the Formation of International Polity Club”. DO, February 6, 1915.

<sup>9</sup> “War Was Inevitable Declares Prof. Flick”, DO, May 2, 1915.

<sup>10</sup> “Says Germany is Cause of Conflict”, DO, May 5, 1915.

The ideals behind this interventional movement stemmed from the application of Progressive Era beliefs to the broader world stage. The students and faculty felt that it was their responsibility, as Woodrow Wilson would later say, to “make the world safe for democracy.” This very idea was accepted by an increasingly large number of faculty members, led by Dr. Flick, who had earlier declared that the Germans were the enemy. Flick believed that the war was truly a world-wide affair and that it was the responsibility of the United States to intervene on the Allied side. He demonstrated these views when he lectured that, “We must forget isolationism and meet square on world responsibilities and duties.”<sup>11</sup>

This type of faculty support encouraged the students to become involved in the preparedness movement, and student protests and rallies were held. The students further engaged in the war effort when they held a massive fund raiser to supply money for the preparedness program. Their fund raising attempt, however, was thwarted, as Chancellor Day stepped in and forbid the collection of money for the war. His reasons for shutting down the fund raiser are debatable. Though some may point to his adverse stance against the initiation of military preparedness or his German sympathizing tendencies, the main reason for the shutdown of the fund raiser was the economic ramifications that such an act would have had on the university. Prior to this event, Day had considerable economic concerns about the university, specifically in the amount of scholarship money available. Acting on this concern, Day felt that the school could literally not afford to lose any more money.

As would be expected, Day’s termination of the fundraiser sparked even more students to protest for military preparedness on campus, as voices from all over the university demanded a change in policy. In an effort to quell these protests, Chancellor Day gave a speech on the topic, attempting to calm the protesting students and faculty by exhibiting his full confidence in the safety of the United States. Though he acknowledged the need for a means to defend the country through national defense, he strongly stated that this type of militarization was unjust at the present time:

It is consummate nonsense, the thought of Germany attacking us. The idea is being spread by politicians. Military education in the colleges is one part of preparedness. A Christian country must prepare for any attack that is going to be made, but it must not go into hysteria over an imaginary attack by an emaciated country not a foe.<sup>12</sup>

Though his opinion was in the minority, Day was far from alone and was supported by a number of faculty members. For example, Professor Frederick W. Roman, the head of the Economics Department, was vehemently against not only preparedness, but against the war itself. Roman theorized that military propagandists were “Selfish Capitalists,” whose principle goal was to make money. Instead of becoming a militarized nation, he believed that there were greater problems at home that needed to be addressed:

We do not need increased armament and augmented army and navy half as much as we do an improvement of the internal conditions of the country...We have great national problems such as those of poverty, crime, insanity and disease, the solution of which is of more immediate importance than military preparation.<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> Galpin, *Syracuse University Volume II; The Growing Years*, p. 376.

<sup>12</sup> “Chancellor Day Speaks on Preparedness Issue”, *DO*, February 21, 1916.

<sup>13</sup> “‘Increased Armament Not Needed’, Says Professor Fredrick Roman Discussing Preparedness Situation”, *DO*, February 15, 1916.

Professor Roman's stance, which was congruent with Days', is that of a progressive reformer whose focus is geared more toward changing American society at home than changing the world abroad. In addition, Day arranged a series of lectures by intellectual figures outside of the university who spoke out against preparedness. One of the most prominent was world famous internationalist Norman Angell, who spoke on campus on February 23, 1916.<sup>14</sup> In his lecture, Angell stated that though preparedness may be needed in the future, a rush to do so would cause the nation to neglect its other foreign policies. These included:

The rights of trade; immigration residence which we intend to grant foreigners...the rights which we demand for our own citizens on land, as in Mexico, or the high seas as in the conflict with Germany and England.<sup>15</sup>

Thus, Angell, like Day, recognized that though military preparedness may be needed in the future, there were more important policies which called for attention at home. Though Angell and Day differed somewhat on the importance of America's foreign policy, Angell provided backing for Day's stance on the need of preparedness.

Though protests for preparedness continued, Day continued to strengthen the peace movement on campus. He did so by inviting Hamilton Holt, a well known writer on the subject of world peace, to speak on campus.<sup>16</sup> Holt's first lecture was so successful that Day brought him back to lecture in late April. In this lecture, Holt stated the value of peace and the price of militarism. He asked the students to look around the world at highly militarized nations and evaluate their current status, demonstrating his point by repeatedly asking, "Do warlike nations inhabit the earth?" He then proposed his theory that the nations currently at war were the most militaristic, while the United States and Canada were the least militaristic; pointing out that the U.S. was a nation of peace and prosperity due to the lack of a militant run society.<sup>17</sup> Once again, Chancellor Day, who was desperate for support, had his opinions of the war affirmed by experts and world renowned scholars.

Despite Day's best efforts, in early 1917, strong protest arose for the implementation of military training on campus after a student run newspaper had circulated a leaflet which asked students to initiate a money drive for military preparedness. These protests were even stronger than in the previous year, and were supported by Dean Howe and Dean Walker, who were both men of significant influence at the university. Later in the year, when President Wilson broke off all contacts with Germany, the rebellion reached a boiling point. Students on campus immediately organized programs for the support of U.S. intervention in the war, exemplified by events such as "Preparedness Balls" and other fund raisers. At this point, it became clear that the supreme need on campus was the immediate initiation of a military program to train and equip troops for the war effort.<sup>18</sup>

But Day stuck to his plan and further ignored the outcries from the students and faculty. Though he did not implement military preparedness on campus, he never reprimanded the protesters. This policy of non-action by Day is surprising due to the extremely radical nature of many of the protests. For example, the students created their own Rifle Club and spread flyers around campus which declared that Syracuse was the last large eastern university in the entire country that had not yet implemented military training on campus. The students further stated their defiance and exhibited their patriotism by

<sup>14</sup> "Norman Angell to talk on America's Foreign Policy", *DO*, February 11, 1916.

<sup>15</sup> "Advocates Clearly Defined Foreign Policy to Prevent Fear of Aggressiveness", *DO*, February 24, 1916.

<sup>16</sup> "Advocate of World Peace to Speak at Eight Tonight", *DO*, March 1, 1916.

<sup>17</sup> "United States is Among Countries Least Militaristic", *DO*, April 16, 1916.

<sup>18</sup> Galpin, *Syracuse University Volume II; The Growing Years*, p. 376.

declaring that they were ready to start their own form of military training off campus if the school continued to refuse their request for immediate action.

Finally, the students made their views official at a meeting of the Senior Council where they drafted a declaration demanding the immediate initiation of military preparedness on campus. In addition, the document contained detailed plans of how the military training would be organized along with the signatures of thousands of students from the university. The agenda and goal of the document was summarized in detail by the *Daily Orange* the following day:

Preliminary discussion brought out the fact that it is probable the plan will include a proposal to make military training an alternative to the present Gymnasium workout required of all students. The other problems of obtaining a leader, the appointment of officers, the uniforming and equipping of the corps, and the definite organization will be worked out by the committee after consultation with officers of the regular army stationed at Syracuse.<sup>19</sup>

It was now clear that the vast majority of Syracuse University was in favor of entering the war. The students showed no signs of ceasing their outcry until the campus was a working military training facility. Yet, even in the face of this direct defiance of his authority, Day remained silent and repeatedly demanded that the faculty and the university police allowed the protests to continue.

On April, 2 1917, when Woodrow Wilson and the United States declared war on Germany, Chancellor Day was finally forced to submit to the masses, and a program for military training was initiated on the campus of Syracuse University at an assembly which drew nearly 12,000 students. Chancellor Day defended his previous stance on the implementation of a preparedness movement on campus stating that he “had not deemed it advisable for the university to declare war before Congress.”<sup>20</sup> Despite this attempt at humor, Day realized that the school was in danger due to the economic strain which would come with a reduction in enrollment because of the war.

However, beyond this concern, Day seemed to suddenly change from someone who was strongly against U.S. intervention in the war against Germany, to someone who was bursting with a sense of nationalism and patriotism. He preached about the support of Wilson’s and America’s values, and even wrote a large magazine article which was published in *The Syracusean* on May 1, 1918 in which he talked about the war. In the article, Chancellor Day expressed his very passionate and very progressive ideas on the war against Germany itself, but also touched on more abstract topics such as women’s rights, prohibition, and God. He wrote, “The length of the war is not on our calendars. It is in the defeat of our foe, of the world’s foe. When will the war close? When Germany is whipped out of all semblance of militarism into Christian democracy! Not until then!”<sup>21</sup> He then expressed his sheer hatred for the Germans and their society due to the murder of women and children and pledged his allegiance to President Wilson. He seemed to reach an enraged state in the final few paragraphs where he ridiculed all aspects of German life, stating that:

The name of German Kultur, German Civilization, have become a byword and a stench in the earth, --- effete, decayed, rotted. They are an offense and a menace to the earth and should be removed absolutely and forever. There should be a century of disinfection

<sup>19</sup> “Senior Council to Suggest Plan for Military Training”, *DO*, September 25, 1917.

<sup>20</sup> Galpin, *Syracuse University Volume II; The Growing Years*, p. 378.

<sup>21</sup> “The State of the Country”, *Syracusen*, p. 12, May 1, 1918.

before an American student enters a German university...The time of conquest of territory, of the absorption of weaker peoples by war has passed and must not be permitted to return...Germany has reaped her materialistic philosophy and is being destroyed by it...we are now in it to preserve human rights throughout the world and we must see this through to the last man and the last dollar. Militarism must be removed from the earth and the freedom of all men everywhere to pursue the peaceful pursuits of life must be given to all mankind...The name of Christ would rebuke the Kaiser's mode of warfare.<sup>22</sup>

In the last few paragraphs, Day expressed his progressive ideals for both home and abroad when he talked about the need to raise the status of citizenship for women in America, asking all the readers to join him and "Hail the coming of women to her inalienable estate". Strangely enough, Day seemed to want to express another one of his progressive stances when he somehow made the transition from war to prohibition and the selfish squander of grain that should be used for the war effort.

Thus, though the article touched on many different issues, it boldly demonstrated the extremity of Day's progressive values and his strict belief in the rights and the freedom of man. He furthered these views when he proclaimed that the First World War would be the last of all wars, and declared that all types of militarism would no longer be acceptable in the post-war era of reform and peace.

The article also demonstrates the extreme change of direction in Day's view of the war. Once a German sympathizer, he now viewed all aspects of German life as unacceptable and appalling. His complete turn-around after the declaration of war demonstrates that while Day had his own opinions on certain affairs, when it came to the defense of his country, he was purely patriotic. Though it may seem odd that a man of such strong progressive opinion repeatedly chose to reject the process of preparedness on campus, Day never wavered from his take on the war being wrong. Instead, he attempted to avoid the chaotic breakdown of his institution and thus the breakdown of the many progressive reforms on campus which had begun with his inception as chancellor in 1894. Despite this attempt, once the U.S. entered the war, Day was as patriotic as the next man.

Thus, it must be made clear that Day's refusal to allow military preparedness on campus was not due to a lack of love for his country. Rather, it was done because he loved his country so much that he wanted to see it continue to grow without the interruption of a World War to stand in its way. Perhaps the best example of Day's patriotism was his constant upholding of the rights of free speech by not regulating any of the protests during the war.

Although it took Day until 1917 to show the ideals of nationalism and progressivism, he made sure to emphasize that he held no place in his heart for any teacher or student who voiced their support of the Germans or refused to fight in the war. He even stated that, "If there is any man on faculty who goes around the campus chattering about Germany, let him go where he can fight for Germany."<sup>23</sup> Though some small anti-war sentiment existed on campus, no records of it exist, and the closest thing to documentation on the subject come from two cases where draft dodgers were found on campus and disciplined by police.

The first such instance occurred in early September 1918, and involved a 20 year old Russian student who was working in a cafeteria in Sims Hall when he was captured and accused of draft

<sup>22</sup> "The State of the Country", *Syracusan*, p. 29, May 1, 1918.

<sup>23</sup> Galpin, *Syracuse University Volume II; The Growing Years*, p. 379.

dodging. The report of the incident appeared in the *Syracuse Herald* on September 4, 1918. In the article, the suspect, identified as Felix Jegorski, said that he would refuse to fight after being told of the new military draft. The man who reported him, fellow cook Joseph Morrison, claimed that Jegorski said, "I will go West or to Mexico, I won't fight. To hell with the law. To hell with the government, they can't make me fight."<sup>24</sup> Jegorski was placed into custody by the U.S. government, and was tried as a draft dodger.

Though in previous years Chancellor Day may have supported this voice which sought peace rather than conflict in the world, now that his nation was at war and the campus was directly involved in the war effort, he was a changed man. In the case of Jegorski, the university only acted on a federal law which stated that draft dodging was illegal. In fact, it was the FBI who headed the investigation of the Syracuse draftee.

That being said, Day often encouraged all those who were part of the war effort, and even gave speeches about the just cause of the war. He refused to tolerate anyone who spoke out against U.S. involvement in the war, believing that this type of view devalued the millions of lives which were being interrupted by the war. In addition, Day seems to have realized that while the war may have caused progressivism at home to struggle, similar progressive ideals would be essential to reshape Europe.

In the following weeks and months, the campus on the Hill was quickly transformed into a military training facility. All buildings were handed over to the War Department, and a Special Committee was formed by the Trustees to oversee the progress of the transformation from education facility to American Army center. The support for this militarization of the campus was widely popular and both the students and faculty tried their best to help the war cause. Class discussions on campus turned sharply toward the examination of the war as demonstrated by a quote from an article which was featured in the *Syracuse Post Standard* on July 9, 1918:

The aim of the war, the conditions of the war and plans for the period following the war will be the subject of daily lectures for members of Syracuse University training camp... Geography of countries engaged in the struggle and customs of their nation will be explained by faculty members of the university who have visited the countries.<sup>25</sup>

There were also volunteer organizations, such as the Y.M.C.A., which held events and functions for those stationed on campus. The unity created by these programs yielded a very communal feeling on campus, as everyone seemed to have a part in the betterment of the world. This cooperation was certainly appreciated by the military, as demonstrated by this quote from Capt. H. D. Push, who, after being asked to comment on the role of the Y.M.C.A, replied that, "Too much cannot be said in praise of what the Y.M.C.A is doing for our boys."<sup>26</sup>

All in all, the school received 1000 men by Armistice Day, and 2000 men who came through the training program at Syracuse University served in combat. The 81 students and alumni who died in the war were honored on campus, and letters and reports from students fighting in Europe covered both student and citywide newspapers and magazines.<sup>27</sup>

---

<sup>24</sup> "Russian Defies Federal Draft Law", *Syracuse Herald*, September 4, 1918.

<sup>25</sup> "Lectures on War Topics for Training Camp Men", *Syracuse Post Standard*, July 9, 1918

<sup>26</sup> "Movie Staged on Hill for Benefit of Soldiers", *Syracuse Journal*, July 10, 1918.

<sup>27</sup> Galpin, *Syracuse University Volume II; The Growing Years*, p. 385.

Thus, the main point to take away from this is that the campus was not at all militarized until the spring of 1917 at the American intervention in the war. Once this military preparedness was finally advocated by Chancellor Day the campus erupted in a patriotic fever that had been brewing for nearly four years. Despite the anti-war talk of years past and the outcry from students and faculty alike at Day's refusal to allow military training on campus, the campus community remained unified and the administration remained stable. The same, however, can not be said of Columbia University under the watch of ultra-progressive president Nicolas Murray Butler.

When Nicolas Murray Butler took over as President of Columbia University in 1902, he immediately made known his strongly progressive views when he labeled his goals for the school expansion and evolution. In his inaugural address, he further emphasized these goals when he stated that, "Great personalities must be left free to grow and express themselves, each in his own way, if they are to reach a maximum efficiency."<sup>28</sup>

In order to achieve the goal of efficiency, Butler proposed major changes in the administration of the university; the most important being the termination of all administrative powers of the professorial class and the creation of the Board of Trustees whose only function was to oversee administrative matters in the university. He believed that this would allow professors to further focus on their educational duties rather than waste their time on what he saw as boring administrative paperwork. He even went as far to say that a professor "wishes to be let alone with his own students in order that he may best serve the purpose for which he has become a member of the University."<sup>29</sup>

Butler believed that the modern era of higher education, with larger enrollments than ever before, called for a more systematic method of administration. This change in the fundamental structure of the faculty's role in administration was the start of a series of centralist reforms which created individual realms of responsibility for administration and included the creation of Provost's and the reinstatement of Deans.

Despite other amiable, highly progressive reforms during the first years of his Presidency, such as the teaching of natural science and research, the development of a social life on campus by placing students in the same college students in their own dormitories, an expanded course catalog, and the exploration of an international exchange program, Nicolas Butler created substantial anger and resentment among the professors for his autocratic methods of administration.<sup>30</sup>

Labeling himself as a "new conservative", Butler embraced individuality in institutional development, yet rejected individualistic behavior seen to be detrimental to the university, and responded to such radicalism in a swift and firm matter. When dealing with professors, he decided rather than bargained, informed rather than consulted. He refuted any criticism that stood in the way of the development of the institution and rejected any nonconformist or radical thinking from the faculty. He deemed that while freedom of expression was valued, it would only be tolerated within certain limits, and instead preached the universal goal of making Columbia University, "A national and international powerhouse of scholarship and service."<sup>31</sup>

---

<sup>28</sup> "Scholarship and Service", *Columbiana Collection*, Columbia University, April 19, 1902.

<sup>29</sup> Columbia University, *Annual Reports of the President and Treasurer to the Trustees* (New York: For the University, 1910), p. 48.

<sup>30</sup> William Summerscales, *Affirmation and Dissent: Columbia's Response to the Crisis of World War I* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1970), p. 30.

<sup>31</sup> Summerscales, *Affirmation and Dissent: Columbia's Response to the Crisis of WWI*, p. 31.

In such instances, where Butler saw the faculty as becoming too radical so as to compromise the integrity of the institution, the accused professors were simply dismissed. Some of the most notable victims of such discipline prior to the war were Harry Thurston Peck, George E. Woodberry, and Edward MacDowell, all of whom were nationally renowned scholars in their respective fields. All three men were dismissed as a direct result of their differences with Butler and for speaking out against his opinions. While Peck's downfall had been one "predominantly of personal temperament, Woodberry's had been the direct result of Butler's administrative interference, and MacDowell's was more a mixture of the two."<sup>32</sup> Though this type of dismissal hurt the school academically, Butler believed that the action paled in comparison to placing the integrity of the university in jeopardy. This precise type of centralist yet progressive form of rule created issues of morality and radicalism within the faculty while it propelled Columbia toward the label of the greatest institution in the world. Despite this rise in status, many members of the faculty saw Butler's goals for the university as unattainable and unreasonable. His behavior was often viewed as similar to that of the president of a corporation who was ruthless in his quest for supremacy.

The most glaring disturbance from his faculty began in 1910 and involved a Professor of Psychology named James Mckeen Cattell. Professor Cattell was a well known psychologist who took great interest in the affairs of the academic government. A progressive in his own right, Cattell believed that it was the institution's responsibility "to conserve the traditions of the past and guide the progress of the future."<sup>33</sup> Though he believed in keeping some of the age old traditions at the university, he was also an avid reformer who had little concern for his own well being. As he said, "A reformer should be concerned with accomplishing his ends rather than conserving his dignity."<sup>34</sup> As it happened, this statement was eventually accurate in his personal case, as he was dismissed by the university on October 1, 1917. The terms of this dismissal are important in understanding the dominant factor which led to the uprisings at Columbia University during the First World War.

After the aforementioned changes to the structure of the university's administration, in 1910 Professor Cattell began to act as the voice of the faculty, complaining about a variety of issues. Not surprisingly, these complaints included his disapproval of the changes in administration made by Butler. He even went as far as making the claim that the trustees were unfit to represent academia, and warned of the "autocratic usurpations" which would occur due to the changes.<sup>35</sup>

Cattell, instead, suggested a tripartite system of administration which combined the faculty, the alumni, and the surrounding community. In a bitter statement, Cattell warned of the demoralizing effect Butler's administrative reforms would have on the faculty:

I object even more to the irresponsibility of the university president than to his excessive powers. The demoralization that the president works in the university is not limited to his own office; it has given us the department-store system, the existing exhibit of sub-bosses, deans, heads of departments, presidential committees...all subject to him and dependent upon his favor.<sup>36</sup>

---

<sup>32</sup> Laurence R. Veysey, *The Emergence of the American University* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1965), pp 426-428.

<sup>33</sup> J. McKeen Cattell, *University Control* (New York: The Science Press, 1913), pp. v-vi.

<sup>34</sup> J. McKeen Cattell, *University Control* (New York: The Science Press, 1913), pp. v-vi.

<sup>35</sup> Summerscales, *Affirmation and Dissent: Columbia's Response to the Crisis of WWI*, p. 77.

<sup>36</sup> Summerscales, *Affirmation and Dissent: Columbia's Response to the Crisis of WWI*, p. 77.

Nicolas Murray Butler's response to this claim by Cattell was one of anger, as he called Cattell's statements "a curious perversion of the facts."<sup>37</sup> Later that year, Cattell circulated a memo to the faculty in which he expressed his opinion that the university was deteriorating due to low faculty salaries, increased administrative control, and the subversion of academic freedom through a "bureaucratic system by which nearly everything is done by the president with or without consultation with his subordinated deans and heads of departments."<sup>38</sup> In addition, Cattell voiced his opinion that the number of professors in the Academy of Science paled in comparison to those employed at the other prestigious institutions around the country.

This particular complaint exhibits once more Cattell's progressive agenda, but more importantly, his effort to make Columbia University the greatest institution in the country. It is perhaps not a coincidence that Butler and Cattell both yearned for a better Columbia, as they both saw the Progressive Era as a time where change and the renewal of traditional values were two very prominent themes in society. The fact that these men saw two different ways of orchestrating this expansion was the main reason for their contempt for each other.

After receiving Cattell's memo, an angered Butler gathered the support of the trustees, as well as several faculty members. He then asked one of the trustees, a man named Francis S. Bangs, what he should do about the radical preaching of Cattell. Bangs replied to Butler, advising him to dismiss him immediately, theorizing that the act would be of no great importance saying that, "We have lost so many men of eminence that I don't believe a total loss of him will hurt us now."<sup>39</sup>

The problem Butler faced was that though many members of the faculty saw Cattell as overly rebellious, his support was strong within the professorial class. One such supporter, a prominent member in both the faculty and the administration, was Dean Keppel. Keppel evaluated Cattell's popularity when he wrote that:

Cattell's brilliant editorship of *Science* and the *Popular Science Monthly*, even when he uses them to tell us of our sins of omission and commission as a university, and possibly because of this use, endears him to us all. He himself is a living proof that we have some academic freedom at any rate".<sup>40</sup>

So, instead of taking the advice of Bangs and further alienating the faculty, Butler threatened Cattell by sending him a letter of warning in an attempt to let the situation disappear. Unfortunately for Butler, the confrontation did not vanish as he had hoped, and would soon come back to serve as the dominating issue at the university in the years to come.

As time went on, it became evident that Butler's autocratic centralist system and Cattell's rebellious communal ideology could no longer co-exist at the university. And, since Butler's agenda called for constant evolution and expansion, the Cattell problem needed to be dealt with once and for all. The simplest way for Butler to accomplish this was firing Cattell with the support of the trustees, which he did on May 9, 1913.

Yet Butler and the trustees underestimated the support Cattell had within the faculty. Numerous faculty members spoke out against the decision by the administration, including both professors and

<sup>37</sup> Columbia University Archives through 1910 (J. McKeen Cattell folder), Butler to Cattell, January 5, 1910, pp. 1-4.

<sup>38</sup> Archives through 1910 (J. McKeen Cattell folder), Butler to Cattell, January 5, 1910, pp. 1-4.

<sup>39</sup> Columbia University Archives, 1910-1918 (F.S. Bangs folder) Bangs to Butler, December 3, 1910.

<sup>40</sup> Frederick P. Keppel, *Columbia* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1914), p. 159-160

Deans. For example, Frederick J. E. Woodbridge, Dean of the Graduate Facilities, wrote to Butler that if the resolution to dismiss Cattell was adopted, it would, “operate to the serious disadvantage of the scientific prestige of the University and would be regarded by the Graduate Facilities as very unfortunate.”<sup>41</sup>

What was even more important was the outcry which was directed at the lack of free speech at the university due to the treatment of Cattell. For the first time in the recorded history of Columbia University, professors and other faculty members claimed that their right to freedom of speech, as dictated in The Bill of Rights, was being suppressed by the university. Professor Pupin, of the Physics department voiced his opinion on the matter bluntly and directly to Butler when he wrote that, “Cattell’s involuntary retirement at this present time might be constructed as due to Columbia’s narrowness of academic views and intolerance.”<sup>42</sup>

The support of Cattell by the faculty was widespread and could not be ignored by Butler. Due to this protest, he was forced to withdraw the proposal to fire Cattell on May 21, 1913. This division between the faculty and the trustees, specifically between Cattell and Butler, would remain evident for the next four years. Though physical evidence of this feud for the years 1913-1916 are unknown, the issue certainly circulated back into the main stream in 1917, when the U.S. was seemingly on the brink of entering the war and free speech was at its most restrained state.

On January 10, 1917, Cattell submitted a memo at a faculty meeting which expressed his strong anti-war views and asked for the faculty’s support for a bill being drafted in Congress which would prevent the army from sending unwilling draftees to fight in Europe. Though the faculty had supported Cattell’s progressive views in the past, this radical proposal was too much for many members of the faculty. Due to this, they wrote a collective letter to Cattell which informed him that, “We do not share the sentiments of the memorandum and that we regard with entire disapproval the terms in which it is expressed.”<sup>43</sup> A copy of the letter was sent to Butler who was instructed to ignore it by taking “no official notice of the incident.”<sup>44</sup>

But instead of doing so, Butler displayed the letter to the trustees, and had Cattell, along with fellow anti-war activist Professor Dana, dismissed from the university. However, the type of anti-war propaganda displayed by Cattell’s memo had been apparent on campus since the start of the war. One of the first public displays of what the trustees would later call “unpatriotic dissent”, appeared as an editorial printed in *The New York Times* on February 9, 1917. The editorial, written by Columbia University Professor Charles Edward Russell, expressed that:

The present situation, so far as the United States is concerned, is due only to the injustice of our one-sided enforcement of those International laws that have been violated by Germany. Since we have taken a radical stand against Germany, only one just course is conceivable; the insistence on the immediate lifting by Great Britain of the illegal blockade of neutral countries. If this demand had been insisted upon at an earlier time, there would be no crisis.<sup>45</sup>

---

<sup>41</sup> Archives, 1910 through 1918 (J McKeen Cattell folder), Woodbridge to Butler, May 13, 1913.

<sup>42</sup> Archives, 1910 through 1918 (J McKeen Cattell folder), Pupin to Butler, May 13, 1913.

<sup>43</sup> Archives, 1910 through 1918 (J McKeen folder), Shotwell, Dewey, Keppel, Robinson, et al. to Cattell, March 3 1917.

<sup>44</sup> Archives, 1910 through 1918 (J McKeen folder), Seligman to Butler, March 3, 1917.

<sup>45</sup> “Professor Boas Dissent”, *New York Times*, February 9, 1917.

Thus, Russell was not only speaking as a pacifist, but was also defending Germany while denouncing the decisions of President Wilson and the justification of the Allied cause. Less than a week later, there was more upheaval involving the war on campus when approximately 300 students held a mass meeting to support the highly protested scheduled appearance of Russian theologian, Count Tolstoy, who was to speak on campus the following night. The meeting sought to protect the right to freedom of speech and backed highly ridiculed Professor Prince, who had organized the appearance.<sup>46</sup> Though the protest was peaceful, it served to demonstrate that the campus was still distinctly divided on the issues surrounding the war, and that students and faculty alike had grown tired of the increased intervention by the university in curtailing free speech. In response to this explosion of anti-war protest, the trustees saw the need to establish a deafening blow to all anti-war sentiment, as well as all forms of rebellion from both the students and faculty.

Though Butler had been strongly against military preparedness on campus in prior years, after the German declaration of continued unrestricted submarine warfare in February 1917, he seemed to have become increasingly patriotic. This newfound sense of patriotism in Butler was observed by the trustees, many of whom had wished for U.S. intervention on the allied side for many years. They took advantage of Butler's shift by publishing a statement which sought to curtail the teaching or speaking of ideals which were subversive to the U.S. government. The statement, which appeared in the *New York Herald* on March 6, 1917, was as follows:

Resolved, that the Chairman and clerk of the Trustees, the Chairman of the Committees on Education, Finance, and Legal Affairs, the President of the University be appointed a Special Committee to inquire and ascertain whether doctrines which are subversive of, or tend to the violation or disregard of the Constitution or laws of the United States or of the State of New York or which tend to encourage a spirit of disloyalty to the Government of the United States, or the principles on which it is founded, are taught or disseminated by officers of the University; and, generally to inquire into the state of teaching in the University; such special committee to report its findings and recommendations to the Trustee as soon as convenient...Resolved, that unqualified loyalty to the Government of the United States be required of all students, officers of administration and officers of instruction in the university as a condition of retaining their connection with the University, and that the President have authority to exercise disciplinary powers of the University to carry this resolution into effect.<sup>47</sup>

In effect, the document gave Butler and the trustees sweeping authoritative disciplinary powers and provided them with a direct tool to avoid the type of dissent which was promoted by Cattell. The resolution took all rights of freedom of speech away from the students and faculty. What is more, the trustees had this act passed directly after the Zimmerman Telegraph was intercepted and as the United States was on the brink of war. By doing so, the trustees took advantage of the popular sentiment of patriotism and exercised their power in a way that prevented any further dissent on campus and established the university in the national light as a devotedly patriotic institution.

Yet, there remained a problem on campus which resulted from this form of patriotic censorship. It was the same problem which had divided the faculty from the trustees when the war broke out in 1914; the fact that a far greater percentage of the faculty was amiable toward Germany and German culture. Though one of the reasons for this was the fact that some professors were of German blood, the

---

<sup>46</sup> "Students Protest Tolstoy Muzzling", *NYT*, February 15, 1917.

<sup>47</sup> Columbia University, University Council Minutes (October 1915 to April 1921), p. 896, meeting of March 14, 1917.

majority had become familiar with German culture while studying at German universities during the earlier parts of their careers. This was largely due to the fact that prior to the opening of Johns Hopkins University, the only university where a student could earn a Ph.D was in Germany.<sup>48</sup> Because of this, the majority of the faculty had ties to Germany rather than England or France. Some professors displayed this support in the prewar years more than others, as Professor Franz Boas participated in the Germanistic Society of Columbia University while John W. Burgess went as far as conducting his lectures in Berlin in German, unlike previous professors.

Thus, the Columbia faculty had sufficiently fewer “Anglophiles” than some of the other major universities in the nation, and more importantly, possessed much less pro-British sentiment than the trustees.<sup>49</sup> This being said, few faculty members at Columbia were inspired to sympathize with the Germans at the outbreak of war in 1914, yet they were also not enthusiastic of immediate American intervention on the side of the Allies.

So when the trustees past the patriotism resolution, the jobs of all those professors who had sided with the German cause or culture were in jeopardy of falling victim to the swift axe of Butler. It should not come as any great surprise then, that two days before the U.S. officially entered the war, Butler forced three German professors to take leaves of absence with half pay, with the understanding that, “any sign of political activity or opposition to the policy of the United States would bring about an immediate separation from the university.”<sup>50</sup> This type of policy was used to regulate free speech, as well as to prohibit any protest of the massive preparedness program which was taking control of the campus.

Though the faculty was divided on the cause of the war, who was to blame, and what the United States’ role should be, in the end Butler had the last say in what forms of opinion were allowed to be voiced. This unilateral policy was displayed when Butler dismissed both Professor Cattell and Professor Dana on October 1, 1917, for spreading documents which were “tending to encourage disloyalty.”<sup>51</sup> Yet these dismissals yielded a new wave of protests on campus which focused on the denial of civil rights by the university administration. These protests occurred after Cattell issued a statement regarding his dismissal on October 4, 1917. Cattell professed the injustice of the actions taken by Butler and pleaded his innocence when he wrote:

It is contrary to academic traditions maintained for six hundred years, to dismiss a university professor on account of his opinions expressed in a proper way to experts in the subject...I am opposed to war and to this war, but I have undertaken no agitation against the Government nor against its conduct of the war. I have written nothing against the draft law or against sending armies to Europe, although I regard both measures as subversive of the national welfare.<sup>52</sup>

Cattell’s outcry against his dismissal by the university brought to light the issue of the freedom of speech which had been significantly curtailed since the March 6 resolution on patriotism. The protest for this cause was strengthened when popular Political Science Professor Charles Beard resigned in

---

<sup>48</sup> Robert A. McCaughey, *Stand, Columbia* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2003), p. 245.

<sup>49</sup> McCaughey, *Stand, Columbia*, p. 246.

<sup>50</sup> Archives, 1910 through 1918, (F.S Bangs Folder), Butler to Bangs, April 5, 1917.

<sup>51</sup> “Columbia Ousts Two Professors, Foes of War Plans”, *NYT*, October 2, 1917.

<sup>52</sup> “Dismissal Illegal, Cattell Declares”, *NYT*, October 4, 1917.

response to the unjustified dismissal of Cattell and Dana. Beard stated his resignation, along with his reasons for departure in an emotional letter to Butler, which declared that:

Having observed closely the inner life at Columbia for many years, I have been driven to the conclusion that the university is really under the control of a small and active group of trustees who have no standing in the world of education...I was among the first to urge the declaration of war by the United States, and I believe that we should now press forward with all our might to a just conclusion. But thousands of my countrymen do not share this view. Their opinions cannot be changed by curses or bludgeons. Arguments addressed to their reason and understanding are our best hope.<sup>53</sup>

In this statement, Beard clearly stated that while he supported the war, it was essential for the opinions and voices of all members of society to be heard in order to understand where opposing arguments came from. He insisted that the foundation of the United States was based around the notion of freedom of speech and opinion. Due to both Beard's opposite stance on the war, as well as his notoriety and popularity as an extremely progressive figure on campus, his resignation caused major uproar from the students and faculty.

One source of this uproar stemmed from rumors which circulated around campus that hinted at a strike and rebellion by the students in response to the resignation of Beard. In the strike, the students supposedly would, "quit their classrooms in a body as a protest to the repressive methods of the Trustees".<sup>54</sup> These rumors circulated via fliers, which were pinned up all over campus and demanded the stoppage of the unlawful regulation of free speech on campus by the trustees. The students also expressed themselves through protest, as on October 10, 1917, nearly 500 students held a rally on the steps of Low Library in defiance of the dismissals of Cattell, Dana, and Beard.<sup>55</sup>

In response to this protest by the students and the published statements made by numerous faculty members, a meeting was scheduled in an effort to restore unity on campus. On October 11, 1917, the Committee of Nine, a panel of both trustees and faculty members which had been created only months before, met to discuss the reasons for the actions taken by the trustees. The facts and evidence against Cattell were laid out, and there was an open discussion centered on the cause of the pronounced division between faculty and trustees.<sup>56</sup> But the wounds inflicted by the dismissals were too deep, as neither Cattell nor Beard returned to the university, and the divisions between the faculty and administration grew larger as the war raged on.

In the following weeks, the implementation of military preparedness on campus increased and Columbia was soon engulfed by the war. But even though Columbia's contribution of both men and supplies to the war was significant, the controversy involving the suppression of free speech and the effects of the firing of professors Cattell, Dana, and Beard, lasted long after the war ended in 1918.

So, as we can see, the repercussions of the progressive reforms brought to the university by President Butler created major divisions between members of the faculty and administration. The newly appointed Board of Trustees served to implement Butler's agenda and created a newfound separation of the faculty and the administration. The tension instigated by these reforms created a distinct division between the faculty and the trustees in the years prior to the war.

<sup>53</sup> "Quits Columbia; Assails Trustees", *NYT*, October 9, 1917.

<sup>54</sup> "To Sue Columbia, Cattell's Threat", *NYT*, October 10, 1917.

<sup>55</sup> Summerscales, *Affirmation and Dissent: Columbia's Response to the Crisis of WWI*, p. 62.

<sup>56</sup> "Committee of Nine for Columbia Peace", *NYT*, October 11, 1917.

These divisions intensified further when Butler used his newly created Board of Trustees to discipline Professor Cattell. This example of the suppression of any threat to his power would serve as a benchmark for Butler wartime administration. When U.S. intervention in the war was imminent, differing opinions on campus sparked Butler to issue the trustees enough power to control and suppress any unwanted opinion or protest. It was this suppression of free speech which caused the campus to erupt in 1917 over the dismissal of several faculty members due to their opinions on the war.

In conclusion, when both President Butler and Chancellor Day took leadership positions at their aforementioned institutions, they each had visions of grandeur. Strongly progressive, both men yearned for the development and elevation of their institutions through reform and evolution. Yet when WWI broke out in Europe in 1914, both Butler and Day were forced to address internal conflicts which stemmed from the events taking place overseas. The two conflicts, both of which pitted each man's own personal ideals against the opinions of their faculty and students, stood as a threat to divide each campus.

When comparing the leadership qualities of Butler and Day, it is clear that while both men struggled to cope with the massive reactions to the war in Europe, each attempted to avoid conflict in different ways. While Butler used his position of power to quell those voices which were unlike his own in an effort to create unity on campus, Day made certain that he never abused his position of power to discipline or reprimand opinions which differed from his own, and thus created a melting pot of opinions. A great testament to this was the fact that for the majority of the war, Day's view on the issue of military preparedness was completely opposite than that of the majority of students. Despite this, Day chose not to act with the type of disciplinary bias displayed by Butler and the trustees at Columbia. Though he acknowledged his disagreement with the arguments, he never once stopped a protest or ridiculed protesters because of their opinion.

Perhaps this was a tribute to Day's progressive attitudes toward personal freedoms and his deeply ground patriotism. Though he may have failed in his battle to prevent the initiation of military preparedness at Syracuse, Day succeeded in maintaining unity despite the differing of opinions. By never using his power to moderate the many differing voices on campus like Butler, Day allowed opinions of the war to be discussed freely and without regulation. Because of this, the inflammatory issue of free speech never once crept into the wartime spectrum at Syracuse University, whereas it virtually engulfed the campus of Columbia. By achieving peace and unity on campus despite chaotic circumstances, Day succeeded where Nicolas Murray Butler failed, and proved that the tumultuous events at Columbia did not engulf all major universities. Though Butler established utilitarian rule over Columbia, his contrite dealings with professors, as well as his lack of tolerance for conflicting views created tension and eventually crisis at Columbia. On the other hand, Day's direction over Syracuse University with a steady hand and an open mind, guided Syracuse peacefully through one of the most controversial periods in U.S. history.

References

Books

Cattell, J. McKeen. *University Control*. New York: The Science Press, 1913.

Columbia University. *Annual Reports of the President and Treasurer to the Trustees*. New York: For the University, 1910.

Galpin, Freeman. *Syracuse University II; The Growing Years*. New York: Syracuse University Press, 1960

Keppel, Frederick P. *Columbia*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1914.

McCaughey, Robert A. *Stand, Columbia*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2003.

Summerscales, William. *Affirmation and Dissent: Columbia's Response to the Crisis of World War I*. New York: Teachers College Press, 1970.

Veysey, Laurence R. *The Emergence of the American University*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1965.

Newspapers

"Scholarship and Service." *Columbiana Collection*, Columbia University, 19 April. 1902.

"European War Discussed by Cosmopolitans." *Daily Orange* 13 October. 1914.

"Professor Sperry Gives Lecture on War Situation." *Daily Orange* 11 November. 1914.

"Dr. Mez Gives First of Series of Peace Lectures." *Daily Orange* 2 February. 1915.

"Dr. Mez's Campaign Culminates in the Formation of International Polity Club." *Daily Orange* 6 February. 1915.

"War Was Inevitable Declares Prof. Flick." *Daily Orange* 2 May. 1915.

"Says Germany is Cause of Conflict." *Daily Orange* 5 May. 1915.

"Chancellor Day Speaks on Preparedness Issue." *Daily Orange* 21 February. 1916.

"'Increased Armament Not Needed', Says Professor Fredrick Roman Discussing Preparedness Situation." *Daily Orange* 15 February. 1916.

"Norman Angell to talk on America's Foreign Policy." *Daily Orange* 11 February. 1916.

"Advocates Clearly Defined Foreign Policy to Prevent Fear of Aggressiveness." *Daily Orange* 24 February. 1916.

- “Advocate of World Peace to Speak at Eight Tonight.” *Daily Orange* 1 March. 1916.
- “United States is Among Countries Least Militaristic.” *Daily Orange* 16 April. 1916.
- “Senior Council to Suggest Plan for Military Training.” *Daily Orange* 25 September. 1917.
- “Professor Boas Dissent.” *New York Times* 9 February. 1917.
- “Students Protest Tolstoy Muzzling.” *New York Times* 15 February. 1917.
- “Columbia Ousts Two Professors, Foes of War Plans.” *New York Times* 2 October. 1917.
- “Dismissal Illegal, Cattell Declares.” *New York Times* 4 October. 1917.
- “Quits Columbia; Assails Trustees.” *New York Times* 9 October. 1917.
- “To Sue Columbia, Cattell’s Threat.” *New York Times* 10 October. 1917.
- “Committee of Nine for Columbia Peace.” *New York Times* 11 October. 1917.
- “Russian Defies Federal Draft Law.” *Syracuse Herald* 4 September. 1918.
- “Movie Staged on Hill for Benefit of Soldiers.” *Syracuse Journal* 10 July. 1918.
- “Lectures on War Topics for Training Camp Men.” *Syracuse Post Standard* 9 July. 1918.
- “The State of the Country.” *Syracusan* 1 May. 1918.

#### Archives

- Columbia University, University Council Minutes (October 1915 to April 1921), meeting of 14 March. 1917.
- Columbia University Archives through 1910, (J. McKeen Cattell folder), Butler to Cattell, 5 January. 1910.
- Columbia University Archives, 1910-1918, (F.S. Bangs folder) Bangs to Butler, 3 December. 1910.
- Columbia University Archives, 1910 through 1918, (J McKeen Cattell folder), Woodbridge to Butler, 13 May. 1913.
- Columbia University Archives, 1910 through 1918, (J McKeen Cattell folder), Pupin to Butler, 13 May. 1913.
- Columbia University Archives, 1910 through 1918, (J McKeen folder), Shotwell, Dewey, Keppel, Robinson, et al. to Cattell, 3 March. 1917.

Columbia University Archives, 1910 through 1918, (J McKeen folder), Seligman to Butler, 3 March. 1917.

Columbia University Archives, 1910 through 1918, (F.S Bangs Folder), Butler to Bangs, 5 April. 1917.

Biography:

Andrew Samuels is history major from Belmont, Massachusetts. He is a senior specializing in American history and wrote this paper in the fall semester of the 2004-2005 academic year. The topic of the paper was derived from the general theme of progressivism in his History 401 Senior Seminar class under Professor Andrew Cohen. Next year, Andrew will be working at Brookline High School in Brookline, MA as he hopes to become a history teacher at the high school level in the future.

## STAFF BIOS:

*Cherie Peters* is a senior medieval history major. She is currently a member of Phi Alpha Theta, the National Society of Collegiate Scholars and Golden Key Honor Society. She is also a National Deans List scholar and has recently won the Ketcham Prize from the Syracuse University History Department. The most exciting escapade of her college career was getting lost as a tour guide at Kilkenny Castle, in Ireland. She plans to one day go back, preferably sooner rather than later.

*Corinne Coluccio* is graduating this May with a B.A. in history and a minor in political science. She began her college career as an art major, but after taking a class on the history of modern China she transferred into Arts and Sciences to pursue history. While her focus is in American history, she did not forget her interest in non-western history and decided to study abroad in Hong Kong and Beijing, China. Her experience abroad inspired her to take on a minor in political science. Upon graduation she will start her job at White and Case LLP in New York City as a legal assistant. She will work in the Intellectual Property/Litigation practice area.

*Andrew Jaz* is a senior History major with an emphasis in American history. In addition to his history studies, he has had two and a half years of intensive study in Landscape Architecture which he doubts will be useful again in his life. Nonetheless, his four years at Syracuse have been interesting (to say the least) and he looks forward to carrying his experiences into the working world. Andrew is often regarded as quirky and aloof by his friends, but it is his firm belief that they truly believe him to be a chivalrous intellectual. This summer, Andrew will move to New York City and plans on walking his dog in Central Park and reading the New Yorker like a true New York native. Somewhere along the way, he hopes to begin his career in writing and publishing.

*Phoebe Sanborn* is a senior history major with plans to travel back in time after graduation. Until then, Chronos makes an excellent substitution. Once the details of temporal paradoxes are smoothed out, she will be accepting applications for a "daring sidekick" and "quirky techy" to accompany her on all her adventures. Unless, of course, someone has a better job offer?

*Kelly Bogart* is History major, specializing in Modern European and World War history and a member of the National Society of Collegiate Scholars. Kelly also works full-time for Syracuse University in the Center for Policy Research as an assistant to thirteen of the Center's professors. Unfortunately, none of them are history professors, but she tolerates this deficiency for the time being. She plans to apply to graduate school after graduation in the hopes of one day becoming a history professor herself.

*Nicole Sanford* is a sophomore History/Television, Radio and Film major. She plans on using her experiences on Chronos as a springboard to fame and fortune, so she can retire by 25 and spend the rest of her life producing music videos for obscure European bands. She will miss the seniors a lot, but frankly, they were just getting in her way and now that they're leaving she can finally start to put her plans for domination into action.

*Submissions to Chronos*  
can be dropped off in the  
History Department at  
145 Eggers Hall

[HistoryJournSU@hotmail.com](mailto:HistoryJournSU@hotmail.com)

IF I HAD A DREAM THAT ONE DAY THE SONS OF FORMER SLAVE OWNERS WILL BE ABLE TO SIT DOWN TOGETHER AT THE TABLE OF BROTT

WOULD I MOVE THE WORLD FOR HIMSELF OR FOR THE WORLD? ASK HIMSELF OR FOR THE WORLD? ASK HIMSELF OR FOR THE WORLD? ASK HIMSELF OR FOR THE WORLD?

HER HOOD MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR. RESPECT THE GODS AND THE DEVILS BUT KEEP THEM AT A DISTANCE. CONFUCIUS: WHEN I FOUND HIM, HE HAD CROSSED THE LINE I HAD LOOKED

# CHRONOS

THE SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY UNDERGRADUATE HISTORY JOURNAL

AT MY HANDS TO SEE IT AS THE SAME PERSONS IN THE FUTURE AS SUCH A GLORY OVER EVERYTHING ARRIVED TO MAN I THINK HOW